American Journal of Dance Therapy
1982, Vol. 5, 28–42

Posture Sharing in Dyadic Interaction

Davida Navarre, Ph.D.[1]
Vice-President for Research and Planning
Cambridge Television Productions

The role of posture sharing in the development of a positive relationship is generally acknowledged as a critical aspect of dance therapy. Often noted is the distinction between "mimicking" of body positions and "sharing" of movement quality (*effort* in Laban's Effort system). This experiment investigates posture sharing in an interview dyad, defining the movement unit so that it includes not only shared position in space but also shared movement quality. Participants in the posture sharing condition report both significantly more positive assessments of themselves and of the interviewer, and significantly greater similarity beween themselves and the interviewer. This impact of posture sharing is explained in a social psychology model of behavior in which interaction is viewed in terms of individuals negotiating roles with one another.

The notion that posture sharing among interactants indicates a shared viewpoint or positive relationship has been noted in a variety of settings, both by investigators who intensively analyze nonverbal behavior in naturalistic face-to-face interactions (Condon & Ogston, 1966, 1967; Kendon, 1970, 1973; LaFrance & Broadbent, 1976; Scheflen, 1964, 1973), and by researchers who manipulate body positions under controlled experimental conditions (Dabbs, 1969; LaFrance, 1981; Navarre, 1980; Trout and Rosenfeld, 1980). Although the relationship beween posture sharing and positive assessment among interactants applies to all fields where communication is important, it is especially critical to dance therapy where communication is primarily nonverbal.

The naturalistic research approach involves exhaustive analysis of films or videotapes of participants in face-to-face interaction to tease out the underlying patterns or unwritten rules of nonverbal behavior. Working within this framework, Condon, Kendon, and Scheflen have independently noted the role of posture sharing during positive interactions.

Condon studied, in frame-by-frame film analysis, the (simulated) interaction of doctor and patient (Condon and Ogston, 1967), and the interaction of mother and neonate (Condon and Sander, 1974). He

---

[1]Formerly Dance Therapist, South Beach Psychiatric Center, Staten Island, New York.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Dr. Davida Navarre, Vice-President for Research and Planning, Cambridge Television Productions, 810 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139.

noted the existence of a behavioral unit which he called interactional synchrony: "sustaining of direction of movement together by the various parts of the body moving at a given time" (Condon, 1968, p. 28). In other words, Condon views interactional synchrony as the precise timing of body movements between interactants, rather than the actual sharing of posture or movement of identical body parts between interactants. Kendon (1970), who analyzed synchrony among individuals in a British pub, also noted its occurence between a speaker and listeners. Scheflen (1973), a psychiatrist who studied a filmed family therapy session in frame-by-frame analysis, noted the existence of general postural conformation between therapist and patient which occurs regularly at times of patient lucidity. To Scheflen, such common postures between interactants reflects a shared viewpoint.

Another research approach, the experimental, requires a manipulation of a specifically defined behavioral unit, or variable, under controlled conditions. Some investigators have begun to use posture sharing as the manipulated, or experimental variable.

In an early experiment studying posture sharing, Dabbs (1969) had confederates "mimic" and "antimimic" postures of subjects in an interview situation. He found that in the mimic condition subjects experienced similarity between self and interviewer; and that initial similarity (as measured on a self-reported personality test) between participants interacts with the mimic condition to produce subject liking of the interviewer.

Navarre and Emihovich (1978) related posture sharing to subject reported liking of others in a small group. Trained observers who viewed group interaction *in vivo* through a one-way mirror which encircled three walls (270°) of the room, noted each instance of shared posture among interactants. The number of an individual's nonverbal "coalitions" was significantly related to how well that individual was liked by members of the group.

LaFrance (1979), who differentiates between two kinds of posture sharing, postural mirroring, and postural congruence,[2] related posture sharing with student reported rapport with the teacher in the classroom. She finds a relationship between postural mirroring, but not postural congruence, and rapport.

Posture Sharing in Dance Therapy

The notion that shared body movement is a critical element in the

[2]LaFrance (1981) distinguished between two forms of posture sharing: in postural congruence, two interactants facing each other would both move their left arm; in postural mirroring, two interactants facing each other would move their arms so that, if they were looking at a mirror, it would seem that they were moving the identical arm.

development of positive relationship between interactants is a central tenet in dance therapy theory and practice, with application both to the therapist-client relationship and to the development of group process.

Schmais and White (1970), in their influential paper "Introduction to Dance Therapy," explicitly discuss this assumption in terms of the therapist-client relationship:

> The dance therapist forms a relationship by "tuning in" with the patient's affective state as shown in his movement... (incorporating) into his own movements the essence or predominant quality expressed in the patients' movements. This "tuning in" results in a rapport with the patient. (p. 3)

They also noted that shared body movement among group members produces social interaction presumably on the basis of positive, shared relationships between interactants.

This approach was developed by the pioneering work of dance therapist Marian Chace in the 1940's and 50's. She explicitly emphasized that the dance therapist should reflect the mood of the patient in her own body movements, meeting such patient movements "with movements of equal force" (Chaiklin, 1975, p. 53) and rhythm. In her discussion of the critical "initial contact" between patient and therapist, Chace (Chailkin, 1975) focused on the role of shared body movement. Here, she noted the impact of shared movement quality in addition to shared body postures in the development of positive relationships:

> The movements used in establishing initial contact with a patient may be qualitatively similar to those of the patient... Intense alertness is essential in judging which approach should be used so that the dance therapist may immediately establish herself as a "safe" person. (p. 73)

More recently, other dance therapists have incorporated these concepts into their work. One vivid example can be viewed in Janet Adler's (1970) filmed case history of dance therapy with an autistic child. Adler repeatedly refers to sharing qualities of the child's movement repertoire as a means of entering the child's world.

Clinical research in dance therapy has also noted the presence of shared body movement, often relating such movement to the development of both the client-therapist relationship and the group process.

Schmais and Felber (1977), in their methodology of dance therapy observation and analysis, differentiate among three kinds of "synchronous" body movement: 1) shared temporal rhythm (independent of which body part is moving in rhythm); 2) shared movement quality (*effort* in Laban's notation system); and 3) shared space (identical body part moving in the same direction).

The *effort* movement notation system was developed by Laban (1960), and applied to dance therapy and psychotherapy research by Bartenieff and Davis (1973; Davis, 1979) among others. The *effort* vocabulary deals, not with position in space, but with the movement quality. There are four bipolar movement qualities (*efforts*) which can occur independently or in combination: space (direct and indirect); weight (strong and light); time (quick and slow); and flow (bound and free).

Brown and Navarre (1977) analyzed the play and movement therapy of an autistic girl, based on intensive observation of a filmed longitudinal study. The therapist initially developed rapport with the young patient by mirroring her characteristic gestures, notably a finger flapping movement.

In a study which applies the three types of synchrony (Schmais and Felber, 1977), Felber recorded occurrences of synchrony, plotting their fluctuations through a dance therapy session. She describes the presence of a developmental sequence in both the patterns of synchrony and in group formation.

In summary, researchers have found posture sharing to be related to liking (Navarre and Emihovich, 1978), development of rapport (LaFrance, 1979), and a shared perspective, based on more intensive interaction between participants (Scheflen, 1973). These findings support reports of dance therapists that incorporating the essence of clients' movements forms the basis for the therapeutic alliance. One issue, however, is the different definitions of posture sharing. Investigators of nonverbal behavior, while distinguishing between different forms of posture sharing and interactional synchrony, consistently focus on position in space. Dance therapists generally emphasize the need to incorporate the essential movement quality rather than simply mimicking the body movements spatially.

Nonverbal Behavior and Role Negotiation

In social psychology, particularly among the symbolic interactionists, nonverbal behavior is viewed in terms of social identity, role definition, and negotiations of roles between interactants. Individuals are viewed as constantly presenting a social identity with positive attributes, which Goffman (1967) labels "face," through their verbal and nonverbal acts. Nonverbal behaviors, although not within awareness, critically influence the association of positive and negative attributes (Rosenthal, Hall, DiMatteo, Rogers, & Archer, 1979).

This approach has a venerable history, with roots in the social behaviorism of George Herbert Mead (1962) and Charles Horton Cooley (1926). Mead views the behavior of individuals as the means to

approaching individual experience. He also emphasized that individual acts occur within the social or interpersonal act. These social acts, or gestures, are for Mead, "significant symbols" whose meanings are interpreted by participants in the interaction. Furthermore, each individual must be able to interpret and respond to the meaning of his own as well as others' gestures, with the result that the other's response further shapes his/her own behavior. Mead and Cooley view man as essentially a role taking animal, and this "taking the role of the other" is the means for providing the "common content" required for common understandings.

In summary, the perspective of the symbolic interactionists emphasizes individual experience in terms of the interpersonal act or gesture, which is shaped by the acts of others in the interaction. Man is viewed as a social, role taking animal, whose basis of interpersonal understanding lies with the taking of the other's role in the course of interaction.

Elaborating the concept of individuals taking on roles in negotiating social interaction, Erving Goffman has articulated in some detail what he has termed the "presentation of self in everyday life" (1959). Goffman has explicated the critical role of identity manipulation, even when the expectations of interactants are congruent (*i.e.* there exists a "working consensus"), and especially when such a working consensus does not exist. Interpersonal communication is viewed within the context of individuals controlling the manipulation of information in establishing a social identity and negotiating roles. By verbal and nonverbal acts, each individual in a situation enacts his/her "line" through which is expressed both his/her view of the situation and evaluation of the participants, especially the self. "Face" is the term Goffman (1967) uses to describe the positive self image individuals effectively claim for themselves by the "line" they present in an interaction (p. 5). Goffman (1974) also stresses the critical role that the specific situation, which he labels the "frame," plays in organizing the meaning of behavior for the participants, and thus their experiences. Frame, which refers to both environmental and individual specific factors, not only delimits such issues as status, social role, intimacy, rapport, but also denotes whether the interaction is to be taken at face value (*e.g.*, as in play, flirting, mock combat).

In summary, Goffman emphasizes the essential role of negotiating social identity in interpersonal interaction. In elaborating this process he depicts several key concepts, including individual face or positive image an individual claims, and frame or specific context in which the interaction takes place.

The present study tests experimentally the hypothesis that posture sharing between interactants indicates a shared perspective and is thus

related to experience of positive relationship and similarity between those interactants. The posture sharing unit is defined both by shared position in space and by shared movement quality. This study hypothesizes that:

1. Subjects will rate themselves more positively in posture sharing (PS) than in neutral movement condition (NON).

2. Subjects will rate interviewer more positively in posture sharing (PS) than in neutral movement condition (NON).

3. Subjects will rate more similarity between themselves and the interviewer in the posture sharing (PS) than in the neutral movement condition (NON):
   a. measured by the number of similar responses to questions about themselves and the interviewer (SIM-1)
   b. measured for each subject by the distance between the scores of the interviewer and the subject on Bales' (1970) three axes combined (SIM-2).

Methodology

The principle investigator individually interviewed 43 female subjects randomly assigned to one of two movement conditions: posture sharing (PS) and neutral movement condition (NON). After each interview, each subject responded to the experience on a questionnaire (Bales, 1970).

Subjects were freshmen women participating in the experiment as part of their academic requirement. Subjects were informed that they would be interviewed about their experiences as college students. All 43 subjects were assigned at random to one of the two movement conditions, and were interviewed individually for 15 minutes in a room with a one-way mirror.

Behind the mirror were four women, students with one to two semesters study of dance therapy theory. Two of the women behind the mirror were "observers". They noted for each interview which of the two conditions (PS, NON) was occurring, the quality of condition attainment, and a description of the movement behavior of both subject and interviewer. The purpose of the observers was to verify that movement condition attainment met specified criteria. The other two women behind the mirror were "raters" who, after observing each interview, filled out the identical scale as the subject, rating both subject and interviewer. The

purpose of the raters was to provide another set of data to compare with subject data. While subject responses are those of the participant, rater responses are those of an outsider viewing the interaction. For research purposes, observers and raters heard no sound from the interview. Evaluations were based on visual data alone.

Observers had approximately one semester's background in movement behavior theory and observation. Training of observers consisted of a brief discussion before the study began, both to explain the concept of posture sharing and to demonstrate attainment of the conditions (PS, NON) in the areas of postural mirroring, movement quality, and small gestures. Raters were not trained, but asked simply to observe the interviews and respond on the Bales' scales after each interview. Neither observers nor raters knew the research hypotheses, although they were familiar with dance therapy theory.

Each interview began with the interviewer asking the identical question on freshman life of each subject, and then interpolating into the conversation a series of questions about dormitories, friends (same and opposite sex), food, classes, and relationships with family. Interviews were limited to 15 minutes.

Definition of Movement Unit

The movement behavior, or independent variable, in this study included both the posture sharing condition (PS) and the neutral movement condition (NON).

Posture sharing was defined as the co-occurrence between both participants of: 1) general postural mirroring (e.g., similar erectness in posture, general postural shape, crossing of same arm or leg, same hand gesture to head); 2) equivalent small movements (e.g., fidgeting, scratching, tapping); and 3) equivalent muscular tonus (e.g., muscle tension in gesture and posture) and quality, or effort.

The neutral movement position was defined as the interviewer taking movement positions different from the subject, involving different movement qualities, and not engaging in gestural or postural movements at the same time as the subject. However, the interviewer's movements and positions were neutral in affective tone, neither particularly engaging nor distancing.

Observer notes, as well as intermittent use of videotape to record interviews, provided the following information: confirmation that the movement conditions (PS, NON) were achieved; extent to which all aspects of posture sharing (mirroring, small movements, and *effort*) were achieved; general movement descriptions of the interview; and, general equivalency of interviews in the two conditions in terms of the nonverbal

behaviors which were not included in the posture sharing variable (e.g., intensity of interviewer responses, postural lean, head nods, facial expression, eye contact).

Scales

The scales which subjects and raters filled out, the dependent variable, were developed by Bales and his colleagues (1970, 1979) over a 20 year period of observing small groups, and applied for use in the dyadic interaction. They consist of a 26 item questionnaire which taps three bipolar dimensions: prominence (dominant–submissive); sociability (positive–negative); and orientation (task oriented–emotionally oriented). Bales' scales were chosen because they were among the few instruments assessing interpersonal ratings which were both comprehensive in scope and yielded validity and reliability data.

Statistical Analyses

One way analysis of variance was computed for both subject and rater evaluation of the interview, as measured by Bales' (1970) sociability (positive–negative) scale, and other measures derived from the Bales' scales. In addition, Pearson correlation of inter-observer and inter-rater reliability was performed. Results for the analysis of variance was computed both for statistical significance and for effect size.[3]

Results

The results show that when there is posture sharing: 1) subjects experience the interview more positively; 2) subjects ($n = 82$) experience themselves more positively ($p < .001$, $d = 2.203$), and 3) the interviewer is experienced more positively ($p < .01$, $d = 1.086$) (Table 1).

Not only do subjects experience the interview more positively in the presence of posture sharing, but they also experience more similarity between themselves and the interviewer on both of the scales which measure this dimension: 1) SIM-1 which measures the number of questions which subjects answered identically for themselves and the interviewer ($p < .001$, $d = -1.311$) and 2) SIM-2 the linear combination of all three Bales' dimensions ($p < .05$, $d = -0.833$) (Table 1).

[3]Effect size tells how large an effect is, disregarding its significance level (p) and the number of subjects (N). It measures the degree of departure from the null hypothesis (*i.e.* that the hypothesis is not true) in standard deviation units and is generally defined as the difference between the means of the two conditions divided by their common standard deviation. In my analysis, the denominator was the standard deviation of the control group (NON) Effect size is here measured in "d" units.

Table 1

Analysis of Variance Data Set I (N = 28)

Variable	Mean (NON)	Mean (PS)	Standard Deviation (NON)	Standard Deviation (PS)	F Ratio	Effect Size
Subject rate self (PN)[a]	4.000	8.077	1.852	2.691	22.306***	2.203
Subject rate interviewer (PN)	5.113	8.308	2.924	2.840	8.428**	1.086
Subject rate differences (SIM-1)	6.267	2.077	3.195	2.178	15.904***	−1.311
Interactants' distance (SIM-2)	6.763	3.190	4.292	3.092	6.204*	−0.833
Rater rate differences (SIM-1)	9.533	3.077	5.400	2.405	15.802***	−1.196
Rater rate interviewer (PN)	1.900	6.400	2.444	2.942	17.303***	1.842
Rater rate subject (PN)	2.833	4.150	3.999	4.528	0.586	0.329

[a]Positive–Negative bipolar axes of Bales' sociability scale.

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$
***$p < .001$

Subject experience is also confirmed by outsiders viewing the interaction. The two raters who completed identical Bales' scales to that of the subjects also evaluated the interview more positively in the posture sharing condition, and noted more similarity between participants in the posture sharing condition ($p < .001$, $d = -1.196$). Interestingly, although raters note the interviewer to be more positive in the posture sharing condition ($p < .001$, $d = 1.842$) they do not rate the subject more positively in the posture sharing condition (Table 1).

Another set of analyses was performed for all subjects ($n = 37$) who were interviewed and who completed the entire measuring instrument (Bales, 1970), independently of whether the posture sharing condition (as defined in this study) was completely attained. Generally, incomplete posture sharing, as evaluated by observers, involved either: 1) adequate postural mirroring, but inadequate shared *efforts*, or 2) a specific situation where the subject sat immobile and limp throughout the inter-

view. For these analyses, posture sharing is defined as shared position in space but not necessarily shared effort qualities.

Results here (Table 2) show that subjects experienced themselves more positively in the posture sharing condition ($p < .05$, $d = 0.967$). Interestingly, however, they do not experience the interviewer as significantly more friendly ($p > .10$, $d = 0.082$).

Subjects also experienced significantly more similarity between themselves and the interviewer for SIM-1 only ($p < .05$, $d = -0.729$) (Table 2).

Table 2

Analysis of Variance Data Set II (N = 37)

Variable	Mean (NON)	Mean (PS)	Standard Deviation (NON)	Standard Deviation (PS)	F Ratio	Effect Size
Subject rate self (PN)[a]	4.438	6.857	2.503	3.321	5.917*	0.967
Subject rate interviewer (PN)	5.500	5.762	3.183	5.224	0.031	0.082
Subject rate differences (SIM-1)	6.000	3.619	3.266	3.201	4.937*	−0.729
Interactants' distance (SIM-2)	6.606	5.004	4.194	4.214	1.317	−0.382

[a]Positive–Negative bipolar axes of Bales' sociability scale.

*$p < .05$

In summary, when posture sharing is comprehensive (including both shared position in space and also shared movement efforts) subjects clearly experienced both themselves and the interviewer more positively in the posture sharing condition. In addition, subjects also experienced more similarity between themselves and the interviewer in the posture sharing condition. When posture sharing is less comprehensive (only shared position in space) subjects experience only themselves, but not the interviewer, more positively. They continue to experience more similarity between themselves and the interviewer, but only on one of the two scales used to measure similarity.

Observer and Rater Reliability

Since verifying the reliability of posture sharing criteria is a critical part of this study, Pearson correlations were made for inter-observer

assessment of the interview conditions. Distinction was made between interviews where subjects completely filled out the questionnaire (n = 37) and between 28 of those interviews where observers agreed that subjects attained full posture sharing (i.e., postural mirroring, small movements, and *effort*). Since the definition of Data Set I (n = 28) involves agreement between the two observers, the Pearson correlation is 1.0, with significance better than .000. Interestingly, with Data Set II (n = 37) all subjects for whom there are complete data, the Pearson correlation is quite high (0.891), with significance still better than .000 (Table 3).

Table 3

Pearson Correlation Between Observers

Data Analysis	Value	P
Data Set I, N = 28	1.000	.000
Data Set II, N = 37	0.891	.000

Table 4

Pearson Correlation Between Raters

Variable	Value	P
Raters rate subject (PN)[a]	0.476	.000
Raters rate interviewer (PN)	0.521	.000

Note. Since Rater 1 and 2 were not consistently the identical individual, correlations between raters were done by coding the responses of both raters for each rater, and then making the correlation analyses. The N, therefore, for rater correlations, is twice 37, or 74.

[a]Positive–Negative bipolar axes of Bales' sociability scale.

In addition, Pearson correlations were made for assessment of the interviews made by the raters. Rater reliability for the sociability dimension (*i.e.*, positive/negative evaluaton) of the Bales' scales was made for both assessment of subject (0.476), and of interviewer (0.521). In both cases, statistical significance of inter-rater reliability is better than .000 (Table 4).

Discussion

The results are interesting for several reasons. First, they confirm the posture sharing variable as a meaningful unit of nonverbal behavior in

face-to-face interaction. Secondly, they reveal that the posture sharing unit, while clearly functioning in the development of positive assessments is complex. Finally, questions are raised about the role of posture sharing, and how it affects both the participant's and the observing outsider's (raters') assessment of the interview.

Although studies have confirmed the presence of posture sharing (LaFrance, 1981; Scheflen, 1964), there has previously been no causal evidence that posture sharing causes positive assessments. Even Dabbs' (1969) experiment only found that mimicking caused experiences of similarity with an interviewer. Confirming that hypothesis in a controlled experimental situation is an advance.

A second issue is the complexity of the posture sharing variable. There is strong statistical evidence that posture sharing functions as a nonverbal statement of positive relationship, in effect stating that participants are "sharing the same position". This is perceived in terms of similarity or positiveness, and thus forms the basis for development of rapport or alliances. However, this function is in part dependent, not only on shared position in space, but also on shared movement effort.

Such findings are relevant for the dance therapist whose relationship with clients is primarily nonverbal and who often makes use of posture sharing to develop the therapeutic alliance (Schmais and White, 1970). Although studies have noted the usefulness of posture sharing in dance therapy (Schmais and White, 1970; Schmais and Felber, 1977) few studies have experimentally examined the role of posture sharing in interaction and none of those has included the quality of movement (*effort*) as part of the posture sharing variable. Thus, this experiment provides direct confirmation of the theory that, by sharing the essential quality of another's body movement, a dance therapist facilitates nonverbally the development of a positive relationship between self and client. Posture sharing, particularly when it included not only body position but also movement effort, operates as a clear statement that participants are "in the same position" and "sharing a similar perspective," on which basis an alliance is formed.

Limitations and Questions

Certain methodological limitations of this study raise questions of interest. Most apparent are limitations due to the specific context of the experiment: all the participants, including subjects, interviewer, and observers, are women; and the situation is an interview dyad which lasts 15 minutes. What is still unknown is to what extent posture sharing must be practiced to effect its positive role. For example, is five minutes of interaction as effective as 15 minutes; and must posture sharing be

ubiquitous, or are there naturally occuring "ceilings" and "bases" which operate most effectively?

A more critical question is the impact of experimenter effect since the principal investigator also operated as the interviewer and could have influenced the results through behaviors other than posture sharing (Rosenthal, 1966). One control for experimenter influence occured by using observers and by examining the videotape for instances of such influence. This issue, however, can only be addressed by a follow-up study which involves interviewers who, although trained in posture sharing, are unaware of the experimental hypotheses.

A final limitation is the *post hoc* nature of movement condition attainment (complete posture sharing) based on observers criteria. Of the 43 subjects interviewed only 37 completely answered the forms; of those 37 subjects, only 28 were included in the final sample of complete posture sharing. Although this limitation attests to the difficulty of including *effort* as a movement variable, it need not weaken the experiment. Clearly, presence of shared *effort* in posture sharing intensifies the impact of this movement variable; however, even with absence of such shared effort, overall results are still attained. Thus, while the presence of shared effort in posture sharing can clearly be viewed as a crticial component, even when the total sample is taken into account, posture sharing is found significantly related to subject experiences of positive feeling and simliarity with the interviewer.

Thus, posture sharing with another person, to move with that person, share their position and quality of movement, is to say that you are "with" that person, "sharing the same position," and by extension, you are viewed more positively and more similarly. In addition, not only are you viewed more positively, but the person views him/herself more positively. How does this happen? What model of behavior can account for this phenomenon? The enactment of posture sharing between individuals in face-to-face interaction to evoke a sense of positive feeling and of similarity, is viewed in terms of an indivdiual's presenting or negotiating roles, whose significance to other interactants is determined in part by the specific context of the interview, such as the status, gender, and identity of the participants.

Interpersonal behavior is here viewed primarily as individual negotiation, assertion, and establishing of social roles, within a framework developed by Mead (1962) and articulated by Goffman (1967, 1974). The extent to which such an underlying (either inherent or learned "conventional") behavioral structure accounts for some portion of this behavior is debated (Danziger, 1976; Duncan and Fiske, 1977; Goffman, 1974). What is generally accepted, however, is the critical role of context, which Goffman (1974) labels the "frame," in organizing

and delineating the meaning or significance of behavior. Frame is seen as not only delimiting issues like status and social role, but also as asserting whether the interaction is to be taken at face value.

In summary, posture sharing is viewed within this model as one of many behaviors which occur between interactants as part of role negotiation and assertion of social identity. In general, posture sharing is viewed positively, as a statement of sharing another's position, of being "with" the other person. However, exactly how posture sharing is viewed is dependent on its occurrence in the "frame" or context, which defines aspects of the social role and the extent to which such assertions can be taken at face value. Posture sharing in an interview context, when a person of higher status takes on the posture of the interviewee, especially when the interviewer not only "mimics" the posture but also shares the essential qualities of the movement, is viewed as a strong positive statement which can be taken at face value.

References

Adler, J. *Looking for me.* New York: NYU Film Library, 1970.

Alperson, E.D. Experimental movement psychotherapy. *American Journal of Dance Therapy, 1977, 1,* 1.

Bales, R.F. *Personality and interpersonal behavior.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.

Bales, R.F., and Cohen, S.P. *SYMLOG: A system for the multiple level observation of groups.* New York: The Free Press, 1979.

Bartenieff, I., and Davis M. *Effort-shape analysis of movement: The unity of expression and function.* Albert Einstein College of Medicine, 1965. In M. Davis (Ad. Ed.), *Research approaches to movement and personality.* New York: Arno Press, 1972.

Brown, D., and Navarre, D. Movement assessment and treatment of an autistic child. In C. Schmais, and F. Orleans (Eds.), *Dance therapy research: seven pilot studies.* New York: Hunter College, 1977.

Chaiklin, H. (Ed.) *Marian Chace: her papers.* Columbia, Md.: American Dance Therapy Association, 1975.

Condon, W.S. Linguistic-kinesic research and dance therapy. Paper presented at American Dance Therapy Association Conference, October, 1968.

Condon, W., and Ogston, W. Sound film analysis of normal and pathological behavior patterns. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disorders, 1966, 143,* 338-346.

Condon, W., and Ogston, W. A segmentation of behavior. *Journal of Psychiatric Research, 1967, 5,* 221-235.

Condon, W., and Sander, L. Neonate movement is synchronized with adult speech: Interactional participation & language acquisition. *Science, 1974, 183,* 99-101.

Cooley, C.H. The roots of social knowledge. *American Journal of Sociology, 1926, 32,* 59-65.

Dabbs, J. Similarity of gestures and interpersonal influence. *Proceedings of the 77th Convention of the Americn Psychological Association, 1969, 4,* 337-8.

Danziger, K. *Interpersonal communication.* New York: Pergamon Press, 1976.

Davis, M. Labananalysis of nonverbal communication. In: *Nonverbal communication.* Weitz, S. (Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, 1979, 182-206.

Duncan, S., and Fiske, D. *Face to face interaction: Research, methods, and theory.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1977.

Goffman, E. *The presentation of self in everyday life.* Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1959.

Goffman, E. *Interaction ritual.* Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1967.

Goffman, E. *Frame analysis.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Haase, R., and Tepper, D. Nonverbal components of empathetic communication. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 1972, *19,* 417-24.

Kendon, A. Movement coordination in social interaction. *Acta Psychologica,* 1970, *32,* 100-12.

Kendon, A. The role of visible behavior in the organization of face-to-face interaction. In: *Social communications and movement.* VonCranach, M., and Vine, I. (Eds.). London: Academic Press, 1973.

Laban, R. *The mastery of movement.* Ullman, L. (Ed.). London: Macdonald & Evans, 1960.

LaFrance, M. Nonverbal synchrony and rapport: analysis by the cross-lag panel technique. *Social Psychology Quarterly,* 1979, *42,* 66-70.

LaFrance, M. Posture mirroring and rapport. In Davis, M. (Ed.), *Interaction rhythms.* New York: Human Sciences Press, 1981.

LaFrance, M., and Broadbent, M. Group rapport: posture sharing as a nonverbal indicator. *Group and Organizational Studies,* 1976, *1,* 328-33.

Mead, G. *Mind, self, and society.* Chicago: Charles W. Morris, 1962.

Navarre, D. Postural mirroring in the interview dyad. Unpublished paper, 1980.

Navarre, D. *Posture sharing in the interview dyad.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, S.U.N.Y. at Buffalo, 1981.

Navarre, D., and Emihovich, C. Movement synchrony and the self-analytic group. Paper presented at the Eastern Communication Association, Boston, 1978.

Rosenthal, R. *Experimenter effects in behavioral research.* New York: Appleton-Century-Croft, 1966.

Rosenthal, R., Hall, J., DiMatteo, M., Rogers, P., and Archer, D. *Sensitivity to nonverbal communication: the PONS test.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

Scheflen, A. The significance of posture in communication systems. *Psychiatry,* 1964, *26.*

Scheflen, A. *Communicational structure: analysis of a psychotherapy transaction.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973.

Schmais, C., and Felber, D. Dance therapy process: a method for observing and analyzing a dance therapy group. *American Journal of Dance Therapy,* 1977, *1,* 2.

Schmais, C., and White, E. Introduction to dance therapy. *Workshop in Dance Therapy: Its Research Potentials.* Proceedings of a Joint Conference by Research Department of Postgraduate Center for Mental Health, Committee on Research in Dance and American Dance Therapy Association. New York: Committee on Research in Dance, 1970.

Trout, D., and Rosenfeld, H. The effect of postural lean and body congruence on the judgement of psychotherapeutic rapport. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior,* 1980, *4, 3,* 176-89.