

## Knowing When to Say "I Love You": An Expectancy Approach to Affectionate Communication

Kory Floyd  
University of Arizona

*While vital for the development and maintenance of healthy interpersonal relationships, the overt communication of affection is fraught with risk. As a result, understanding the nature of affectionate communication is not only a matter of identifying behavioral tendencies, but also of exploring individuals' normative expectancies for appropriate affectionate behavior. The present study examines the influence of biological sex, dyadic sex composition, and relationship type on people's perceptions of how frequently they engage in affectionate behavior and how appropriate they feel such behavior to be. Predictions regarding the influence of these factors were largely supported; moreover, the congruence between expectations and people's reports of their actual behavior was examined.*

Few forms of relational communication are as simultaneously vital and risk-laden as affectionate communication. Affectionate behavior in a close relationship not only carries meaning about one partner's feelings for the other, but also it often serves as a standard by which relational development is gauged (for example, relational partners often remember the first hug, the first kiss, or the first time the words "I love you" were spoken; see Owen, 1987). As such, it can contribute to reduced uncertainty about the state of the relationship (Berger & Bradac, 1982), by causing relational partners to feel valued and cared for (Floyd, in press-b).

In spite of its importance, affectionate communication is also fraught with risk. For one, expressions of affection can easily be misinterpreted. For example, the phrase "I love you" could be received as a romantic sentiment even if platonic love was the intended meaning,

**Kory Floyd** (M.A., University of Washington, 1994) is a doctoral candidate in communication at the University of Arizona, Tucson AZ 85721.

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, November 1997, Chicago, IL.

**COMMUNICATION RESEARCH REPORTS**, Volume 14, Number 3, pages 321-330

or it may be attributed to ulterior motives such as an attempt to pressure the recipient into sexual involvement or premature relational commitment (Booth-Butterfield & Trotta, 1994). In same-sex relationships, the expression could be viewed as a homosexual overture even if it were not intended as such (Morman & Floyd, 1996). Even if there were no misunderstanding about the intended meaning, the sentiment may not be reciprocated, leaving the sender in a face-compromising position (Shimanoff, 1985).

Because of this inherent tension, our understanding of this important relational communicative process should be informed not only by an examination of what influences the frequency of affectionate behavior, but also of the factors that cause affectionate behavior to be considered appropriate or inappropriate. Although there is not necessarily a perfect correlation between actual and expected behavior, their relationship is often substantial (Floyd & Voloudakis, 1997). However, there could well be individual or relational factors that influence the perceived appropriateness of a behavior but have no effect on the frequency of that behavior, or vice versa. The present inquiry examines the issue of congruence between perceptions of actual and expected behavior by examining the influence of individual- and relational-level factors on the perceived frequency and appropriateness of affectionate behaviors in dyadic relationships.

#### *Factors Influencing Appropriateness and Frequency of Affection*

Previous research has identified several factors that influence not only the occurrence of affectionate communication but also perceptions of its appropriateness. Chief among these is the biological sex of the communicator. For example, Sprecher and Sedikides (1993) reported that women in their study communicated more total emotion than men and specifically expressed greater levels of several positive emotions related to affection, including love, liking, joy, and contentment. Others have found that women in same- and opposite-sex relationships value overt expressions of affection, such as saying "I love you," more than do men (e.g., Floyd, in press-a). Moreover, Floyd and Morman (in press) reported that women perceived that they engaged in more affectionate behavior than did men, and that both women and men considered affectionate communication more appropriate when coming from a woman than a man.

The sex composition of a relationship has also been shown to influence affectionate behavior. Previous studies have almost invariably found that men in same-sex relationships are less affectionate than men in opposite-sex relationships or women in either configuration. For example, Shuntich and Shapiro (1991) reported that, in two experiments, subjects in male-male dyads invoked affectionate verbal responses to stimuli significantly less frequently than those in female-female or opposite-sex dyads. Subjects in the latter two configurations did not differ significantly from each other. Similarly, Greenbaum and Rosenfeld (1980) studied naturally occurring nonverbal affectionate behaviors and found that male-male dyads engaged in significantly fewer and less intense behaviors than those invoked by other dyadic types. Specifically, male-male dyads were most likely to engage in brief mutual handshakes, while dyads involving at least one woman were more likely to kiss and/or embrace. Finally, Floyd and Morman (in press) reported that male-male friendships engaged in less affectionate behavior and perceived that they engaged in less affectionate behavior than friendships involving at least one woman, and that both women and men considered affectionate behavior less appropriate for male-male dyads than for female-female or opposite-sex relationships. (For additional

examples, see Noller, 1978; Shimanoff, 1985.)

One shortcoming of many studies of affectionate communication is that they have focused on one relationship type (usually either platonic friendships or romantic dyads), precluding comparisons across relational types. Because expectations differ according to the social norms attached to different relationships, we should also expect relationship type to influence communicative behavior. While it is intuitive that affection will be considered more appropriate in romantic than nonromantic relationships, there is some evidence to suggest that familial ties also influence expectations for affectionate communication. For example, in a comparison of same-sex friends and same-sex siblings, Floyd (1995) reported that siblings considered it more appropriate to hug, to say that they like each other, and to say that they love each other than did friends. Similarly, in a study of adult fraternal relationships, Floyd (1996-a) found that men considered it more appropriate to express affection verbally and nonverbally to their brothers than to men to whom they were not related. It is plausible that the familial tie mitigates against the suspicions of sexual involvement often engendered by affectionate interaction, and that for this reason affection may be considered more appropriate in familial than non-familial relationships (see also Floyd & Morman, in press).

The present study examined differences between familial and non-familial relationships by comparing platonic friendships with dyads of full biological, non-twin siblings. Previous research has suggested the efficacy of this comparison, as siblings and friends are both peer-like relationships among relative status equals (Bedford, 1993; Floyd, 1996b). As such, these relationships may be the most parallel familial and non-familial relationships that exist. The present study proposes that friends and siblings will differ in their expectancies toward affectionate communication; however, it is unclear whether they will differ in their actual frequency of such behaviors.

Considered in concert, these findings suggest multiple hypotheses regarding the appropriateness of affectionate communication and the frequency with which it occurs. The following hypotheses regarding appropriateness are advanced:

- H1: Women perceive affectionate communication to be more appropriate than do men.
- H2: Affectionate communication is considered more appropriate in opposite-sex than in same-sex relationships.
- H3: Affectionate communication is considered more appropriate among siblings than among friends.
- H4: Sex and sex composition interact to affect perceived appropriateness, such that the difference between same- and opposite-sex relationships is greater for men than for women.
- H5: Sex and relationship type interact to affect perceived appropriateness, such that the difference between friends and siblings is greater for men than for women.

Main effects for sex and sex composition are also proposed for the frequency of affectionate behavior. Specifically:

- H6: Women report engaging in affectionate behaviors more

- frequently than do men.
- H7: Affectionate communication is more frequent in opposite-sex than in same-sex relationships.
- H8: Sex and sex composition interact to affect frequency, such that the difference between same- and opposite-sex relationships is greater for men than for women.

Because it is unclear whether siblings and friends will differ in the perceived frequency of their affectionate behaviors, the influence of relational type was addressed in the following research question:

- RQ: What effect, if any, does relationship type have on the perceived frequency of affectionate communication?

In addition, sex is hypothesized to interact with relationship type to affect the frequency of affectionate behaviors. Specifically, it is predicted that women will be more affectionate with their friends but that men will be more affectionate with their siblings. If the prediction made in hypothesis 5 is supported, then men will consider affectionate behavior to be more appropriate when directed toward a sibling than a friend, but women will not make a similar discrimination. Were that the case, then men should report greater frequency of affectionate behavior with siblings. However, if women do not perceive a difference in appropriateness, then it is hypothesized that they will be more affectionate with their friends simply in the interests of relational maintenance (an interest not as prevalent in the more permanent sibling relationship). Specifically:

- H9: Sex and relationship type interact to affect frequency, such that women report greater frequency with friends than with siblings, but men report greater frequency with siblings than with friends.

## METHOD

Respondents were 318 American undergraduate students from a large university in the southwestern U. S. There were 160 men and 155 women (3 did not specify their sex). Ages ranged from 18 to 45 years; the mean age was 21.47 years ( $SD = 4.58$ ).

Frequency and appropriateness of affectionate communication were assessed using a 13-item instrument developed by the author (Floyd & Morman, in press).<sup>1</sup> Respondents were presented with 13 verbal and nonverbal affectionate behaviors and asked to indicate, on a seven-point scale, how frequently they engage in each behavior in their target relationship, and how appropriate they perceive each behavior to be as a means of communicating affection to their target. Higher scores indicate higher perceived frequency and appropriateness. Means and standard deviations for each item are presented in Table 1. Although both verbal and nonverbal behaviors are presented, there is no hypothesized difference between frequencies or appropriateness for each. Therefore, total frequency and appropriateness scores were calculated by summing responses to all 13 items (coefficient alphas = .85 for perceived frequency and .88 for perceived appropriateness). Each resulting score has a theoretic range of 13 to 91. Content validity of the items was assessed and confirmed by Floyd (in press-b), who submitted the items to a pilot study in which

respondents were asked to strike those items not corresponding to affectionate

**TABLE 1**  
Means and Standard Deviations for Affection Items

Item	Mean for appropriateness	SD for appropriateness	Mean for frequency	SD for frequency
Hug	6.11	1.64	5.59	1.84
Put arm around shoulder	5.73	1.76	4.93	1.87
Kiss on cheek	4.23	2.42	3.27	2.23
Kiss on lips	1.88	1.65	1.60	1.34
Hold hands	2.79	1.97	2.07	1.67
Shake hands	4.19	2.32	2.74	2.09
Say "I like you"	4.11	2.16	2.56	1.84
Say "I love you"	4.68	2.39	3.65	2.26
Say "I admire you"	4.53	2.17	2.74	1.94
Say "I care for you"	4.67	2.17	3.24	2.06
Say "I value our relationship"	4.66	2.14	3.21	2.01
Say "I feel close to you"	3.79	2.12	2.35	1.71
Say "I'm fond of you"	3.44	2.15	1.91	1.41

Note: Scores on both scales ranged from 1 to 7; means and standard deviations represent the sample as a whole.

communication.

Respondents were randomly assigned to report either on a close friend ( $n = 162$ ) or on a sibling ( $n = 156$ ). Those asked to report on a friend were instructed to select someone they considered a close friend, rather than simply an acquaintance, and to exclude relatives and current or former romantic partners. Those reporting on a sibling were asked to select a full biological sibling who was not a twin of theirs. Approximately half of the respondents were instructed to report on a same-sex relationship ( $n = 163$ ), while the rest were asked to choose an opposite-sex relationship ( $n = 155$ ). Respondents completed a questionnaire in reference to their target relationship and returned in anonymously to the investigator.

## RESULTS

Analyses for frequency and appropriateness of affectionate communication used a 2 (sex of subject)  $\times$  2 (sex composition of relationship)  $\times$  2 (relationship type) completely crossed factorial design, with the three-way interaction suppressed due to the sample size and the absence of an hypothesized higher-order interaction. Hypothesized relationships were tested with planned 1 *df* polynomial contrasts.

As anticipated, frequency and appropriateness were correlated,  $r = .72$ ,  $p < .01$ . A multivariate analysis of variance was therefore conducted to obtain omnibus effect sizes.<sup>2</sup> The omnibus MANOVA produced the following significant multivariate effects, based on

Wilks's lambda: Sex of subject,  $F(1, 304) = 13.31, p < .001, R^2 = .12$ ; Sex composition of relationship,  $F(1, 304) = 8.59, p < .001, R^2 = .08$ ; Sex of subject by relationship type,  $F(1, 304) = 3.30, p < .05, R^2 = .03$ ; Sex of subject by sex composition,  $F(1, 304) = 8.00, p < .001, R^2 = .07$ .

Hypotheses 1 through 3 predicted main effects for sex of subject, sex composition, and relationship type on perceived appropriateness of affectionate communication. The first hypothesis was that women would perceive expressions of affection to be more appropriate than would men. The univariate effect was significant,  $F(1, 304) = 26.68, p < .001, \eta^2 = .11$ . As expected, mean scores on appropriateness were higher for women ( $M = 59.15, SD = 15.14$ ) than for men ( $M = 43.29, SD = 19.08$ ). Hypothesis 1 was supported.

The second hypothesis predicted that expressions of affection would be perceived as more appropriate in opposite- than in same-sex relationships. The univariate effect was significant,  $F(1, 304) = 13.85, p < .001, \eta^2 = .06$ . As hypothesized, mean scores were higher for opposite-sex relationships ( $M = 58.25, SD = 16.97$ ) than for same-sex relationships ( $M = 51.59, SD = 17.84$ ). Hypothesis 2 was supported. A main effect for relationship type was predicted in hypothesis 3, such that expressions of affection would be considered more appropriate among siblings than among friends. Mean scores were higher for siblings ( $M = 56.20, SD = 16.28$ ) than for friends ( $M = 53.51, SD = 18.95$ ), but the univariate effect was nonsignificant,  $F(1, 304) = 2.89, p = .09$ . The third hypothesis was not supported.

An ordinal interaction between sex and sex composition was predicted in the fourth hypothesis, such that the difference between same- and opposite-sex relationships would be greater for men than for women. The univariate interaction effect was significant,  $F(1, 304) = 13.90, p < .001, \eta^2 = .06$ . Consistent with the hypothesis, women's scores on appropriateness did not differ significantly between same-sex relationships ( $M = 59.19, SD = 12.76$ ) and opposite-sex relationships ( $M = 59.11, SD = 17.13$ ),  $t(152) = .03, p > .05$ . For men, however, affection was considered significantly more appropriate in opposite-sex relationships ( $M = 54.86, SD = 17.04$ ) than in same-sex relationships ( $M = 36.41, SD = 16.94$ ),  $t(157) = -4.04, p < .001$ . Hypothesis 4 was supported.

A similar ordinal interaction was proposed in hypothesis 5 between sex and relationship type, such that the difference between friends and siblings would be greater for men than women. The univariate interaction effect was significant,  $F(1, 304) = 5.42, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03$ . Consistent with the prediction, women's scores on appropriateness did not differ significantly between siblings ( $M = 58.35, SD = 14.54$ ) and friends ( $M = 59.97, SD = 15.79$ ),  $t(152) = .67, p > .05$ . By contrast, men reported affectionate communication to be significantly more appropriate among siblings ( $M = 49.04, SD = 19.92$ ) than among friends ( $M = 39.06, SD = 17.56$ ),  $t(157) = -2.04, p < .05$ . Hypothesis 5 was supported.

Hypotheses 6 and 7 predicted main effects for sex and sex composition on the perceived frequency of affectionate communication. The sixth hypothesis proposed that women would engage in affectionate expressions more frequently than would men. The univariate effect was significant,  $F(1, 304) = 11.29, p = .001, \eta^2 = .05$ . As predicted, mean scores for frequency were higher for women ( $M = 42.27, SD = 14.42$ ) than for men ( $M = 33.63, SD = 13.06$ ). Hypothesis 6 was supported.

Hypothesis 7 predicted that affectionate expressions would be more frequent in opposite-sex relationships than in same-sex relationships. Although mean frequency scores were higher for opposite-sex dyads ( $M = 41.08, SD = 15.06$ ) than for same-sex pairs ( $M = 38.74, SD = 13.95$ ), the difference was not statistically significant,  $F(1, 304) = 1.52, p > .05$ . Hypothesis 7 was not supported.

An ordinal interaction between sex and sex composition was predicted in hypothesis 8, such that the difference between same- and opposite-sex relationships on perceived frequency would be greater for men than for women. The univariate interaction effect was nonsignificant,  $F(1, 304) = 2.26, p > .05$ . Hypothesis 8 was not supported.

The potential influence of relationship type on frequency was addressed in the research question, which asked whether siblings and friends would differ in how frequently they reported communicating affection to each other. The univariate effect was nonsignificant ( $F(1, 304) = .007, p > .05$ ), indicating no main effect of relationship type on perceived frequency.

A disordinal interaction was proposed in hypothesis 9 between sex and relationship type, such that women would be more affectionate with their friends than their siblings, but men would be more affectionate with their siblings than their friends. The univariate interaction effect was significant,  $F(1, 304) = 5.78, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03$ . Consistent with the hypothesis, women reported more frequent affectionate behavior with friends ( $M = 45.09, SD = 14.74$ ) than with siblings ( $M = 39.55, SD = 13.64$ ),  $t(151) = 2.41, p < .05$ . By contrast, men reported more frequent affectionate behavior with siblings ( $M = 37.40, SD = 13.61$ ) than with friends ( $M = 30.94, SD = 12.13$ ),  $t(158) = -1.95, p < .05$ . Hypothesis 9 was supported.

## DISCUSSION

Predictions regarding the influence of sex, sex composition, and relationship type on the perceived appropriateness and frequency of affectionate communication were largely supported. As predicted, affection was considered more appropriate when coming from a woman than a man, and when occurring in opposite-sex than same-sex relationships. These findings appear reflective of culturally ingrained gender discriminations in expected interpersonal behavior, the antecedent of which may be found in aspects of gender role training (Hetherington & Parke, 1986; Noller, 1978). Moreover, there was a significant interaction between sex and sex composition, such that the difference between same- and opposite-sex relationships was greater for men than for women. This finding is in line with others suggesting that the masculine gender role may cause men to forego expressing affection to each other even when it is felt (Swain, 1989).

The third hypothesis, that affectionate communication would be considered more appropriate among siblings than among friends, was not supported. Although the mean difference was in the predicted direction, it did not attain statistical significance, indicating that for this sample, affection was considered equally appropriate in both relationship types. Relationship type, however, did significantly interact with sex as hypothesized. For men, affection was considered more appropriate among siblings than among friends, but women did not make a similar distinction. Therefore, relationship type did not affect expectancies for the sample as a whole, but for males only. That men consider it more appropriate to be affectionate with siblings than with friends may reflect a culturally bound expectation that one can engage in a wider range of behaviors with one's family members than with non-kin (see Ihinger-Tallman, 1987).

Findings regarding the perceived frequency of affectionate behavior followed a pattern somewhat divergent from those regarding perceived appropriateness. As predicted, women reported engaging in affectionate behaviors more often than did men. However, neither a main effect for sex composition, nor the hypothesized interaction between sex and sex composition, emerged as significant. These findings are in contrast to those identified with regard to expectancies; thus, while affection was considered more appropriate in

opposite- than same-sex relationships, it did not occur significantly more frequently in opposite-sex pairs. Further, no differences for reported frequency were found between male-male, female-female, and opposite-sex dyads. This pattern suggests an imperfect relationship between what relational partners consider to be behaviorally appropriate and the behaviors they report engaging in in those relationships.

This discongruence is further illustrated by hypothesis 9, which was the only point in the research at which the prediction for frequency was not consistent with the prediction for appropriateness. Specifically, it was found in hypothesis 5 that men consider affection more appropriate among siblings than friends, but that women show no significant difference between the two relationships. In hypothesis 9, however, it was predicted that men would report being more affectionate with their siblings than their friends, but that women would report being more affectionate with friends than with siblings. That both hypotheses were supported suggests that, although affectionate behavior may be subject to interpersonal expectancies, the manding is not absolute. Rather, in this example, women considered affectionate communication to be equally appropriate in both relationships, although they reported a difference in the actual frequency with which they engaged in such behavior.

These examples of discongruence between perceived appropriateness and reported behavior ought to be of interest to any who study interpersonal expectancies and their effects on communicative interaction. Although expectancy- or rule-based theories do not postulate that the oughtness of behaviors will perfectly predict their occurrence, examining the relationship between expectancies and actual behavior can be theoretically fruitful for at least two reasons. For one, it can indicate the extent to which expectancies are isomorphic with behavioral realities. In the present study, for example, a number of differences emerged in what was considered appropriate that did not affect respondents' reported behaviors. Moreover, studying examples of such discongruence across multiple studies may indicate patterns, or domains in which expectancies and behaviors covary and domains in which they do not. Such an understanding could largely aid efforts both to predict behavior from expectancies and to predict when expectancy violations are most likely to occur.

The present study is limited in terms of its use of college-aged subjects. However, many suggest that respondents in this age group are ideal for the study of platonic friendships, given the heightened importance often placed on friendship at that stage of life (Berscheid, Snyder, & Omoto, 1989). Further, while college students may be somewhat over-represented in research on friendship, they are seriously underrepresented in research on sibling relationships. Rather, most studies of siblings focus either on children (e.g., Stocker & Dunn, 1990) or on older adults (e.g., Connidis, 1989). Nevertheless, comparable measures with different age groups may be fruitful. Although extant research on affection does not suggest differential effects due to age, it may still be informative to test predictions regarding expectancies for affection using respondents from varying age groups.

## NOTES

1. As reported in Floyd (in press-b; Floyd & Morman, in press), the selection of items for the affection scale was guided by similar work by Twardosz et al. (1979; see also Twardosz et al., 1987). Twardosz and her colleagues developed their measurement model of affectionate behavior as a coding scheme for third-



party coding of behavior, rather than for self-report measures. However, items used in the present scale reflect their general categories of: 1) affectionate words (e.g., saying "I love you"); 2) active affectionate physical contact (e.g., hugging); and 3) passive affectionate physical contact (e.g., holding hands). Although the verbal and nonverbal items comprise different factor-based subscales, their correlation is substantial ( $r = .89$ ), suggesting the efficacy of treating the scores as unidimensional.

2. Some research has suggested that relational closeness may moderate the frequency or perceived appropriateness of affectionate communication. To control for this potential, a multivariate analysis of covariance was initially conducted, with relational closeness as the covariate. Closeness was measured using the Relationship Closeness Inventory (Berscheid et al., 1989). However, the covariate was nonsignificant and so a factorial MANOVA was used in the analyses. To further rule out the possibility that any observed effects could be attributed to differences in relational closeness, a  $2 \times 2 \times 2$  factorial ANOVA was performed on the closeness scores to determine whether reported levels of closeness differed among any of the groups being studied. No significant effects emerged.  $F$  values at  $df = 1, 308$  were as follows: for sex of subject,  $F = 2.89$ ; for sex configuration,  $F = .13$ ; for relationship type,  $F = 3.46$ . None of these effects was significant at the  $\alpha = .05$  level.

## REFERENCES

- Bedford, V. H. (1993). Relationships between adult siblings. In A. E. Auhagen & M. von Salisch (Eds.), *Interpersonal relationships* (pp. 119-141). Gottingen: Hogrefe, Verlag fur Psychologie.
- Berger, C., & Bradac, J. (1982). *Language and social knowledge: Uncertainty in interpersonal relations*. London: Arnold.
- Berscheid, E., Snyder, M., & Omoto, A. M. (1989). The relationship closeness inventory: Assessing the closeness of interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 792-807.
- Booth-Butterfield, M., & Trotta, M. R. (1994). Attributional patterns for expressions of love. *Communication Reports, 7*, 119-129.
- Connidis, I. A. (1989). Siblings as friends in later life. *American Behavioral Scientist, 33*, 81-93.
- Floyd, K. (1995). Gender and closeness among friends and siblings. *Journal of Psychology, 129*, 193-202.
- Floyd, K. (in press-a). Close friends' perceptions of the importance of self disclosure and positive affect. *Psychological Reports*.
- Floyd, K. (1996-a). Brotherly love II: A developmental perspective on liking, love, and closeness in the fraternal dyad. *Journal of Family Psychology, 11*, 196-209.
- Floyd, K. (1996b). Communicating closeness among siblings: An application of the gendered closeness perspective. *Communication Research Reports, 13*, 27-34.
- Floyd, K. (in press-b). Communicating affection in dyadic relationships: An application of expectancy violations theory. *Communication Quarterly*.

Floyd, K., & Morman, M. T. (in press). Affectionate communication in nonromantic relationships: Influences of communicator, relational, and contextual factors. *Western Journal of Communication*.

Floyd, K., & Voloudakis, M. (1997, November). *Affectionate behavior in adult platonic friendships: Interpreting and evaluating expectancy violations*. Paper presented at annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Greenbaum, P. E., & Rosenfeld, H. M. (1980). Varieties of touching in greetings: Sequential structure and sex-related differences. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 5 (1), 13-25.

Hetherington, E. M., & Parke, R. D. (1986). *Child psychology: A contemporary viewpoint* (3d ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ihinger-Tallman, M. (1987). Sibling and stepsibling bonding in stepfamilies. In K. Pasley & M. Ihinger-Tallman (Eds.), *Remarriage and stepparenting: Current research and theory* (pp. 164-182). New York: Guilford.

Morman, M. T., & Floyd, K. (1996, July). "I love you, man": Overt expressions of affection in male-male interaction. Paper presented at annual meeting of the International Network on Personal Relationships, Seattle, WA.

Noller, P. (1978). Sex differences in the socialization of affectionate expression. *Developmental Psychology*, 14, 317-319.

Owen, W. F. (1987). The verbal expression of love by women and men as a critical communication event in personal relationships. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 10, 15-24.

Shimanoff, S. B. (1985). Rules governing the verbal expression of emotions between married couples. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 49, 147-165.

Shuntich, R. J., & Shapiro, R. M. (1991). Explorations of verbal affection and aggression. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 6 (2), 283-300.

Sprecher, S., & Sedikides, C. (1993). Gender differences in perceptions of emotionality: The case of close heterosexual relationships. *Sex Roles*, 28, 511-530.

Stocker, C., & Dunn, J. (1990). Sibling relationships in childhood: Links with friendships and peer relationships. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 8, 237-244.

Swain, S. (1989). Covert intimacy: Closeness in men's friendships. In B. Risman & P. Schwartz (Eds.), *Gender in intimate relationships: A microstructural approach* (pp. 71-86). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Twardosz, S., Schwartz, S., Fox, J., & Cunningham, J. L. (1979). Development and evaluation of a system to measure affectionate behavior. *Behavioral Assessment*, 1, 177-190.

Twardosz, S., Botkin, D., Cunningham, J. L., Weddle, K., Sollie, D., & Schreve, C. (1987). Expression of affection in day care. *Child Study Journal*, 17, 133-151.

Copyright of Communication Research Reports is the property of Eastern Communication Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.