

**SITAR Program 2005**  
Montreal, Quebec

**Sunday**

8:30 Registration and continental breakfast

9:00 Opening Session

Welcome: Krista Trobst (York University) and D. S. Moskowitz (McGill University)

Keynote  
Address: Lorna Smith Benjamin (University of Utah)

Interpersonal psychology from Freud to DSM-V

10:15 Aaron Pincus, Amy Przeworski, Alissa Yamasaki, Michele B. Kasoff,  
Michelle G. Newman, Louis G. Gastonguay, and Thomas D. Borkovec  
(Pennsylvania State University)  
Interpersonal Pathoplasticity in Generalized Anxiety Disorder: A Cluster  
Analytic Replication

10:40 Break

10:55 Fiona S. Schulte and Myriam Mongrain (York University)  
Healthy and Unhealthy Dependence: Implications for Major Depression

11:20 Douglas A. Vakoch (SETI Institute), Kaya Ono (Clark University), and  
Yuh-shiow Lee (National Chung Cheng University, Taiwan)  
Interpersonal Issues in Cross-Cultural Perspective: A Comparison of  
Japan and the United States

11:45 Pamela Sadler (Wilfrid Laurier University) and Erik Woody (University  
of Waterloo)  
Analysis of the Process of Complementarity using SEM-Based Dyadic  
Models

12:10 Lunch

- 1:30 Panel: Project for an Evolutionary Personality Psychology  
Chairs: David C. Zuroff (McGill University) and Marc A. Fournier  
(University of Toronto at Scarborough)
- Speakers:
- Marc A. Fournier, David C. Zuroff, Erika Patall (McGill University), Bonnie Cheng (University of Toronto at Scarborough), Erin Mae Hurley (University of Toronto at Scarborough), John Gosset, and Alexandra Frankel (McGill University)  
Mapping the Rank Domain
- Michelle Leybman (McGill University), David C. Zuroff, Marc A. Fournier, and Carolina Pansera (McGill University)  
Mapping the Alliance Domain
- Tharsni Kankesan (University of Toronto at Scarborough), Marc A. Fournier, and David C. Zuroff  
Mapping the Coalitional Domain
- 3:00 Del Paulhus (University of British Columbia)  
Agentic and Communal Self-Enhancement
- 3:25 Break
- 3:40 Business meeting
- 4:40 Poster session
- 6:30 Dinner at Le Caveau, 2063 Victoria, Montreal (near President-Kennedy Ave., between University St. and Mansfield St.)

## Monday

- 8:30 Continental breakfast
- 9:00 Lindsay E. Ayearst and Krista K. Trobst (York University)  
The MMPI-2 Interpersonal Scales: Looking for the Circle
- 9:25 G. Scott Acton (Rochester Institute of Technology)  
Contributions of Interpersonal Theory to Human Enviromics: A  
Research Agenda
- 9:50 Christy Hofsess, Debbiesiu Lee, and Terence Tracey (Arizona State University)  
Understanding Intrapersonal Congruence in Context
- 10:15 Terence J. G. Tracey (Arizona State University)  
An Ideographic Examination of Interpersonal Self-Ratings
- 10:40 Break
- 10:55 Panel: Interpersonal Behavior, Interpersonal Problems and Interpersonal  
Motivation  
Chair: Martin Grosse Holtforth (University of Bern, Switzerland)
- Speakers:
- Leonard M. Horowitz (Stanford University)  
Frustrated Interpersonal Motives, Interpersonal Problems, and Subjective  
Distress
- Martin Grosse Holtforth, Klaus Grawe (University of Bern, Switzerland), Louis  
Castonguay (Pennsylvania State University), & Birgit Mauler (Christoph-  
Dornier-Klinik, Germany)  
What You Want Is Not What You Get – Goal Importance, Goal Satisfac-  
tion, and Interpersonal Problems
- Kenneth Locke (University of Idaho) and Pamela Sadler (Wilfrid Laurier  
University)  
Interpersonal Motives and Interpersonal Conflicts
- 12:25 Lunch
- 1:35 Michael Gurtman, Katherine Bennett, Heather Hutchinson, Lacey Johnson, Barb  
Ruth, Laura Terry, and Michelle Wright (University of Wisconsin-Parkside)  
Agency, Communion, and Positive Psychology

2:00 Panel: The Prototype: A Concept that Helps Us Examine Interpersonal Motives and Goals

Chair: Leonard M. Horowitz (Stanford University)

Speakers:

Leonard M. Horowitz (Stanford University)  
Inter-rater Disagreements and Miscommunication

Bulent Turan (Stanford University)  
The Availability of Two Related Prototypes: Trustworthiness and the Secure Base (Attachment) Script

Lynne Henderson (Stanford University)  
Social Allergies and Frustrated Interpersonal Goals

3:30 Closing coffee

## Poster Presentations

1. Socially Anxious Individuals: Self and Other-perceptions of Interpersonal Behaviour  
Khushnuma Amaria & Jonathan M. Oakman (University of Waterloo)
2. Distinguishing Vulnerable Narcissism from Avoidant Personality Using Measures of Interpersonal Problems and Social Anxiety  
Nicole M. Cain, Aaron L. Pincus, & Claudia A. Pimentel (Pennsylvania State University)
3. The Relationship Between Pretreatment Interpersonal Problems, Working Alliance, Alliance Fluctuations, and Outcome  
Liz Davis, Candace Patterson, M. E. Crowley, & Timothy Anderson (Ohio University)
4. The Impact of Client-Provider Interpersonal Behaviors on Service Outcome: An Application of the Interpersonal Circumplex Model  
Laurette Dubé, Debbie S. Moskowitz, & Zhenfeng Ma (McGill University)
5. The Unfriendly Side of the Circumplex: What's Left When We Take Away What's Bad?  
Nicole Ethier (University of Waterloo), Erik Woody (University of Waterloo), Pamela Sadler (Wilfrid Laurier University)
6. Self-Presentation as Role Enactment: A Look at Acting in Everyday Life  
Mark Gapen & Marshall Duke (Emory University)
7. The Relationship of Interpersonal Style with Attachment and Object Relations  
Gregory A. Goldman & Timothy Anderson (Ohio University)
8. Status Dynamics in a Canadian Fraternity  
Alana L. Greco (University of Toronto at Scarborough), Marc A. Fournier (University of Toronto at Scarborough), & David C. Zuroff (McGill University)
9. Case Formulation in Interpersonal Reconstructive Therapy: Using SASB and copy process theory to reliably track repeating interpersonal themes.  
Natasha Hawley, Kenneth L. Critchfield, Ronna J. Dillinger, & Lorna S. Benjamin (University of Utah)
10. The Impact of Leader's Social Rank Style on Group Members' Need Satisfaction and Perceptions of Group Performance  
Allison C. Kelly, Emily A. Martin, Michelle J. Leybman, & David C. Zuroff (McGill University)
11. The Impact of Alliance Styles on Objective Group Performance  
Michelle J. Leybman, Allison C. Kelly, Emily A. Martin, & David C. Zuroff (McGill University)

12. Situational  
Zuroff (McGill University)  
The Impact of Alliance Styles on Subjective Group Performance and the Specificity of Alliance Styles  
Michelle J. Leybman, Allison C. Kelly, Emily A. Martin & David C. University)
13. Sampled  
Michael Quek & Debbie S. Moskowitz (McGill University)  
Neural Network Modeling of Close Relationships with Empirical Event-  
Personality Data
14. Temperament and Goal Orientation as Predictors of Social Strategy Use and Affect  
Lena C. Quilty & Jonathan M. Oakman (University of Waterloo)
15. Does Mood Affect What We See in Others? The Impact of Dysphoria on the Assessment of Social Behaviour  
Greg Rousell & Pamela Sadler (Wilfrid Laurier University)
16. Using SASB Observational Coding to Differentiate Families with High and Low Potential for Child Abuse  
Elizabeth A. Skowron & Aaron L. Pincus (Pennsylvania State University)
17. Interpersonal Complementarity in the Workplace  
Anne-Marie Turcotte-Tremblay, Moon-ho Ringo Ho, & D. S. Moskowitz (McGill University)
18. The Voice of Interpersonal Distress: Fundamental Frequency of Speech and Interpersonal Issues  
Douglas A. Vakoch (SETI Institute), Dean A. Pollina (Department of Defense Polygraph Institute), & Lee H. Wurm (Wayne State University)

## Contributions of Interpersonal Theory to Human Enviromics: A Research Agenda G. Scott Acton (Rochester Institute of Technology)

Completion of the Human Genome Project signaled the beginning of a new era in understanding the contributions of genes to human behavior, yet this understanding will never eliminate the importance of environments, for genes invariably work in combination with environments. Interpersonal theorists' great contribution to human enviromics is the understanding of dyadic interactions. Lewin's (1936) classic formulation assumed that Behavior =  $f$ (Person, Environment); the present model, by contrast, is explicitly probabilistic:  $\Pr(\text{Behavior}) = f(\text{Person, Environment})$ . Rasch (1960), best known for his one-parameter logistic model, formulated a family of so-called Rasch models:  $\Pr(X = 1) = f(\square + \square)$ . In this model,  $X = 1$  can be understood as a target individual's exhibiting a particular state (i.e., behavior or affect),  $\square$  can be understood as the target's own corresponding trait, and  $\square$  can be understood as a partner's complementary state. This model can be used to test all of the competing formulations of interpersonal complementarity, including Acton and Zodda's (2005) generalized interpersonal principle of complementarity. First, a pool of unidimensional items measuring the states of a generalized partner must be calibrated. Second, the target individual's level on the complementary trait must be measured. Third, the target and partner must be observed over time in an experience-sampling study, cohort study, or clinical trial. Fourth, the correlations among the target's actually exhibited states over time can be tested for circumplex structure. In epidemiologic terms, complementarity is a model for incidence or initiating a new behavior, and circumplex structure is a model interrelating the prevalences of different behaviors over a given time. In addition to the circumplex, a competing model for the structure of behavior is a hierarchial model. The relative fit of these structures can be tested using randomization tests of hypothesized order relations, but the principle of complementarity as formulated here does not depend on one structure fitting better than the other. This model can be expanded to include anticomplementary social roles, in which the target's exhibited state departs from complementarity owing to rigidity (including role disputes, role transitions, and therapeutic noncompliance with a patient's problematic states) or residual deviance for which no term exists (including interpersonal skills deficits and bizarre nonconformity). Rigidity can be described as being firm and unyielding in the face of the interpersonal situation, whereas residual deviance can be described as acting out a social role that is utterly out of context. Rigidity can be modeled as uniform differential item functioning (DIF):  $\Pr(X = 1) = f(\square + \square + z)$ , where  $z$  is the effect of the anticomplementary role. Residual deviance can be modeled as nonuniform DIF:  $\Pr(X = 1) = f(\square + \square + z + z^*\square)$ . This model can be expanded still further by regressing  $\square$  and  $\square$  onto their causes. For example, interdependence theory models the causes of a partner's state as a function of the partner's outcome expectancies relative to the target's, based on which Kelley et al. (2003) constructed an entire atlas of interpersonal situations. Similarly, a target's personality trait is likely caused by a number of fixed (genome and intrafamilial environment) and latent (peer group) effects. It is apparent that a psychometric framework modeling the probability of behavior as a function of person and environment represents fertile ground on which interpersonal theory could contribute to the understanding of human enviromics.

**Socially Anxious Individuals: Self and Other-perceptions of Interpersonal Behaviour**  
**Khushnuma Amaria, B.Sc & Jonathan Oakman, Ph.D. (University of Waterloo)**

We analyzed socially anxious and non-socially anxious individuals' self-perception of interpersonal behaviour during an unstructured getting familiar and structured problem-solving task. In previous analyses, we examined self-perceptions in the situation as a function of trait-level interpersonal style and partner-reported in-situation interpersonal behaviour. Socially anxious individuals' self-ratings of in-situation dominance and affiliation were found to be more similar to partner ratings in comparison with non-socially anxious individuals. We extended these findings in the current analyses by examining actual in-situation behaviour (as rated by blind observers), and partner's trait and in-situation behaviour. Mixed dyads (socially anxious participant with non-socially anxious partner) and same dyads (non-socially anxious participant and partner) were contrasted using structural equation modeling. We found that non-socially anxious individuals' in-situation ratings of dominance and affiliation appeared to be strongly influenced by trait levels of these constructs, rather than actual behaviour during the tasks (*actor effects*). Bi-directional paths between participants and partners' self-reported in-situation affiliation (*partner effects*) were weak for both types of dyads, suggesting that participants and partners were not influencing each others' behaviour in this dimension. Similar findings were obtained with situational dominance ratings for mixed dyads. In contrast, participants' in-situation dominance inversely influenced each other in the same dyads. The interpersonal circumplex notion of reciprocity is examined for socially anxious and non-socially individuals. Implications for theory of interpersonal self-perceptions in social phobia are discussed.

**The MMPI-2 Interpersonal Scales: Looking for the Circle**  
**Lindsay E. Ayearst & Krista K. Trobst (York University)**

The present research attempted to create a circumplex measure of interpersonal personality from the item pool of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory – 2 (MMPI-2; Butcher et al., 1989). In Study 1 (N = 423), the results of the construction of a circumplex measure (the MMPI-C) are presented. Assessment of the structural validity of the measure revealed that internal consistency estimates ranged from .51 to .75 and that two factors accounted for 62% of the variance in the underlying structure. Bipolarity was not adequately achieved for two of the four dimensions, however, the overall pattern of intercorrelations followed reasonably well the properties of a circular matrix. Study 2 (N = 245) presents the results of the cross-validation of the MMPI-C in a similar but separate sample.

**Distinguishing Vulnerable Narcissism from Avoidant Personality  
Using Measures of Interpersonal Problems and Social Anxiety  
Nicole M. Cain, Aaron L. Pincus & Claudia A. Pimentel (Pennsylvania State University)**

Contemporary theories of narcissism delineate two different types of narcissistic characters. The first type is a grandiose subtype, which describes individuals characterized by grandiosity, arrogance, entitlement, and exploitativeness. The second is a vulnerable subtype, which overtly present with shyness and modesty but harbor underlying grandiose expectations and entitlement (Cain & Pincus, 2005; Dickinson & Pincus, 2003). Because of their considerable fear of relating to others and their lack of confidence in their ability to initiate and maintain social relationships, vulnerable narcissists are commonly misdiagnosed as having avoidant personality disorder (Dickinson & Pincus, 2003). The present study sought to differentiate between vulnerable narcissists and avoidant personalities and sought to replicate the circumplex results of Dickinson and Pincus (2003) on the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems – Circumplex Scales (IIP-C; Horowitz, Alden, Wiggins, & Pincus, 2000) using a new assessment measure for vulnerable narcissism. Grandiose narcissists, vulnerable narcissists, and avoidant personalities will produce structural summaries that indicate differing interpersonal problems and differing levels of interpersonal distress for each group. Circular variance analyses will show that the vulnerable narcissist group has a much larger circular variance because they encompass a wider range of interpersonal problems on the circumplex. Also, to further differentiate vulnerable narcissists and avoidant personalities, the underlying motivation for social avoidance is examined. Previous work has suggested that entitled, narcissistically-based shyness is qualitatively different than phobic or anxiety-based shyness (Cheek & Melchoir, 1985). Using a self-report measure of shyness, vulnerable narcissists and avoidant personalities will have equal levels of shyness, but will differ when the correlates of social avoidance are examined. Specifically, the avoidant personality's shyness will be correlated with a fear of negative evaluation while the vulnerable narcissist's shyness will be correlated with a narcissistic social avoidance that reflects the expectation that others will disappoint them or not meet their needs.

**The Relationship Between Pretreatment Interpersonal Problems,  
Working Alliance, Alliance Fluctuations, and Outcome  
Liz Davis, BA, Candace Patterson, MA, ME Crowley, Ph.D. & Tim Anderson, Ph.D.  
(Ohio University)**

Subscales of the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems - Circumplex Version have been shown to correlate with client alliance ratings. Previous research (Muran, Segal, Samstag, & Crawford, 1994) has shown a positive correlation between friendly-submissive and alliance. None of the hostile-dominant subscales showed a significant relationship with alliance. The current research sought to duplicate these findings. Participants were clients in the Ohio University Helping Relationships Study. Forty-four clients with problems of an interpersonal nature took the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems – Circumplex Version at intake for a 7-session treatment. Participants were selected for the study only if they had high scores on at least 3 subscales. Alliance was measured after sessions 1, 3, 5, and 7 using the Working Alliance Inventory – Client Version. Correlation revealed a pattern of relationship between WAI and ipsatized IIP subscale scores. Overly Nurturant positively related to Task at session 7 ( $r=.3, p=.057$ ) and to Goals at session 7 ( $r=.292, p=.064$ ). Domineering negatively related to Bond at session 5 ( $r=-.296, p=.054$ ). Socially Avoidant negatively related to Total at session 7 ( $r=-.297, p=.059$ ). No significant relationships were found between friendly-submissive problems and the alliance. In addition, cluster analysis revealed a subset of clients who reported a high-low-high pattern of alliance development. Membership in this cluster was significantly positively related to Domineering ( $r=.375, p=.011$ ). Finally, ipsatized IIP subscale scores were correlated with unstandardized residualized change scores for the Outcome Questionnaire, and a significant negative correlation was found between Overly Nurturant and OQ change score ( $r=-.402, p<.01$ ), indicating that overly nurturant problems are related to better therapeutic outcome. Results indicate that some pretreatment interpersonal problems are an important contributor to the therapeutic relationship and to outcome.

**The Impact of Client-Provider Interpersonal Behaviors on Service Outcome:  
An Application of the Interpersonal Circumplex Model  
Laurette Dubé, Debbie S. Moskowitz & Zhenfeng Ma (McGill University)**

Existing research into service encounters has focused on the impact of providers' behaviors on service outcome to the neglect of clients' own behaviors and has focused on behaviors on the power/control dimension to the neglect of the affiliation dimension. Finally, few studies in existing service literature have looked at the impact of behavioral complementarity between clients and providers on service outcome. The present research aims to complement existing literature by looking at the effect on service outcome of clients' own interpersonal behaviors (the expression effect) as well as providers' behaviors (the exposure effect), using the interpersonal circumplex model (ICM) as the theoretical framework.

Building on existing literature on the ICM, we expected that during service encounters clients' expression of agreeableness and dominance would have more positive impact on service outcome than clients' expression of quarrelsomeness and submissiveness. We also expected that clients' exposure to provider submissiveness and agreeableness would have more positive impact on service outcome than clients' exposure to provider dominance and quarrelsomeness.

Research hypotheses were tested through an event sampling study. Client-provider interpersonal behaviors were measured through direct observation of repeated service encounters surrounding meal services in the dining room of a long-term healthcare facility. Participants were 32 elderly clients. Meal-level measures for each participant were obtained for three meals within a day, every other day of the hospital stay. Interpersonal behaviors were coded by trained coders. Service outcome was assessed in terms of the client's food consumption.

Consistent with hypotheses, results show that clients' expression of dominance and agreeableness had positive effect on clients' consumption. Also as expected, clients' exposure to provider agreeableness had a positive effect on consumption. However, clients' exposure to provider submissiveness as well as to provider dominance had no effect on consumption.

**The Unfriendly Side of the Circumplex: What's Left When We Take Away What's Bad?  
Nicole Ethier, Erik Woody (University of Waterloo)  
& Pamela Sadler (Wilfrid Laurier University)**

Adjective-based representations of the interpersonal circumplex (e.g., Wiggins, 1982; Kiesler, 1983) tend to have disproportionately more socially undesirable terms on the left side of the circumplex. For example, on the right we have desirable terms like "accommodating," "kind," "cooperative," and "pleasant," whereas on the left side we have undesirable, pejorative terms like "ruthless," "cruel," "harmful," and "rude." Although it is possible to think of equally pejorative words on the right (e.g., clingy, saccharine, overtrusting), very few of these words are actually used. We suggest that there is a possible confound of the friendly-hostile dimension with social desirability (i.e., a good vs. bad dimension). The pejorative quality of the words on the left side of the interpersonal circumplex is especially problematic for measuring implicit traits, because such words may conflate implicit hostility (unfriendliness) with low implicit self-liking or self-esteem. We present two studies that illustrate these issues using an Implicit Association Test to measure implicit affiliation (IAT; Greenwald et al., 1998). The affiliation IAT operates by measuring automatic associations between self and hostile vs. self and friendly words, and reaction time is recorded to see which associations are made with more ease. People are said to have a high degree of implicit affiliation when they associate concepts related to "self" and "friendly" consistently faster than concepts related to "self" and "hostile". If, in comparison to the friendly words, more pejorative hostile words are used, then such a measure may inadvertently tap implicit self-liking, rather than implicit affiliation.

## **Mapping the Rank Domain**

**Marc A. Fournier (University of Toronto at Scarborough), David C. Zuroff, Erika Patall (McGill University), Bonnie Cheng, Erin Mae Hurley (University of Toronto at Scarborough), John Gosset & Alexandra Frankel (McGill University)**

Rank style was defined as the preferred strategies with which individuals assess, pursue, and contest social power. We hypothesized two dimensions of individual differences (high vs. low perceived social power and competitive vs. cooperative tactical preference) giving rise to four prototypical rank styles: autocratic leader (high-power competitor), democratic leader (high-power cooperator), loyal subordinate (low-power cooperator), and treacherous subordinate (low-power competitor). Paragraph-length descriptions of the prototypes were prepared and then decomposed into sentence-length questionnaire items, which together constituted the Rank Style with Peers Questionnaire (RSPQ).

Principal components analysis with promax rotation revealed three factors to the RSPQ: “confidence-leadership” (e.g., “I often feel comfortable assuming a leadership position”), “loyalty-cooperation (e.g., “I have the ability to follow, cooperate, and provide loyal support”), and “treachery-competition” (e.g., “I will do whatever it takes to get ahead”). The second and third factors were modestly negatively correlated. Cronbach’s alpha was .80 or higher for each scale. Self-reports on all three scales converged with informant reports from both friends and romantic partners. The scales displayed discriminant validity from social desirability, attachment style, and the Big Five. As predicted, leadership predicted levels of self-esteem over and above the variance attributable to attachment security. Finally, data are presented from a diary study in which day-to-day self-reports of social behavior (i.e., dominant—submissive, agreeable—quarrelsome) were collected over a 1-week period. Each of the three RSPQ scales displayed over time a distinct pattern of behavioral correlates.

## **Self-Presentation as Role Enactment: A Look at Acting in Everyday Life**

**Mark Gapen, B.A. & Marshall Duke, PhD. (Emory University)**

Interpersonal theory stipulates that individuals have a preferred interpersonal style. Individuals’ ability to manipulate their expressed interpersonal style has thus far not been evaluated in a laboratory setting. Drawing on literature from the study of self-presentation as well as concepts from theater, the current study examined the ability of individuals to manipulate their interpersonal style. Two trained actors and two individuals with no acting training were videotaped enacting a script. They were given adjectives from the Interpersonal Adjective Scale-Revised (IAS-R)(Wiggins, 1988) and instructed to perform the script as if they possessed those qualities. The videos were shown to 41 undergraduates who rated them on the IAS-R and subsequently asked to identify the actors. Results indicated that participants could identify the actors at greater than chance levels. Results also supported the hypothesis that individuals could manipulate their interpersonal style. However, support was not found for the hypothesis that trained actors would be more effective in their enactments of different interpersonal styles. Implications for interpersonal therapy are discussed.

**The Relationship of Interpersonal Style with Attachment and Object Relations**  
**Gregory A. Goldman & Timothy Anderson, Ph.D. (Ohio University)**

Presents preliminary findings from an ongoing study of interpersonal functioning in psychotherapy clients at two university-based counseling centers. Forty-eight clients completed the Interpersonal Adjectives Scales – Revised (IAS-R; Wiggins, 1995), the Revised Adult Attachment Scale (AAS; Collins, 1996), and the Bell Object Relations and Reality Testing Inventory (BORRTI; Bell, 1991) prior to their intake appointment. Clients also completed the Working Alliance Inventory (WAI; Horvath, 1981) following sessions one, two, and three. Assured-Dominant and Gregarious-Extraverted octant scores were found to be positively associated with security of attachment as well as quality of object relations. Unassured-Submissive and Aloof-Introverted octant scores were found to be negatively associated with security of attachment and quality of object relations. It appears that within this outpatient sample, a more dominant, extraverted interpersonal style suggests healthier relational functioning. However, dominance did not predict initial strength nor increases in the therapeutic alliance. It is believed that interpersonal complementarity between therapist and client may be a more optimal predictor of the alliance. Nevertheless, findings from the present study further illuminate the relationship between location on the interpersonal circumplex and other relational variables such as attachment style and quality of object relations.

**Status Dynamics in a Canadian Fraternity**  
**Alana L. Greco, Marc A. Fournier (University of Toronto at Scarborough)**  
**& David C. Zuroff (McGill University)**

In the study of small group dynamics, a fundamental question of interest concerns who attains social status—defined as the amount of prominence, respect, and influence one holds in the eyes of other group members. Anderson, John, Keltner, and Kring (2001) found that, among both men and women, individual differences in trait extraversion demonstrated sizable correlations with peer-rating of social status in face-to-face groups (fraternities, sororities, dormitories). This finding raises the question of what behavioral tactics and strategies extraverts utilize in order to get ahead in social settings. To address this question, we invited all active members of a University of Toronto fraternity to provide self-reports of their personality traits (the Big Five Inventory), self-reports of their rank style (the Rank Style with Peers Questionnaire), and ratings of the extent to which they saw each other group member as having prominence, respect, and influence in the fraternity (i.e., social status). We found that: 1) extraversion and conscientiousness predicted peer-ratings of social status; 2) extraversion and conscientiousness predicted a directive rank style; and 3) directive leadership explained the relationship between extraverted and conscientious personality traits and social status.

**Panel**  
**Interpersonal Behavior, Interpersonal Problems, and Interpersonal Motivation**  
**Martin Grosse Holtforth (University of Bern, Switzerland)**

The authors of this panel each contribute to clarifying the relationships between interpersonal behavior, interpersonal problems, and interpersonal motivation from different perspectives. Len Horowitz will present the revised circumplex model of interpersonal behavior that will serve as the theoretical background for the panel presentations. He will summarize an e-mail discussion of the panel members, and provide empirical data on the relations between interpersonal problems and frustrated interpersonal motives. Martin Grosse Holtforth will present empirical data on the associations between interpersonal problems and motivational goals from three clinical and non-clinical samples. Kenneth Locke will raise conceptual, methodological, and pragmatic issues associated with the prediction of interpersonal conflicts from interpersonal motives. The three presentations will hopefully stimulate a vivid discussion surrounding interpersonal motivation as it relates to interpersonal behaviors and interpersonal problems.

**What You Want Is Not What You Get:**  
**Goal Importance, Goal Satisfaction, and Interpersonal Problems**  
**Martin Grosse Holtforth, Klaus Grawe (University of Bern, Switzerland),**  
**Louis Castonguay (Pennsylvania State University) & Birgit Mauler**  
**(Christoph-Dornier-Klinik, Germany)**

The revised circumplex model of interpersonal behavior assumes that interpersonal behaviors have a motivational basis. We propose *motivational goals* as motivational constructs that “underlie” interpersonal behaviors. Interpersonal problems are assumed to be associated with the motivational goals a person pursues and the success of this goal pursuit. In our presentation we will examine the associations between interpersonal problems and motivational goals using the data from two clinical and one non-clinical sample. 503 Swiss psychotherapy outpatients, 260 German psychotherapy inpatients and 295 US-American undergraduates provided self-report data. Interpersonal problems were measured by the IIP, the *intensity* of motivational goals by the Inventory of Approach and Avoidance Motivation (IAAM), and the degree of *satisfaction* of these same goals by the Incongruence Questionnaire (INC). Results indicated that (a) motivational goals are differentially associated with interpersonal problems, and (b) the same goals are differently located within the circumplex space defined by the IIP circumplex scales depending on whether goal intensity or goal satisfaction is examined. Our findings support and further specify the motivational assumptions of the revised interpersonal model. The findings also raise several theoretical and empirical questions: e.g., is goal dissatisfaction a precipitant, an outcome, or a defining feature of interpersonal problems? How should the distinction between approach and avoidance goals be represented within the circumplex model? What is the impact of conflict between motivational goals on goal satisfaction and interpersonal problems? etc.

## **Agency, Communion, and Positive Psychology**

**Michael B. Gurtman, Katherine Bennett, Heather Hutchinson, Lacey Johnson, Barb Ruth,  
Laura Terry, & Michelle Wright (University of Wisconsin-Parkside)**

Positive psychology is a new movement that focuses on the study of adaptive human strengths and virtues (e.g., kindness, forgiveness, hope, leadership, ambition), and on determining what contributes to an individual's overall sense of happiness and well-being.

The purpose of this research is to examine various core constructs of positive psychology within the context of interpersonal theory and the circumplex model. The interpersonal approach stresses Agency and Communion as the superordinate themes of interpersonal life, and as markers for positive adjustment. The goal of our research is to discern the Agentic and Communal features of positive psychology constructs and their measures.

Approximately 160 subjects completed various measures of positive psychology constructs suggested in part by a recent (2003) assessment handbook for the field. Scales tapped constructs related to psychological well-being, values in action, coping, locus of control, positive affect, and hope and optimism; the scales offered approximately 200 items for analysis. Subjects also completed measures of the interpersonal problem circumplex and Big Five model. By projecting items onto the circumplex, nuances in the Agentic and Communal features of the "interpersonal" items were revealed. As expected, these items were concentrated in the A+C+ quadrant.

Next, several advanced undergraduate raters nominated items from selected subscales of positive psychology measures for Agency and Communion, based on expert definitions of A and C. Consensually nominated items were identified, and the empirical placements of these items on the circumplex were determined. These placements suggest coordinates for A and C on the circumplex. Further analysis linked nominated items to their respective scales, and thus revealed the extent to which each scale was saturated with A and C.

The implications of these findings for bridging positive psychology and interpersonal psychology will be discussed.

### **Case Formulation in Interpersonal Reconstructive Therapy:**

**Using SASB and copy process theory to reliably track repeating interpersonal themes.**

**Natasha Hawley, Kenneth L. Critchfield, Ronna J. Dillinger  
& Lorna S. Benjamin (University of Utah)**

Interpersonal Reconstructive Therapy (IRT) asserts that a patient's problems can often be understood in light of lessons learned in relationship to early attachment figures. Copying of early interpersonal patterns into the present is usually seen in one or more of 3 basic forms called "copy processes": 1) Identification, be like the early attachment figure, 2) Recapitulation, act like the figure is still present and in charge, and 3) Introjection, treat myself as I was treated. Case formulation in IRT describes a patient's copy processes in detail, identifies the key figures with whom they were learned, and links these patterns to the patient's current symptoms to serve as a focus and guide for treatment. The Structural Analysis of Social Behavior (SASB) is used to track the past and present relational descriptions elicited in interview, allowing for a precise operationalization of copying.

Aims: This presentation will provide an overview and illustration of the interpersonally-focused case formulation process and its relevance to treatment planning and in-session collaboration. Preliminary inter-clinician reliability data for the procedure will be presented. Method: Clinical interviews conducted by the fourth author were videotaped for review and appropriate consents were granted by the patients for research use of the material. Trained clinical raters from sites in Utah and Wisconsin created independent case formulations of the same interview using a structured template developed for the purpose. Results: Within and between-site reliability estimates were quite good overall for most formulation distinctions. Areas studied include identification of key figures, agreement on copy processes, interpersonal pattern descriptions, and linkages to symptoms. Discussion: Areas of agreement and disagreement on formulation components and detail about development of the template will be presented. Implications for application of interpersonal theory in clinical settings will be discussed.

**A Social Allergy May Have a Different Meaning for Different People:  
The Role of Frustrated Interpersonal Goals  
Lynne Henderson (Stanford University)**

According to our theory, negative affect (e.g., anger) results when an interpersonal motive is frustrated. Social allergens are behaviors in other people that are irritating, presumably because they frustrate a particular interpersonal motive. But the nature of the frustration may not be identical across all individuals in response to a particular social allergen. That is, the same “irritating” situation may have different meanings to different people. If a particular social situation irritates an individual, somewhat different reasons may explain the person’s frustration. In this study, participants rated the degree to which they found each of several social allergens irritating. They were also asked to explain the reason that they felt irritated. Objective judges then “translated” each person’s reason into the standardized items of Ken Locke’s Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Values. Participants reported varying reasons for their frustration with a particular social allergen and varying interpersonal motives. Thus, an understanding of one person’s reaction to a situation seems to depend upon the particular goal that that situation frustrates.

**Understanding Intrapersonal Congruence in Context  
Christy Hofsess, M.Ed., Debbiesiu Lee, Ed.M. & Terence Tracey, Ph.D.  
(Arizona State University)**

In the SITAR Conference in 2003, Hofsess, Lee and Tracey (2003) introduced a concept named *intrapersonal congruence*. This construct refers to the degree to which a person’s interpersonal goal matches their behavior in a given situation. The authors discussed this concept in relation to a study that explored the variance in intrapersonal congruence across sixteen different situations. The study asked participants to recall different situations and recount what their goals and behaviors were in those specific situations. The situations included variability in the relationship between interactants (lover/ family, friend, boss, stranger) and context of the interaction (if the person approaching them was warm, cold, dominant or submissive). The authors found that intrapersonal congruence varied significantly by relationship, but not by context. Individuals were found to report the highest degree of intrapersonal congruence for lover/ family and friend, and the least degree of intrapersonal congruence for boss.

In this presentation, the authors propose a discussion of the post-hoc analyses of the data that will provide more details into the nature of intrapersonal congruence. The post-hoc analyses will address two questions. The first is: What are the general patterns of intrapersonal congruence across situations, and how does it relate to interpersonal complementarity? In this regard, the authors will explore the possibility of a person’s goals mediating their behavior and their interactant’s initiating behavior. The second question that will be addressed by this post-hoc analyses is: How might the variance in intrapersonal congruence relate to the degree to which the person reports interpersonal problems? In this analysis, both type and extent of problems will be examined for how they may explain the variance in intrapersonal congruence across relationships. These analyses will provide further insight into intrapersonal congruence and will offer more support for the necessity of examining covert processes, in addition to overt behaviors, when studying interpersonal interactions.

## **Frustrated Interpersonal Motives, Interpersonal Problems, and Subjective Distress** **L. M. Horowitz (Stanford University)**

Empirical data have often contradicted particular aspects of existing circumplex models of interpersonal behavior. To remedy this problem with the theory, the revised circumplex model of interpersonal behavior includes four modifications that all highlight the fundamental importance of the *interpersonal motive* behind an interpersonal behavior. In the revised model: (1) the negative pole of communion is *indifference*, not hostility; (2) a given behavior is said to *invite* (not evoke) a desired reaction from the partner; (3) the *complement* of a behavior is a reaction that would satisfy the motive driving that behavior; and (4) non-complementary reactions frustrate the motive and induce negative affect. If the motive is unclear, the meaning of the behavior is ambiguous.

The members of this panel have formed an e-mail discussion group that has been examining interpersonal motives in order to better understand behaviors, cognitions, and affects that are commonly observed in psychopathology and to clarify the relationship between frustrated interpersonal motives, subjective distress, and psychopathology. This paper is an attempt to summarize our thinking and describe some data that relates types of interpersonal motives to types of interpersonal problems. It will review some propositions that have been salient in our thinking: (1) Interpersonal motives differ in their level of abstraction: A broad interpersonal motive subsumes narrower interpersonal goals. (2) Interpersonal motives and goals may be divided into two types—self-protective (avoidance) motives and approach motives. (3) People acquire particular strategies for satisfying both types of motives and goals. (4) One reason a motive may get frustrated is that the interpersonal strategies that the person uses do not work; they fail to satisfy the interpersonal goals. For example, other people may not respond to a behavior with the desired complement. (5) Another reason a motive may get frustrated is that it conflicts with one or more other motives. For example, an approach motive may conflict with an avoidance motive. (6) Interpersonal problems arise because one or more motives get frustrated recurrently, producing negative affect. Data will be presented to show the correspondence between classes of interpersonal problems and particular types of frustrated interpersonal motives.

## **Inter-rater Disagreements and Miscommunications** **Leonard M. Horowitz (Stanford University)**

Features that a given person considers prototypic need not agree with those that are rated most prototypic by the group as a whole. We call a person's own particular conception his or her "personal template": Personal templates differ considerably from person to person—even though the group-generated prototype is very stable. This paper provides evidence that individuals differ greatly in the meaning of important terms, thereby exposing a reason for miscommunications. For example, a person may seek evidence that "my romantic partner loves me." The prototype for "love" includes, among its most prototypic features, the following kind of behavioral evidence from a lover: "displaying signs of trust," "touching," "showing compassion," and "disclosing private feelings and thoughts." If an individual's personal template for love includes all of these features, we could say that the person with a motive to be loved has the following interpersonal goals: to perceive evidence of trust, to be touched, to receive compassion, and to learn about the partner's private feelings and thoughts. Features that are highly prototypic, on average, may still be rated very differently across raters. Therefore, behaviors that provide evidence of love may not match the evidence required by someone else. Such differences are commonly observed in a couples therapy. The same principle also highlights unavoidable variability in people's ratings of interpersonal traits. The prototype concept therefore helps clarify an important limitation on inter-rater reliability.

## **Panel**

### **The Prototype: A Concept that Helps Us Examine Interpersonal Motives and Goals Leonard M. Horowitz (Stanford University)**

This panel will examine recent research using the concept of a prototype to expose the connotative meaning of a fuzzy concept. The procedure requires, first, that a large group of individuals identify attributes (or features) of the concept. Then another large group of individuals rate each feature for its importance to the meaning of the concept. The resulting features (ordered according to their rated importance) constitute the “prototype” of the concept. The three papers of this panel examine applications of the method to several research topics.

### **Mapping the Coalitional Domain**

**Tharsni Kankesan, Marc A. Fournier (University of Toronto at Scarborough)  
& David C. Zuroff (McGill University)**

Coalitions allow individuals to pool their resources and to engage in collective defense. We hypothesized two dimensions of coalitional behavior (inclusive vs. exclusive outward barrier maintenance and permissive vs. restrictive inward similarity maintenance) giving rise to four prototypical coalitional styles: “elitist” (exclusive, restrictive), “bohemian” (exclusive, permissive), “democratic” (inclusive, permissive), and “assimilationist” (inclusive, restrictive). The Coalitional Style Questionnaire (CSQ) was developed to assess individuals’ perceptions of their close social groups along these two dimensions. Paragraph-length descriptions of the prototypes were prepared and then decomposed into sentence-length questionnaire items.

101 college students completed the CSQ as well as a battery of other questionnaires. Principal components analysis with varimax rotation revealed two factors to the CSQ: “conformity” (e.g., “Our group is made up of people who have many things in common”) and “exclusivity” (e.g., “We are very accepting of anyone who wants to hang out with us” — reverse-scored). Unit-weighted approximate factor scores demonstrated adequate internal consistency. CSQ conformity and exclusivity scales demonstrated discriminant validity from social desirability, self-esteem, rank style, attachment style, and the Big Five traits. In turn, over and above the variance attributable to attachment style, conformity and exclusivity were found to predict levels of social support, autonomy support, and interpersonal problems.

## **The Impact of Leader's Social Rank Style on Group Members' Need Satisfaction and Group Performance**

**Allison C. Kelly, E. Alia Martin, Michelle Leybman & David C. Zuroff  
(McGill University)**

Group leaders have significant impact on group processes and outcomes; however, the personality correlates of effective leadership remain unclear. Social rank style is an evolutionary personal construct that denotes the typical approach individuals use to achieve and maintain rank among peers (Zuroff, Fournier, & Patall, 2003). Rank style is made up of three dimensions: directive-leadership, consensus-building, and ruthless self-advancement. According to Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985), humans have three innate needs – for relatedness, autonomy, and competence – whose fulfillment predicts well-being and motivation. The current study examined the impact of a leader's rank style on group members' need satisfaction and task performance. Forty-five groups of four female McGill undergraduates participated in an hour-long group task in which one of the four individuals was assigned the role of 'leader.' Pre- and post-task questionnaires were completed. Hierarchical linear modeling revealed that a leader's consensus-building predicted group members' feelings of relatedness and autonomy and that her directive leadership and ruthless self-advancement interacted to predict members' perceived competence. A leader's consensus-building also predicted overall need satisfaction in group members. Group members' overall need satisfaction was found to predict subjective perceptions of group performance, but bore no relationship to objective ratings of group performance. Findings reveal that the subordinates of consensus-building leaders are more likely to experience psychological need satisfaction and perceive their group to have performed well.

## **The Impact of Alliance Styles on Objective Group Performance**

**Michelle Leybman, Allison Kelly, Emily Martin & David Zuroff (McGill University)**

This study examined the impact of alliance styles, defined as individual differences in approaching cooperative relationships, on objective group performance. Based on evolutionary psychology, alliance styles were conceptualized in terms of two dimensions, the tendency to focus on equitable building of alliances, and the focus on hardnosed management of alliances. Multiple regression analyses supported the hypothesis that alliances styles were related to objective group performance. It was found that a group's mean level of hardnosed management predicted objective performance. Objective performance was also predicted by an interaction between a group's mean level of promotion of benefits and the group's mean level of ruthless self-advancement. Specifically, groups that were high in equitable building and low in ruthless self-advancement performed well, whereas groups that were high in equitable building and high in ruthless self-advancement were worse off.

## **The Impact of Alliance Styles on Subjective Group Performance and the Situational Specificity of Alliance Styles**

**Michelle J. Leybman, Allison C. Kelly, Emily A. Martin & David C. Zuroff  
(McGill University)**

This study examined the impact of alliance styles, defined as individual differences in approaching cooperative relationships, on subjective group performance. This study also examined the situational variability of alliance styles. Based on evolutionary psychology, alliance styles were conceptualized in terms of two dimensions, the tendency to focus on equitable building of alliances, and the focus on hardnosed management of alliances. Multilevel modeling supported the hypothesis that alliance styles were related to subjective group performance, which was predicted by a group's mean level of equitable building, and by individual deviations from the group mean in equitable building. In both cases, high levels of equitable building led to high subjective performance. Moreover, low subjective performance was found to predict a shift in alliance styles towards a hardnosed management focus, indicating that alliance style is influenced by situational as well as dispositional factors.

### **Mapping the Alliance Domain**

**Michelle Leybman, David C. Zuroff (McGill University),  
Marc A. Fournier (University of Toronto at Scarborough)  
& Carolina Pansera (McGill University)**

Alliance style was defined as an individual's characteristic style of social behavior used to create and maintain reciprocal (i.e., exchange) relationships. We hypothesized two dimensions of individual differences (high vs. low expectation to benefit from alliances and high vs. low willingness to incur costs in alliances) giving rise to four prototypical alliance styles: committed networker (high, high), smart operator (high, low), willing victim (low, high), and rugged individualist (low, low). Paragraph-length descriptions of the prototypes were prepared and then decomposed into sentence-length questionnaire items. 75 male and 81 female college students completed the Alliance Style Questionnaire (ASQ) as well as a battery of other questionnaires.

Principal components analysis with varimax rotation revealed two factors, closely resembling those we expected, that were labelled "promotion of benefits" and "prevention of costs." Sample items are: "I devote considerable effort to forming and maintaining alliances" and "I pay close attention to how much an alliance is costing me." Unit-weighted approximate factor scores demonstrated good internal consistency. ASQ measures demonstrated discriminant validity from social desirability, self-esteem, rank style, attachment style, and the Big Five traits. Construct validity was demonstrated by a pattern of theoretically predicted relations, including positive associations of the benefits factor with interdependent self-construal and self-esteem and a negative association of the costs factor with interdependent self-construal. In addition, multiple regression analyses showed that even when attachment style was controlled, the benefits factor predicted perceived social support, received social support, and low levels of loneliness; the costs factor predicted low perceived social support.

**Interpersonal Motives and Interpersonal Conflicts**  
**Kenneth Locke (University of Idaho) & Pamela Sadler (Wilfrid Laurier University)**

The interpersonal model suggests that when interactants' motives are not complementary (i.e., they want different levels of closeness or both want control or both want to relinquish control) there may be conflict and dissatisfaction. In other words, the effect of one person's motives in a social interaction depends on the other person's motives and vice versa. Various statistical models exist for representing such non-additive effects, including multiplicative products, squared difference scores, and quadratic equations. We will discuss the strengths and weaknesses of these alternative models within the context of the following issues: (1) Common approaches such as absolute difference scores or multiplicative products make analogous predictions when both interactants report strong and consistent motives, but divergent predictions when at least one individual does not report a strong and consistent motive. These latter individuals pose two additional, related problems. (2) Standard scoring procedures for motive inventories conflate people whose motives are weak (e.g., "I am okay with either leading or following") with people whose motives are strong but conflicting (e.g., "I *really* want you to do what I say but *really* don't want to be blamed for what happens"). (3) There is no theoretical consensus as to what these people want. For example, will indifferent people be equally satisfied with everyone or most satisfied with equally indifferent others? Hopefully, a discussion among the conference participants will help deepen and clarify our understanding of how to approach these issues.

The implications of these findings for bridging positive psychology and interpersonal psychology will be discussed.

**Agentic and Communal Self-Enhancement**  
**Delroy L. Paulhus (University of British Columbia)**

Already associated with agency and communion are corresponding sets of values, traits and behavior tendencies. This paper proposes an addition to those constellations, namely, agentic and communal self-enhancement. These represent individual differences in self-favoring tendencies operationalized as departures from reality motivated by agency and communal values. Agentic self-enhancement is an egoistic bias, a self-deceptive tendency to exaggerate one's social and intellectual status. This tendency leads to unrealistically positive self-perceptions on such traits as dominance, fearlessness, emotional stability, intellect, and creativity. Self-perceptions of high scorers have a narcissistic, "superhero" quality. Communal self-enhancement is a moralistic bias, a self-deceptive tendency to deny socially-deviant impulses and claim sanctimonious, "saint-like" attributes. This tendency is played out in overly-positive self-perceptions on such traits as agreeableness, dutifulness, and restraint. A series of ten studies are described to support this integrative framework for a number of central issues in personality psychology.

**Interpersonal Pathoplasticity in Generalized Anxiety Disorder:  
A Cluster Analytic Replication**

**Aaron L. Pincus, Ph.D., Amy Przeworski, M.S., Alissa Yamasaki, M.S.,  
Michele B. Kasoff, Ph.D., Michelle G. Newman, Ph.D., Louis G. Castonguay, Ph.D.  
& Thomas D. Borkovec, Ph.D. (Pennsylvania State University)**

Kasoff and Pincus (2002) applied cluster analysis and Gurtman's (1994) structural summary method for circumplex data to the IIP-C responses of 51 DSM-IV Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD) patients. These analyses identified four interpersonal subtypes of patients diagnosed with GAD: Intrusive GADs, Cold GADs, Nonassertive GADs, and Exploitable GADs. These subtypes had differential treatment responses to cognitive-behavioral therapy for anxiety but exhibited no significant differences on pretreatment symptom severity, comorbid anxiety disorders, or insecure attachment. Results were interpreted as suggesting a pathoplastic relationship between interpersonal dysfunction and GAD. The current study reports on a replication and extension using an independent sample of 83 patients diagnosed with GAD. Patients again completed measures of interpersonal problems, attachment, and psychopathology. In the second sample, assessment of symptomology and comorbidity was expanded via use of SCID-I, SCID-II, and the Hamilton Depression and Anxiety Scales. Cluster analysis of patients' IIP-C scores and subsequent structural summary representations replicated the four interpersonal subtypes. Results of subtype comparisons on attachment and psychopathology were generally consistent across both samples and supported the conception of interpersonal pathoplasticity in GAD.

**Neural Network Modeling of Close Relationships  
with Empirical Event-Sampled Personality Data  
Michael Quek & Debbie S. Moskowitz (McGill University)**

Parallel-Distributed Processing (PDP) neural network models are one attempt at reconciling the multitude of interacting factors in dynamic systems with a mathematical approach. The purpose of the present study was to apply neural networks to the realm of personality behavior in close relationships. Data from interactions in close relationships was obtained using an event-contingent recording procedure. Information from the procedure included the relationship status of the interactee (i.e., same-sex friend, romantic partner) which allows analysis of how participants' behaviours differ according to different types of close relationships. Suh, Moskowitz, Fournier, and Zuroff (2004) obtained provocative results regarding the behaviour of participants as a function of the gender of both the participants and the persons with whom the participant interacted (same-sex friend, opposite-sex friend, or romantic partner). They found that behaviours were consistent with gender stereotypes when participants were interacting with same-sex friends: men were more dominant with other men, and women were more agreeable with other women. In contrast, stereotypes were violated when participants were interacting with their romantic partners: men with romantic partners were found to be more agreeable and less quarrelsome than women with their romantic partners. As a novel method of data analysis, a constraint satisfaction model was created and modelled using the personality and situational variables that were measured during the interactions. Separate models were created for men and women and were trained using the empirical data. The behavioural prediction output from both models were then compared to examine the differences between men's and women's predicted behaviour in close relationships. The neural network model displayed results consistent with theory, proving the usefulness and potential of constraint-satisfaction models in replicating known psychological phenomena and predicting behaviour in close relation-

**Temperament and Goal Orientation as Predictors of Social Strategy Use and Affect**  
**Lena C. Quilty & Jonathan M. Oakman (University of Waterloo)**

Theorists have long posited that individuals vary in their tendencies to approach reward and avoid punishment. Recently, it has been suggested that goals may prove a viable avenue by which to influence individual approach and avoidance motivation. How goal orientation may impact behaviour in a social situation may therefore give insight into whether goals may prove a promising point at which to intervene for those with emotional difficulties. This study therefore seeks to demonstrate the relationships between approach and avoidance temperament, and social goal and strategy use in a dyadic interaction. Undergraduate participants were asked to elaborate upon promotion (approach) or prevention (avoidance) goals with which they have been successful. They subsequently completed a self-disclosure task with a confederate. Following the interaction, participants reported their social goals, social strategy use and affect. Four observers further assessed social strategy use. Results indicated that while participants experienced similar levels of positive affect and disclosed at similar levels of intimacy, the nature of their disclosures or social strategy use varied with goal prime. Results further indicated, however, that while participants were somewhat impacted by the goal prime, their temperamental level of approach and avoidance motivation was much more powerful in predicting the types of social goals and strategies that they used within the interaction. Indeed, approach and avoidance temperament and goals predicted self-reported and observer coded acquisitive and protective, as well as dominant and affiliative social behaviours. The clinical implications of these findings will be discussed.

**Does Mood Affect What We See in Others?**  
**The Impact of Dysphoria on the Assessment of Social Behaviour**  
**Greg Rousell & Pamela Sadler (Wilfrid Laurier University)**

An important maintaining factor of psychopathology is difficulty in interpersonal relationships. Managing interpersonal interactions effectively requires continual, and reasonably accurate monitoring of others' interpersonal style. Previous research suggests that dysphoric individuals view others' as more friendly and submissive than they actually are (Duong, 2004). This would be an important finding because these are opposite of behaviours typically evoked by a depressed person. Past research also suggests that dysphoric individuals have difficulties detecting friendly overtures, which may perpetuate depressed mood. The present study sought to more directly evaluate these hypotheses by preselecting 17 dysphoric and 24 non-dysphoric individuals and studying their social perceptions using a computerized joystick technique. Participants watched two segments of videotaped therapy sessions. Their continuous perceptions of the client's dominance and friendliness were captured by the joystick. Participants also provided overall assessments of these behaviours. Self report questionnaires of interpersonal style, interpersonal problems, and current mood were obtained.

**Analysis of the Process of Complementarity Using SEM-Based Dyadic Models**  
**Pamela Sadler, Ph.D. (Wilfrid Laurier University) &**  
**Erik Woody, Ph.D. (University of Waterloo)**

This talk describes the variety of processes by which complementarity can take place during social interactions between two persons. The particular model selected to analyze the processes of complementarity depends on a variety of factors, including the degree of knowledge and expectancies that both people have of each other's communal and agentic traits. These models may be used to describe the process of complementarity during interactions between both normal and interpersonally disordered individuals. The latter part of the talk will focus on how to use structural equation modeling to analyze dyadic data. Particular data analytic techniques to be used will depend on what type of dyadic interdependence model is most theoretically convincing, and whether the members of the dyad are distinguishable or interchangeable. The former, distinguishable dyads, are those who can be easily distinguished from each other on a particular characteristic such as gender (e.g., every dyad consists of one male and one female). The latter, interchangeable dyads, are those who cannot be easily distinguished on a particular characteristic such as gender (e.g., every dyad consists of two females). Analysis of data from distinguishable dyads is relatively straightforward in structural equation modeling; however, analysis of data from interchangeable dyads tends to be more complicated. For interchangeable dyadic data, traditionally researchers have ignored the fact that the data is from dyads, averaged scores across dyads, or applied techniques for distinguishable dyads by using random assignment. These traditional approaches have many known downsides. We will describe newer techniques from Woody and Sadler (in press), which build on pioneering work by Kenny (1996) and Griffin and Gonzalez (1995).

**Healthy and Unhealthy Dependence: Implications for Major Depression**  
**Fiona S. Schulte & Myriam Mongrain (York University)**

This study seeks to substantiate the presence of healthy versus unhealthy aspects of the dependent personality style in a sample vulnerable to Major Depression. Graduate students ( $N = 210$ ) diagnosed with a previous history of depression were followed for a period of 16 months. At Time 1, participants completed various measures designed to assess levels of dependency construct, including: the Depressive Experiences Questionnaire (DEQ; Blatt, D'Afflitti, & Quinlan, 1976); the Three Vectors of Dependency Inventory (3VDI; Pincus & Gurtman, 1995); and the Personal Style Inventory (PSI; Robins, Ladd, Welkowitz, Blaney, Diaz, & Kutcher, 1994). Other measures of adjustment were obtained in addition to the assessment of the recurrence of a major depressive episode over the follow-up period. The factor analysis conducted on scale scores for each dependency measure resulted in three factors which were labelled immature, intermediate and mature dependence. Path analyses found immature dependence to be significantly associated with a greater number of past episodes of depression, the recurrence of the disorder, as well as Axis II pathology. In addition, immature dependence was related to a negative view of self, as well as parental neglect. Mature dependence involved a more positive view of others, more positive reports of maternal care, and was unrelated to psychopathology.

## **Using SASB Observational Coding to Differentiate Families with High and Low Potential for Child Abuse**

**Elizabeth A. Skowron, Ph.D. & Aaron L. Pincus, Ph.D. (Pennsylvania State University)**

Structural Analysis of Social Behavior (SASB; Benjamin, 1974, 1996; Pincus & Benjamin, 2004) is complex model of interpersonal and intrapsychic functioning which can be operationalized via both self-report (Intrex Questionnaires; Benjamin 2000) and observer coding (Benjamin & Cushing, 2000) assessment methodologies. The current study utilized the SASB observer coding system and associated software to evaluate differential interpersonal functioning in families identified as at high risk and at low risk for potential child abuse. Videotapes of 17 families engaged in a series of interaction tasks were SASB coded for both interpersonal process and content. SASB coding generates several types of data at multiple levels of analysis, including basic descriptions of interpersonal process and content, analysis of complex interpersonal messages, and sequential analysis of behavior using Markov chains. This poster will describe differences between high risk and low risk family interactions utilizing the full range of SASB coding parameters and methods.

## **An Ideographic Examination of Interpersonal Self-Ratings Terence J. G. Tracey (Arizona State University)**

The interpersonal circle has provided a useful tool in the conceptualization and examination of interpersonal behavior and traits. Measures exist to examine interpersonal aspects of specific behavioral interchanges (i.e., ICRS, Strong et al., 1988), relationships (i.e., CLOIT, Kiesler, 1984), and traits (Wiggins, 1995). However all of these measures were constructed and evaluated on groups of individuals and thus represent the structure of interpersonal behaviors across individuals. However assessment of the extent to which the circular structure of interpersonal behavior fits individuals has not been conducted. The purpose of this presentation is to propose the use of ideographic examinations of the structure of interpersonal behavior and to demonstrate some results found using this approach. Specifically, the extent to which individuals view interpersonal behavior in a manner similar to the interpersonal circle was examined.

1 Do people use the interpersonal circumplex in their thinking about interpersonal behaviors and if so how much deviation from the interpersonal circle is there?

2. Do those individuals who view interpersonal behavior least like those of the normative group demonstrate a specific different pattern of normative scores?

3. Moderation of interpersonal scale-outcome relations as a function of the degree to which individual structures match normative structures?

IAS, IIP, Satisfaction with Life, and Self Liking and Self-Competence (SC and SL, Tafhrodi & Swann, 1995) self-ratings were obtained from a sample of 186 college students (89 males, 97 females; mean age 19.8, SD=3.0). In addition students completed the Paired Interpersonal Questionnaire (PIQ) which involved paired comparison of 8 representative interpersonal items (one from each octant). Respondents rated for similarity/dissimilarity from each other (not as representative of the individual) on a 6 point scale (1=very dissimilar; 6=very similar). The PIQ data were examined using MDS at an individual level and in weighted MDS to examine group variability in structure. It was found that there is a lot of variance in the extent to which individuals use the circumplex to characterize interpersonal behaviors, some fitting well and some using very different structures. Further the extent to which each individual's PIQ fit a circumplex was a moderator of the relation between the measures derived from the IAS and IIP in their relation to satisfaction with life and self concept. Those individuals who viewed interpersonal adjectives in a more circumplex manner had higher relations between IAS vector and extremeness scores and SWL and both self-concept measures than those who used a circumplex less. A similar pattern was evidenced with IIP total score and SWL and self-concept. It thus appears to have substantive value to identify those individuals using and not using the circumplex.

**The Availability of Two Related Prototypes:  
Trustworthiness and the Secure Base (Attachment) Script  
Bulent Turan (Stanford University)**

The concept of “trust” is the cornerstone of attachment theory. It is as important in adulthood as it is in infancy. What cues do adults use to determine whether another person is trustworthy to be there at times of need? The study reported in this paper used the prototype methodology to identify cues indicating that another person is trustworthy. It then assessed, for each participant, the degree to which that participant’s personal template did or did not match the prototype. The greater the discrepancy between personal template and prototype, the poorer the person’s knowledge of indicators of trustworthiness. Because a knowledge of trustworthiness is so vital to knowledge about attachment, it was hypothesized that the measure of trustworthiness would enable us to predict the availability of the prototypical sequence of events in an attachment relationship (secure base script). To test this hypothesis, an animation task involving “secure base interactions” between geometric forms was constructed, and participants were asked to describe the nature of the interaction. The data showed that the availability of one prototype enabled us to predict the availability of the other.

**Interpersonal Complementarity in the Workplace  
Anne-Marie Turcotte-Tremblay, Moon-ho Ringo Ho & Debbie S. Moskowitz  
(McGill University)**

This study examines the influence of the workplace environment on interpersonal behaviour. Past research on interpersonal behaviour developed the principle of complementarity. The traditional interpersonal circumplex model predicts that, on the agency dimension, dominance pulls submission while submission pulls dominance. In contrast, on the communal axis, it is supposed that quarrelsomeness elicits quarrelsomeness while agreeableness begets agreeableness. Nevertheless, as noted by numerous critics (Kiesler, 1983; Orford, 1986), the complementarity principle lacks consideration of other possible moderating variables. The present study compares the impact of the working versus non-working environment on interpersonal complementarity. Within the working environment, we further examine the effect of a partner’s status (supervisor/co-worker/supervisee) in an interaction on complementarity. Results show that workplace environment and status have differential impact on complementarity on the agentic and communal dimensions.

**Interpersonal Issues in Cross-Cultural Perspective:  
A Comparison of Japan and the United States  
Douglas A. Vakoch (SETI Institute), Kaya Ono (Clark University)  
& Yuh-shiow Lee (National Chung Cheng University)**

To compare the extent to which the same interpersonal issues are faced by individuals across cultures, scales were identified based on self-report data from 424 undergraduate students, half from each Japan and the United States. Six scales were identified, each having a Cronbach's alpha <sup>3</sup> .70 and an average inter-item correlation between .20 and .40. The scales measure 1) excessive concern about the evaluations of others, 2) the impact of past abuse, 3) ways the respondent can improve relationships, 4) feeling upset by the actions of others, 5) fear of rejection, especially by a therapist, and 6) fear of abandonment. In each case, the Japanese students reported significantly more distress. The magnitude of these differences were strikingly large for the scale assessing excessive concern about the evaluations of others, as well as the scale measuring fear of rejection, especially by the therapist. Results will be compared with scales constructed from the same questionnaire, but reflecting interpersonal issues as experienced by participants from a single country, drawing on data from 955 undergraduate students from the United States. Challenges of cross-cultural research will be discussed, and conference attendees will be informed about opportunities for presenting research on interpersonal topics at an upcoming meeting of the Society for Cross-Cultural Research, which recently hosted a symposium examining altruism in cross-cultural perspective <[www.seti.org/altruism](http://www.seti.org/altruism)>.

**The Voice of Interpersonal Distress:  
Fundamental Frequency of Speech and Interpersonal Issues  
Douglas A. Vakoch (SETI Institute), Dean A. Pollina  
(Department of Defense Polygraph Institute) & Lee H. Wurm (Wayne State University)**

To identify the acoustical correlates of interpersonal distress, twenty-four participants (13 female, 11 male) individually read a series of sentences while their speech was recorded. Afterwards, each participant completed the NEO Five-Factor Inventory, which measures 5 basic personality traits including Neuroticism, as well as a self-report inventory developed by the first author, which measures 6 classes of interpersonal issues discussed in psychotherapy sessions. The mean, maximum, and standard deviation of the fundamental frequency (F0) of each participant's speech was determined. For women only, Neuroticism was predicted by high mean F0 ( $p < .021$ ), high maximum F0 ( $p < .009$ ), and high standard deviation of F0 ( $p < .012$ ), consistent with previous studies suggesting that stress is manifested vocally by increased mean F0 and greater variability of F0. For females only, responses reflecting excessive concern about the evaluations of others was positively correlated with standard deviation of F0 ( $p < .036$ ), excessive responsibility for partner was predicted by high mean F0 ( $p < .034$ ), fear of abandonment was positively correlated with both mean F0 ( $p < .030$ ) and standard deviation of F0 ( $p < .033$ ), and ineffective interpersonal responses were predicted by high maximum F0 ( $p < .048$ ). These results are interpreted in light of correlations between the scales assessing interpersonal issues and Horowitz's Inventory of Interpersonal Problems.

**Panel**  
**Project for an Evolutionary Personality Psychology**  
**David C. Zuroff (McGill University) &**  
**Marc A. Fournier (University of Toronto at Scarborough)**

The distinguished personality theorist Julian Rotter argued that an ideal personality theory would provide both a comprehensive theory of personality processes and a descriptive language of individual differences, and that the individual differences variables would be directly linked to the process theory. This goal continues to elude theorists, as the classic "big" theories are riddled with conceptual and measurement problems, mini-theories of specific traits are too narrow in focus, and the Big Five traits are the somewhat arbitrary product of factor analysis, lacking anchoring in a process theory.

We propose to use the conceptual structure of Evolutionary Psychology to develop a personality theory that meets Rotter's criterion. Specifically, we adopt as our process theory Bugental's (2000) framework of five social domains (attachment, social rank, reciprocity, coalitions, and mating), each served by a system of evolved psychological mechanisms that generate flexible social behavior. Within each domain, differences in the structure and operation of the systems define dimensions of individual differences. In this symposium, we address domain-specific individual differences in strategic preferences.

Individual differences in attachment have been successfully mapped using a two-dimensional framework that gives rise to four prototypic personality styles. We extended this approach to three social domains relevant to human survival over evolutionary history: rank/hierarchy, alliance/reciprocity, and coalitional groups. In each domain, we conceptualized four prototypical styles, developed questionnaire measures of the styles, and subsequently extracted measures of continuous underlying personality variables. The new measures displayed excellent reliability and validity. We present them as the first products of our project for an evolutionary personality psychology.

## Contact Information

G. Scott Acton  
Rochester Institute of  
Technology  
[acton@mail.rit.edu](mailto:acton@mail.rit.edu)

Khushnuma Amaria  
University of Waterloo  
[kamaria@uwaterloo.ca](mailto:kamaria@uwaterloo.ca)

Lindsay E. Ayearst  
York University  
[layearst@yorku.ca](mailto:layearst@yorku.ca)

Nicole Cain  
Pennsylvania State University  
[nmc179@psu.edu](mailto:nmc179@psu.edu)

Liz Davis  
Ohio University  
[lizdavis@gmail.com](mailto:lizdavis@gmail.com)

Marshall Duke, PhD.  
Emory University  
[psymd@emory.edu](mailto:psymd@emory.edu)

Nicole Ethier  
University of Waterloo  
[naethier@watarts.uwaterloo.ca](mailto:naethier@watarts.uwaterloo.ca)

Marc A. Fournier  
University of Toronto at  
Scarborough  
[marc.fournier@utoronto.ca](mailto:marc.fournier@utoronto.ca)

Mark Gapen, B.A.  
Emory University  
[mgapen@emory.edu](mailto:mgapen@emory.edu)

Gregory A. Goldman  
Ohio University  
[gg232402@ohio.edu](mailto:gg232402@ohio.edu)

Michael B. Gurtman  
University of  
Wisconsin-Parkside)  
[gurtman@UWP.EDU](mailto:gurtman@UWP.EDU)

Natasha Hawley  
University of Utah  
[natasha.hawley@psych.utah.edu](mailto:natasha.hawley@psych.utah.edu)

Lynne Henderson  
Stanford University  
[lynne@psych.stanford.edu](mailto:lynne@psych.stanford.edu)

Christy Hofsess, M.Ed.  
Arizona State University  
[chofsess@cox.net](mailto:chofsess@cox.net)

Martin Grosse Holtforth  
University of Bern  
[grosse@ptp.unibe.ch](mailto:grosse@ptp.unibe.ch)

Leonard M. Horowitz  
Stanford University  
[len@psych.stanford.edu](mailto:len@psych.stanford.edu)

Allison C. Kelly  
McGill University  
[allison.kelley@mail.mcgill.ca](mailto:allison.kelley@mail.mcgill.ca)

Debbiesiu Lee  
Arizona State University  
[debbiesiu@yahoo.com](mailto:debbiesiu@yahoo.com)

Michelle Leybman  
McGill University  
[Michelle@leybman.com](mailto:Michelle@leybman.com)

Kenneth Locke  
University of Idaho  
[klocke@uidaho.edu](mailto:klocke@uidaho.edu)

Myriam Mongrain  
York University  
[Mongrain@yorku.ca](mailto:Mongrain@yorku.ca)

Delroy L. Paulhus  
University of British Columbia  
[dpaulhus@psych.ubc.ca](mailto:dpaulhus@psych.ubc.ca)

Aaron L. Pincus, Ph.D.  
Pennsylvania State University  
[alp6@psu.edu](mailto:alp6@psu.edu)

Michael Quek  
McGill University  
[mquek@ego.psych.mcgill.ca](mailto:mquek@ego.psych.mcgill.ca)

Lena Quilty  
University of Waterloo  
[lcquilty@watarts.uwaterloo.ca](mailto:lcquilty@watarts.uwaterloo.ca)

Moon-ho Ringo Ho  
McGill University  
[mho@ego.psych.mcgill.ca](mailto:mho@ego.psych.mcgill.ca)

Greg Rousell  
University of Waterloo  
[grousell@hotmail.com](mailto:grousell@hotmail.com)

Pamela Sadler, PhD.  
Wilfrid Laurier University  
[psadler@wlu.ca](mailto:psadler@wlu.ca)

Terence J. G. Tracey  
Arizona State University  
[ttracey@asu.edu](mailto:ttracey@asu.edu)

Bulent Turan  
Stanford University  
[bturan@stanford.edu](mailto:bturan@stanford.edu)

Douglas A. Vakoch, Ph.D.  
SETI Institute  
[vakoch@seti.org](mailto:vakoch@seti.org)

Ma Zhenfeng  
McGill University  
[ma\\_zhenfeng@yahoo.com](mailto:ma_zhenfeng@yahoo.com)