ANTHROPOLOGIE • L/1 • pp. 111–125 • 2012

JITKA LINDOVÁ, DENISA PRŮŠOVÁ, KATEŘINA KLAPILOVÁ

NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR CONTRASTS THE RESPECTFUL, COERCIVE, AFFECTIONATE, AND IGNORING DOMINEERING STRATEGIES

ABSTRACT: Studies of the nonverbal behaviors associated with dominance have yielded various, sometimes incompatible, findings. One of the possible reasons is that nonverbal behavior associated with dominance is stereotypically thought to be dynamic and active, which has led to an overestimation of direct domineering over indirect domineering behavior. The latter has attained little attention in the frame of nonverbal behavior. Herein, we aimed to increase the known spectrum of nonverbal behaviors employed in domineering within the context of long-term relationships using a model of four domineering strategies; these strategies are based on combinations of dimensions of prosociality and power. Thirty-three raters (24 women and 9 men) were asked to (1) read four vignettes regarding the four domineering strategies and imagine a romantic partner of each type in a typical domineering situation, (2) outline typical nonverbal behaviors of the imagined person within 10 nonverbal modalities. Approximately 2000 statements were collected. These were categorized by a second group of twelve students (nine women and three men), separately by modalities and domineering strategies. Finally, brief summaries about typical behaviors for each domineering strategy were written by compiling all categories found. The attributed nonverbal behaviors clearly differentiate among the four domineering strategies (i.e., the "respectful", "affectionate", "coercive", and "ignoring" strategy). Moreover, content analysis disclosed two subtypes for each strategy which we termed "active" and "passive". These differed in the amount of expressiveness, movement, and contact with the partner. The nonverbal profiles of the ignoring and affectionate strategies largely deviate from the common view of dominant behavior found in literature.

KEY WORDS: Nonverbal behavior – Dominance – Romantic relationships – Prosociality – Power – Domineering strategy

Received 2 November 2012; accepted 13 May 2013.

INTRODUCTION

Dominance is a pervasive, but also equivocal concept, with many different meanings in every social or biological science. In evolutionary terms, increasing ones own fitness is contingent on acquiring resources, and in a social species such as humans, this is mediated by both cooperating (increasing own fitness together with the whole social unit) and competing (increasing own fitness at the detriment of other(s); Trivers 1971) with others. Dominance can be seen as winning a competition for resources in a social group (Darwin 1859). Natural selection, then, should favor behavioral strategies leading to preferential resource gaining within a group, i.e., to dominance (Dawkins 1989). Dominance, in this sense, is a relative measure and it is at best determined on the level of a dyad or interaction. Rank in a group hierarchy, in contrast, does not always determine all dominance relationships to other group members, as hierarchy does not need to be linear (Drews 1993), and in a particular dyad, the overall lower ranking individual can dominate over an overall higher ranking individual.

Commonly, researchers define dominance on the proximal level using terms including force, confidence, agonism, or even threat and aggression (Carli *et al.* 1995, Maslow 1937, Ridgeway 1984, Wiggins 1979). In contrast, other researchers emphasize that dominance is determined by the effectiveness in acquiring resources within a dyad or social group, *regardless* of the means by which this is done (Hawley 1999). A long-term romantic relationship is likely to be a good example of a dyad where we find different strategies to gain control over resources and the partner (we call these "domineering strategies") which manifest themselves through different patterns of behaviors. Some of these may contradict the common definition of dominance based on coercion and assertiveness not only by including prosocial, in addition to coercive strategies, but also by not always requiring direct expression of power, but by including indirect, e.g., manipulatory, strategies.

Many researchers have examined the topic of how dominance is expressed by and perceived from nonverbal behavior (e.g., Argyle 1988, Burgoon *et al.* 1990, Dunbar, Burgoon 2005, Ellyson, Dovidio 1985, Gifford 1991, Henley 1977, Schwartz *et al.* 1982, Sillars *et al.* 1982). However, we still have little knowledge about how nonverbal behavior is associated with dominance in romantic relationships, because studies have rarely focussed on dominance in a romantic dyad. More general studies of nonverbal behavior and dominance paint a more detailed picture; however they also show interesting contrasts and limitations.

On one hand, naïve observers seem to agree on which nonverbal behaviors are associated with dominance (Gifford 1994, Hall *et al.* 2005), which indicates that they may share a stereotypical concept of dominance including some specific behavioral traits. On the other hand, many studies demonstrate particular associations between specific behavioral displays and self-assessed trait dominance (measured by standardized psychological tools), dominance beliefs of naïve participants, and dominance enforced by the hierarchical position of the subject in the observed group, among others. Here however, contradictory results appear frequently among different studies. For instance, dominance has been associated with an elevated, open, and relaxed posture (Burgoon, Hoobler 2002, Cashdan 1998, Schwartz *et al.* 1982, Tiedens, Fragale 2003, Weisfeld, Beresford 1982), but also with tense and closed posture (Burgoon 1991). Furthermore, it was associated with close proximity (Burgoon *et al.* 1984), but also less proximity (Burgoon 1991), both more smiling and less smiling (for a review, see Hall *et al.* 2002, Schmid Mast, Hall 2004), more eye gaze and less eye gaze (for a review, see Knapp, Hall 2005), a relaxed facial expression (Aguinis *et al.* 1998), but also a lowered brow and non-smiling mouth (Keating *et al.* 1977), and both more and less interpersonal touching (for a review, see, Stier, Hall 1984). Among the more consistent findings, we find a higher looking-while-speaking to looking-while-listening ratio (Dovidio, Ellyson 1982, 1985, Ellyson *et al.* 1980, Exline *et al.* 1975, Kimble, Musgrove 1988), frequent (Cashdan 1998, Kimble, Musgrove 1988) and loud speech (Kimble, Musgrove 1988, Tusing, Dillard 2000), and expressive voice modulation (Burgoon, Le Poire 1999, Tusing, Dillard 2000).

Possibly reflecting the aforementioned inconsistencies, some complex observational studies and meta-analyses bring much weaker evidence about associations between objectively assessed dominance (i.e., based on personality questionnaire scores, measures of behavior, role/rank, or socioeconomic status indicators; excluding impressions about dominance) and measured (coded) nonverbal behaviors (Gifford 1994, Hall *et al.* 2005). In their meta-analysis, Hall *et al.* (2005) found no association with "actual" (i.e., objectively measured, in contrast to "perceived") dominance and similar concepts for the majority of behaviors considered, including smiling, gazing, postural relaxation, body/leg shifting, conversational overlaps, and many others. However, they did find more bodily openness, smaller interpersonal distance, louder speech, more interruption, and perhaps more relaxed sounding voices to be associated with

dominance and similar concepts. However, although these associations were statistically significant, the effects (combined *Z*s) were not very strong or were based on a small number of studies. A specific meta-analysis of the association between speaking time and dominance (not considered by Hall *et al.* 2005) found an overall strong positive correlation, but showed that the association is relatively weaker for actual dominance measured by outcomes, than when dominance was judged by perceivers or measured by questionnaires, and that the strongest relationship was when dominance was assigned by a role (Schmid Mast 2002).

There are several factors which may explain the inconsistencies within this research area. For example, as mentioned above, dominance is a term that refers to many distinct concepts. Nevertheless, some authors do not define what precise meaning they assign to it (e.g., Carli *et al.* 1995, Hall *et al.* 2005). Most importantly, traitdominance, referring to a (mostly self-reported) biological and social predisposition of the subject to gain control in interactions (Cattell *et al.* 1992), and interactional dominance, a communicative act where the control attempt of one individual is met by acquiescence from another (Rogers-Millar, Millar 1979, Dunbar, Burgoon 2005), are very district constructs and therefore need to be treated as separate.

In the following study, we focus on the established dominance which exists in long-term romantic dyads, and is result of a combination of both trait- and interactional dominance, since the predispositions to dominance in one partner can be accomplished only if his/her partner's predispositions are lower than his/her own. This kind of dominance meets the criteria for the evolutionary concept of dominance as described above, as it describes the effectiveness in gaining control over the relationship resources and partner's behavior, it is relative and dyadic. We believe that trait dominance, interactional dominance, and dominance in long-term partnerships, which is a specific combination of both, are so diverse, that findings (e.g., regarding associated nonverbal behavior) with respect to one of them cannot be applied to the other two without further testing. Similarly, it is problematic to consider findings connected with related concepts including "status" or "power" as applicable, as they can be expressed through different nonverbal behaviors.

When attempting to study interactional or dyadic dominance, it is difficult to develop an ecologically valid experimental design which would aim to both provoke domineering effort in a dyad (e.g., romantic partners), as well as allow us to observe and investigate the result of the interaction (i.e., who actually influences the behavior of the other). Instead, researchers often infer the dominance status from cues which may not be directly relevant (e.g., who leads the verbal communication) or base their conclusions about interactional dominance on self-report of the partners or on subjective judgments of naïve raters (e.g., Cashdan 1988). As can be seen in studies which use more than one method to assess dominance, these measures (especially subjectively felt and observed dominance) are weakly correlated with each other (e.g., Schmid Mast, Hall 2004). Consequently, the behaviors associated with dominance derived from these studies, and summarized by Dunbar and Burgoon (2005): "the prototypical nonverbally dominant communicator would be kinesically and vocally dynamic (using more gestures, greater eye gaze, more vocal animation and greater amounts of talk) while giving the impression of relaxation and confidence" (p. 211) may not correspond to characteristics of persons who actually gain control over the behavior of the other. In fact, all other methods of dominance assessment except the monitoring of actual outcomes in terms of control over the other or resources may lead to an overestimation of direct domineering over indirect domineering, which is less conspicuous and tends to be removed from the stereotypical believes about dominance. Direct and indirect domineering have been distinguished for marital verbal communication in a conflict situation (verbal influence), where direct strategies are a) talking about the issue, b) referring to past experience or what others do in the same situation, or c) verbal and physical coercion, and indirect strategies include a) being affectionate and nice, b) ignoring the issue or pretending there is no disagreement, or c) emotional withdrawal, refusal of sex and threatening to leave (Frieze, McHugh 1992).

In the framework of nonverbal behavior, indirect strategies have not garnered much attention. In a majority of studies, both dominance and nonverbal behavior associated with dominance are implicitly expected to be distributed along one axis (dominance-submission or dominance-absence of dominance, where direct domineering behaviors are the key characteristics of the "dominance" pole of the axis). Therefore, universally present dominance displays are usually sought. However, Lindová *et al.* (in prep.) suggest that four distinct domineering strategies with very different behavioral displays should be distinguished, based on combinations of two interpersonal personality dimensions – prosociality (affiliation) and power (defined as a personality predisposition to dominance,

e.g., in terms of good social communication skills; Dunbar, Burgoon 2005).

Domineering strategies

The model of four domineering strategies (Lindová *et al.* in prep.) can be applied to any kind of dual long-term relationship, including romantic relationships. This model builds upon the idea that power, as defined above, is not a necessary condition for domineering. For example, individuals lower in power than their counterparts can still dominate by using more indirect strategies. The high-power-high-prosociality ("respectful") strategy is characterized by good social skills, popularity among others, respect and admiration from others, and a focus on the problem combined with respect for others. The high-power-low-prosociality ("coercive") strategy is characterized by coercion and displays of strength which are usually followed by the retreat of the counterpart. The other two domineering strategies are typically adopted by the individuals with lower power in the dyad. The low-power-high-prosociality ("affectionate") strategy is characterized by high affiliation and expression of affection and dependence, where the counterpart reacts by sympathy and feelings of debt leading to generosity. The low-power-low-prosociality ("ignoring") strategy is characterized by negation, refusal and ignoring, where the counterpart reacts by resignation or seeking alternative solutions. The high-power (respectful and coercive) strategies are considered as direct, whereas the low-power (affectionate and ignoring) strategies are considered as indirect.

In the present study, we intended to use the four domineering strategies proposed by Lindová *et al.* (in prep.) to learn more about different nonverbal behavioral patterns that can be employed in domineering. Our specific aim was to describe nonverbal profiles of these four domineering strategies within the context of the romantic relationship by compiling descriptions of typical behaviors suggested by participants. We attempted to explore whether people stereotypically connect some patterns of behavior with each of the four domineering strategies, as we have defined them. We further intend to explore if such behavioral patterns discriminate among the four domineering strategies and how much they correspond to the stereotypical picture of domineering behavior described in literature.

METHODS

Participants

We recruited two groups of participants. The first group was asked to fill in a questionnaire with open questions, in order to collect their opinions about nonverbal behaviors associated with the four domineering strategies. The second group categorized the statements of the first group into broader categories.

The first group was composed of 24 women and 9 men (mean age 26 years) who were students or teachers at the Faculty of Humanities, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic and at the Prague College of Psychosocial Studies. More women were enrolled because of a higher proportion of female attendants at these institutions. Since many researchers report a higher sensitivity to nonverbal cues in women than men (e.g., Rosip, Hall 2004), we regard the predominance of women in our sample as advantageous rather than limiting. We recruited subjects who had either participated in a course on nonverbal communication or had taught it, as they were more likely to consider particular nonverbal behaviors separately and define them clearly.

The second group of participants consisted of 12 students from the Faculty of Humanities at Charles University, Prague, nine women and three men (mean age 22 years), who had participated for course credit in a nonverbal communication course. They formed six pairs of categorizers, which were gender mixed if possible (i.e., in three cases), in which each received a proportion of statements to categorize (see below).

Construction of vignettes

A vignette for each of four domineering strategies was constructed by modifying more general psychological descriptions from Lindová *et al.* (in prep.) so as to better suit the nature of romantic partners' interactions. Each vignette included the name of the domineering strategy derived from its position on the prosocial and power dimensions and a short description of the strategy an individual used to communicate their own interest and will; mainly if it was direct (open) or not, and how much the person pursuing the described strategy insisted on it. A more detailed explanation of the strategy followed, including a description of extreme forms of such behavior. The final part of the vignettes included an interpretation of a partner's acquiescent behavior. All references to nonverbal behavior were avoided and the text was formulated using more general

behaviour- and (verbal) communication terms. The full versions of the vignettes are presented in *Table 1*.

Procedure

Participants from the first group were asked to read four vignettes regarding domineering strategies (described above), and were given the opportunity, if necessary, to inquire about parts they found unclear. Subsequently, they received a blank questionnaire which listed 10 nonverbal modalities: eye gaze, smile, facial expression, gestures, body posture, body movements, spatial behavior, touch (self and partner), vocal expression, and paraverbal behavior. All participants had knowledge about the meaning and were able to name some examples of these modalities. For each of the four domineering strategies, participants in the first group were asked to imagine a romantic partner (sex not specified) of a particular type (pursuing a particular domineering strategy) in a typical domineering situation and then to describe the typical nonverbal behaviors they would attribute to this person, separated by modalities, into the questionnaire.

Analysis

Approximately 2000 statements about nonverbal behaviors were collected. They were sorted into 40 envelopes, by modalities and domineering strategies. Our next aim was to categorize these statements into

TABLE 1. Vignettes with descriptions of four domineering strategies, which were presented to participants.

Characteristics of vignettes	
The powerful asocial type: (SA)	The powerful prosocial type: (SP)
This is a person with strong natural authority. He/she communicates his/her opinions or will to his/her partner forcefully, allows no discussion, or possibly gives orders. He/she may not be aware of his/her partner's will, or does not consider it as relevant, and does not take it into account. During an escalated conflict, he/she may use verbal or nonverbal aggression to reinforce his/her superiority. SA commands respect from his/her partner. Consequently, the partner of SA partly accepts the notion that the will of SA is more important than his/her own. The partner tries to comply with SA's wishes. SA may also arouse fear of failure in his/her partner.	This is a person with strong natural authority, who expresses his/her opinions and will openly, directly, and in a non-conflict way. He/she acts casually, agreeably and kindly. In many cases, he/she does not make much effort to enforce his/her will. People who assert oneself more actively, especially through successful organization of leisure time and social activities of the couple or larger social group, are also found among SP. When SP gets into a conflict or dispute with his/her partner he/she tries to explain his/her point of view and take account of his/her partner's needs. SP commands respect from his/her partner, who naturally accepts SP's will and has no problem identifying with it. SP can be inspiring for his/her partner and impress him/her with his/her ideas.
The powerless asocial type: (LA)	The powerless prosocial type: (LP)
This is a person who does not express his/her opinions and will openly, but tends to insist on it. He/she usually does not cooperate on decision-making, negates his/her partner's opinions and suggestions or ruins their accomplishment. He/she may also point out how harmful his/her partner's suggestions are, and in some extreme cases even use (psychological) extortion. His/her partner tends to give up to maintain calmness and agreeableness in the relationship.	This is a person who expresses his/her will unconvincingly, but in a gentle and conflict-free way. He/she emphasizes his/her investment into the relationship, devotion and dependence on the partner, and tends to bring evidence for it by extraordinary care for his/her partner. LP often flatters and praises the partner, and points out the goodness of his/her partner and the high quality relationship they are having. His/her partner feels that he/she is important and valuable for LP due to the care given and attention paid by him/her. Additionally, PL can arouse a feeling of debt or regret in his/her partner. In consequence, the partner feels obliged to reciprocate PL's care and fulfill his/her wishes.

Note: The powerful asocial type, Coercive; the powerful prosocial type, Respectful; the powerless asocial type, Ignoring; the powerless prosocial type, Affectionate. Interpretative short names of domineering strategies were not presented to subjects, in order not to constrain the imaginery of participants concerning nonverbal behavior of the respective types by focusing on one characteristic for each type only.

several categories typical for each domineering strategy and nonverbal modality. The categorization had several phases. In the first place, we used a group of categorizers who were blind to the tested concept, to decrease a possible effect of the researcher who might be biased by the theoretical concept in consideration. This gross categorization was performed by pairs of categorizers to decrease individual variation during the categorization process. Each pair received 4 or 8 envelopes (all four domineering strategies in 1–2 nonverbal modalities) and was asked to categorize all statements present in each envelope (separately) according to the similarity of the described behavior and to name each category.

These categorizations were consecutively thoroughly inspected by two researchers (authors of the study; JL, DP). Some logical problems were found, as e.g., identical statements sorted into several different categories, deviation from forming the same common categories across all domineering strategies (e.g., forming the categories direct gaze for one domineering strategy and strong gaze for another despite their large overlap in content etc.) Therefore, the researchers decided to modify the categorizations where needed. Where modifications were necessary, the following rules were adhered to: a) exclusion of equivocal items, b) exclusion of items not belonging to the given modality, c) differentiation between categories describing qualitative and quantitative behavioral variance (e.g., low/high frequency of smiles and felt/false smiles etc.), d) if possible, defining the category in terms of the structure and dynamics of movement rather than functional (communicational) characteristics, e) if possible, using categories of a similar meaning to those described in literature (this concerned mainly the modality smile, where we adhered to Ekman's (1985) types: felt smile, false smile, and Chaplin smile). Ekman's work (1985) on basic emotions was also used for categorization within the modality of facial expressions. And f) to constitute the same mutually exclusive categories for all domineering strategies (with the possibility to be absent in some strategies) within one modality. The final categorization represents a consensus of both researchers.

For each established nonverbal category, we summed up all statements pertaining to it within a particular domineering strategy. Thus, we obtained a measure of the intensity of occurrence of each category for each domineering strategy. Only a group of at least four statements was considered as occurrence of a nonverbal category within a given strategy. E.g., the category direct gaze included 12 statements for the respectful strategy, 20 statements for the coercive strategy, 6 statements for the affectionate strategy, and less then four, i.e., was not recorded, in the case of the ignoring strategy (see *Table 2*).

Each category was specified by a title and a brief verbal description after a qualitative inspection of statements belonging to it. Contents of other categories were taken into account in order to differentiate categories from each other. Previous findings and common terms and definitions used in literature on nonverbal behavior (e.g., Dunbar, Burgoon 2005, Hall *et al.* 2005) were used as a framework for construction of category descriptions. Brief summaries about typical behavior for each modality and domineering strategy were written by compiling all main categories found.

Finally, these descriptions of typical behavior for individual modalities were compared with results in other nonverbal modalities and with psychological theory about domineering strategies (e.g., Dunbar, Burgoon 2005, Henley 1977). Consequently, a final description of nonverbal behavior for each domineering strategy was compiled and is presented in the following section.

RESULTS

Our respondents attributed many nonverbal behaviors to each of the "respectful", "affectionate", "coercive", and "ignoring" domineering strategies. The overall pattern of nonverbal behaviors seems to clearly differentiate among these four strategies, although some behaviors occur in several domineering strategies.

A resulting list of categories and their intensities (total number of statements sorted to each category), separated for individual modalities, for all domineering strategies, is given in *Table 2*.

During the content analysis on the level of modalities and whole behavioral profiles, we aimed to find compact descriptions of nonverbal behavioural profiles, i.e., avoid behaviourally incompatible characteristics (e.g., frequent and rare gaze) within one profile. Consequently, two instead of one profile for each domineering strategy emerged, representing a solution leading to compact descriptions of nonverbal behavioral profiles. These were called substrategies. The behaviors which differed between substrategies were mostly related to the amount of activity the individual employed for domineering. Therefore, we formulated a passive and active substrategy for each of the four domineering strategies.

TABLE 2. Intensity of behavioral categories for the respectful, coercive, affectionate, and ignoring strategies counted as the number of statements sorted into each category.

Category / domineering strategy	Respectful	Coercive	Affectionate	Ignoring
Eye Gaze				
Piercing		15		
Direct	12	20	6	
Averted				10
Mild			16	4
Pleasant	4		9	
Wide-eyed	4			
Long/frequent	12	11	10	
Short/rare		10	7	14
Flitted	4			4
Balanced	12			
Smile				
Disagreeable (Chaplin)		19		6
False		11	15	16
Natural (felt)	17		13	
Conspicuous	12			
Soft			15	11
Frequent	6		7	
Rare		10		8
Facial expression				
Anger		24		
Tension (strength, determination)		24		
Joy/satisfaction	15		10	
Interest	8			
Calmness	11			
Disgust				9
Tension (defience)				8
Sadness (despair)			17	6
High expressiveness	14			
Low expressiveness		7	7	9
Pretentiousness				9
Gestures				
Aggressive		12		
Conspicuous	12	11		5
Strong (swift, rapid)		11	4	6
Bland			11	12
Calm	8		5	6
Unmature (childish)				5
Natural (pleasant)	20			
Frequent	8		5	
Rare			8	8

TABLE 2. Continued.

Category / domineering strategy	Respectful	Coercive	Affectionate	Ignoring
Body posture				
Upright	20	10	4	
Tense (stiff)		6	6	5
Hunched			11	14
Relaxed (natural)	11			
Self-confident		4		
Loose			5	
Body movements				
Swift (uncontrolled)		16		4
Firm		15		
Controlled	12	8		
Unnatural				6
Nervous			7	4
Unsteady			4	
Calm	12		17	
Natural	6			
High mobility	13			
Low mobility	6		6	8
Spacial behavior				
Enters partner's space	12	22	15	11
Protects own space	5	16	5	14
Respects partner's space	15		11	6
Lets partner enter own space	4		11	4
Touch				
Firm (intrusive)	8	10		4
Agressive		7		
Unpleasant (cold)		5		
Soft	5		11	7
Friendly (smooth, warm)	15		11	
Frequent	12		9	6
Rare	6	16	7	9
Passively accepts			6	
Vocalization				
Firm	10	10		5
Distinctively modulated	11	8	4	4
Pleasant	8		9	
High pitched (shrill)				5
Calm			4	
Unpleasant				4
Undistinguished			6	
Loud		10		
Medium loud	4			
Quiet			8	4

TABLE 2. Continued.

Category / domineering strategy	Respectful	Coercive	Affectionate	Ignoring
Verbalization				
Speaks much	4		4	
Speaks little			6	6
Listens	5		4	
Does not listen		4		

Note: Intensities lower than those of four statements in one category are not shown.

The respectful (high-power-high-prosociality) strategy

Common characteristics

A person who pursues the "respectful" strategy maintains an upright and relaxed body posture. He/she has a medium loud, but distinctively modulated voice, which is firm and pronounced, yet pleasant.

The passive substrategy

He/she maintains balanced eye contact, which is firm, direct, as well as warm and pleasant. Occasionally, he/she lets the gaze flit about a little. He/she often smiles naturally. He/she has calm or satisfied facial expressions. His/her gestures are calm and natural as well. He/she moves calmly, effectively, and naturally. He/she respects his/her partner's space. He/she touches his/her partner pleasantly and softly, though infrequently. He/she carefully listens to his/her partner's talk.

The active subtrategy

He/she maintains a long eye contact, which is firm, direct, and pleasant or even wide-eyed (as an expression of interest). He/she smiles conspicuously. He/she is very expressive, showing frequent facial expressions related to interest and joy. He/she often uses conspicuous, but natural gestures. He/she is considerably mobile, and his/her movements are effective and natural. He/she often enters his/her partner's space and accepts if the partner acts in the same way. He/she touches his/her partner often, firmly and expressively, but gently. He/she speaks often.

The coercive (high-power-low-prosociality) strategy

Common characteristics

He/she executes very strong, swift, rapid, and conspicuous gestures. Often, these have negative content, regarded as mostly aggressive or "dominant". He/she maintains an upright body posture, which may sometimes be tense and stiff. He/she enters his/her partner's space while protecting his/her own space. He/she has a loud, firm and expressive voice. He/she monopolizes the conversation, ignores his/her partner and interrupts his/her partner's speech.

The passive subtrategy

He/she hardly ever makes eye contact or smiles. He/she is very non-expressive. His/her movements are firm and controlled. He/she very rarely touches, and his/her eventual touches are cold.

The active subtrategy

He/she looks long or often, and straight into his/her partner's eyes. Sometimes, the gaze becomes piercing. He/she uses false or otherwise unpleasant smiles. He/she expresses tension, strength, determination, but also anger and aggression. He/she moves swiftly without good control. He/she touches firmly and aggressively in extreme cases.

The affectionate (low-power-high-prosociality) strategy

No common characteristics were found for the active and passive substrategy.

The passive substrategy

He/she averts his/her gaze, smiles softly or has a sad face. He/she gestures modestly or calmly, and rarely. He/she has a hunched or sometimes stiff body. He/she moves very little, or moves calmly. He/she keeps a distance from his/her partner. He/she touches infrequently and softly. His/her voice is silent and undistinguished. He/she hardly speaks, but likes to listen.

The active substrategy

He/she is characterized by a long and piercing gaze, frequent or long smile, which can be natural, but also false. This corresponds with a satisfied facial expression. He/she uses dynamic gestures with affiliative meanings.

He/she has a loose or upright posture. He/she moves nervously and unsteadily. He/she enters his/her partner's space and likes to let his/her partner enter his/her own space. He/she often touches his/her partner, using slightly more expressive, and friendly touches. He/she likes being touched by his/her partner. His/her voice is relatively quiet and pleasant. He/she likes both to speak and listen to his/her partner.

The ignoring (low-power-low-prosociality) strategy

No common characteristics were found for the active and passive substrategy.

The passive substrategy

He/she maintains a mild and unsecure gaze. He/she smiles softly and unnaturally. He/she is very unexpressive, but often tense. He/she gestures rarely, blandly, and shows nervousness. He/she holds a hunched body posture. He/she moves slowly and blandly. He/she protects his/her own space. He/she touches very rarely and softly. He/she has a quiet voice and speaks rarely.

The active substrategy

He/she avoids eye contact. His/her smile appears unnatural and false. He/she sometimes mocks his/her partner. He/she frequently uses false expressions, as feigned despair. His/her true expressions include disgust. Strong and conspicuous (even aggressive), but also false gestures can occur. Occasionally, he/she uses immature, simple gestures. He/she holds a tense and stiff body posture. He/she moves unnaturally, sometimes swiftly. He/she protects his/her space, but enters his/her partner's space as well. He/she touches firmly and unpleasantly. He/she has a firm and expressive voice, often high in pitch. He/she speaks very little.

DISCUSSION

All passive substrategies are generally characterized by low expressiveness, little movement and low physical contact with the partner. Besides these general similarities, there are important differences in behavior among the four passive domineering substrategies. The overall impression ranges from natural and pleasant (the passive "respectful" substrategy), through strong and aggressive ("coercive"), and calm and quiet ("affectionate") to bland and insecure nonverbal behavior ("ignoring"). Vocalizations of the "respectful" and "coercive" substrategies are expressive in contrast to the bland vocalization of the "affectionate" and "ignoring" substrategies. While the "coercive" and "ignoring" strategies lack facial expressiveness, the "respectful" strategy tends to use mild positive emotional expressions, and the "affectionate" strategy characteristically uses an expression of sadness. The passive strategies also differ according to spatial behavior and attentiveness to the partner's speech, which is characterized by both respect for partner's space and attentiveness to his/her speech in the "respectful" strategy, lack of both in the "coercive" strategy, preference of spatial distance, but great attentiveness in the "affectionate" strategy and withdrawal in the "ignoring" strategy.

In contrast, the active substrategies are generally characterized by high expressiveness, high mobility and entering the partner´s space. They represent more extreme and also more distinct forms of each domineering strategy. The overall behavior spans from rich natural and positive displays in the "respectful" substrategy, through sharp nonverbal displays and body tension in the "coercive" strategy, and loose and unsteady movements in the "affectionate" strategy to conspicuous,

TABLE 3. Occurrence of nonverbal cues of dominance as described by Dunbar and Burgoon (2005) in eight domineering substrategies.

Cues of dominance described by Dunbar and Burgoon (2005)	Domineering strategy and substrategy							
	Respectful		Coercive		Affectionate		Ignoring	
	Passive	Active	Passive	Active	Passive	Active	Passive	Active
Intense gesturing	−	+	+	+	−	+	−	+
Intense eye gaze	−	+	−	+	−	+	−	−
Great talking time	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	−
Vocal animation	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	+
Relaxation	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	−
Confidence	+	+	−	+	−	−	−	−

unnatural nonverbal displays in the "ignoring" strategy. Perhaps the most contrasting are facial emotional expressions, being strong and positive, including joy and interest, in the case of the "respectful" and "affectionate" strategies, false and positive or strong and negative, such as anger, in the case of the "coercive" strategy, and negative such as disgust and feigned despair in the case of the "ignoring" strategy. The strategies also clearly differ in tactile and spatial behavior, where the "respectful" strategy is characterized by intense positive contact with the partner, and an acceptance of his/her partner's contact behaviors, the "coercive" strategy is characterized by intense and often negative contact with the partner, and no acceptance of his/her partner's contact behaviors, the active "affectionate" strategy is characterized by intense positive contact initiation, and seeking partner's contact behaviors, and finally the passive "ignoring" strategy is characterized by visually ignoring the partner with an occasional unpleasant tactile contact and a protection of own space.

We suggest that factors which determine which strategy and substrategy an individual is likely to pursue will be associated with his/her personality (e.g., prosociality/affiliation) on the one hand, and his/her power sources (e.g., mate value) on the other. Power sources can be expected to remain relatively stable during one romantic relationship, but not *across* relationships for an individual, as they are also a function of his/her partner's value, and these might change with different partners. In contrast, personality traits are relatively stable both within and across relationships (Robins *et al.* 2002). Therefore, individuals may be expected to "switch" between the high-power and low-power strategies, but not between the high-prosociality and low-prosociality strategies across relationships. On a situational level however, we suggest that the nature of a specific conflict or topic of conversation may influence whether a high-prosocial or a low-prosocial domineering strategy will be used at that moment: conflicts which elicit negative emotions (e.g., responsibilities of the partners) will be more likely to lead to the implementation of low-prosocial strategies, whereas neutral and positive topics (e.g., leisure time activities) will lead to the tendency to choose high-prosocial strategies. In addition, situational factors such as motivation to dominate in a particular situation are likely to determine changes between the active and passive domineering substrategies within one relationship. Moreover, as was suggested by Dunbar and Burgoon (2005), higher domineering activity can be expected in dyads with a similar level of power in both partners. In contrast, in studies which imposed or observed dyads with a great status or power difference between the two individuals, a more passive dominance profile was likely to arise.

It is also important to note that the fact that an individual shows nonverbal behaviors characteristic for a "domineering" strategy does not imply that this individual is actually dominant in the particular relationship. Whether using a domineering strategy will lead to dominance depends on the specific interaction with the partner who can behave either submissively or may also pursue a domineering strategy, as well as on situational factors.

When compared with findings concerning nonverbal behavior and dominance, as reviewed by Dunbar and Burgoon (2005), we see that nonverbal profiles of the ignoring and affectionate strategies largely deviate from what has been commonly considered as dominant behavior in literature (*Table 3*). In contrast, these two strategies resemble all three forms of indirect verbal influence as described by Frieze and McHugh (1992): being affectionate and nice corresponds to the nonverbal profile of the "affectionate" strategy, while disregarding others and emotional withdrawal are important aspects of the nonverbal profile of the "ignoring" strategy.

Even if we consider only direct domineering strategies, which are proposed to lead to dominance more frequently than indirect strategies (Lindová *et al.* in prep.), our results provide important extensions to previous findings. Specifically, previous inconsistencies regarding, for example, the frequency of gazing, touch and smile associated with dominance could have arisen due to differences in the prevalence of active versus passive domineering in respective studies.

Our findings, although based on beliefs of participants about associations between domineering strategies and nonverbal behaviors, differ considerably from past research on stereotypical associations between dominance and nonverbal behavior. The previous findings meta-analyzed by Hall *et al.* (2005) found dominance and similar concepts to be associated with participants' beliefs about more gazing, gesturing, touching of others, higher vocal variability, loudness, more interruptions, higher rate of speech, and perhaps more nodding, body/leg shifting, and vocal relaxation, and less smiling, less raised brows, less postural relaxation, less self touch, lower interpersonal distance, less pausing during speech, and finally, lower pitch. We were not able to confirm any of these associations for all four domineering strategies. Moreover, even for the two direct domineering strategies, the respectful and coercive strategy, we confirmed only higher vocal variability, and

partly more gesturing, a lower interpersonal distance, and more gazing to be typical for both (for gesturing and distance, this was true only for the active, but not the passive, respectful substrategy, and for gazing, it was true only for both active, but not for both passive, substrategies). However, loudness, frequent interruptions, less smiling, lowered brows and less posture relaxation was confirmed for the coercive strategy only. And in contrast, more touching of others, vocal relaxation, and lower pitch were obtained solely for the respectful strategy. The remaining nonverbal behaviors found significant by Hall *et al.* (2005; higher rate of speech, more nodding, body/leg shifting, less self touch, less pausing during speech) were not mentioned systematically by our participants, therefore are probably not believed to be associated with either dominance strategy (but note that is some cases, this may have been the consequence of the methodology used here; e.g., head nodding might not have been triggered since the modality head movements was not included in the questionnaire).

Findings from former observational (coding) studies seem to be more concordant with the variability of nonverbal profiles connected with dominance, as obtained by our study. The specific associations of nonverbal behaviors with dominance were occasionally confirmed for some (sub)strategies in our study. For instance, the previous finding of an upright posture (Weisfeld, Beresford 1982; not considered separately by Hall *et al.* 2005) was confirmed for both the respectful and coercive strategies. Considering other posture characteristics, a relaxed posture was typical for the respectful strategy, but a tense posture was more typically mentioned by participants for the coercive strategy. Both of the low-power strategies were characterized by a variety of different postures including stiff, loose, or hunched. The lack of general association between relaxation and dominance was already shown by the meta-analysis by Hall *et al.* (2005). Interestingly, the category open body posture, found previously to be associated with dominance by Hall *et al.* (2005), did not appear in our study at all. This could be considered as evidence for the hypothesis formulated by Cashdan (however not supported by her own study, Cashdan 2004), that open body postures can be a by-product of relaxation and social ease of some dominant people (characterized by popularity). However, we cannot exclude the possibility that the less frequent mentioning of an open body posture by participants was an artifact of the research method (we used the Czech translation of body posture "držení těla", which may evoke more the physical body posture rather than postural expression of an internal state).

Beliefs about intensity of eye contact were variable within each strategy except for the ignoring strategy, which was characterized by avoidance of gaze. For the respectful, coercive, and affectionate strategies, both high (to extremely high) and low (or balanced) intensities of gaze were mentioned by participants, which we used in our analysis as one of the characteristics constituting the distinction between the active and passive substrategies. Perhaps, the absence of an association between gaze and dominance in the meta-analysis by Hall *et al.* (2005) and inconsistencies in studies reviewed by Knapp and Hall (2005) were caused by an important proportion of passively domineering participants, who did not tend to use intense eye contact, across previous studies.

Similarly, intensity of smile differed between active and passive prosocial strategies (less smiling in general was found for the ignoring strategy and also for the coercive strategy); the passive respectful substrategy was characterized by frequent, but not intense smiles. The other substrategies were characterized not only by less frequent and intense, but also sometimes by atypical types of smiles (e.g., false smiles). Inconsistent findings regarding smiling and dominance have been reported earlier (Schmid Mast, Hall 2004). In agreement with this, the meta-analysis of Hall *et al.* (2005) found no association between smile and dominance. Some authors have extensively discussed the difference between the association of smile and dominance in men and in women, and what effects affective and motivational states have on the interaction between dominance and smiling (Schmid Mast, Hall 2004, Cashdan 1998). Importantly, Cashdan (1998) also hypothesizes that affiliative behaviors used by women to gain high status lead to a positive association between smile and status.

Closer distance or entering partner's space, as previously found by Hall *et al.* (2005), was found to be a typical characteristic for the coercive strategy and all active substrategies from the remaining three, and may, therefore, be considered as one of the most generally used dominance behaviors.

Another relatively consistent finding across domineering strategies, but one not so consistent with previous research, was regarding the associations of dominance and voice characteristics. The meta-analytic finding by Schmid Mast (2002) of longer talking time of more dominant people was confirmed for the coercive strategy, and the active respectful and affectionate strategies, but not for the passive prosocial strategies and

for the ignoring strategy. Both direct strategies, respectful and coercive, and the active ignoring substrategy were further characterized by firm voice and distinctive modulation, which are characteristics surprisingly not confirmed by previous meta-analytic studies (Hall *et al.* 2005, Schmid Mast 2002). On the other hand, further to Hall's *et al.* (2005) meta-analytic findings of loud speech and relaxed voices in dominant people, these were each confirmed for only a single strategy in our study, the former for the coercive strategy, and the latter for the respectful strategy. Similarly, more interruption, significant in Hall *et al.* (2005), was found only for the coercive strategy.

Limitations and future directions

First, it should be noted that our conclusions are based on the beliefs our participants held about the association of certain psychological characteristics with nonverbal behaviors. These do not need to correspond to real associations (see, e.g., Gifford 1994, Hall *et al.* 2005). Additionally, future studies need to elucidate if these nonverbal behavioral profiles also appear when using observational methodology.

Furthermore, the instructions for participants might be seen as problematic, providing a lot of space for individual imagination. For example, participants could have differed in the type of domineering situation they focused on. However, the high intensity (number of statements) of some behavioral displays (categories) present in individual strategies indicates that there was relatively high agreement about the typical characteristics of the strategies across imagined situations. On the other hand, this qualitative approach applied on a relatively large sample of respondents allowed us to describe less typical behavioral displays that may be products of the variable situations imagined. Future research should look to confirm or disprove some of the behaviors we report, for each of the four types of domineering; this could be done using several well described situations in a dyadic interaction.

An important limitation to address is that we have not specified the gender of the described person in the instruction. It might be argued that because of the stereotypical perception of men as more active and dominant, the participants might imagine men more often within the direct, high-power strategies, and women within the indirect and low-power strategies. Therefore, low-power strategies might contain more behaviors that are associated with feminine behavior and high-power strategies might contain more behaviors associated with masculine behavior. Further research should (1) delineate nonverbal displays of all domineering strategies while imagining either a man or a woman, (2) compare the proportion of all four strategies in a representative female and male sample of coupled participants.

CONCLUSIONS

In the present study, we present a first attempt to systemize the variability in dominance behavior. We describe not only the coercive and the direct prosocial (termed respectful) domineering strategies, but also include the less typical "indirect" domineering strategies (affectionate and ignoring; Lindová *et al.* in prep.) to complete the picture about patterns of behaviors used to gain control in a romantic relationship. We explored people's beliefs about typical nonverbal behaviors associated with these four domineering strategies. Through our questionnaire we were able to acquire open statements from participants about what nonverbal behaviour they thought each of these four domineering strategies would exhibit. We conclude that there is a clear, distinct set of typical behavioral displays believed to be associated to each of the four domineering strategies. Moreover, during the qualitative analysis, we found that two distinct subtypes (substrategies) within each domineering strategy emerged, which were characterized by overall low versus overall high nonverbal activity. These substrategies were labeled passive and active. Furthermore, we found that only some of the strategies and substrategies, mostly the high-power strategies (respectful and coercive) and/or active substrategies, are characterized by nonverbal behaviors corresponding to the common view of nonverbal dominance behavior presented in current literature. The newly described nonverbal behavioral patterns related to dominance seem to be similar to indirect verbal domineering strategies as found by Frieze and McHugh (1992). Further, we suggest some explanations for previous inconsistencies regarding associations of nonverbal behavior and dominance, by identifying particular behaviors associated with each of the individual domineering strategies. We believe that such enriched knowledge will have direct benefits in relationship counselling and related applied fields, e.g., by increasing awareness of less overt domineering behaviors, and providing those being counselled with more efficient communication strategies. As this research was based on the subjective beliefs of participants, future studies should investigate if actual, objectively measured domineering behaviors match the profiles of the four

domineering strategies described in this study. Future work should also show how these strategies are distributed between men and women, and what relationship there is between feminine and masculine nonverbal behavior and nonverbal displays for particular domineering strategies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The article was supported by the grant SVV-2012-265 703 (by the Czech Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports) and by Charles University Research Centre (UNCE 204004). This publication was supported by the The Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports – Institutional Support for Longterm Development of Research Organizations – Charles University, Faculty of Humanities (P20). Great thanks to Victoria R. Mileva for her language corrections and comments and Jan Havlíček for his comments.

REFERENCES

AGUINIS H., SIMONSEN M. M., PIERCE C. A., 1998: Effects of nonverbal behavior on perceptions of power bases. *Journal of Social Psychology* 138: 455–469.

ARGYLE M. 1988: *Bodily communication. 2nd ed.* Methuen, London.

BURGOON J. K., 1991: Relational message interpretations of touch, conversational distance, and posture. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 15: 233–259.

BURGOON J. K., BIRK T., PFAU M., 1990: Nonverbal behaviors, persuasion, and credibility. *Human Communication Research* 17: 140–169.

BURGOON J. K., BULLER D. B., HALE J. L., DETURCK M. A., 1984: Relational messages associated with nonverbal behaviors. *Human Communication Research* 10: 351–378.

BURGOON J. K., HOOBLER G., 2002: Nonverbal signals. In: M. L. Knapp, J. A. Daly (Eds.): *Handbook of interpersonal communication. 3rd ed.* Pp. 240–299. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

CARLI L. L., LAFLEUR S. J., LOEBER C. C., 1995: Nonverbal behavior, gender, and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 68: 1030–1041.

CASHDAN E., 1998: Smiles, speech, and body posture: How women and men display sociometric status and power. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 22: 209–228.

CATTELL B. C., EBER H. W., TATSUOKA M. M., 1992: *Handbook for the sixteen personality factor questionnaire (16 PF). Institute for personality and ability testing*. Champaign, Illinois.

DOVIDIO J. F., ELLYSON S. L., 1982: Decoding visual dominance: Attributions of power based on relative percentages of looking while speaking and looking while listening. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 45: 106–113.

DOVIDIO J. F., ELLYSON S. L., 1985: Patterns of visual dominance behavior in humans. In: S. L. Ellyson, J. F. Dovidio (Eds.): *Power, dominance, and nonverbal communication*. Pp. 129–149. Springer, New York.

DUNBAR N. E., BURGOON J. K., 2005: Perceptions of power and interactional dominance in interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 22: 207–233.

EKMAN P., 1985: *Telling lies: Clues to deceit in the marketplace, politics, and marriage*. W. W. Norton & Company, London.

ELLYSON S. L., DOVIDIO J. F, 1985: *Power, dominance, and nonverbal behavior.* Springer-Verlag, New York.

ELLYSON S. L., DOVIDIO J. F., CORSON R. L., VINICUR D. L., 1980: Visual dominance behavior in female dyads: Situational and personality factors. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 43: 328–336.

EXLINE R. V., ELLYSON S. L., LONG B., 1975: Visual behavior as an aspect of power role relationships. In: P. Pliner, L. Krames, T. Alloway (Eds.): *Advances in the study of communication and affect. Vol. 2*. Pp. 21–52. Plenum Press, New York.

FRIEZE I. H., MCHUGH M. C., 1992: Power and influence strategies in violent and nonviolent marriages. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 16: 449–465.

GIFFORD R., 1991: Mapping non-verbal behavior on the interpersonal circle. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 61: 279–288.

GIFFORD R., 1994: A lens-mapping framework for understanding the encoding and decoding of interpersonal dispositions in nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 66: 398–412.

GREGORY S. W., WEBSTER S., 1996: A nonverbal signal in voices of interview partners effectively predicts communication accommodation and social status perceptions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70: 1231–1240.

HALL J. A., COATS E. J., SMITH LEBEAU L., 2005: Nonverbal behavior and the vertical dimension of social relations: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin* 131: 898–924.

HALL J. A., HORGAN T. G., CARTER J. D., 2002: Assigned and felt status in relation to observer-coded and participant-reported smiling. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 26: 63–81.

HENLEY N., 1977: *Body politics: Power, sex, and nonverbal communication.* Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

KEATING C. F., MAZUR A., SEGAL M. H., 1977: Facial gestures which influence the perception of status. *Sociometry* 40: 171–176.

KIMBLE C. E., MUSGROVE J. I., 1988: Dominance in arguing mixed-sex dyads: Visual dominance patterns, talking time, and speech loudness. *Journal of Research in Personality* 22: 1–16.

KNAPP M. L., HALL J. A., 2005: *Nonverbal communication in human interaction. 6th ed.* Wadsworth, Belmont.

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

LINDOVÁ J., PRŮŠOVÁ D., KLAPILOVÁ K., in preparation: Domineering strategies in romantic relationships can be derived from the interpersonal dimensions affiliation and power.

ROBINS R. W., CASPI A., MOFFITT T. E., 2002: It's not just who you're with, it's who you are: Personality and relationship experiences across multiple relationships. *Journal of Personality* 70: 925–64.

ROGERS-MILLAR E. L., MILLAR F. E., 1979: Domineeringness and dominance: A transactional view. *Human Communication Research* 5: 238–246.

ROSIP J. C., HALL J. A., 2004: Knowledge of nonverbal cues, gender and nonverbal decoding accuracy. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior* 28: 267–286.

SCHMID MAST M., 2002: Dominance as expressed and inferred through speaking time: A meta-analysis. *Human Communication Research* 28: 420–450.

SCHMID MAST M., HALL J. A., 2004: When is dominance related to smiling? Assigned dominance, dominance preference, trait dominance, and gender as moderators. *Sex Roles* 50: 387–399.

SCHWARTZ B., TESSER A., POWELL E., 1982: Dominance cues in nonverbal behavior. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 45: 114–120.

SILLARS A. L., COLETTI S. F., PARRY D., RORGERS M. A., 1982: Coding verbal conflict tactics: Nonverbal and perceptual correlates of the 'Avoidance–Distributive–Integrative' distinction. *Human Communication Research* 9: 83–95.

STIER D. S., HALL J. A., 1984: Gender differences in touch: An empirical and theoretical review. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 47: 440–459.

TIEDENS L. Z., FRAGLE A. R., 2003: Power moves: Complementarity in dominant and submissive nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 84: 558–568.

WEISFELD G. E., BERESFORD J. M., 1982: Erectness of posture as an indicator of dominance or success in humans. *Motivation and Emotion* 6: 113–131.

Jitka Lindová
Denisa Průšová
Kateřina Klapilová
Department of Anthropology
Faculty of Humanities
Charles University in Prague
U Kříže 8
158 00 Praha 5
Czech Republic
E-mail: jitka.lindova@seznam.cz
E-mail: Prusova.d@seznam.cz
E-mail: Katerina.klapilova@seznam.cz