

Interpersonal behaviors and friendship in a Chinese culture

Bonnie K. Y. Tam and Michael Harris Bond

Chinese University of Hong Kong

This research is designed to assess the links between interpersonal behaviors and relationship development. A measure of friendship, labeled 'communion', was developed that focused exclusively on the characteristics of the relationship itself. It was hypothesized that greater use by both parties of behaviors promoting the interests of the other, 'beneficence', and of behaviors respecting the rights of the other, 'restraint', would result in greater communion between the roommates by the end of their first 6 months together. Both dimensions of behavior proved to be related to communion, although beneficence by both parties was relatively stronger than restraint. These findings were discussed in terms of other types of relationships where there is less freedom of involvement and greater hierarchy.

Introduction

Most studies of actual friendship development have focused on single variables and ignored the multidimensional complexity of those behaviors leading to friendship development (Hays, 1985). We designed the present study to investigate the whole range of behaviors that promote friendship formation in Chinese culture for a sample of university roommates, newly assigned to live together in the same room.

A recent study of personality, self-disclosure and friendship in Chinese university roommates by Wong and Bond (1999) attempted to establish a model linking an actor's social perceptions of the social relationship of friendship to self-disclosure by self and by roommate. At the level of personality perceptions, they found that a self-rated, high level of application by the respondent, and perceived high levels of helpfulness and intellect in the respondent's roommate were predictors of friendship strength as rated by the respondent. At the behavioral level, both the amount and intensity of the respondent's level of self-disclosure and the amount of the roommate's self-disclosure were correlated with friendship strength.

Most importantly for the present paper, Wong and Bond's (1999) results showed that self-disclosure was *not* correlated with perceived roommate helpfulness and intellect, even though both these perceptions of the roommate were also correlated with friendship. They, therefore, speculated that perceived roommate helpfulness and intellect might have operated to promote friendship strength through roommate behaviors *other than* self-disclosure. The present study is thus designed to discover what are the other interpersonal behaviors that could further predict the strength of friendship in Chinese roommates.

Previous studies on interpersonal relationship development in Western cultures have identified a number of strategies that are used to initiate, escalate, maintain, or terminate a relationship (see Dindia, 1994). According to Bell and Daly (1984), affinity seeking is an

active, social-communicative process and a major interactional goal in the initiation of relationships. Friendship thus involves social-emotional and instrumental exchanges which together help to promote and maintain a communal relationship.

Honeycutt and Patterson (1997) investigated the use of affinity-seeking strategies by American college students. Their data analysis yielded four underlying factors from 27 descriptions of roommate behaviors, namely 'other-involvement', 'rewarding communication', 'control', and 'cleanliness or orderliness'. The factor representing strategies of other-involvement, which included behaviors characterized by warmth, care, and empathy toward the roommate, and disclosing personal information, emerged as the only significant predictor of roommate friendship.

The scale of affinity-seeking strategies used in Honeycutt and Patterson's (1997) study was empirically developed in an individualistic, Western culture. Their 27 strategies did not adequately address the more social-oriented communication style in collectivistic cultures like the Chinese. The current study made an attempt to 'culturalize' the measure of affinity-seeking behaviors by adding emically developed behaviors to this imported scale, thereby avoiding the use of imposed-etic measures that could be a contributor to failures of replication studies outside North America (Smith & Bond, 1998; ch. 11).

Apart from positive 'friendship-enhancing' behaviors, it is important to take into account negative, 'friendship-disrupting' behaviors. Rook (1984) has found that expression of negative affect detracted significantly from the positive benefits typically associated with friendship and social support. According to Clark and Grote (1998), relationship costs imposed on the other, whether intentionally or unintentionally enacted, are negatively correlated with friendship satisfaction.

Some potentially important relationship costs have recently been discussed by social psychologists examining interactional justice in organizational settings (e.g. Tyler & Bies, 1990). They define interactional justice as behavior communicating benevolence, neutrality and respect in such organizational contexts. The 'respect' component of interactional justice includes behaviors acknowledging the rights of the petitioner and behaviors that avoid communicating indifference and hostility. These respect markers have implications for employee commitment to the organization and acceptance of painful organizational outcomes, like termination. We expect that they will likewise affect friendship development.

The discussion of respect and its markers is reminiscent of Brown and Levinson's (1987) analysis of positive and negative face. According to Leichthy and Applegate (1991), 'Negative face refers to an individual's desire to have one's autonomy prerogatives respected' (p. 452). Respecting another's autonomy involves avoiding acts that over-impose adaptation demands on the other party to the relationship, and show that one values his or her rights and freedoms. Such respect markers are involved in all relationships, whether task-oriented or intimate, and require vigilance and self-discipline to enact. We expect that these negative behaviors, often missing from prior measures of interpersonal exchanges, need to be included in any attempt to link behaviors to relationship outcomes.

Predictions

We expect that roommate interpersonal behaviors may be integrated into two factors, one involving the exchange of favors and another involving the avoidance of disrespectful behaviors. We predict that higher levels of both behavioral groupings will predict friendship strength in roommates after they have interacted over some time in this close, egalitarian relationship.

Method

Participants

Eighty-nine undergraduates (43 males and 46 females) of the Chinese University of Hong Kong participated in this study. They were aged from 18 to 22 ($M=19.5$ years, $SD=0.95$ years). Fifty-nine of them were recruited from the subject pool for general psychology while the rest were recruited by convenience sampling in the University dormitories from mid-November 1999 to mid-January 2000. All participants were residents of the University's dormitories and had been living with the current same-sex roommate in dormitories only after September 1999. Their length of rooming together ranged from 1.27 months to 5 months ($M=2.70$ months, $SD=0.87$ months).

Materials

Four of the five measures taken were used in the current study, namely those measuring the personality of the self (PS), roommate interpersonal behavior of the self (RIB-S), roommate interpersonal behavior of the roommate (RIB-R), and friendship strength (FS). They were bound together in a questionnaire booklet, with the order of the four relevant questionnaires incompletely randomized to eliminate possible order effects. The incomplete randomization was in the order PS-RIB-S/RIB-R-FS, making a total of two orders of the four measures. All measures were written in Chinese, the participants' native language. Apart from the questionnaire booklet, a consent form and a debriefing sheet were prepared to explain the purpose of this study and observe the ethical standards of the APA.

Friendship strength. We needed a measure of friendship strength in order to assess the impact of the various roommate behaviors. This scale was to be composed of items that referred to the relationship itself. In developing this scale, the ADF-F2 measure of Wright (unpubl. data, 1991) was first decomposed. In this widely used scale of friendship, a mixture of items from different conceptual categories was found, including those assessing respondent feelings, intentions, and behaviors along with partner's attributed feelings, personality, and behaviors. By conflating these conceptual categories into a measure of friendship, researchers are unable to ascertain the linkages among the processes involved in producing a strong relationship.

Only two items measuring the respondent's perception of the relationship were found in the items constituting the ADF-F2. To supplement this meager number of relationship-focused items, six additional items that address the quality of the relationship explicitly were generated through interviews with other roommates. Four of the items describe positive relationship qualities, and the other four describe negative relationship qualities (see Table 1 for the specific items).

Personality of the self. The Sino-American Person Perception Scale (SAPPS) was used for participants to assess their own personality. The SAPPS is a measure of personality perceptions for the Chinese developed by Yik and Bond (1993). The short form of SAPPS with 32 items was employed. It is a seven-point scale on bipolar adjectives of personality on eight dimensions of personality: openness, emotional stability, extroversion, application, intellect, helpfulness, restraint, and assertiveness.

Reliability, validity and comprehensiveness of the instrument have been shown in various studies of personality perceptions of self and others in Chinese (e.g. Bond & Shiu, 1997;

Table 1 Eight component items of the communion scale

Items in English translation	Factor loading
1. Our relationship is harmonious.	0.86
2. Our relationship is friendly.	0.87
3. Because of circumstances that neither he/she nor I can do anything about, there is quite a bit of tension and strain in our relationship. (R)*	0.74
4. Our relationship is conflictual. (R)	0.72
5. Our relationship is superficial. (R)	0.76
6. Our relationship is tense. (R)	0.72
7. When he/she and I get together, I enjoy a special kind of companionship that I don't get from any of my other acquaintances.*	0.63
8. Our relationship is close.	0.81

R, Reversed items. Total variance explained by single, first factor = 58.47%.

*Item taken from ADF-F2.

Wong & Bond, 1999). The personality of the respondent was measured so as to have a control variable available to ensure that the respondent's ratings of friendship strength were independent of his or her personality dispositions.

Roommate interpersonal behavior of the self and the other. Items measuring behaviors between roommate dyads that are thought to affect the quality of their friendship, 'Roommate Interpersonal Behaviors' (RIBs), were developed for this study. Every item describes a specific, observable act by either one of the roommate dyad. There were three main sources of all behavioral items used:

1. Twenty-six items from Honeycutt and Patterson's (1997) affinity-seeking strategies were translated and then back-translated by bilingual students. Since our development of the RIB scale was intended to assess observable behavior, wordings from the original items that referred to any intentions of the actor were left out. Furthermore, necessary modifications to produce culturally equivalent and comprehensible items were made.
2. With the aim of covering the whole range of behaviors in the roommate dyadic interaction, the first author conducted interviews with current residents in university dormitories. Another 14 roommate interpersonal behaviors, some of which were thought to enhance and some to reduce friendship strength, were generated from these interviews. Two versions of the RIB items were developed, one (RIB-S) for the respondent's ratings on the frequency of occurrence of his or her own behaviors (e.g. I invite him/her to go shopping), and the other (RIB-R) for the respondent's perceptions of the frequency of the roommate's corresponding behaviors (e.g. He/she invites me to go shopping).
3. In addition, another 19 items tapping concepts of interactional justice (Tyler & Bies, 1990) in the roommate context (e.g. Whenever I talk to him, he always talks and talks, and does not give me a chance to say anything) were added to the RIB-R.

There were in total 40 and 59 items in the RIB-S and RIB-R, respectively.

Procedure

Participants from the subject pool were asked to fill in the questionnaires during an experimental hour. In this setting, at most, five participants filled in the questionnaires at the same time. The rest of the participants completed the questionnaires individually in their dormitories. In either situation, participants were invited to sign the consent form before they started. Moreover, participants were reminded to follow the order of the measures as they appeared in the booklet. They were given as much time as they needed to complete the whole questionnaire booklet, which normally took about 30 minutes, then a debriefing sheet was given to the participants.

Results

Friendship strength

A principal component, exploratory factor analysis of the eight relationship items yielded a single-factor solution. All the item loadings were found to be greater than 0.63 (see Table 1) and the reliability of the eight-item scale was high ($\alpha=0.89$). After examination of the eight items, the factor was named 'communion', a term which implies a relationship characterized by both depth and harmony at its positive end.

The level of communion for any roommate pair was calculated by averaging the scores of the eight items, with all negative items reversed. The level of communion in the current sample ranged from 1.38 to 5.88, $M = 4.38$, $SD = 0.98$, spanning a wide range of communion in roommate relationships.

Roommate interpersonal behavior of the self and the roommate

Since the ADF-F2 contained behavioral items that describe the behavior of the respondent as well as the perceived behavior of the respondent's roommate, these two categories of items from the ADF-F2 items were extracted and added to the factor analyses of the RIB-S and the RIB-R items. Thus, two ADF-F2 items were added to the RIB-S and four ADF-F2 items were added to the RIB-R, yielding a total of 42 and 63 items, respectively. These are large numbers of items relative to the 89 participants completing the questionnaires, and fall well below the number required to reach the usual 5:1 ratio of participants to items. As a conservative response to this potential for unreliability in the results of the factor analysis, we extracted fewer principle components. Use of this strategy increases the saturation of items onto factors, thereby enhancing the reliability and replicability of the factors (Guadagnoli & Velcier, 1988).

Principal component exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the RIB-S and RIB-R items separately. A scree plot suggested the presence of two factors in each case. A varimax rotation was conducted for both measures. Constituent items of the respective factors of the two behavior scales were similar in content. Using a criterion of $|0.40|$ in the item loadings and after discarding any items that loaded onto both factors, 17 items were found to load onto Factor 1 of the RIB-S ($\alpha=0.92$) and seven items onto Factor 2 of the RIB-S ($\alpha=0.79$). In the factor analysis of the RIB-R, 20 items were found to load onto Factor 1 ($\alpha=0.91$) and 12 items onto Factor 2 ($\alpha=0.82$). Items in each factor and their factor loadings are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Constituent items for factors of roommate interpersonal behavior

Items in English translation	Factor loading
Beneficence by the self	
1. I offer help to him. When he is in need, I find out whatever I can do to help.*	0.63
2. I take the initiative to discuss with him the lifestyles we prefer.	0.60
3. I maintain a kind of comfortable, relaxed, unperturbed expression.*	0.54
4. I act as active, enthusiastic and talk to him in a lively tone.*	0.74
5. I ask him about his personal feeling towards important matters and encourage him to talk.*	0.70
6. I tell him interesting stories and jokes.*	0.74
7. I invite him to go shopping.*	0.49
8. I use his nickname or 'we' instead of 'you and I'.*	0.62
9. When talking to him, I respond with non-verbal cues, questioning or quoting what he has said before.*	0.61
10. I often smile at him.*	0.69
11. I disclose my feeling, fear and anxieties with him.*	0.60
12. I praise him and help him reduce his anxiety.*	0.74
13. I plan to have meals and spend time with him.*	0.73
14. I care about him, and sympathize with the problems and setbacks that he encounters.*	0.79
15. I tell him about our shared interests, tastes and similarities.*	0.67
16. I can count on having to go out of my way to do things that will keep my relationship with him/her from 'falling apart'.‡	0.50
17. When I plan for leisure time activities, I make it a point to get in touch with him/her to see if we can arrange to do things together.‡	0.73
Restraint from harming by the self	
1. When he is resting or concentrating on work, I avoid disturbing him.	0.66
2. I boast or order him around to show my superiority. (R)*	0.83
3. I do something that he hates very much. (R)	0.79
4. I keep to myself things we share, e.g. telephone. (R)	0.64
5. I maintain tidiness and personal hygiene.*	0.48
6. I scold him for no reason. (R)	0.72
7. I make fun of or insult him without restraint in his presence. (R)	0.55
Beneficence by the other	
1. He offers help to me. When I am in need, he finds out whatever he can do to help.*	0.60
2. He takes the initiative to discuss with me the lifestyles we prefer.	0.63
3. He maintains a kind of comfortable, relaxed, unperturbed expression.*	0.50
4. He acts as active, enthusiastic and talks to me in a lively tone.*	0.75
5. He asks me about my personal feeling towards important matters and encourages me to talk.*	0.64
6. He tells me interesting stories and jokes.*	0.60
7. He invites me to go shopping.*	0.47
8. He uses my nickname or 'we' instead of 'you and I'.*	0.56
9. When talking to me, he responds with non-verbal cues, questioning or quoting what I have said before.*	0.53
10. He often smiles at me.*	0.63
11. He discloses his feeling, fear and anxieties with me.*	0.70
12. He praises me and helps me reduce my anxiety.*	0.66
13. He plans to have meals and spend time with me.*	0.67

Table 2 *Continued*

Items in English translation	Factor loading
14. He cares about me, and sympathizes with the problems and setbacks that I encounter.*	0.77
15. He tells me about our shared interests, tastes and similarities.*	0.66
16. He always greets me with 'Good morning', 'I'll go now, bye' or 'I'm back'. [†]	0.58
17. He often says 'Thank you' to show his appreciation. [†]	0.55
18. He treats me in a fair manner. [†]	0.56
19. He/she is willing to spend time and energy to help me succeed at my own personal tasks and projects, even if he/she is not directly involved. [‡]	0.50
20. He/she understands the personal goals and ideals that are most important to me and encourages me to pursue them. [‡]	0.63
Restraint by the other	
1. When I am resting or concentrating on work, he avoids disturbing me.	0.45
2. He boasts or orders me to show his superiority. (R) *	0.62
3. He does something that I hate very much. (R)	0.60
4. He keeps to himself things we share, e.g. telephone. (R)	0.40
5. He maintains tidiness and personal hygiene.*	0.43
6. He scolds me for no reason. (R)	0.60
7. He makes fun of or insults me without restraint in my presence. (R)	0.76
8. He interrupts while others are talking. (R) [†]	0.60
9. He lies to me. (R) [†]	0.53
10. Whenever I talk to him, he always talks and talks, and does not give me a chance to say anything. (R)	0.58
11. He allows himself to do one behavior (e.g. talk on the phone at midnight), but if I do the same, he complains about me. (R)	0.60
12. He/she is the kind of person who likes to 'put me down' or embarrass me with seemingly harmless little jokes or comments. (R)	0.69

R, Reversed item.

*Items modified from affinity-seeking strategies; [†]items tapping interactional justice; [‡]items from ADF-F2.

Since items in Factor 1 of both the RIB-S and the RIB-R depict the actor actively doing favors and being helpful to the roommate, the factors were interpreted and labeled as 'beneficence by the self' and 'beneficence by the other', respectively. These two factors had a high degree of item similarity, with 88% of the items in 'beneficence by the self' overlapping with those in 'beneficence by the other'.

Component items of Factor 2 in both the RIB-S and the RIB-R characterize the actor avoiding either doing harm to or interfering with the rights of the roommate, thus showing respect for the roommate through restraint. These factors were thus labeled 'restraint by the self' and 'restraint by the other', respectively. Eighty-six percent of its items in 'restraint by the self' overlap with those constituting 'restraint by the other'.

Predicting roommate friendship strength

Degree of communion correlated significantly with three personality characteristics of the self (PS), namely intellect ($r(87)=0.27$, $P < 0.01$), helpfulness ($r(87)=0.27$, $P < 0.01$), and

restraint ($r(87)=0.22$, $P<0.05$). To find out the personality predictors of friendship strength, all PS variables were entered into a stepwise multiple regression analysis. It was found that helpfulness of the self and intellect of the self accounted for 12.5% of the total variance in communion. These self-perceived personality variables may influence the perception of friendship across *all* friendships, and not be confined to this particular roommate relationship. So, to find out which interpersonal behaviors relate to friendship strength in this particular relationship, it was first necessary to partial out the potentially confounding influence of these perceived personality variables. This step is taken below in assessing the predictability of communion using the four factors of roommate behavior.

Roommate interpersonal behaviors and communion

Three out of the four factors of roommate interpersonal behaviors (RIB) were correlated with communion. The two beneficence factors, beneficence by the self and beneficence by the other, were found to be highly correlated with communion, $r(87)=0.79$, $P<0.01$ and $r(87)=0.72$, $P<0.01$, respectively. In contrast, the correlation between restraint by the other and communion was relatively low although also significant, $r(87)=0.26$, $P<0.05$. The correlation between restraint by the self and communion was not significant, $r(87)=0.07$, ns.

In order to control for possible influences of respondent personality on the communion ratings, those respondent personality traits that correlated with communion, namely intellect and helpfulness, were first partialled out. Even after partialing out these personality correlates of perceived communion, it was found that beneficence by the self emerged as the best predictor of communion, explaining 48.5% of the variance ($\beta=0.56$, $P<0.01$). Restraint by the other and beneficence by the other accounted for an additional 6.7% ($\beta=0.39$, $P<0.01$) and 1.7% ($\beta=0.25$, $P<0.05$) of the variance, respectively. The remaining factor, restraint by the self, could not significantly predict the level of communion ($\beta=0.05$, $P>0.05$). There was no differential impact of these behavior factors on communion as a function of whether the roommates were male or female. Nor was there a difference in the level of communion between male and female roommate pairs.

Thus, three RIB factors combined to predict a total of 56.9% of the variance in communion *after* any possible confounding effects of the perceiver's personality were removed. So, the three identified RIBs appear to be effective agents of friendship strength, independent of the personality of the respondent judging that friendship.

Discussion

Measures of relationship

To assess friendship, we developed and employed a relationship scale that solely focused on the qualities of the relationship itself and treated the relationship as a separate, identifiable construct. The relationship terms used to assess the strength of friendship in this study yielded a single dimension labeled 'communion'. This dimension taps relationship depth, strength and integrity that is not just applicable to same-sex peers in a medium-length interaction. They could equally well be applied to describe other interpersonal relationships, such as teacher–student, father–daughter, policeman–citizen, and so forth. Communion is probably the major primary dimension to all relationship ratings, corresponding to the role dimension of complexity (McAuley *et al.*, 1999) and to the behavioral dimension of association/dissociation (Triandis, 1977; pp. 23–31).

A taxonomy of relationship terms corresponding to the taxonomy of personality terms (e.g. Goldberg, 1981) is now needed to help address the growing chorus for a greater relationship focus in social psychological research (Ho, 1998). It is probable that there is more than one dimension defining all relationships, and different behaviors from role enactors will relate to these additional dimensions, just as the roommate interpersonal behaviors assessed in this study related to communion in this study.

Roommate interpersonal behaviors

A host of potential friendship-relevant behaviors was identified and measured in this study of Chinese roommates. Two meaningful factors of RIBs were observed, whether from the respondent or from his/her roommate. Regardless of their source, they were conceptually similar and shared many of the same behaviors.

The first factor, beneficence, was similar to the factors labeled 'other-involvement' and 'rewarding communication' by Honeycutt and Patterson (1997). We propose that this prosocial type of behavior is common and fundamental in promoting friendship in any culture, since the beneficent actor shows care and concern towards the other person by actively catering to his or her needs and interests during their interactions. Doing so promotes liking from the recipient based on the rewarding value of these behaviors. Specific prosocial behaviors may be distinctive to members of a particular culture, but we propose that the relationship-enhancing function of beneficence will be universal.

Items from the negative pole of the second factor, restraint, reflect disrespectful or harming behaviors directed towards the other person. These behaviors may constitute the peer equivalent of interactional injustice (Tyler & Bies, 1990). It is highly likely that when the other exhibits such behaviors, conflicts would occur between the roommate dyad because the personal rights of the recipient of that behavior would be perceived as being abused. These behaviors or their absence violate interpersonal norms and may be construed as intended impoliteness, thereby resulting in counter-attack and relationship breakdown (Tedeschi & Bond, 2001).

Given the Chinese cultural emphasis on maintaining harmony (Gao *et al.*, 1996), inhibiting such unjust behaviors may be even more decisive in promoting the integrity of the relationship. In Chinese culture, close interpersonal relationships, like friendship, tend to be viewed within a longer time frame. In order to keep the relationship long-lasting, one may restrain one's expression of these 'individualistic' or egocentric behaviors to prevent interactions escalating into an open conflict.

We speculate that individuals from more individualistic cultures may not restrain themselves from exhibiting disrespectful behaviors as much as individuals from more collectivistic cultures, and would also openly discuss or confront perceived disrespectful behaviors directed towards themselves from others. Indeed, those from individualistic cultures may expect others to confront perceived injustices, and assume that lack of protest signals acceptance of such intrusion. If so, the stage is set for difficult relationships between roommates from collective and individualistic cultures.

Predicting friendship strength

Beneficence by *both* roommates was associated with higher levels of communion. Each party to this relationship provided many valued social outcomes for the other, thereby enhancing their relationship. That enhancement was associated with receiving favors *from* the other, as

has earlier been demonstrated in Honeycutt and Patterson's (1997) study. Communion is also enhanced by extending favors *to* the other. Both types of favor-doing are themselves strongly correlated, as one might expect, but contribute separately towards deepening the relationship. Friendship is a process of reciprocal exchange of rewards.

Restraint by the other was also associated with communion. Restraint is related to the politeness style characteristic of Chinese culture, in which one shows respect and concern for other social members by avoiding invasion of others' basic rights. One restrains oneself from enacting intrusive behaviors and avoids doing anything that might lead the other person to be offended. It is important that one behaves considerately, 'following the golden mean' in everything one does with another person, in order to ensure more harmonious future encounters.

Results from this study also suggest that beneficence will be the most powerful factor in determining relationship outcomes. Beneficence, whether by self or one's roommate, correlated at very high levels with communion and was much more predictive of communion than was the other's restraint towards the self. There may be a cultural component in the strength of beneficence relative to restraint, since Bond and Forgas (1984) have demonstrated the greater strength of another's agreeableness in predicting associative behaviors in a Chinese as opposed to another individualistic cultural group.

Future research

We expect that communion will be shaped in *any* type of relationship by beneficent and by restrained behaviors by the self and from the other. Additional dimensions of relationship, like hierarchy, probably characterize relationships, and the behaviors that link to this and other dimensions of relationship remain to be explored once a comprehensive taxonomy of relationship dimensions has been developed.

It will be appreciated that all ratings in this study were taken from one of the two roommates. For this reason, it was necessary to partial out any possible personality influences on the ratings of achieved communion. It is, however, a matter of theoretical interest whether the other party to this relationship, the roommate being rated, shares the same perceptions of the behaviors exchanged and the communion achieved. Other empirical work on Chinese friendship (Lee & Bond, 1998) and communication behaviors (Leung & Bond, 2001) suggest that correlations of these ratings will not be impressively high. It would be fascinating to include the judgements of more objective, third party observers in this sort of research to begin disentangling the complexity of factors shaping the judgements of behaviors, personalities, and their behaviors.

Acknowledgment

We thank Jessica Y. Y. Kwong for her advice on the refinement of the measures used in this study and her help with the statistical analyses.

Received: September 2001.

Correspondence: Dr Michael Harris Bond, Department of Psychology, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, New Territories, Hong Kong, S. A. R., China. Email: mhb@cuhk.edu.hk

References

- Bell, R. A. & Daly, J. A. (1984). The affinity-seeking function of communication. *Communication Monographs*, 51, 91–115.
- Bond, M. H. & Forgas, J. (1984). Linking person perception to behavior intention across cultures: The role of cultural collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 15, 337–352.
- Bond, M. H. & Shiu, W. Y. F. (1997). The relationship between a group's personality resources and the two dimensions of its group process. *Small Group Research*, 28, 194–217.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, M. S. & Grote, N. K. (1998). Why aren't indices of relationship costs always negatively related to indices of relationship quality? *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2, 2–17.
- Dindia, K. (1994). A multiphasic view of relationship maintenance strategies. In: *Communication and Relational Maintenance* (eds D.J. Canary & L. Stafford), pp. 91–112. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Gao, G., Ting-Toomey, S. & Gudykunst, W. B. (1996). Chinese communication processes. In: *The Handbook of Chinese Psychology*, (ed. M. H. Bond) pp. 280–293. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Developing a taxonomy of trait-descriptive terms. In: *New Directions for Methodology of Social and Behavioral Science: Problems with Language Imprecision* (ed. D. Fiske), pp. 43–65. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Guadagnoli, E. & Velcier, W. F. (1988). Relation of sample size to the stability of component patterns. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 265–275.
- Hays, R. B. (1985). A longitudinal study of friendship development. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 909–924.
- Ho, D. Y. F. (1998). Interpersonal relationships and relationship dominance: An analysis based on methodological relationism. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 1, 1–16.
- Honeycutt, J. M. & Patterson, J. (1997). Affinity strategies in relationships: The role of gender and imagined interactions in maintaining liking among college roommates. *Personal Relationships*, 4, 35–46.
- Lee, R. Y. P. & Bond, M. H. (1998). Friendship in Chinese culture. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 1, 179–190.
- Leichty, G. & Applegate, J. L. (1991). Social-cognitive and situational influences on the use of face-saving persuasive strategies. *Human Communication Research*, 17, 451–484.
- Leung, S. K. & Bond, M. H. (2001). Interpersonal communication and personality: Self and other perspectives. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 4, 69–86.
- McAuley, P. C., Bond, M. H. & Kashima, E. (1999). Cross-cultural insights into the neglected, elusive situation: Contextually-defined dimensions of role relationships in two cultures, Hong Kong and Australia. *Paper Presented to the Conference on Cultural Diversity and European Integration, Graz, Austria, June–July*.
- Rook, K. S. (1984). The negative side of social interaction: Impact on psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 1097–1108.
- Smith, P. B. & Bond, M. H. (1998). *Social Psychology Across Cultures*, 2nd edn. London, UK: Prentice Hall Europe.
- Tedeschi, J. T. & Bond, M. H. (2001). Aversive behavior and aggression in cross-cultural perspective. In: *Behaving Badly: Aversive Behaviors in Interpersonal Relationships* (ed. R. Kowalski), pp. 257–293. Washington, DC: APA Books.
- Triandis, H. C. (1977). *Interpersonal Behavior*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Tyler, T. R. & Bies, R. J. (1990). Interpersonal Aspects of Procedural Justice. In: *Applied social psychology in business settings*, (ed. S. J. Carroll), pp. 77–98. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Wong, S. C. H. & Bond, M. H. (1999). Personality, self-disclosure and friendship between Chinese University roommates. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 2, 201–214.
- Yik, M. S. M. & Bond, M. H. (1993). Exploring the dimensions of Chinese person perception with indigenous and imported constructs: Creating a culturally balanced scale. *International Journal of Psychology*, 28, 75–95.