

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

1973

Alienation as it is manifested nonverbally in focused encounters : a test of Goffman's hypothesis.

Janice. Drakich
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Drakich, Janice., "Alienation as it is manifested nonverbally in focused encounters : a test of Goffman's hypothesis." (1973). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 932.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/932>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

ALIENATION AS IT IS MANIFESTED NONVERBALLY IN FOCUSED
ENCOUNTERS: A TEST OF GOFFMAN'S HYPOTHESIS

by

Janice Drakich

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate
Studies through the Department of
Sociology and Anthropology in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts at
the University of Windsor

Windsor
1973

© JANICE BRAKICH, 1973

533378

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	(i)
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	(iii)
<u>CHAPTER</u>	
I - STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
II - THE CONCEPT OF ALIENATION.....	9
III - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON NON-VERBAL BEHAVIOUR.....	17
IV - HYPOTHESES AND DEFINITION OF TERMS.....	25
V - METHODOLOGY.....	31
VI - RESULTS.....	36
VII - CONCLUSIONS	63
APPENDIX	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	72
VITA AUCTORIS.....	78

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Mean Frequencies of Showing Interest and Show Disinterest for Subjects Rated as Interested and Bored on the Self Rate Measure of Alienation	37
2. Mean Frequencies of Non Verbal Behaviour for All Time Segments According to Self Report Measures	39
3. Frequency of Showing Interest-Showing Disinterest by Time Segment	41
4. T-Test of the Mean Frequencies of Showing Interest-Showing Disinterest by Time Segment	42
5. Mean Frequencies of Showing Interest-Showing Disinterest in Each Time Segment According to the Self Report Measure of Alienation	43
6. Percentage of Subjects in Each Self Report Measure by Time Segment	45
7. T-Test of Mean Frequency of Scale Ratings on Each Self Report Measure by Time Segment According to Sex Composition of Groups	47
8. Mean Frequency of Showing Interest and Showing Disinterest for All Time Segments by Sex Composition of Groups	51
9. Mean Frequencies of Non Verbal Behaviour by Sex	53
10. Percentage of Others' Rating of Subjects by Subjects Nonverbal Behaviour	54
11. Percentage of Subjects' Rating on Self Report Measure of Alienation by NonVerbal Behaviour	58

ABSTRACT

One of the findings of Goffman's participant observation research has been the description of alienation from interaction. This study was designed to validate his results in a controlled laboratory setting. Nine groups of volunteer subjects, involved in a focused interaction, were videotaped through a one-way mirror and their nonverbal behaviour was quantified using a category system developed from Goffman's work and nonverbal research studies. The purpose of this thesis was 1) to provide support for Goffman's findings that alienation is manifested nonverbally in focused encounters; and, 2) to provide a test of the feasibility of utilizing electronic recording devices and systematic observation in the clarification and extension of findings obtained in field observation studies.

Goffman's descriptive analysis was used to develop discrete categories of involvement and alienation. All groups were videotaped in half hour sessions, and were asked to evaluate themselves and others with regard to feelings and involvement during the session.

Results provided empirical support for Goffman's observations under controlled laboratory conditions. Findings indicate that: 1) boredom and interest are communicated nonverbally in an interaction. Further, that frequency and type of nonverbal behaviour are related to interest and boredom; 2) time is a contributing factor to alienation. As time goes on in an interaction, alienation increases; 3) the degree

of alienation demonstrated nonverbally is influenced by the sex of the actor and the sex composition of the group.

This study showed that concepts developed in participant observation studies can be fruitfully studied, evaluated and extended in the laboratory.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks are due to many colleagues and professors who helped me in this study. Anyone who has worked with Dr. M.L. Dietz must be permanently indebted to her for her deep interest in her student's work. I wish to express my sincere gratitude to this dedicated woman not only for her direction and assistance in this thesis, but also for her understanding and continued support throughout my academic career.

I am indebted also to the other members of my committee, Dr. Ann Diemer and Dr. J.A. Malone for their helpful suggestions, their encouragement, and their careful reading of my thesis.

I would like to thank Dr. J.D. Ferguson for the use of his office facilities and for taking time to read my thesis and offer suggestions.

I would like to express a special thank you to Christopher Peebles and Dr. T. White for their assistance in the computer programming, to the graduate teaching assistants for supplying the subjects for this thesis, and to Pam Russell who typed this thesis.

I am also indebted to my parents who have supported me throughout my academic career.

CHAPTER ONE

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

One of the findings of Goffman's participant observation research has been the description of alienation from interaction. This study was designed to validate his results in a controlled laboratory setting. Nine groups of volunteer subjects, involved in a focused interaction, were videotaped through a one-way mirror and their nonverbal behaviour was quantified using a category system developed from Goffman's work and nonverbal research studies. The purpose of this study was: 1) to provide support for Goffman's findings that alienation is manifested nonverbally in focused encounters; and, 2) to provide a test of the feasibility of utilizing electronic recording devices and systematic observation in the clarification and extension of findings obtained in field observation studies.

Goffman's work has had a great popularity among sociologists and students of the social sciences because they intuitively respond to his work with a feeling that his analysis is correct. This has been true of the response to Mead, Becker, Matza and others as well. However, the symbolic interactionists and the ethnomethodologists have failed to make use of empirical research supportive of their findings developed by researchers in communication fields, and in experimental and social psychology. Although we recognize the argument posed regarding the artificiality of the lab situation¹, we also are aware of the possibility

¹ See Douglas (1970c) p.202.

in the lab of focusing on a limited aspect of behaviour and of examining this behaviour as it is demonstrated by a number of persons under similar conditions.

Goffman's works according to Douglas (1970b) are considered naturalistic sociology. Naturalistic sociology is committed to the integrity of the phenomena which simply means that phenomena must be investigated in their natural, ongoing setting as experienced in everyday life. Naturalistic sociology shares with the phenomenological sociologies, and symbolic interactionism² this commitment to retain the integrity of the phenomena and undertake the scientific study of socially meaningful phenomena with the systematic observation and analysis of everyday life. It is not necessary for the purpose of this thesis to discuss the differences in the theoretical stance of these different approaches³ but it is necessary to recognize the fact that the methodologies of these approaches are parallel and share common ground with the methodology of field observation.⁴ Therefore, field observation studies

² Phenomenological sociologies include: ethnomethodology; existential sociology; and naturalistic sociology. Douglas (1970b) sees symbolic interaction as dichotomous - one strain being phenomenological interactionism and the other, behavioural interactionism. Symbolic interaction was kept separate from the general category of phenomenological sociologies so as not to enter into the debate on the dichotomy of symbolic interaction. For further elaboration consult Douglas (1970b).

³ See Herbert Blumer (1969), Norman K. Denzin (1970a) and Jack D. Douglas (1970b) for a discussion on the differences in the stance of these approaches.

⁴ See Bruyn's discussion of phenomenological procedures in The Human Perspective in Sociology: The Methodology of Participant Observation, 1966, pp.271-281.

or participant observation studies would be defined in this thesis as those studies deriving from these different approaches.

Participant observation is a field strategy that combines "document analysis, respondent and information interviewing, direct participation and observation, and introspection" (Denzin, 1970c, p.186). Because of the subjectivity and unstructured nature of this method it has been subject to criticisms of validity, reliability, and generality of results. Becker (1958), Denzin (1970c), and Douglas (1970b), among others, have considered the problem of proof in participant observation. Becker has urged researchers employing participant observation to attempt greater formalizations and systematization of the methods they use and proposed new modes of reporting results "so that the reader is given greater access to the data and procedures on which the conclusions are based" (Becker, 1968, p.41). Denzin (1970c) discusses "triangulation", his term for the use of multiple methods, to raise the experimenter above the biases involved in single methodologies. He quotes Webb (1966) saying that by employing multiple methods researchers may more confidently assume that:

When a hypothesis can survive the confirmation of a series of complimentary methods of testing it contains a degree of validity unattainable by one test within the more constricted framework of a single method (Denzin, 1970c, p.308).

Douglas states that overt and covert field research studies should be undertaken of field research methods to determine their reliability and validity (Douglas, 1970b, p.30). The problem is that similar methods are being used to determine the validity of findings of that

4.
method. Douglas suggests that this difficulty may be "overcome by the use of more highly controlled and explicit methods and by consciously adapting a strategy of successive approximations toward better methods" (Douglas, 1970b, p.30).

It becomes apparent that with the development of new electronic devices it is possible to begin to verify findings that are derived from participant observation studies. The current popularity of the everyday life studies in sociology provide an ideal field from which to develop specific hypotheses based on descriptive materials. The hypotheses that can be tested in situations in the laboratory can be recorded and subjected to careful analysis.

To aid in narrowing the gap between the empiricists and the phenomenologically oriented sociologists and to attempt to improve the benefits of both of their methods, Goffman's analysis of "alienation from interaction" has been selected for an initial examination of the use of video-recorded laboratory situations in testing the verifiability of participant observation research.

Erving Goffman has devoted most of his research to the study of interaction patterns. The study of social interaction is of central importance in sociology, as interactions constitute the basic processes of human life. Culture is transmitted to children and newcomers in social groupings through interaction with parents and through socializing agents. It is through interaction that people learn the attitudes, values, norms and statuses of their social group. Sociologists have

looked at social interaction in a variety of ways such as its function in socialization; the effect of interaction on the self concept; and how it effects and is effected by reciprocal interpersonal relationships; and patterned behaviour. However, Goffman has been primarily concerned with episodic or repeated interactions focusing on the way an interaction is maintained and how, if disrupted, interactants manage to keep it alive.

Goffman sees social interaction as being manifested in patterns or streams of behaviour that persist over time; establish social relationships and, eventually, social structures (Laswell, et. al, 1965, p.238). Mainstream sociologists have in the last several decades dealt with face-to-face interactions most often in the context of collective behaviour, ignoring the routine and uneventful face-to-face interactions of daily life. In Blumer's (1966) discussion of Mead's treatment of social interaction he states that "the prevailing practice of psychology and sociology is to treat social interaction as a neutral medium, as a mere forum for the operation of outside factors." Thus sociologists account for human behaviour in interaction "by resorting to societal factors, such as cultural prescriptions, values, social roles or structuring pressures" (Blumer, 1966, p.285). This treatment of social interaction differs from Mead's conception of interaction in that it ignores the fact that interaction is symbolic and a positive formative process. Mead's presentation of interaction also differs from Goffman's treatment in that Goffman's "world of interaction is non-developmental and rather static" (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p.344).

Goffman, Schutz, and Douglas⁵, feel that these routine uneventful face-to-face interactions should be studied in their own right, so that patterns and natural sequences can be identified.

The subject matter of face-to-face interaction is the development of events and sequences of behaviour which occur when people encounter one another. While the analytical boundaries of this field have not been clearly defined, all face-to-face interactions are seen as sharing the following characteristics: "a brief span of time; a limited extension of space; and a restriction to those events that must go to completion once they have begun" (Goffman, 1967a, p.1).

The method employed by Goffman in his collection of data is that of observation and deductive analysis. He has identified patterns of behaviour and their consequences using as his data "the glances, gestures, positioning and verbal statements that people continually feed into the situation whether intended or not" (Goffman, 1967a, p.1). These external signs that indicate orientation and involvement allow a description of the natural units to be extrapolated from them and aid in the discovery of the "normative order prevailing within and between

⁵ "Goffman's works are based on the principle of the integrity of the situation which maintains that any (face-to-face) situation is of importance in itself in determining (the meaning of) what goes on in the situation... The philosophical phenomenologists have shared this idea of the integrity of the situation and have expressed it primarily in terms of what Schutz (1962) has called "the paramount reality of the Lebenswelt." (Douglas, 1970b, p.37) Garfinkel in his development of ethnomethodology has taken the integrity of the situation to be the basic principle of phenomenological sociology.

these units" (Goffman, 1967a, p.1).⁶

It is maintained that in any conversational encounter there are generally accepted norms that govern expected behaviour.⁷ Very little interaction occurs without some element of code, norm, or rule entering into it to act as a guide for behaviour. These norms may vary depending on the subculture and the type of conversational encounter. Conversational encounters are of two types: unfocused interaction and focused interaction.⁸ An unfocused encounter is one which occurs merely by individuals being in one another's presence, such as interactions at parties or street behaviour. The focused encounter, however, is more structured and occurs when individuals tacitly agree to interact for a period of time with the knowledge that there will be a single focus of

⁶ Denzin states that "human action involves behaviour of both covert and overt variety and because the meanings attached to objects often change during an encounter the interactionist endeavors to relate covert, symbolic behaviour with overt patterns of interaction". (Denzin, 1970a, p.266).

⁷ Michal McCall defines these accepted norms as boundary rules. She states that "boundary rules are simply norms that protect, or effectuate, the focus. The boundary rules make it possible to get done whatever must be done by excluding any potentially disruptive characteristics of the encounter, social relationship, or the larger social world and by making sure every element necessary to the focus is present. The content of the boundary rules is partially determined by existing societal norms and partially emergent. The existence of boundary rules is a part of the structure of social relationships and encounters and is thus pre-existent." (M. McCall, 1970, p.37). See also George McCall (1970b) for a more detailed description of norms.

⁸ For a more detailed analysis of focused and unfocused encounters see Goffman (1961).

cognitive and visual attention. There are more rules to guide behaviour in a focused encounter and in many cases these norms are somewhat opposing, thus requiring more effort on the part of the individual participant to maintain a proper balance in the interaction. For the purpose of this thesis, only the focused encounter will be considered.

Goffman states that when individuals agree to participate in a focused conversational encounter they are subject to a system of etiquette with social constraints as to the proper and improper allocation of involvements (Goffman, 1967b, p.115). Individuals become locked into the interaction by the obligation to become spontaneously involved and to sustain a focus of attention so as to maintain the ceremonial order. Not only must the individual become spontaneously involved herself but she must also ensure that others maintain proper involvement. If a participant breaks a rule in the system of etiquette, her co-participants may attempt to restore the ceremonial order. Participation in a focused encounter is a difficult thing as it is delicate and requires a balance of conduct.

On the one hand participants are required to be spontaneously carried away by the topic of conversation; on the other hand they are obliged to control themselves so they will always be ready to stay within the role of communicator and stay alive to the touchy issues that might cause others to become ill at ease. On the one hand they are obliged to adhere to all applicable rules of conduct and on the other hand they are obliged to take enough liberties to ensure a minimum level of involving excitement. (Goffman, 1967b, p. 134).

CHAPTER TWO

THE CONCEPT OF ALIENATION

Goffman goes beyond an explication of the rules of conduct in a focused encounter to a discussion of alienation resulting from any deviation from these norms.⁹ Alienation is an easy state to fall into as a result of the number of seemingly opposing obligations and appears to be the rule in focused encounters rather than the exception. Alienation according to Goffman is defined as "misbehaviour of a kind that can be called misinvolvement" (Goffman, 1967b, p.117). Goffman's definition of alienation differs from the concept of alienation as commonly used in sociology.

The sociological literature on the concept of alienation presents a diversity of meanings. Melvin Seeman (1959) has condensed the general contexts, in which the term alienation is used, into five categories, namely: powerlessness; meaninglessness; normlessness; isolation; and self-estrangement. A discussion of these five variants is not

⁹ Denzin states that "rules of conduct develop around the dimensions of deference, demeanor, knowledge, tasks, and 'in-public conduct.' I suggested that because relationships take on a life of their own, each member feels obliged to sustain that moral order - to some degree on all occasions, public or private. In addition, I noted that perceptions of relational deviance may range from feelings of 'this is routine' to irritation, embarrassment, extreme self-relational threats, and public accusations of deviance. Taking the role of any relational member, the following conditions can be hypothesized as giving rise to perceptions of misconduct. The first and most general hypothesis states that misconduct is perceived whenever any relational member fails to uphold the moral order of his relationship ... Feelings of irritation arise when the relational partner fails to aid the other member in carrying off a routine act, or when a member acts to excess in areas that have little consequence for subsequent interactions" (Denzin, 1970b, p.82).

necessary here as Seeman deals with Goffman's definition of alienation in his treatment of normlessness.

According to Seeman "normlessness" is derived from Durkheim's discussion of "anomie". Merton also deals with the idea of normlessness or anomie in that it can result from an imbalance or conflict between culturally prescribed goals and the means available for realizing them.

"The idea of normlessness has been overextended to include a wide variety of both social conditions and psychic states: personal disorganization, cultural breakdown, reciprocal trust, and so on". (Seeman, 1959, p.51). Seeman differentiates the meaning of normlessness from powerlessness, and meaninglessness. He states that normlessness is independent of the other two meanings in that:

expectancies concerning unapproved means can vary independently of the individuals expectancy that his own behaviour will determine his success in reaching a goal (what I have called "powerlessness") or his belief that he operates in an intellectually comprehensible world ("meaninglessness"). (Seeman, 1959, p.51).

Seeman moves from this broad discussion of normlessness and points out Goffman's treatment of alienation which focuses on "the smallest of social systems, the simple conversation." (Seeman, 1959, p.51). Seeman sees Goffman as treating alienation in terms that closely resemble the anomic feature:

In speaking of "misbehaviour" or "mis-involvement," Goffman is treating the problem of alienation in terms not far removed from the anomic features I have described that is, the expectancy for socially unapproved behaviour (Seeman, 1959, p.51).

) Goffman sees alienation neither as unfortunate nor negative but rather as a normal and expected part of social interaction. He sees

case is a voluntary one and the individual through her actions communicates that although she is able to focus her attention on the interaction she wilfully refuses to do so, thus showing disrespect and subject to being held accountable. (Goffman, 1967b; p.117).

Alienation as self-consciousness results when the individual devotes "his attention to himself as an interactant at a time when he should be free to involve himself in the content of the interaction" (Goffman, 1967b, p.118). Usually a flight into self-consciousness occurs when the individual's self-image is threatened in the group. If there is a threat of loss, self-consciousness may be a way of protecting the self; if there is a threat of gain, self-consciousness may be a way of rejoicing (Goffman, 1967b, p.119). Self-consciousness is expressed through behaviours that indicate embarrassment.

Interaction consciousness involves a participant that is concerned to an improper degree with the mechanics of the interaction. In other words, the individual is more interested in the ceremonial order of the interaction than with involving herself in the interaction. Thus, by their non-participation in the conversation they are indirectly responsible if the interaction fails. One example that Goffman uses to illustrate interaction-consciousness is that of a deadening silence which may occur in a group. In this case, when the group starts running out of things to say the individual will focus her attention away from the conversation and onto the realization that the conversation is failing thus contributing to the eventual silence.

Other-consciousness is similar to self-consciousness however,

the object of attention in this case is another member or members of the group. Goffman states that when an individual perceives other members as being either "insincere" or "affected" she may feel hostility towards them as they have, in her mind, broken the ground rules of interaction. "Affected individuals seem chiefly concerned with controlling the evaluation an observer will make of them, and seem partly taken in by their own pose" (Goffman, 1967b, p.121). Insincere individuals on the other hand, "seem chiefly concerned with controlling the impression the observer will form of their attitude toward things or persons, especially toward him, and seem not to be taken by their own pose" (Goffman, 1967b, p.121). The hostility an individual feels toward these "affected" and "insincere" participants will cause the individual to focus her attention from the conversation to these violators.

A second source of other-consciousness Goffman indicates, may be found in the phenomenon of over-involvement: There are certain norms in a conversational encounter as to the amount of involvement and the degree of emotion that an individual may express in a conversational encounter. If the individual oversteps these limits, the other members will see this as a lack of self-control and their focus of attention will move from the conversation to the over-involved speaker. Therefore, the overinvolved individual has managed to alienate the others in the group. As Goffman describes it, one man's over-eagerness is another's alienation (Goffman, 1967b, p.123). Goffman goes on to say that "the alienative effect the individual has on others is usually

one he cannot escape having upon himself" (Goffman, 1967b, p.123).

Thus, when the over-involved individual calms down she may sense her improper behaviour and become alienated herself.

A third source of other-consciousness is the individual's excess attention to the speaker and not to the topic of talk. The speaker may present certain distractions to the listener and cause the listener's attention to focus on these distractions rather than on the conversation.

Goffman lists several sources of distraction:

the speaker may be very ugly or very beautiful; he may have a speech defect such as a lisp or a stutter; he may have inadequate familiarity with the language, dialect, or jargon that the listeners expect to hear; he may have a slight facial peculiarity, such as a hare lip, eye twitch, crossed or wall eyes; he may have temporary communication difficulties such as a stiff neck, hoarse voice, etc. (Goffman, 1967b, p.123-124.)

In focused encounters where individuals do not become spontaneously involved yet feel the obligation to do so they may feel a certain uneasiness and attempt to give the appearance of being involved. This type of behaviour is defined by Goffman as "affectation of involvement". In affecting involvement the individual attempts to save the feelings of the other members of the group as well as her position in the group. However, Goffman notes that affectation of involvement is often not successful. For some unexplainable reason, the individual finds it necessary to demonstrate to others that she is not fully involved in the topic of talk as the interaction is not able to capture her attention. This unsuccessful concealment of alienation is displayed by symptoms of boredom. Goffman states that some symptoms of boredom suggest "that

the individual will make no effort to terminate the encounter or his official participation in it but will no longer give as much to it" (Goffman, 1967b, p.127). "Other symptoms of boredom suggest that the individual is about to terminate official participation and function as a tactful warning of this" (Goffman, 1967b, p.127). Observable signs of boredom, according to Goffman, are side involvements such as: leafing through magazines; preening; yawning; lighting a cigarette; over-relaxing; finger-tapping; wiggling; and staring into space.

In Goffman's discussion of self-conscious he states that this form of alienation is manifested by symptoms of embarrassment. Goffman discusses these symptoms in more detail in his paper, "Embarrassment and Social Organization". Goffman states the embarrassment is recognized in others and even in oneself by:

objective signs of emotional disturbance: blushing, fumbling, stuttering, an usually low- or high-pitched voice, quavering speech or breaking of the voice, sweating, blanching, blinking, tremor of the hand, hesitating or vacillating movement, absentmindedness and malapropisms (Goffman, 1967c, p.97).

When individuals attempt to conceal their embarrassment they will manifest the following signs: "fixed smile, nervous hollow laughter, busy hands, the downward glance that conceals the expression of the eyes" (Goffman, 1967c, p.102).

In summary, then, every focused encounter is guided by a ceremonial order which is maintained by a system of etiquette. Individuals are obliged to adhere to the norms contained in the system of etiquette so as to ensure that the ceremonial order flows smoothly. The main obligations to a conversational encounter are that of spontaneous in-

volvement and official focus of attention. If for any reason the individual is unable to focus her attention on the topic of talk, or does not become spontaneously involved in the interaction, she will become alienated and in turn cause alienation in others. Alienation is a negative social attribute which individuals attempt to conceal by affecting involvement. Goffman states that in an unsuccessful attempt to affect involvement individuals manifest certain behaviours which can be interpreted as boredom or embarrassment to inform others of their alienation from the interaction.

CHAPTER THREE

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE
ON NONVERBAL BEHAVIOUR

Nonverbal behaviour has been the subject of experimental research for the last fifty years (Ekman, 1965a, p.391). The research of non-verbal behaviour is of importance to observational methodology because of its "visibility, naturalness and discriminability" (Weick, 1968, p.382). Research in this area has indicated that nonverbal behaviour can communicate: (a) information relative to an affective state (Davitz, 1964; Frijda, 1969); (b) intensity of an emotional state (Ekman, 1965b); and (c) quality of an interpersonal relationship (Ekman, 1965a).

Individuals spend only a small portion of their interactional time verbalizing; Birdwhistell estimates that:

In a normal two person conversation the verbal components carry less than 35 percent of the social meaning of the situation, more than 65 percent is carried on the nonverbal band ... For instance, we may communicate by our manner of dress, our body odour, our physique, our posture, our body tension, our facial expression and degree of eye contact, our hand movements, our punctuality or lack of it, the way we choose to position ourselves in relation to the other person, the vocal sounds accompanying our verbal messages, and many, many more things (McCroskey, Larson and Knapp, 1971, p.93).

Communication analysts tend to agree that perhaps most of the expression of emotional states related to ongoing social situations occur on the nonverbal level (Birdwhistell, 1961, p.56). Ekman states:

... the classes of information provided by nonverbal behaviour can serve to repeat, contradict, or substitute for a verbal message, as well as accent certain words, maintain the communicative flow, reflect changes in the relationship in association with particular verbal messages and indicate a person's feeling about his verbal statement (Ekman, 1965a, p.441).

The independent assessment of attitudes as they are communicated by posture and position cues allows the measurement of the degree of inconsistency in the attitude communications of an individual, such as between posturally communicated attitudes and verbally communicated attitudes. Furthermore, since in a number of everyday communication situations the communication of attitudes in an overt manner is culturally discouraged, the use of nonverbal cues can be a valuable means of determining the attitude of the communicator. This is particularly true in the case of alienation in focused encounters, as the symptoms of alienation are brought about by an individual attempting to affect involvement, since alienation is expected to be concealed according to social norms.

It is necessary to consider the research on nonverbal behaviour primarily because Goffman uses the nonverbal behaviour that occurs in a situation as his data. In his analysis of alienation he has identified nonverbal behaviours that are indicators of alienation. The review of the literature on nonverbal behaviour will encompass only those behaviours that can be related to boredom and embarrassment specifically. The classes of nonverbal behaviour that will be reviewed are as follows: direction of gaze, eye contact and mutual gaze; body movements; and listener responses.

Goffman (1964) suggests that direction of gaze plays a crucial role in the initiation and maintenance of social encounters. He points out:

that where an individual is looking is an important indicator of his social accessibility. This is because, whether or not a person is willing to have his eye "caught", whether or

not, that is, he is willing to look back into the eyes of someone who is already looking at him, is one of the principle signs by which people indicate to each other their willingness to begin an encounter. It seems that it is through the mutually held gaze that two people commonly establish their 'openness' to one another's communications ... It would appear that it is through the continued maintenance of this positioning in relation to one another, and through intermittent mutual gazes that each participant expresses his continued commitment to it (Kendon, 1967, p.23).

Exline and Winters "believe that involvement and affect are communicated via movement or lack of movement of the eyes in the context of a given interaction situation" (Exline, Winters, 1965, p.320).

Simmel (1924) states that the eyes have a unique social function in that by means of mutual gaze one establishes communication with others.

Ellsworth (1968) suggests that the increases or decreases of eye engagement, in response to a variety of affective and other signals, leads to the idea that visual behaviour itself may have a communicative function.

These ideas have been empirically supported. Argyle and Dean (1965) found that without eye contact people are not fully in communication. Exline (1963) states that groups composed of persons more disposed toward communication than control engage in more mutual visual interaction than groups not so disposed. Argyle, Lalljee, and Cook (1968) have pointed out that mutual gaze and visual scanning function in three ways: feedback; synchronizing the speech; affiliative balance. Direction of gaze indicates the direction of attention and functions both as an act of perception by which one interactant can monitor the behaviour of the other and as an expressive sign and regulatory signal by which she may

influence the behaviour of the other.

The function of gaze direction and mutual gaze has not been of central importance to researchers in this field. Most of the studies available have dealt with relationships between habits of looking and other characteristics of the looker. Nielson (1962) found that looking away while listening indicated dissatisfaction with the communicator's speech. Modigliani (1971) supported the proposition that subjects decreased their level of eye contact while embarrassed. Argyle (1968) suggested that dominant and/or socially poised individuals look more than submissive and/or socially anxious persons. Women have been found to engage in more overall eye contact (Exline, Gray, and Schuette, 1965; Exline and Winters, 1965). Specifically, women engage in more eye contact while speaking (Exline, Gray and Schuette, 1965; Libby, 1970); more eye contact while listening (Exline and Winters, 1965); and more eye contact during silences (Exline, Gray and Schuette, 1965).

In summation then, eye contact and/or direction of gaze serve several functions in interaction, and, differences in looking behaviour exist between males and females. Therefore, from the research on looking behaviour, it can be generally concluded that eye contact, or the lack of it, would indicate whether or not an individual is focused on the topic of talk.

Body movements are repeated and patterned behaviours of the head, legs and hands which are manifested for the purpose of performance and expression. Although the face and eyes are considered a better channel of communication as to the nature of an emotion, body postures and

gestures can communicate the intensity of an emotion as well as the positive or negative state of an emotion (Ekman and Friesen, 1967; Dittman, 1969). Ekman and Friesen (1967) state that when a person is emotionally aroused the individual will move her body rather than remain still and a specific emotion can be inferred from observing a body act. "While the face is generally alive and mobile during conversation and potentially could readily display the entire range of intensity, politeness usually inhibits extreme facial expressions which may instead be reflected in body acts or positions" (Ekman and Friesen 1967, p. 318). Barnlund states that when individuals are not communicating verbally they "usually supply a running physical commentary on their conscious and unconscious preoccupation as they move about, straighten their clothing, etc." (Barnlund, 1963, p. 525). Dittman (1962) found that moods were reliably differentiated by frequency of body movements.

Although the research in the area of body movement has established the fact that body movements have a communicative function, the researchers, for the most part, fail to indicate the specific body movements involved and in what manner these movements conveyed attitude or mood.

James (1932) was able to isolate four postural categories, namely: approach; withdrawal; expansion; and contraction. James' categories of approach and withdrawal are related to the present concern in that they include forward-back lean of the trunk and direction of orientation. Approach is defined as an attentive approach communicated by a forward lean of the body while withdrawal is defined as a negative,

refusing or repulsed posture communicated by a drawing back or turning away. According to James (1932) and Mehrabian (1968) the forward lean of the body communicates a relatively positive attitude while the backwards lean of the body indicates a more negative attitude. Schefflen (1964) states that changes in posture, eye contact or position may indicate that the individual is temporarily removing herself from the communication situation. Rosenfeld (1966b) expected postural shifts to reveal discomfort but were seldom observed. He did find however, that over-all postural shifts (gross body movements) had a nonsignificant positive correlation with self-manipulations and negative correlations with smiles and positive head nods. Self-manipulations reveal discomfort or anxiety (Rosenfeld, 1966b).

Reece and Whitman (1962) studied the effect of an investigator's warmth and coldness upon the amount of verbal output in a situation where the subject was free associating. They defined warmth in terms of (1) more frequent smiling, (2) the absence of finger-tapping, (3) greater degree of eye contact with the subject, (4) greater degree of forward bodily lean (in a chair) toward the subject. What Reece and Whitman define as warmth will be considered as a showing interest response in this study.

In human communication individuals manifest specific signals to indicate that they are paying attention to the speaker. Dittman (1972) has grouped such behaviours into a general area termed listener responses.

Listener responses (LR) comprise a borderline group of behaviours between the verbal and nonverbal. Some of them consist of linguistic forms ('Yeah', 'I see', and the like), while others do not (head movements and some types of smiles). They are all discrete events ... but are best described as specific signals that the listener is paying attention to the speaker (Dittman, 1972, pp.404-405).

Dittman (1972) found in his study of listener responses that listener responses serve a social function in a conversation as useful feedback to a speaker and that females manifested more listener responses than males. Others have also studied the communicative function of listener responses. Fries (1952) found that in face-to-face conversations head nods function as signals of continued attention. Rosenfeld (1966) states that positive head nods operate as social reinforcers and approval techniques. Goffman (1967d) states that participants convey to a speaker that they are according her their attention by appropriate gestures.

The nonverbal behaviour manifested in the experimental portion of this thesis will be recorded using videotape equipment. The use of videotape equipment as a research tool has been dealt with only superficially in sociological and psychological research. More detailed discussions of the varied uses of videotape as a research and learning tool can be found in the psychotherapy literature. Videotape is employed in counselling, therapy and teaching groups for feedback and self-confrontation.

Surprisingly, videotape equipment has not been used extensively in nonverbal research. The major recording devices in this area are

motion pictures, still photographs, and the researcher herself coding live from the experimental situation. Videotape has advantages over all these recording tools in that it records both picture and sound and can be subjected to a more detailed analysis. Researchers in the area of nonverbal behaviour are beginning to realize the advantages of videotape recording for the efficient analysis of social interaction and comprehensive scoring and its use is gradually increasing.

CHAPTER FOUR

HYPOTHESES AND DEFINITION OF TERMS

A bringing together of the framework used by Goffman in his social approach to alienation with the experimental research on nonverbal behaviour forms the basis for the comparison of the results derived from a participant observation study and a controlled experimental video analysis of alienation from interaction.

The assumptions implicit in this study are: 1) that certain nonverbal behaviours manifested in controlled experimental situations are similar to those manifested in everyday life; and, 2) that nonverbal behaviour communicates information regarding the individual in interaction as does nonverbal behaviour.

Goffman states that alienation occurs commonly in focused encounters, such as seminars and board meetings, and that alienation is perceived by other members of the group through observable signs of boredom and embarrassment as a result of an individual's inability to conceal her alienation. This thesis will attempt to qualify these generalizations by considering the following questions: a) are there compositional factors in focused encounters that effect alienation; b) in ongoing interactions is alienation, that occurs consistently, manifested in special nonverbal behaviours; and, c) are nonverbal cues to alienation perceived with any consistency by others in a group.

Behaviours have been selected from research on nonverbal communication as indicators of involvement and alienation from interaction and

have been matched with those behaviours described by Goffman in his discussion of alienation. The following behaviours: a) direction of gaze toward the speaker; b) forward lean of the torso toward the speaker; and, c) listener responses, have been designated as Showing Interest behaviours. These communicate the involvement of an individual in a given topic during interaction. The following behaviours: a) direction of gaze away from the speaker; b) a backward lean of the torso away from the speaker; c) fewer listener responses; d) self and object manipulation; and, e) gross body movements, have been designated as Showing Disinterest behaviours and are indicative of the individual's alienation from the topic of talk (e.g. considered to be symptomatic of boredom and embarrassment).

In order to test the expected relationship of nonverbal behaviour to interest and alienation, the following hypothesis was formulated:

HYPOTHESIS 1:1

H_1 There will be a difference in the frequency and type of nonverbal behaviour manifested by interested and bored subjects.

OPERATIONALLY STATED:

Subjects who rate themselves as interested on the Self Rate Measure of Alienation will manifest different frequencies of the Showing Interest and Showing Disinterest behaviours than subjects who rate themselves bored on the Self Rate Measure of Alienation.

One factor that may have an effect on alienation is that of

time. Time was considered a contributing factor to alienation. That is, as time went on in an interaction, the number of alienated subjects was expected to increase. To test the relationship of time to alienation the following hypothesis was formulated:

HYPOTHESIS 2:1

H_1 There will be an increase in the number of people alienated as time progresses in an interaction.

OPERATIONALLY STATED:

As time goes on in an interaction the number of subjects who rate themselves as less interested and more bored will increase from the earlier time segments to the later time segments.

If alienation increases as time progresses in an interaction then the frequency of Showing Interest behaviours should decrease and the frequency of Showing Disinterest behaviours should increase. To test the relationship of time to frequency of movements the following hypothesis was formulated:

HYPOTHESIS 3:1

H_1 There will be a change in the amount of alienation shown as the length of time in an interaction increases.

OPERATIONALLY STATED:

There will be a change in the frequencies of Showing Interest and Showing Disinterest from the earlier time segments to the later time segments.

Goffman does not differentiate alienation in relation to social

categories. However, research on nonverbal behaviour has shown differences in the type of nonverbal behaviour manifested by males and females. To test the relationship of sex to nonverbal behaviour indicating alienation the following hypothesis was formulated:

HYPOTHESIS 4:1

H_1 There will be a difference in the type and frequency of nonverbal behaviour related to involvement and alienation manifested by males and females.

To test the relationship of the groups, according to their sex composition, to nonverbal categories indicating alienation the following hypothesis was formulated:

HYPOTHESIS 5:1

H_1 There will be a difference in the nonverbal behaviour manifested by the all male groups, the all female groups and the mixed sex groups.

To control for situational influences on alienation, task, setting, and time will be the same in all experimental situations. The researcher will introduce the experiment and conduct the evaluation session following a set format:

Definition of terms

Alienation will constitute misbehaviour of a kind that can be called misinvolvement. Misinvolvement will constitute symptoms of boredom and embarrassment. These symptoms include looking away, leaning away, self manipulation, object manipulation, gross body movements, hand over mouth and hand supporting head.

Affectation of Involvement involves contriving an appearance of being involved in a conversational interaction.

Boredom occurs when the conversation fails to capture the attention of an individual. The symptoms of boredom indicate a termination of involvement. Symptoms of boredom include object manipulation, self manipulation, finger-tapping, wiggling, and staring into space.

Embarrassment is a result of one's inability to conceal one's alienation adequately. Embarrassment reflects a failure in one's self presentation to others. It is not so much a direct consequence of one's ineptness as it is a consequence of one's knowledge that this ineptness will be observed and negatively evaluated by others. Symptoms of embarrassment constitute the following behaviours: hesitations and vacillations, looking away, self and object manipulations.

Focused Encounters are characterized by a single official focus of cognitive and visual attention that all full pledged participants help to sustain.

Showing Disinterest: A general category which includes the following behaviours: gross body movements; hand over mouth; hand supporting head; leaning away; looking away; object manipulation; self-manipulation.

Gross Body Movements: A relatively gross movement of the body, trunk, legs or shift in position of the hips.

Hand Over Mouth: The placement of the hand over the mouth.

Hand Supporting Head: The positioning of the hand in such a manner as to support the head.

Leaning Away: Backward lean of the body away from the speaker.

Looking Away: When a member of the group is not focusing her attention on the speaker.

Object Manipulation: Any noticeable movement of the arm, hand or fingers in contact with some object.

Self Manipulation: A part of the body in contact with another part of the body, e.g. rubbing, scratching, tapping arm or leg with fingers, lip-pursing, and preening.

Showing Interest: A general category which includes the following behaviours: leaning toward; listener responses; looking toward.

Leaning Toward: Forward lean of the body toward the speaker.

Listener Responses include those behaviours which indicate attention. These responses are head nods, and linguistic forms such as: yes; I see; Unh-hunh; yeah; good; and the like.

Looking Toward: When a group member looked at the speaker regardless of whether or not the speaker was looking back.

CHAPTER FIVE

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The subjects were forty-five undergraduate students enrolled in an Introductory Sociology course at the University of Windsor. All took part in the study on a voluntary basis. The subjects were randomly placed in nine five-member groups. These nine groups consisted of three all-female groups, three all-male groups, and three mixed sex groups. The reason for selecting five members as the group size was based on a study by Slater (1958). Slater conducted a study involving groups ranging in size from two to seven. He found that groups consisting of five members were most effective in dealing with an intellectual task involving the exchange of information and ideas.

Pretest

Two different groups were subjected to pretesting. The subjects were selected from students enrolled in a sociology course at St. Clair Community College in Windsor, Ontario. The main purpose of the pretest was to determine: a) the model of videotape camera that would produce the clearest picture; b) the type of task to be assigned to the groups; c) a pretesting of the instruments to be used; and, d) to obtain an estimate as to the amount of time required to carry out the experiment.

All experimental situations were conducted in the Small Groups Laboratory. The Laboratory is an informal meeting room equipped with one-way mirrors, microphones, observation room, sound and tape recording

systems. The groups were videotaped through the one-way mirror with sound fed through the laboratory system. The videotape allowed for head-to-foot views of all five subjects on a single screen.

The first group was given a work task with a typed sheet of instructions. The second group was given a discussion task and the instructions were conveyed verbally. Different camera models and lenses were used during the sessions. It was discovered that a discussion task was best suited for the experiment. With typed written instructions the subjects tended to focus their visual attention on the paper rather than the speaker-therefore, there was little looking behaviour. A wide-angle lens had to be used to allow the inclusion of all the subjects in the frame at the same time. The use of a wide-angle lens also allowed for the camera to be placed in a fixed position giving the researcher the freedom to observe the interaction and to attend to any problems that might arise. A video feedback session was included in the pretest sessions. The video feedback allowed the subjects to recall what had occurred in the interaction and to observe their behaviour as well as others' behaviour. Although the feedback session was very useful, informative, and provided supportive evidence as to the occurrence of alienation, it had to be abandoned because it involved more time than could be scheduled.

Procedure

All groups met in the Small Groups Laboratory and were videotaped through the one-way mirror. The subjects were informed of the videotaping but not of the purpose of the study. This was done in the

hope of easing their suspicions and curiosity so that during the conversation they would not worry about what was going on. The researcher informed the groups that they had to reach a solution to the problem of skyjacking. This topic was chosen because it was assumed to be familiar to all the subjects as it was the highlight of the news at that time also, it was not a controversial topic in that everyone would be interested in reaching a solution. The purpose of instructing the subjects to decide on a solution to skyjacking was to give structure to the topic of talk and also of designating an official focus of cognitive attention. The subjects were then left to discuss the topic for thirty minutes. After thirty minutes the researcher entered the room and distributed three questionnaires. The first questionnaire was a self report of alienation (see Appendix A). Modigliani (1971) employed a similar questionnaire in his study of embarrassment. The self report measure of alienation contained a series of polar adjective ratings on which the subject was to describe how she felt during the first ten minutes of the conversation, the middle ten minutes of the conversation, and the last ten minutes of the conversation. Each polar adjective rating was scored on a seven point scale. The second questionnaire (see Appendix B) was a written report of the reasons for the feelings expressed by the subjects on the first questionnaire for each time period. The third questionnaire (see Appendix C) was a written report to assess the subject's visibility of other members' feelings during the conversation. They were instructed to state how they thought each of the other members felt during the discussion and to

explain in what ways each member acted to convey this impression to her. After the completion of the questionnaires the subjects were dismissed.

Coding

The videotapes were coded according to the category system (see Appendix D) which was formulated from the research available on nonverbal communication to measure showing interest and showing disinterest. Coding will refer to the objective, systematic and quantitative description of any symbolic behaviour (Cartwright, 1953, p.424). Each videotape was played through five times without sound to code each individual's behaviour for each ten minute segment. The sixth time it was run with sound to record the verbal and psycholinguistic listener responses. A stop watch was used to calculate the ten minute segments. The method of coding was simply a measure of frequency within each selected category of behaviour. This type of methodological approach namely, the components approach, is that employed in most encoding studies. In using the components approach the frequency of specific nonverbal behaviours are measured. Encoding refers to the examination of a subject's own nonverbal behaviour, measuring some aspect of what the person actually does. Dittman (1962) found that information about effect within an individual could be gained from the simple counting of gross body movements. Ekman advocated the use of "rate measures of the frequency of occurrence of the nonverbal responses within each category" as the basic methodological procedure in nonverbal behaviour (Ekman, 1965a, p.143). According to Ekman (1965a), rate measures of frequency supply data which can be related to both

experimental variables and other behaviours being recorded. Ekman states that rate measures of frequency are useful in the study of:

a) the expressive aspect of nonverbal behaviour in that changes in the rate of occurrence of specific nonverbal responses can be related to experimental variables such as frustration, conflict or stress. In this case, only the individual need be studied; and b) the communicative aspect of nonverbal behaviour in that changes in the rate of occurrence of specific nonverbal responses for one subject can be related to the changes in the rate of occurrence of the same or other nonverbal responses of another subject (Ekman, 1965a, p.144). It is necessary to state that the nonverbal behaviours that are considered in this thesis are only those behaviours which are observable. Thus, actual movements shown by the individuals are classified and measured.

The coding of the videotapes was done by the researcher herself. To the question of reliability of scoring, the researcher worked on the transcriptions of all the videotapes studied in this thesis, so they have been done according to a consistent method.

CHAPTER SIX

RESULTS

To test the relationship of nonverbal behaviour to alienation the amount of Showing Interest and Showing Disinterest behaviour was related to the Self Report Measure of Alienation, interested/bored. The mean frequencies for Showing Interest and Showing Disinterest through all three time segments for subjects who rated themselves as interested was correlated with the mean frequencies of Showing Interest and Showing Disinterest through all three time segments for those subjects who rated themselves bored. Showing Interest has been defined as the cumulative frequency of nonverbal behaviours which indicate that the subject is focusing her attention on the topic of talk while Showing Disinterest has been defined as the cumulative frequency of nonverbal behaviours which indicate that the subject is not focusing her attention on the topic of talk.

Table 1 displays the mean frequencies of Showing Interest and Showing Disinterest behaviours through all three time segments for those subjects who rated themselves interested or bored on the Self Report Measure of Alienation.

TABLE 1
 MEAN FREQUENCIES OF SHOWING INTEREST AND SHOWING
 DISINTEREST FOR SUBJECTS RATED AS INTERESTED
 AND BORED ON THE SELF RATE MEASURE OF
 ALIENATION

NON-VERBAL CATEGORIES	MEAN FREQUENCIES OF NONVERBAL BEHAVIOUR		VALUE OF t	ONE-TAILED PROBABILITY OF t
	INTERESTED	BORED		
SHOWING INTEREST	18.081	16.043	.486	n.s.
SHOWING DISINTEREST	94.162	118.435	3.09	.005

Statistical significance $p \leq .05$

Note: Non-significant probabilities of t have been shown as n.s.

The Self Report Measure of Alienation contained a series of bipolar adjective ratings (at ease/self-conscious, poised/awkward, free/constrained, calm/embarrassed, interested/bored) scored on a seven point scale by which the subject was to describe how she felt during the focused interaction. On the actual questionnaire the direction of these bipolar adjectives was reversed, however, when these measures were coded the socially positive attributes: at ease, poised, free, calm, and interested were considered low on the scale (1-3) and the socially negative attributes: self-conscious, awkward, constrained, embarrassed, and bored were considered high on the scale (5-7). The subjects who rated themselves on the midpoint (4) were excluded from the analysis as

they were considered to be neither at ease nor self-conscious, neither poised nor awkward, neither free nor constrained, neither calm/nor embarrassed, neither interested nor bored.

There is a significant difference in the nonverbal behaviour of subjects who rated themselves bored as compared to those who rated themselves interested. This difference indicates that the type and frequency of nonverbal behaviour is related to the subjects' perception of themselves as interested or bored. The interested subjects showed interest more frequently and disinterest less frequently ($p=.005$) than the bored subjects. These results lend support to the hypothesis that interest of subjects is indicated by nonverbal behaviour and confirm the hypothesis that disinterest of subjects is indicated by nonverbal behaviour. In specific nonverbal categories interested subjects manifest more listener responses, while bored subjects manifest a higher frequency of looking away, object manipulation, self-manipulation ($p=.025$) and hand supporting head. Ekman and Friesen (1969) suggest that when people attempt to deceive others there is an increase in certain types of nonverbal behaviour which they define as self adaptors. The definition of self adaptors is closely related to the definition of self manipulation as defined in this study. Since the symptoms of boredom are the result of attempting to affect involvement in other words, deception, the significant difference in the frequencies of self manipulation between those subjects interested and bored would support the above prediction.

The mean frequencies of Showing Interest and Showing Disinterest

TABLE 2

MEAN FREQUENCIES OF NONVERBAL BEHAVIOUR FOR ALL TIME SEGMENTS

ACCORDING TO SELF REPORT MEASURES

SELF REPORT MEASURE	SHOWING INTEREST	SHOWING DISINTEREST	LEANING TOWARD	LISTENER RESPONSES	GROSS BODY MOVEMENTS	HAND OVER MOUTH	LOOKING AWAY	SELF MANIPULATION	OBJECT MANIPULATION	HAND SUPPORTING HEAD	LEANING AWAY
POISED	16.83	96.26	1.02	15.79	5.07	5.81	19.31	31.21	8.98	4.98	1.10
AWKWARD	14.89	108.89	0.33	14.56	6.11	4.89	17.78	33.56	11.33	6.00	1.33
CALM	17.45	92.31	0.91	16.52	4.91	5.04	16.31	31.43	9.10	4.43	0.98
EMBARRASSED	10.70	106.30	0.80	9.90	6.40	6.90	25.00	24.90	8.20	6.30	1.90
FREE	17.21	94.15	0.949	16.23	4.92	5.23	17.36	31.92	9.64	4.72	1.05
CONSTRAINED	14.38	105.00	1.06	13.31	6.38	6.13	20.38	28.38	10.31	7.19	1.19
AT EASE	17.26	93.48	1.02	16.21	5.12	5.71	16.64	31.07	9.05	4.71	1.10
SELF-CONSCIOUS	11.94	102.53	.77	11.18	5.71	4.30	21.88	28.77	12.41	4.30	1.35
INTERESTED	18.08	94.16	1.05	17.00	5.62	5.65	18.16	29.35	8.32	5.19	1.19
BORED	16.04	118.44	.96	15.04	5.61	5.57	26.13	39.00	11.65	6.00	1.26

were also correlated with the Self Report Measures of Alienation indicating the subjects' evaluation of her own poise, embarrassment, self consciousness and freedom in the group. Table 2 displays the mean frequencies of Showing Interest, Showing Disinterest and the mean frequencies of the individual nonverbal behaviours by the Self Report Measures. Subjects who rated themselves as interested, poised, at ease, free and calm consistently show more interest behaviours compared to more disinterest behaviours shown by subjects who rated themselves as bored, awkward, self conscious, constrained and embarrassed.

The results shown in Table 1 and Table 2 indicate that Showing Interest behaviours occur more frequently for subjects rating themselves, interested, poised, at ease, free and calm. Showing Disinterest behaviours occur with greater frequency for those subjects rating themselves bored, awkward, self conscious, constrained and embarrassed. These findings support the contention of many researchers that nonverbal behaviour communicates the affect within an individual.

The length of time that an interaction continued was considered as a potentially contributing factor to alienation. Table 3 displays the frequencies of Showing Interest and Showing Disinterest behaviours for time segments consisting of ten minute intervals.

TABLE 3
 FREQUENCY OF SHOWING INTEREST -
 SHOWING DISINTEREST BY
 TIME SEGMENT

NON VERBAL CATEGORIES	TIME SEGMENT			TOTAL
	FIRST	MIDDLE	LAST	
SHOWING INTEREST	285	245	234	764
SHOWING DISINTEREST	1351	1380	1543	4274
TOTAL	1636	1625	1777	5038

$$\chi^2 = 12.1, df = 3.$$

These frequencies differ significantly over time ($p = .01$) thus, it can be concluded that there is a relationship between frequency of movement and the duration of an interaction. Table Four shows the mean frequency for Showing Interest and Disinterest by time segment. Showing Interest behaviours are seen to decrease significantly ($p = .04$; $p = .004$) as the interaction continues and Showing Disinterest increases particularly in the last time segment ($p = .01$).

TABLE 4

T - TEST OF THE MEAN FREQUENCIES OF SHOWING INTEREST
SHOWING DISINTEREST BY TIME SEGMENT

NON VERBAL CATEGORIES	MEAN FREQUENCY	VALUE OF t	ONE-TAILED PROBABILITY OF t
SHOWING INTEREST FIRST TIME SEGMENT	6.3556	1.76	.04
SHOWING INTEREST MIDDLE TIME SEGMENT	5.4444		
SHOWING INTEREST FIRST TIME SEGMENT	6.3556	2.76	.004
SHOWING INTEREST LAST TIME SEGMENT	5.2000		
SHOWING DISINTEREST FIRST TIME SEGMENT	30.0222	.49	n.s. (.314)
SHOWING DISINTEREST MIDDLE TIME SEGMENT	30.6667		
SHOWING DISINTEREST FIRST TIME SEGMENT	30.0222	2.36	.01
SHOWING DISINTEREST LAST TIME SEGMENT	34.2889		

Statistical significance $p \leq .05$

Note: Non-significant probabilities of t have been indicated as n.s.

Table 5 is a breakdown of the mean frequencies of Showing
Interest and Showing Disinterest behaviours by time segment according

TABLE 5

MEAN FREQUENCIES OF SHOWING INTEREST - SHOWING DISINTEREST

IN EACH TIME SEGMENTS ACCORDING TO THE

SELF REPORT MEASURES OF ALIENATION

SELF REPORT MEASURE	SHOWING INTEREST			SHOWING DISINTEREST		
	TIME SEGMENTS			TIME SEGMENTS		
	FIRST	MIDDLE	LAST	FIRST	MIDDLE	LAST
INTERESTED	7.64	5.20	5.16	28.21	28.90	27.66
BORED	3.27	6.18	5.00	37.45	37.18	46.267
POISED	6.34	5.71	6.21	30.39	32.88	33.58
AWKWARD	5.37	3.00	4.00	31.00	33.00	62.50
FREE	6.38	5.21	5.29	28.46	30.30	32.87
CONSTRAINED	5.75	3.57	5.00	30.00	39.14	51.80
CALM	8.04	5.82	5.08	27.41	30.61	32.03
EMBARRASSED	4.38	3.75	7.00	36.88	36.00	36.88
AT EASE	7.27	5.47	5.05	29.59	29.22	33.08
SELF-CONSCIOUS	4.77	4.33	4.33	28.92	41.67	59.67

to the Self Report Measures of Alienation. This table indicates that there is a general trend for Showing Interest behaviours to decrease over time and Showing Disinterest behaviours to increase over time. It is interesting to note that subjects who rated themselves bored or embarrassed show different patterns of Showing Interest and Showing Disinterest behaviours and also show different patterns in the time segments.

Tables 3, 4, and 5 support the hypothesis that as the amount of time in interaction increases Showing Interest decreases and Showing Disinterest increases. These results suggest that people become progressively more bored as the time goes on in a focused encounter. On reviewing the Self Report Measures by time, Table 6 indicates that the percentage of subjects bored, at ease, poised, free and calm progressively increased from the first time segment to the last time segment.

Also, the percentage of subjects interested, self-conscious, awkward, constrained and embarrassed progressively decreased from the first time segment to the last time segment. However, the ten per cent increase in the percentage of bored subjects in the last time segment did not seem large enough to effect the significant difference in Showing Disinterest in the first and last time segments. Therefore, a closer examination of the Self Report Measure of interested/bored was undertaken. It was found that forty-nine percent of the subjects rated themselves progressively less interested and more bored on the Self Report Measure. In many cases, rankings moved from very interested

TABLE 6
 PERCENTAGE OF SUBJECTS IN EACH SELF REPORT
 MEASURE BY TIME SEGMENT

SELF REPORT MEASURES OF ALIENATION	TIME SEGMENT		
	FIRST	MIDDLE	LAST
INTERESTED	72%	69%	62%
BOKED	28	31	38
TOTAL PER CENT	100	100	100
POISED	76	94	95
AWKWARD	24	6	5
TOTAL PER CENT	100	100	100
AT EASE	65	92	93
SELF CONSCIOUS	35	8	7
TOTAL PER CENT	100	100	100
FREE	67	83	88
CONSTRAINED	33	17	12
TOTAL PER CENT	100	100	100
CALM	77	91	93
EMBARRASSED	23	9	7
TOTAL PER CENT	100	100	100

to less interested rather than to extremely bored.

Although subjects were more comfortable and less self-conscious as the interaction progressed, they were also less interested. It may be that the initial discomfort and the desire to make a good impression increases the appearance of interest, what Goffman calls affectation of involvement, or actual involvement in the interaction during the initial stages of interactions.

Consistent differences were found both in the nonverbal behaviours and the Self Report Measures of Alienation by sex composition of the group. This has been predicted based on the earlier studies relating to nonverbal behaviour to sex.

Table 7 shows the mean frequencies of the scale ratings on each Self Report Measure by time segment according to the sex composition of the groups. The scale moves from the socially positive attributes such as interested, calm, at ease, poised, free which are at the low end of the 1-7 scale to their opposite socially negative attributes on the high end of the scale.

From the results in this table all-male groups rated themselves significantly higher than the all-female groups on the following Self Report Measures:

- a) interested/bored in the first time segment ($p=.002$)

- b) calm/embarrassed in the first time segment ($p=.03$)

- c) at ease/self-conscious in the middle time segment,
($p=.04$)

- d) free/constrained in the last time segment ($p=.04$)

TABLE 7

T-TEST OF MEAN FREQUENCY OF SCALE RATINGS ON EACH SELF
REPORT MEASURE BY TIME SEGMENT ACCORDING TO
SEX COMPOSITION OF GROUPS

TIME SEGMENT	MEAN FREQUENCY OF SCALE RATING ACCORDING TO SEX COMPOSITION OF GROUPS			ONE-TAILED PROBABILITY OF t		
	MALE	FEMALE	MIXED	MALE- FEMALE GROUPS	FEMALE- MIXED GROUPS	MALE- MIXED GROUPS
FREE - CONSTRAINED						
FIRST	3.400	2.933	3.667	n.s. (.210)	n.s. (.084)	n.s. (.365)
MIDDLE	2.800	2.333	3.067	n.s. (.182)	.048	n.s. (.363)
LAST	2.933	1.876	2.333	.044	n.s. (.144)	n.s. (.164)
POISED - AWKWARD						
FIRST	3.067	3.333	3.533	n.s. (.302)	n.s. (.347)	n.s. (.179)
MIDDLE	2.267	2.533	3.133	n.s. (.221)	.044	.011
LAST	2.200	2.333	2.333	n.s. (.388)	n.s. (.50)	n.s. (.374)
CALM - EMBARRASSED						
FIRST	3.067	2.200	3.333	.035	.004	n.s. (.378)
MIDDLE	2.200	1.667	3.067	n.s. (.121)	.001	.05
LAST	2.200	1.733	2.200	n.s. (.258)	n.s. (.125)	n.s. (.50)
INTERESTED - BORED						
FIRST	4.333	2.667	3.267	.002	n.s. (.110)	.05
MIDDLE	3.600	3.133	2.800	n.s. (.232)	n.s. (.277)	n.s. (.12)
LAST	4.067	3.867	2.467	n.s. (.401)	.016	.027
AT EASE - SELF CONSCIOUS						
FIRST	3.533	3.067	3.800	n.s. (.214)	n.s. (.106)	n.s. (.324)
MIDDLE	2.733	1.867	2.600	.047	.034	n.s. (.297)
LAST	2.133	1.867	2.067	n.s. (.310)	n.s. (.358)	n.s. (.445)

Statistical significance $p \leq .05$

Note: Non-significant probabilities of t have been indicated as n.s.

The all-male groups also rated themselves significantly higher than the mixed sex groups on the following Self Report Measures:

- a) interested/bored in the first time segment ($p = .05$)
- b) interested/bored in the last time segment ($p = .02$)

and significantly lower on the following Self Report Measures:

- a) poised/awkward middle time segment ($p = .01$)
- b) calm/embarrassed middle time segment ($p = .05$)

The female groups rated themselves significantly lower than the mixed sex groups on the following Self Report Measures:

- a) calm/embarrassed in the first time segment ($p = .004$)
- b) at ease/self-conscious in the middle time segment ($p = .03$)
- c) free/constrained in the middle time segment ($p = .04$)
- d) poised/awkward in the middle time segment ($p = .04$)
- e) calm/embarrassed in the middle time segment ($p = .001$)

and significantly higher on the following Self Report Measure:

- a) interested/bored in the last time segment ($p = .01$)

Taking each Self Report Measure separately it is seen for at ease/self-conscious that the only significant difference occurs in the middle time segment when the all-female groups are the most at ease followed by the mixed sex groups and the all-male groups being the most self-conscious. For the Self Report Measure of poised/awkward the all-male groups are more poised than the mixed sex groups. Females rated themselves more free in the middle time segment than the mixed sex groups on the Self Report Measure of free/constrained and in the last time segment the females were the most free followed by the mixed sex

groups and the male groups being the most constrained. In the Self Report Measure of calm/embarrassed the all-female groups were the least embarrassed and the mixed sex groups were the most embarrassed in the first time segment. Females remained the least embarrassed throughout all three time segments. In the last time segment the all-male groups and the mixed sex groups had the same mean which was slightly higher than the all-female groups. The all-male groups tended to rate themselves more bored than the all-female groups and mixed groups through all time segments. The all-female groups were the most interested in the first time segment with boredom increasing to the last time segment and the mixed groups being the most interested in the last time segment. Generally, it may be concluded that the mixed groups were more awkward in the first and middle time segments; more constrained in the first and middle time segments; more embarrassed in the first and middle time segments. In the last time segment the mixed groups became equally poised, less constrained than the all-male groups; more calm and more interested. The all-female groups were less poised than the all-male groups and mixed sex groups in the first and middle time segments; more free and more calm than the all-male and mixed sex groups through all time segments and more interested in the first and middle time segment than the all-male groups and mixed sex groups.

The observations of these groups by the researcher indicate that the all-female groups managed to keep interest alive in the discussion far longer than the all-male groups. Perhaps this difference

could be explained by the fact that the females changed topics frequently and usually in the direction of personal topics, always returning however, to the original topic. Also, the all-female groups felt more at ease and free than the mixed sex or all-male groups. The feeling of freedom and easiness in the group could have facilitated the free flow of the discussion and, in turn, interest. The all-female groups rated themselves less poised than the all-male groups. This could be attributed to the fact that the females were less informed on specific occurrences related to the topic. The all-male groups rated themselves more bored than the other groups. The all-male groups seldom, if ever, changed topics and because of this the discussion was repetitious which could have been a cause for the boredom. The all-male groups also rated themselves more self-conscious, constrained and embarrassed than the all-female groups. Perhaps in all-male groups where the members are strangers, and the roles of the members are not clearly defined and males may be less certain of how they are expected to act. They may thus feel self-conscious, constrained, embarrassed and possibly more competitive. Females are likely to be expected to be more sociable under all circumstances.

The mixed sex groups found it more difficult getting the conversation started in the initial stages than the other sex groups and interest did not grow until the last time segment. The mixed sex groups rated themselves more constrained, more awkward, more

embarrassed and more self-conscious. This could be attributed to the fact that both sexes were present and the fact that the obligation for spontaneous involvement was not maintained. The mixed sex groups also changed topics frequently and usually in the direction of personal topics. In most of the groups there was an attempt made by the subjects at introducing themselves. The only exceptions to this occurred in the mixed sex groups. In mixed sex groups there is socially expected behaviour that would not be expected in single sex groups. This reason may account for the irregular results of the mixed sex groups.

The mean frequencies of Showing Interest and Showing Disinterest for all time segments by sex composition of groups is displayed in Table 8.

TABLE 8
MEAN FREQUENCY OF SHOWING INTEREST AND SHOWING
DISINTEREST FOR ALL TIME SEGMENTS BY
SEX COMPOSITION OF GROUPS

NON VERBAL CATEGORIES	SEX COMPOSITION OF GROUPS			ONE-TAILED PROBABILITY OF t		
	MALE	FEMALE	MIXED	MALE- FEMALE	MIXED- FEMALE	MALE- MIXED
SHOWING INTEREST	13.4667	29.667	8.2667	.007	.0001	n.s. (.064)
SHOWING DISINTEREST	133.1333	87.333	64.0667	.002	.044	.0001

Statistical significance $p \leq .05$

Note: Non-significant probabilities of t have been indicated as n.s.

In nonverbal behaviour female groups display significantly greater Showing Interest behaviour than male groups ($p=.002$). Compared to mixed sex groups, all-female groups manifest significantly higher amounts of Showing Interest ($p=.0001$) as well as Showing Disinterest ($p=.04$). The all-male groups manifest higher amounts of Showing Interest and significantly higher amounts of Showing Disinterest ($p=.0001$). Thus, all-female groups manifest more Showing Interest behaviour than the other sex groups and the all-male groups manifest more Showing Interest behaviour than the mixed sex groups. The all-male groups manifest more Showing Disinterest behaviour than the all-female groups and the all-female groups manifest more Showing Disinterest behaviour than the mixed sex groups. From these results, the mixed sex groups manifest less Showing Interest and less Showing Disinterest behaviour.

On the basis of sex alone, apart from same sex or mixed sex group composition, males and females differ significantly in non-verbal behaviour. Table 9 shows the mean frequencies of nonverbal behaviour by sex.

Males tend toward: 1) more looking away from the speaker ($p=.002$); 2) more leaning away from the speaker ($p=.01$); 3) more gross body movements ($p=.01$); 4) less listener responses ($p=.003$); and 5) more hand over mouth behaviour ($p=.03$). Generally, males manifested less Showing Interest ($p=.004$) and more Showing Disinterest ($p=.012$).

The frequencies of Showing Interest and Disinterest were each divided into high and low categories as those frequencies above and

TABLE 9
MEAN FREQUENCIES OF NON VERBAL BEHAVIOUR BY SEX

NON VERBAL CATEGORIES	MALE	FEMALE	VALUE OF t	ONE-TAILED PROBABILITY OF t
SHOWING INTEREST	10.5455	23.1739	2.78	.004
SHOWING DISINTEREST LISTENER	110.7727	79.8696	2.34	.012
RESPONSES	9.4091	22.2174	2.89	.003
LEANING TOWARD	1.0909	.9565	.25	n.s.
LOOKING AWAY	28.2273	9.0870	3.06	.002
GROSS BODY MOVEMENTS	17.7273	11.1304	2.16	.01
HAND OVER MOUTH	7.5000	3.9565	1.87	.03
SELF MANIPULATION	31.3636	29.6087	.33	n.s.
HAND SUPPORTING HEAD	5.0455	4.6522	.18	n.s.

Statistical significance $p \leq .05$

Note: Nonsignificance probabilities of t have been indicated as n.s.

below the mean. This procedure was used to determine the relationship between frequency of actual nonverbal behaviour, Showing Interest and Disinterest, to Self Report Measures and Others' Ratings of the subjects. The previous results have indicated that the subjects manifested differences in nonverbal behaviour according to their Self Report Measure of Alienation. This demonstrates that individuals do nonverbally communicate how they feel during interactions.

Since these nonverbal behaviours are visible and have a communicative function the question arises as to how accurately other

members in a group decode these nonverbal behaviours. Ekman (1972) hypothesized that individuals will differ in their patterns of accuracy, recognizing some emotions but not all emotions. In the Ekman study emotions were judged from photographs, while in this study the individuals were involved in a conversational encounter and had to make judgments on the feelings of the other four members in the group.

Table 10 displays the percentage of others' ratings of subjects by the subjects nonverbal behaviour.

TABLE 10
PERCENTAGE OF OTHERS' RATING OF SUBJECTS
BY SUBJECTS NONVERBAL BEHAVIOUR

NONVERBAL CATEGORIES	OTHERS' RATING OF SUBJECTS					
	INTERESTED	BORED	AT EASE	UNEASY	QUIET	SHY
LOW SHOWING INTEREST	58%	90%	64%	81%	78%	60%
HIGH SHOWING INTEREST	42	10	36	19	22	40
TOTAL PERCENT	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
LOW SHOWING DISINTEREST	64	41	52	52	53	60
HIGH SHOWING DISINTEREST	36	59	48	48	47	40
TOTAL PERCENT	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

The results indicate that subjects with low Showing Interest Behaviours were seen as more bored, at ease, uneasy, interested, quiet and shy than the subjects with high Showing Interest behaviours.

Subjects with low Showing Disinterest behaviours were seen as more interested, at ease, uneasy, quiet, shy and less bored than the subjects with high Showing Disinterest behaviours. In Others' Ratings of Subjects there appears to be a relationship between type and frequency of nonverbal behaviour to the ratings of boredom. That is, when individuals showed Low Interest and High Disinterest behaviours they were seen more often as bored than those subjects who showed high interest and low disinterest behaviours. On the rating of interest the results are not consistent with what was expected. It was predicted that subjects manifesting Low Disinterest Behaviours and High Showing Interest Behaviours would be seen more often as interested.

However, subjects manifesting low Showing Interest behaviours and low Showing Disinterest behaviours were seen more often as interested. A possible explanation is that Showing Interest nonverbally is not sufficient in and of itself to communicate interest and that the Others'

- Ratings of Subjects were also based on the verbal participation of the subjects. The results on the ratings of boredom are not affected by the results on interest ratings in that boredom is primarily communicated nonverbally. Goffman (1967b) suggests that bored individuals attempt to maintain the required level of participation. Therefore, even though both interested and bored subjects participate the bored

subjects manifested certain nonverbal behaviours to indicate their boredom which interested subjects would not necessarily manifest.

As for the ratings of at ease, uneasy, quiet and shy there appears to be little consistency with the ratings and the type and frequency of nonverbal behaviour. The results show that subjects who manifested low Showing Interest behaviours were seen as more uneasy, quiet, shy and at ease than subjects who manifested high Showing Interest. ~~The~~ subjects manifesting low Showing Interest should not be more at ease and uneasy than those subjects manifesting high Showing Interest. However, if the table is read across the results show that the subjects who manifest low Showing Interest are seen more often as uneasy and subjects manifesting high Showing Interest are seen more often as at ease. In both high and low Showing Disinterest there is no difference in the ratings of at ease and uneasy. In Others'

Rating of Subjects the ratings of quiet and shy are both high for those subjects who manifest Low Showing Interest behaviours and low Showing Disinterest behaviours. A possible reason for this could be that those subjects who are quiet and shy manifest little nonverbal behaviour perhaps so as to not draw attention to themselves.

The inconsistencies in the results of Others' Rating of Subjects could be attributed to two reasons: 1) that accuracy of perception varies with the type of emotion displayed 2) that frequency and type of nonverbal behaviour could have no relationship to boredom, interest, easiness, uneasiness, or quietness and shyness. The first reason cannot be adequately dealt with in this study. The second

reason was examined. Table 11 displays the relationship of the subjects' own ratings on the Self Report Measure of Alienation by the type and frequency of the subjects nonverbal behaviour. This table indicates that those subjects who manifest low Showing Interest behaviour rate themselves less interested, calm, at ease, and more poised than subjects who manifest high Showing Interest. Those subjects who manifested low Showing Disinterest behaviour rate themselves more interested, poised, free, calm, and at ease than those subjects who manifest high Showing Disinterest behaviour. These results aid in supporting the other results that interest and boredom are communicated nonverbally. The inconsistency and small differences in the Self Report measures of poised-awkward, at ease-self-conscious, calm-embarrassed can be explained. People perceive interest or boredom deriving from the situation but poised-awkward, at ease-self-conscious, calm-embarrassed, quiet and shy are internal conditions for which individuals perceive themselves as responsible. Therefore, people will be more willing to admit interest-boredom than the negative social attributes of awkward, self-conscious, embarrassed, quiet or shy. An interesting result is that the subjects did not rate themselves as shy but other's rated subjects shy.

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE OF SUBJECTS' RATINGS ON SELF REPORT
MEASURE OF ALIENATION BY NONVERBAL BEHAVIOUR

SELF REPORT MEASURE OF ALIENATION	LEVELS OF SHOWING INTEREST AND SHOWING DISINTEREST			
	LOW SHOWING INTEREST	HIGH SHOWING INTEREST	LOW SHOWING DISINTEREST	HIGH SHOWING DISINTEREST
INTERESTED	64	75	78	57
BORED	36	25	22	43
TOTAL PER CENT	100	100	100	100
POISED	91	87	91	88
AWKWARD	9	13	9	12
TOTAL PER CENT	100	100	100	100
FREE	78	78	84	75
CONSTRAINED	22	22	16	25
TOTAL PER CENT	100	100	100	100
CALM	86	88	94	81
EMBARRASSED	14	12	6	19
TOTAL PER CENT	100	100	100	100
AT EASE	82	87	87	80
SELF CONSCIOUS	18	13	13	20
TOTAL PER CENT	100	100	100	100

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

In summary, the following results were attained:

1. The general contention of the researchers of nonverbal behaviour that nonverbal behaviour has a communicative function has been supported by the data in this thesis. Specifically the hypothesis (Hypothesis 1:1) that boredom and interest are communicated nonverbally in an interaction has been supported. Further, that frequency and the type of nonverbal behaviour are related to interest and boredom. That is, those subjects who rated themselves interested manifested more Showing Interest behaviours which include listener responses and leaning toward the speaker as well as less Showing Disinterest behaviours which include looking away from the speaker, self manipulation, object manipulation, hand supporting head and leaning away. These results are also supportive of Goffman's concept of alienation. Tables 1, 2, and 10 illustrate these relationships.
2. It was predicted in Hypothesis 2:1 that time is a contributing factor to alienation, and is supported by the results of the data. As time goes on in an interaction alienation increases. The researcher wishes to take issue with Goffman's concept of alienation as a contagious disease. Goffman states that once an individual becomes alienated the other individuals in the group will become alienated. It is the researcher's belief that it is not the perception of alienation (boredom) in others that causes one to become alienated but rather a series of other factors. That is, one result of alienation is that of less verbal participation or termination of involvement, therefore there

are less people carrying on the discussion. With the factor of time and the decrease in active participation the topic is more easily exhausted and repetition sets in which causes alienation in others.

Therefore, it is the results of alienation that lead to alienation in others rather than the perception of alienation in others.

3. The degree of alienation demonstrated nonverbally is influenced by the sex of the actor and the sex composition of the group. The data show that males manifest less Showing Interest behaviours and more Showing Disinterest behaviours while females manifest more Showing Interest behaviours and less Showing Disinterest behaviours, thus supporting Hypothesis 4:1. These findings also support the research on looking behaviours and listener responses. Exline, Gray and Schuette (1965) found that women engage in more overall eye contact and more eye contact while speaking and during silences. Exline and Winters (1965) found that women engage in more eye contact while listening. Dittman (1972) found that women manifest more listener responses than males. In this study, males manifest more leaning away from the speaker, looking away from the speaker, gross body movements, and hand over mouth. These sex differences may be related to the fact that males in our culture are socialized to inhibit and mask many kinds of emotion.

The results for all-female, all-male groups are consistent with the results obtained from the analysis of sex differences. The results of the mixed sex groups however, were not straightforward. In nonverbal behaviours the all-female groups manifested more Showing

Interest behaviours than the all-male groups and mixed sex groups. The all-male groups manifested more Showing Disinterest behaviours than the female or mixed sex groups. It would be expected that the results from the mixed sex groups would lie somewhere between those of the single sex groups. However, the mixed sex groups manifested less Showing Interest and less Showing Disinterest than either the all-female groups or the all-male groups. These differences could be related to the fact that different behaviours are expected in mixed sex groups than in single sex groups.

The Self Report Measures generally indicate that females were more interested, at ease, free and less embarrassed than the other groups. This could be attributed to the fact that females are supposed to be more attentive, more sympathetic and more open with people than males. All the groups were to a similar degree awkward and self-conscious. The reasons for this could be that they were uneasy because of the experimental situation, knowledge of the video taping and the fact that the groups were composed of strangers.

4. If nonverbal behaviour is communicative to what extent do others perceive this communication? The results indicate that individuals perceive alienation from interaction more accurately than easiness or uneasiness in an interaction. The subjects were also fairly accurate in their perception of interest. However, the results are not consistent and suggest that other factors may be involved in the ratings of others on interest. In coding the videotapes only the behaviours of the subjects when listening were coded. If a subject was actively

participating in the discussion to a greater degree than other members in the group there would be less of an opportunity to code his behaviour while listening. Therefore, in order to accurately estimate interest, the verbal participation should be coded as well. The reasons for inconsistent results on easiness and uneasiness may be attributed to the fact that individuals are not readily disposed to disclose feelings that are socially negative attributes and may indicate that they are at ease when in fact they are uneasy.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSIONS

There are several important conclusions that may be drawn from this research. The data presented in the body of this thesis has provided direct support for Goffman's concept of "Alienation from Interaction". Goffman states that alienation occurs frequently in focused encounters and that alienation from interaction is manifested by observable signs of boredom and embarrassment. The results of this study demonstrate that individuals nonverbally communicate both involvement and alienation in encounters with others. Nonverbal behaviours were consistently related to the degree of alienation perceived by the actor. Actors who rated themselves bored gave more nonverbal indicators of alienation than actors who rated themselves interested. It was also found that alienation demonstrated nonverbally was influenced by the sex of the actor and the sex composition of the group. Goffman, in his analysis of alienation, did not deal with the influence of a time factor on alienation. The study found that as the duration of an interaction increased the number of alienated individuals increased.

Although the results indicate a relationship between the frequency of movements and the Self Report Measures of Alienation, there was no determination whether subjects were honest in their Self Reports. It is believed however, that subjects were more honest in their report

of interest and boredom as these states are more readily related to external factors than in reports of awkwardness, uneasiness and embarrassment which may be related to personal inadequacies. There are, of course, some people who are more effective in concealing their alienation during an encounter. There was no way of determining whether or not individuals present were effectively concealing their alienation.

Unfortunately, the experimental results shed little light on the decoding behaviour of subjects in focused encounters. Originally, the researcher had hoped to more clearly demonstrate to what degree individuals accurately perceive involvement or alienation of another individual. This area of investigation is important to Goffman's work on alienation in that he places emphasis on the behaviour of an individual as a result of other's perceiving her misinvolvement from the interaction. It would also be interesting to look at sex differences in decoding behaviour. Research in this area indicates that females are more receptive to nonverbal emotional cues than males (Buck, 1972). Information on the quality of decoding of communications may be an additional indicator of alienation of the subjects. That is, when individuals listen they organize their concentration on the verbal and nonverbal communication in an interaction. Only after individuals attend to the conversation are they able to perceive verbally and/or nonverbally the degree of involvement or alienation of another. Therefore, if one of the subjects is continually inaccurate in her perception of others it may be because she herself

is alienated rather than a function of quality or sensitivity of the subject herself.

In most decoding studies subjects judge effect from still photographs usually specific to one body area such as the face. One problem with this method is that the information that may be conveyed by a still photograph is very limited. If subjects, who have verbally communicated with each other, are allowed to view themselves in an interaction by video feedback it would be possible to explore the reasons for individuals exhibiting certain nonverbal behaviour and to obtain other's interpretations of the behaviour. In the pretest portion of this experimental study the feedback session proved to be very informative. After the encounter, the videotaped recording of that encounter was played back to the subjects. In this feedback session the tape was played for ten minute periods and after each period there was a discussion and often the tape was played back to clarify points in the discussion. During the ten minute viewing periods the subjects were to write down who they thought was bored and what the individual did to indicate this boredom to them. After the ten minute period each subject verbally indicated when she was bored, why she was bored, and if she could recognize the behaviour she manifested when she was bored. The other subjects supported, rejected, or added to what the subject said. In doing this, the researcher was given an indication of what kinds of nonverbal behaviours were manifested when subjects were bored and also how others saw another individual in the group. Time did not allow for the inclusion of a

feedback session in this study. However, the possibilities of obtaining useful data from such a method are great if only for exploratory purposes.

The instruments and their implementation in this study could be improved upon. One weak point in the Self Report Measure of Alienation is that there was only one measure of interest. This could easily be improved simply by adding other measures of interest. This would provide an effective internal consistency check of interest.

A weakness in the Other Ratings of the Subjects is that these ratings encompassed all the time segments. The difficulty here is that a general rating is given to the subjects rather than a rating by time segment as are the Self Ratings and Self Report Measure of Alienation. If time had allowed, the Other Ratings of Subjects would also have been done by time segment. Also, it would have been easier to perform statistical analysis if the Other Ratings of Subjects were based on a scale similar to that of the Self Report Measure of Alienation instead of a written report which requires a great deal of coding time. However, written reports allow for a greater range and freedom of comment.

A further suggestion is that if anyone has similar data to that in this study she should not use the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences unless very careful consideration is undertaken. It was found that SPSS was very limited and the researcher was unable to manipulate the data for proper analysis.

Participant observation studies have been duly criticized in

the literature for their lack of empirical justification. Campbell (1955), Vidich and Shapiro (1955) attempted to evaluate the validity of participant observation studies by comparing the results of a participant observation study to those of survey research. The results in these two studies are favourable; however, the researcher believes that systematic observation in an experimental situation is more closely related to participant observation and a better method of evaluating the validity of a participant observation study.

This study demonstrates the feasibility of the use of laboratory settings and electronic recording devices and provides an excellent example of verification and amplification of participant observation findings. The results also show that data obtained in the field can be the basis for systematic observation and coding in an experimental situation.

Appendix A: Self Report Measure of Alienation

Circle how you felt during the first ten minutes of this session

at ease	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	self conscious
poised	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	awkward
constrained	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	free
embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	calm
interested	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	bored

Circle how you felt during the middle ten minutes of this session

at ease	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	self conscious
poised	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	awkward
constrained	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	free
embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	calm
interested	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	bored

Circle how you felt during the last ten minutes of this session

at ease	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	self conscious
poised	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	awkward
constrained	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	free
embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	calm
interested	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	bored

Appendix B: Written Reports of Feelings

Describe in a few words the situations in which you felt the feelings circled on sheet A.

First Ten Minutes

Middle Ten Minutes

Last Ten Minutes

Appendix C: Others' Ratings of SubjectsHow I Thought Others Felt

In the first space describe how you thought that person felt during the session.

In the second space discuss what the person did to convey the above feeling.

(HOW)

name of
group
member

(WHAT)

name of
group
member

name of
group
member

name of
group
member

Appendix D: Category System

NONVERBAL BEHAVIOURS	FIRST TEN MINUTES	MIDDLE TEN MINUTES	LAST TEN MINUTES	TOTAL
-------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-------

LOOKING TOWARD				
----------------	--	--	--	--

LEANING TOWARD				
----------------	--	--	--	--

LISTENER RESPONSES				
--------------------	--	--	--	--

GROSS BODY MOVEMENTS				
----------------------	--	--	--	--

HAND OVER MOUTH				
-----------------	--	--	--	--

HAND SUPPORTING HEAD				
----------------------	--	--	--	--

LEANING AWAY				
--------------	--	--	--	--

LOOKING AWAY				
--------------	--	--	--	--

OBJECT MANIPULATION				
---------------------	--	--	--	--

SELF MANIPULATION				
-------------------	--	--	--	--

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Argyle, Michael. 1968. Social Interaction. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Argyle, Michael, and Dean, J. 1965. "Eye Contact, Distance and Affiliation." Sociometry, 28, pp.289-304.
- Argyle, Michael, Lalljee, M.G., and Cook, M. 1968. "The Effects of Visibility on Interaction in a Dyad." Human Relations, 21, pp. 3-17.
- Barnlund, Dean. 1968. Interpersonal Communication: Survey and Studies. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Becker, Howard. 1958. "Problems of Inference and Proof in Participant Observation." American Sociological Review, 23, pp.652-659.
- Birdwhistell, Ray. 1966. "Paralanguage: Twenty-five Years After Sapir." Lectures on Experimental Psychiatry. Edited by H.W. Brosin. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press.
- Blumer, H. 1966. "Sociological Implications of the Thought of George Herbert Mead." Social Psychology Through Symbolic Interaction. Edited by G. Stone and H. Faberman. Massachusetts: Ginn-Blaisdell. 1970.
- _____. 1969. Symbolic Interactionism. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Bruyn, Severyn. 1966. The Human Perspective in Sociology: The Methodology of Participant Observation. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Buck, Ross. 1972. "Communication of Affect through Facial Expressions in Humans." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 23, pp. 362-371.
- Cartwright, Dorwin. 1953. "Analysis of Qualitative Material." Research Methods in the Behavioural Sciences. Edited by L. Festinger and D. Katz. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Campbell, Donald. 1955. "An Informant in Quantitative Research." American Journal of Sociology, 60, pp.339-342.
- Denzin, Norman. 1970a. "Symbolic Interactionism and Ethnomethodology." Understanding-Everyday Life. Edited by Jack D. Douglas. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1970.

- Denzin, Norman. 1970b. "Rules of Conduct and the Study of Deviant Behaviour: Some Notes on the Social Relationship." Social Relationships. Edited by George McCall et. al. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1970.
- Denzin, Norman. 1970c. The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Dittman, Allen, T. 1962. "The Relationship Between Body Movements and Moods in Interviews." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 26, p.480.
- Dittman, Allen, T. 1963. "Kinesic Research and Therapeutic Processes: Further Discussion." Expressions of the Emotions in Man. Edited by Peter H. Knapp. New York: International Universities Press, Inc.
- Dittman, Allen, T. 1972. "Conversational Behaviours." The Journal of Communication, 22, pp. 404-423.
- Dittman, A., Parloff, M., and Boomer, D. 1965. "Facial and Bodily Expression: A Study of Receptivity of Emotional Cues." Psychiatry, 28, pp. 239-244.
- Dittman, A., Llewellyn, G. 1969. "Body Movement and Speech Rhythm in Social Conversation." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 11, pp. 98-106.
- Douglas, Jack. 1970a. Understanding Everyday Life. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- _____. 1970b. "Understanding Everyday Life." Understanding Everyday Life. Edited by Jack Douglas. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.
- _____. 1970c. The Relevance of Sociology.
- Ekman, Paul. 1957. "A Methodological Discussion of Nonverbal Behaviour." Journal of Psychology, 43, pp.141-149.
- _____. 1965a. "Communication through Nonverbal Behaviour: A Source of Information about an Interpersonal Relationship." Affect, Cognition, and Personality. Edited by S. Tomkins. New York, Springer.
- _____. 1965b. "Differential Communication of Affect by Head and Body Cues." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2, pp.726-735.

- Ekman, P., and Friesen, W.V. 1967. "Head and Body Cues in the Judgment of Emotion: A Reformulation." Perceptual Motor Skills, 24, pp.711-724.
- _____. 1969. "The Repertoire of Non-verbal Behaviour - Categories, Origins, Usage and Coding." Semiotica, 1, pp. 49-98.
- _____. 1969. "Nonverbal Leakage and Clues to Deception." Psychiatry, 32, pp. 88-106.
- Ellsworth, P. and Carlsmith, J.M. 1968. "Effects of Eye Contact and Verbal Content on Affective Response to Dyadic Interaction." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10, pp.15-20.
- Exline, R. 1963. "Explorations in the Process of Person Perception: Visual Interaction in Relation to Competition, Sex and Need for Affiliation." Journal of Personality, 31, pp.1-20.
- Exline, R., Gray, D., Schuette, D. 1965. "Visual Behaviour in a Dyad as Affected by Interview Content and Sex of Respondent." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1, pp. 201-209.
- Exline, R., and Winters L.C. 1965. "Affective Relations and Mutual Glances in Dyads." Affect, Cognition, and Personality. Edited by C.Z. Izard. New York: Springer.
- Finifter, Ada. 1972. Alienation and the Social System. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Fries, C.C. 1952. The Structure of English. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Frijda, N.H. 1969. "Recognition of Emotion." Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. Edited by Leonard Berkowitz. New York: Academic Press.
- Glaser, B., and Strauss, A. 1964. "Awareness Contexts and Social Interaction." American Sociological Review, 29, pp. 669-679.
- Goffman, Erving. 1961. Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.
- _____. 1964. Behaviour in Public Places. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
- _____. 1967a. Interaction Ritual. New York: Anchor Books.
- _____. 1967b. "Alienation from Interaction." Interaction Ritual. Edited by Erving Goffman. New York: Anchor Books.

Goffman, Erving. 1967c. "Embarrassment and Social Organization." Interaction Ritual. Edited by Erving Goffman. New York: Anchor Books. pp. 97-112.

_____. 1967d. "On Face-Work." Interaction Ritual. Edited by Erving Goffman. New York: Anchor Books. pp. 5-46.

Gross, E. and Stone, G. 1964. "Embarrassment and the Analysis of Role Requirements." American Journal of Sociology, 70, pp. 1-15.

Hutt, S.J., and Hutt. 1970. Direct Observation and Measurement of Behaviour. Springfield, Illinois: Thomas.

James, W.T. 1932. "A Study of the Expression of Bodily Posture." Journal of General Psychology, 7, pp. 405-437.

Kendon, A. 1967. "Some Functions of Gaze Direction in Social Interaction." Acta Psychologica, 26, pp. 22-63.

Kendon, A. and Cook, M. 1969. "The Consistency of Gaze Patterns in Social Interactions." British Journal of Psychology, 60, pp. 481-494.

Lasswell, T., Burma, J., and Aronson, S. 1965. Life in Society. Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Libby, W.L. 1970. "Eye Contact and Direction of Looking as Stable Individual Differences." Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 4, pp. 303-312.

Maxwell, Gerald. 1963. "Visibility in Small Groups." Journal of Social Psychology, 61, pp. 311-325.

McCall, George. 1970a. Social Relationships. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

_____. 1970b. "The Social Organization of Relationships." Social Relationships. Edited by George McCall. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, pp. 3-34.

McCall, Michal. 1970. "Boundary Rules in Relationships and Encounters." Social Relationships. Edited by George McCall. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company. pp. 35-61.

McCroskey, Larson, and Knapp. 1971. An Introduction to Interpersonal Communication. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- Mehrabian, A. -1968. "The Inference of Attitudes from the Posture, Orientation, and distance on a Communication." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 32, pp. 296-308.
- _____. 1969. "Significance of Posture and Position in Communication of Attitude and Status Relationships." Psychological Bulletin, 71, pp. 359-366.
- Mehrabian, A. and Ferris, S.R. 1967. "Inference of Attitudes from Non-Verbal Communication." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 31, pp. 248-252.
- Mehrabian, A. and Wiener, M. 1967. "Decoding of Inconsistent Communications." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 6, pp. 109-114.
- Mehrabian, A. and Williams, M. 1969. "Nonverbal Concomitants of Perceived and Intended Persuasiveness." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13, pp. 37-58.
- Modigliani, A. 1968. "Embarrassment and Embarrassability." Sociometry, 31, pp. 313-326.
- Modigliani, A. 1971. "Embarrassment, Facework and Eye Contact: Testing a Theory of Embarrassment." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17, pp. 15-24.
- Nielsen, G. 1962. Studies in Self-Confrontation. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen.
- Reece, M.M. and Whitman, R.W. 1962. "Expressive Movements, Warmth, and Verbal Reinforcement." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 64, pp. 234-246.
- Rosenfeld, H.M. 1966a. "Approval-seeking and Approval Inducing Functions of Verbal and Nonverbal Responses in a Dyad." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, pp. 597-605...
- _____. 1966b. "Instrumental Affiliative Functions of Facial and Gestural Expressions." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, pp. 65-72.
- Schefflen, A.E. 1964. "The Significance of Posture in Communication Systems." Psychiatry, 27, pp. 316-331.
- Seeman, Melvin. 1959. "On the Meaning of Alienation." Alienation and the Social System. Edited by Ada Finifter. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. pp. 45-54.

- Simmel, Georg. 1924. "On Visual Interaction." Social Psychology Through Symbolic Interaction. Edited by G. Stone and H. Faberman. Massachusetts: Ginn-Blaisdell. pp. 300-303.
- Slater, Phillip, E. 1958. "Contrasting Correlates of Group Size." Sociometry, 21, pp. 129-139.
- Thompson, D.F., and Meltzer, L. 1964. "Communication of Emotional Intent by Facial Expression." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 68, pp. 129-135.
- Vidich, A. and Shapiro, G. 1955. "A Comparison of Participant Observation and Survey Data." American Journal of Sociology, 60, pp. 28-33.
- Webb, Eugene, J., et. al. 1966. Unobstrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Weick, Karl. 1968. "Systematic Observational Methods." The Handbook of Social Psychology. Edited by G. Lindzey and E. Aronson. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley. pp. 357-451.

VITA AUCTORIS

NAME: Janice Drakich

EDUCATION:

Secondary: Walkerville Collegiate Institute
Windsor, Ontario
Senior Matriculation, 1968

Undergraduate: University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario
General Bachelor of Arts, 1970

Graduate: Department of Sociology and Anthropology
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario