

EFFECTS OF DIRECT AND IMPLIED METHODS OF REQUESTING
HELP ON IMPRESSIONS FORMED OF PERSONS
WITH A PHYSICAL DISABILITY

by

Tom Davis-Bissing

B.G.S., University of Kansas, 1980

Submitted to the Division of Speech
and Drama, Department of Communication
Studies, and to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University of
Kansas in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts.

Thesis Committee:

Redacted Signature

Chairperson

Redacted Signature

Redacted Signature

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to express my appreciation to all the people who helped me, including those who provided me with rides, listened patiently to my thoughts and ideas, and gave me much needed encouragement. Special thanks go to:

Angela Wallace and James Olson who freely donated their time and talent to make the videotape.

My wife Linda Davis-Bissing who provided me with the love, support, and motivation essential to completing this project.

My friend and advisor Paul Friedman who patiently and lovingly contributed much time and energy over a two year period.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF FIGURES	v
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Summary of Hypotheses	6
CHAPTER 2: METHOD	8
Preparation of Materials	8
Videotape	8
Questionnaire	9
Information Sheet	10
Subjects	10
Design	10
Procedure	10
CHAPTER 3: RESULTS	13
Results for All Ss	14
Results for Male Ss when a Female was in the Wheelchair	14
Results for Male Ss when a Male was in the Wheelchair	18
Results for Female Ss when a Male was in the Wheelchair	18
Results for the Implied Method of Requesting Help Comparing the Sex of the Person in the Wheelchair	18
Results for the Direct Method of Requesting Help Comparing the Sex of the Person in the Wheelchair	25
Results for Female Ss when a Female was in the Wheelchair	25
CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION	38
Tests of Hypotheses	38
Hypotheses 1a and 1b	38
Hypotheses 2a and 2b	39
Hypotheses 3a and 3b	39

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 4: (Cont.)	
Hypotheses 4a and 4b	40
Hypotheses 5a, 5b, 6a, and 6b	40
Hypotheses 7a and 7b	41
Summary	41
Possible Confounding Factors	42
Belief that the Person in the Wheel- chair had a Disability	42
Nonverbal Messages	43
Defects in the Measurement of First Impressions	44
Implications for Further Research	44
REFERENCES	46
APPENDIX A: VIDEOTAPE SCRIPT	48
APPENDIX B: MATERIALS	53

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1: Breakdown of Experimental Cells 11

FIGURE 2: Breakdown of Subjects by Reported Belief
that the Person in the Wheelchair had a
Disability and Reported Prior Experience
with Someone Close in a Wheelchair 15

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1a: Comparisons of the Mean Scale Ratings of Liking Reported by All Subjects as a Function of Direct and Implied Methods of Requesting Help 16

TABLE 1b: Comparisons of the Mean Scale Ratings of Willingness to Associate Reported by All Subjects as a Function of Direct and Implied Methods of Requesting Help 17

TABLE 2a: Comparisons of the Mean Scale Ratings of Liking Reported by Male Subjects for a Female in the Wheelchair as a Function of Direct and Implied Methods of Requesting Help 19

TABLE 2b: Comparisons of the Mean Scale Ratings of Willingness to Associate Reported by Male Subjects for a Female in the Wheelchair as a Function of Direct and Implied Methods of Requesting Help 21

TABLE 3a: Comparisons of the Mean Scale Ratings of Liking Reported by Male Subjects for a Male in the Wheelchair as a Function of Direct and Implied Methods of Requesting Help 22

TABLE 3b: Comparisons of the Mean Scale Ratings of Willingness to Associate Reported by Male Subjects for a Male in the Wheelchair as a Function of Direct and Implied Methods of Requesting Help 24

TABLE 4a: Comparisons of the Mean Scale Ratings of Liking Reported by Female Subjects for a Male in the Wheelchair as a Function of Direct and Implied Methods of Requesting Help 26

TABLE 4b: Comparisons of the Mean Scale Ratings of Willingness to Associate Reported by Female Subjects for a Male in the Wheelchair as a Function of Direct and Implied Methods of Requesting Help 28

LIST OF TABLES (Cont.)

TABLE 5a:	Comparisons of the Mean Scale Ratings of Liking for the Implied Method of Requesting Help Reported by All Subjects as a Function of the Sex of the Person in the Wheelchair	29
TABLE 5b:	Comparisons of the Mean Scale Ratings of Willingness to Associate for the Implied Method of Requesting Help Reported by All Subjects as a Function of the Sex of the Person in the Wheelchair	31
TABLE 6a:	Comparisons of the Mean Scale Ratings of Liking for the Direct Method of Requesting Help Reported by All Subjects as a Function of the Sex of the Person in the Wheelchair	32
TABLE 6b:	Comparisons of the Mean Scale Ratings of Willingness to Associate for the Direct Method of Requesting Help Reported by All Subjects as a Function of the Sex of the Person in the Wheelchair	34
TABLE 7a:	Comparisons of the Mean Scale Ratings of Liking Reported by Female Subjects for a Female in the Wheelchair as a Function of Direct and Implied Methods of Requesting Help	35
TABLE 7b:	Comparisons of the Mean Scale Ratings of Willingness to Associate Reported by Female Subjects for a Female in the Wheelchair as a Function of Direct and Implied Methods of Requesting Help	37

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

It is reasonable to believe that persons with a physical disability need intimate relationships as much or more than people without a disability. Because a person with a disability faces an alien environment in day to day living, assistance and support provided by a significant other is especially important. A close relationship, however, is more difficult for a person with a disability to attain. For many reasons, such as adaptation of lifestyle, reduction of rewards, or limitation of activity, close relationships with a person with a disability often are avoided by physically normal people. Indeed, because of interactional awkwardness, even casual relationships between normals and persons with a disability can be stressful and uncomfortable. (Davis, 1961)

Erving Goffman (1963) states that the mere anticipation of such an encounter can lead to both parties arranging life to avoid them. If a person with a physical disability concentrates on relating to other persons with a disability, separation from the mainstream of society is maintained, resulting in increased feelings of being an outsider. Furthermore, since only a small percentage of the population has a physical disability, the chances of finding a compatible other are greatly reduced.

The first big problem encountered by persons with a disability, when they do attempt to establish relationships with physically normal people, is cutting through stigmatizing stereotypes. Many of our impressions of another person are the result of stereotypes, applied instantly and without conscious thought. (Schneider, Hastorff & Ellsworth, 1979) A stereotype is a simple, overgeneralized, set of characteristics

assumed to fit a category of people. Stereotypes are used like a type of shorthand in the perceiver's effort to make sense of the world.

(Schneider et al., 1979) The problem with stereotypes is that uncertainty is resolved in a way that fits the stereotypic mold. Stereotypes tend to influence information processing by being more cognitively available, i.e. they fill in the gaps in our perception with preconceived notions and promote selective recall and reinterpretation. (Snyder, Tanke & Berscheid, 1977) One study showed that stereotypic beliefs even alter the behavior of the target person to conform with stereotypic expectations. (Snyder et al., 1977)

The stereotypes that physically normal people hold of persons with a disability tend to be condescending and degrading. Studies suggest that nearly half of persons without a disability have primarily negative attitudes toward persons with a physical disability. (English, 1977) Individuals describing their beliefs about persons with a disability have used terms such as helpless, hopeless, and lacking in potential. (Siller, Chipman, Ferguson & Vann, 1967)

There has been a considerable amount of research on what occurs when persons with a disability relate to persons without a disability. Findings agree that interactions between them are strained, uncomfortable, and uncertain. (Davis, 1961; Goffman, 1963; Katz, 1981) Kleck, Ono & Hastorff (1966) found that in an interview-like situation, in which a confederate served as either a physically normal or a physically disabled stimulus person, physically normal subjects reacted in an inhibited and over-controlled manner. Using a similar format, Comer & Piliavin (1972) found that persons with a disability are more uncomfortable and

tend to show more avoidance behaviors when interacting with a normal interviewer than with an interviewer with a disability. Shears & Jensema (1969) had 94 subjects rank 10 types of physical disabilities with respect to desirability in a friend and as a self-affliction. Results suggested that six dimensions probably combine and interact in the formation of stereotypes of a person with a disability. These dimensions, (visibility, interference in communication, social stigma, prognosis of reversibility, extent of incapacity, and difficulty in daily living) all create interactional awkwardness and uncertainties.

Several of these dimensions (e.g. extent of incapacity, difficulty in daily living, and interference in communication) may be due to the unfamiliarity of the nondisabled person with the needs of the person with a disability or assuming dependency of the person with a disability. The latter may be related to the value our society places on independence. After examining various lines of evidence, Wright (1960) concludes that "...independence as a global, emotional ideal is highly valued in our society."

Additionally, interpersonal relations between persons with and without a disability tend to follow a superior-inferior model of social interaction. (English, Marinelli & DellOrto, 1977a) A common situation that may affect impressions of persons with a disability occurs when these persons want physical help to perform a task. Helping represents an asymmetrical social relationship that can easily lead to status judgments: the person helped is likely to be judged inferior. (Wright, 1960) When persons with a disability desire help, they can either ask for it directly or indirectly, i.e. imply the existence of a need and allow the the persons around them to take the initiative to meet it. Persons

with disabilities need to know whether the direct or implied request is more likely to have a positive affect on impression formation and interpersonal attraction. The investigator believes that the implied approach emphasizes dependency and one-sidedness of the social relationship, thus reinforcing negative stereotypes and leading to more negative first impressions. If persons with a disability take responsibility for their own needs by asking for help when it is desired, they: (1) emphasize their independence, (2) reduce the one-sidedness of their social relationships, and (3) reduce their unfamiliarity with the needs of a person with a disability.

This rationale suggests the main hypothesis of this study: (1a) Subjects will report more favorable impressions of persons with a disability who make direct requests than those who make implied requests. And its corrolary: (1b) Ss will report more willingness to interact with persons with a disability who make direct requests than with those who make implied requests.

When cross-sex interactions are considered, other factors, such as physical attractiveness, become increasingly important. Unfortunately, research on cross-sex attraction does not include situations where a physical disability is involved. Physical attractiveness, however, is a well documented component of attraction. In a study of couples at the University of Minnesota, experimenters paired 752 new students according to physical attractiveness as rated by a panel of students. By advertising the pairing as computer matching, the experimenters were able to control the matching and accumulate personality measures such as the MMPI and the Minnesota Counseling Inventory. Results showed that the only significant predictor of couple compatibility and liking was physical attractiveness. (Walster, Aronson, Abrahams & Rottman, 1966).

In a study of 10-11 year old boys and girls, Richardson (1971) found that a physical disability adversely affects preferences. He used 21 pictures of a child varying only the form of appearance. Subjects were 420 London school children who each ranked 5 of the 21 pictures according to personal preference (liking). Results showed that a black child was preferred over a child with a disability, and the more disfiguring the disability, the lower the ranking. The implication is that there is considerable agreement regarding the unattractiveness of physical disabilities, even at an early age.

Another factor in cross-sex situations is role expectations. A role can be defined as a collection of rights and duties. The basic notion is that people interact according to learned expectations of behavior. Every role is closely related with one or more other role, such as male-female, dependent-independent, disabled-nondisabled. It has been argued that successful people are those who accurately know the expectations for the greatest number of roles, have the best role skills, and have the strongest tendency to engage in role-taking activities.

(English, 1977b)

In our society, independence has not been a part of a woman's role. Freud's claim that passivity, dependence, and nurturance are healthy female attributes and that assertiveness is a sign of neuroticism reflects that attitude. (Williams, 1979) In this study requests for help that imply assertiveness and independence could be affected by sex-role expectations.

Furthermore, females have been found more accepting of disabilities and less oriented to physical attraction than males. Higgs (1971) studied 376 persons, including high school students, college undergradu-

ates, counselors, and parents. Each subject completed the Attitude Toward Disabled Person scale, a knowledge test about physical disabilities and a contact rating index. Results indicated that females generally possessed more knowledge, higher contact ratings, and more positive attitudes toward a person with a physical disability than did males. Furthermore, on the basis of their study of cross-sex attraction in college students, Stroebe, Insko, Thompson, and Layton (1971) concluded that physical attractiveness is a more important determinant of opposite-sex attraction for males than for females.

Summary of Hypothesis

Hypotheses 2a thru 6b coincide with sex-role expectations. Hypotheses 7a and 7b contradict sex-role expectations because of the mitigating influence of female subjects.

1a. Subjects will report more favorable impressions of a person with a disability who makes direct requests than one who makes implied requests.

1b. Ss will report more willingness to interact with a person with a disability who makes direct requests than one who makes implied requests.

2a. Males will report more favorable impressions of a female with a disability who makes implied requests than one who makes direct requests.

2b. Males will report more willingness to interact with a female with a disability who makes implied requests than one who makes direct requests.

3a. Males will report more favorable impressions of a male with a disability who makes direct requests than one who makes implied requests.

3b. Males will report more willingness to interact with a male with a disability who makes direct requests than one who makes implied requests.

4a. Females will report more favorable impressions of a male with a disability who makes direct requests than one who makes implied requests.

4b. Females will report more willingness to interact with a male with a disability who makes direct requests than one who makes implied requests.

5a. Ss will report more favorable impressions of a female with a disability who makes implied requests than of a male with a disability who also makes implied requests.

5b. Ss will report more willingness to interact with a female with a disability who makes implied requests than of a male with a disability who also makes implied requests.

6a. Ss will report more favorable impressions of a male with a disability who makes direct requests than of a female with a disability who also makes direct requests.

6b. Ss will report more willingness to interact with a male with a disability who makes direct requests than of a female with a disability who also makes direct requests.

7a. Females will report more favorable impressions of a female with a disability who makes direct requests than one who makes implied requests.

7b. Females will report more willingness to interact with a female with a disability who makes direct requests than one who makes implied requests.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

The purpose of the study was to investigate the impact of methods of requesting help on the first impressions physically normal persons form of persons with a disability. For the purpose of this study, having a disability will be defined as using a wheelchair. First impressions will consist of reported liking and reported willingness to interact with the subject in the future. Ss viewed a videotape which showed a female and a male student studying together. One of the students was using a wheelchair. The videotape contained four situations in which it was necessary for the physically normal person to consider the needs of the person in the wheelchair. After viewing the videotape, the Ss filled out questionnaires. This chapter will provide a detailed description of the method. This description will be divided into four parts: preparation of materials, subjects, design, and procedure.

Preparation of materials

Videotape

Two drama students, a female and a male, volunteered to make the videotape. Four videotape segments were prepared: (1) a female in the wheelchair using direct methods of requesting help; (2) a male in the wheelchair using direct methods of requesting help; (3) a female in the wheelchair using implied methods of requesting help; and (4) a male in the wheelchair using implied methods of requesting help. The four situations imbedded in the videotaped episode, in which it was necessary for the physically normal person to consider the needs of the person with a disability, were: (1) the person in the wheelchair drops some books under the table so that it is difficult to retrieve them without help; (2) the physically normal person

stands and writes on the chalkboard which causes the person in the wheelchair to be uncomfortable due to their difference in height; (3) the person in the wheelchair wants a book which is out of reach on the far end of the table; and (4) the person in the wheelchair wants a soft drink from the vending machine out in the hall. In the direct method condition the person in the wheelchair states each need and then requests the other to perform the necessary function. In the implied method condition, the person in the wheelchair states no request. The other person initiates the helping act. The two drama students alternated roles and followed a script. (See Appendix A for script) Minor variation in wording of statements was permitted to promote authenticity and genuineness. Each videotape segment was approximately two minutes and 15 seconds in length. The setting of the videotape was a classroom with a long table in front of a wall chalkboard. There was a book on the far right end of the table. The actors entered from the left side and the videotape started as they approached the table.

Questionnaire

Dependent measures consisted of ratings of the person in the wheelchair on 19 seven-point scales. (See Appendix B for questionnaires) The rating scales included: (1) twelve ratings of personality characteristics; (2) a measure of liking; (3) a measure of how much they would like to know the person better; and (4) five measures of the behavioral intentions of the subjects toward the person in the wheelchair. The personality characteristics alternately contained positive and negative traits which may be components of liking. The measures of behavioral intentions were a modified version of Triandis's Behavioral Differential (1964) which asked subjects to indicate their willingness to spend time with the target person in a number of ways. This was designed to determine how much interest subjects actually

had in interacting, and what decisions they would make about the level to which the relationship would proceed.

Information Sheet

An information sheet (See Appendix B for Information Sheet) was devised to: (1) find out if the subjects had any prior knowledge about the actors in the videotape; (2) believed that the person in the wheelchair had a disability; and (3) determine if the subject had prior experience with a person who used a wheelchair. The questions were answered by a yes or a no, with an explanation requested if: (1) they had prior knowledge of one or both of the actors; (2) they reported that they did not believe the person had a physical disability; or (3) they reported prior experience with someone close in a wheelchair.

Subjects

The participants in this study were 134 female and male volunteers taking the University of Kansas basic communication courses. Participation was one way of fulfilling course requirements. Data from six subjects was discarded because they recognized one or both of the actors in the videotape. Data were analyzed from 128 Ss, 64 in each method of requesting help condition. Individual cell sizes, based on the sex of the person in the wheelchair and the sex of the subject, ranged from 12 to 20. (See Figure 1)

Design

The design was a 2 x 2 x 2 randomized groups factorial design, with the method of requesting help (direct or implied), sex of the person in the wheelchair, and the sex of the subject as the factors varied. Factors were varied by showing one of the four videotape segments described earlier.

Procedure

The videotape segments were shown to groups ranging in size from two to 15. The Ss were first asked to sign a consent form. (See Appendix B

for Consent Form) Prior to showing the videotape, this paragraph was read to the Ss.

"Following this videotape, you will be asked some questions about your impressions of the two people in the videotape. Since the videotape is very short, it is necessary that you give your full attention to the television screen."

After showing the videotape, the experimenter passed out questionnaires for both actors. (See Appendix B for questionnaires) Care was taken that the questionnaires were randomly distributed with half of the questionnaires having the rating sheet for the female on top; the other half

FIGURE 1
BREAKDOWN OF EXPERIMENTAL CELLS

SUBJECTS	SEX OF PERSON IN WHEELCHAIR	METHOD OF REQUESTING HELP		TOTALS
		DIRECT	INDIRECT	
Female	Female (Same Sex)	17	12	53
	Male (Cross Sex)	12	12	
Male	Female (Cross Sex)	16	20	75
	Male (Same Sex)	19	20	
TOTALS		64	64	128

had the male rating sheet on top. The Ss were given as much time as necessary to complete the questionnaires. After returning the questionnaires, the Ss filled out the information sheets. (See Appendix B for Information Sheet) After collecting the information sheets, the experimenter explained the study and gave the Ss an opportunity to express their views and reactions.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

The dependent measures were analysed in a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design using Student's T-test. Results are based on the difference of the mean ratings of each variable on a seven-point scale. The null hypothesis is that the difference between the means of the two levels of the independent variable is a function of experimental error.

Results will be given comparing the method of requesting help (direct or implied): for all Ss (hypotheses 1a and 1b); male Ss when the person in the wheelchair was female (hypotheses 2a and 2b); male Ss when the person in the wheelchair was male (hypotheses 3a and 3b); female Ss when the person in the wheelchair was male (hypotheses 4a and 4b); and female Ss when the person in the wheelchair was female (hypotheses 7a and 7b). Results will also be given for the methods of requesting help (direct or implied) comparing the sex of the person in the wheelchair (hypotheses 5a, 5b, 6a, and 6b).

Reports of liking are the ratings for: (1) the 12 personality characteristics; (2) the question "Do you think you would like or dislike Angela (or Jim)?"; and (3) a variable created by totaling these 13 ratings. When the personality characteristics were coded, the least possession of the negative traits were assigned the greatest value. In effect, Complaining became Less Complaining, Selfish became Less Selfish etc.

Reports of willingness to interact are the ratings for: (1) the question "Do you think you would like to get to know Angela (or Jim) better?"; (2) ratings of willingness to engage in five different activities ranging from being partners in a game to spending time on a regular basis; and (3) a variable composed of the total of the above six ratings.

The number of Ss who reported that they did not believe the person in the wheelchair had a disability, was nearly equal in both conditions. In the direct method condition, 27 of 64 Ss reported they did not believe; in the implied method condition, 24 of 64 Ss reported they did not believe. The number of Ss who reported prior experience with someone close in a wheelchair was also nearly equal across conditions. In the direct method condition, 18 of 64 Ss reported they had prior wheelchair experience; 19 of 64 in the implied condition reported having prior experience of this type. (See figure 2)

Results for All Ss

T-tests showed that five of the 14 variables for reported liking were significant, including the total of all the liking-related variables. Friendly was significant at .04, Less Complaining at .02, Feels Good About Self at .02, Interesting at .05, and the total of all liking variables was significant at .015. (See Table 1a) The means for all variables for reported liking except "Less Bossy" showed a higher score for the direct method condition than for the implied method.

For the seven variables for reported willingness to interact, none were significant and the means tended only to show a very slight trend towards the direct method of requesting help. (See Table 1b)

Results for Male Ss when a Female was in the Wheelchair

T-tests showed that there were significant differences on two personality characteristics when males were describing a female in the wheelchair using direct requests versus males describing that female using implied requests. Less Bossy, significant at .03, supported the hypothesis. (Implied condition was higher than direct condition.) Less Dependent, significant at .02, was in opposition to the hypothesis. (Direct condition was higher than implied condition.) Personality characteristic Less Manipulative neared significance

FIGURE 2

BREAKDOWN OF SUBJECTS BY REPORTED BELIEF THAT THE PERSON
 IN THE WHEELCHAIR HAD A DISABILITY AND REPORTED PRIOR
 EXPERIENCE WITH SOMEONE CLOSE IN A WHEELCHAIR

DIRECT METHOD					IMPLIED METHOD			
Reported Belief					Reported Belief			
Yes	No	Total	%		%	Total	Yes	No
11	7	18	28%	Prior Experience	30%	19	11	8
26	20	46	72%	No Prior Experience	70%	45	29	16
37	27	64		Total		64	40	24
58%	42%		100%	%		100%	62%	38%

TABLE 1a

COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SCALE RATINGS OF LIKING REPORTED BY ALL SUBJECTS AS A FUNCTION OF DIRECT AND IMPLIED METHODS OF REQUESTING HELP

N= 64 DIRECT, 64 IMPLIED

VARIABLES	METHOD	MEANS ¹	T-SCORE	SIG.
<u>Part I: Personality Characteristics</u>				
Friendly	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.7031</u> ²	2.06	.042
	Implied	5.3125		
Less Complaining	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.2344</u>	2.39	.018
	Implied	3.5313		
Feels Good About Self	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.7031</u>	2.40	.018
	Implied	4.0469		
Less Selfish	<u>Direct</u>	<u>3.8594</u>	1.68	NS
	Implied	3.3594		
Interesting	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.8594</u>	2.01	.046
	Implied	4.3906		
Less Manipulative	<u>Direct</u>	<u>2.8125</u>	0.79	NS
	Implied	2.5781		
Pleasant	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.1406</u>	1.77	NS
	Implied	4.7344		
Less Touchy	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.2031</u>	1.26	NS
	Implied	3.8750		
Caring	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.3750</u>	1.51	NS
	Implied	4.0469		
Less Dependent	<u>Direct</u>	<u>2.9844</u>	1.78	NS
	Implied	2.3594		
Kind	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.1250</u>	1.29	NS
	Implied	4.8594		
Less Bossy	<u>Direct</u>	<u>2.9844</u>	-0.16	NS
	Implied	3.0313		
<u>Part II: Direct Question</u>				
Liking of the Person in the Wheelchair	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.4219</u>	0.55	NS
	Implied	4.2813		
<u>Part III: Composit Variable</u>				
Total of Liking Variables	<u>Direct</u>	<u>55.4063</u>	2.47	.015
	Implied	50.4063		

¹A higher score indicates a more positive rating.

²The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

TABLE 1b

COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SCALE RATINGS OF WILLINGNESS TO
ASSOCIATE REPORTED BY ALL SUBJECTS AS A FUNCTION OF
DIRECT AND IMPLIED METHODS OF REQUESTING HELP

N= 64 DIRECT, 64 IMPLIED

VARIABLES	METHOD	MEANS ¹	T-SCORE	SIG.
<u>Part I: Direct Question</u>				
Willingness to get to Know the Person in the Wheelchair	Direct	4.4219	-0.06	NS
	Implied	<u>4.4375</u> ²		
<u>Part II: Ratings of willingness to</u>				
Be Partners in a Game With Her (Him)	Direct	<u>4.7969</u>	1.61	NS
	Implied	4.2656		
Go Out to Eat at a Restaurant With Her (Him)	Direct	<u>4.7969</u>	0.81	NS
	Implied	4.5313		
Invite Her (Him) to Meet My Friends	Direct	<u>4.8906</u>	1.52	NS
	Implied	4.4219		
Discuss My Personal Problems With Her (Him)	Direct	<u>3.4531</u>	0.04	NS
	Implied	3.4375		
Spend Time With Her (Him) on a Regular Basis	Direct	<u>3.9531</u>	0.80	NS
	Implied	3.7031		
<u>Part III: Composite Variable</u>				
Total of Willingness to Interact Variables	Direct	<u>26.3125</u>	0.95	NS
	Implied	24.7969		

¹A higher score indicates a more positive rating.

²The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

at .06 in support of the hypothesis. (See Table 2a) Most of the means were very close when compared by condition; and no particular trend was evident.

None of the variables for reported willingness to interact were significant and no trend was apparent. (See Table 2b)

Results for Male Ss when a Male was in the Wheelchair

When the male Ss were describing the male in a wheelchair using one of the two methods for requesting help, only one of the personality characteristics, Less Manipulative at .02, was shown to be significant by T-tests. (See Table 3a) All but two of the 14 variables for liking had higher means for the direct method condition than for the implied method condition. However in most cases, the difference in the means was small.

None of the variables for reported willingness to interact were significant for this experimental cell. (See Table 3b) Six of the seven variables had higher means in the direct method condition.

Results for Female Ss when a Male was in the Wheelchair

Females rated the male confederate significantly different on five of the 14 liking-related variables in this cell. The significant variables were personality characteristics Friendly (sig = .05), Feels Good About Self (sig = .03), Pleasant (sig = .004), Caring (sig = .02), and the composite variable (sig = .02). (See Table 4a) The direct condition mean had a higher score in all cases than the implied condition mean; and all but three variables had a T-score greater than one.

No willingness to interact variable was found to differ significantly between conditions. (See Table 4b) All direct condition means were greater than the corresponding implied condition means.

Results for the Implied Method of Requesting Help Comparing the Sex of the Person in the Wheelchair

TABLE 2a

COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SCALE RATINGS OF LIKING REPORTED BY
MALE SUBJECTS FOR A FEMALE IN THE WHEELCHAIR AS A FUNCTION
OF DIRECT AND IMPLIED METHODS OF REQUESTING HELP

(Hypothesis 2a)

N= 16 DIRECT, 20 IMPLIED

VARIABLES	METHOD	MEANS ¹	T-SCORE	SIG.
<u>Part I: Personality Characteristics</u>				
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.8750</u> ²		
Friendly			1.88	NS
	Implied	5.2500		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.2500</u>		
Less Complaining			0.77	NS
	Implied	3.8000		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.2500</u>		
Feels Good About Self			-0.09	NS
	Implied	4.3000		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.3750</u>		
Less Selfish			0.74	NS
	Implied	3.9500		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.9375</u>		
Interesting			0.51	NS
	Implied	4.7000		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>2.5000</u>		
Less Manipulative			-1.94	.061
	<u>Implied</u>	<u>3.6500</u>		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.0625</u>		
Pleasant			0.67	NS
	Implied	4.7500		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.2500</u>		
Less Touchy			0.60	NS
	Implied	3.9500		

¹A higher score indicates a more positive rating.

²The higher mean of the pair is underlined

TABLE 2a (Cont.)

VARIABLES	METHOD	MEANS ¹	T-SCORE	SIG.
Caring	Direct	4.1250	-0.41	NS
	<u>Implied</u>	<u>4.3000</u> ²		
Less Dependent	<u>Direct</u>	<u>3.3750</u>	2.44	<u>.020</u> ³
	Implied	2.0000		
Kind	Direct	4.7500	-0.23	NS
	<u>Implied</u>	<u>4.8500</u>		
Less Bossy	Direct	2.6875	-2.24	.032
	<u>Implied</u>	<u>3.8000</u>		
Part II: Direct Question				
Liking of the Person in the Wheelchair	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.5625</u>	0.12	NS
	Implied	4.5000		
Part III: Composite Variable				
Total of Liking Variables	<u>Direct</u>	<u>55.0000</u>	0.28	8NS
	Implied	53.8000		

¹A higher score indicates a more positive rating.

²The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

³Underlined significance score indicates a reversal of the hypothesis.

TABLE 2b
 COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SCALE RATINGS OF WILLINGNESS TO
 ASSOCIATE REPORTED BY MALE SUBJECTS FOR A FEMALE
 IN THE WHEELCHAIR AS A FUNCTION OF DIRECT
 AND IMPLIED METHODS OF REQUESTING HELP

(Hypothesis 2b)

N= 16 DIRECT, 20 IMPLIED

VARIABLES	METHOD	MEANS ¹	T-SCORE	SIG.
<u>Part I: Direct Question</u>				
Willingness to get to Know the Person in the wheelchair	Direct	4.5625	-0.45	NS
	Implied	<u>4.8000</u> ²		
<u>Part II: Ratings of Willingness to</u>				
Be Partners in a Game with Her	Direct	<u>4.7500</u>	0.09	NS
	Implied	4.7000		
Go Out to Eat at a Restaurant with Her	Direct	<u>4.6250</u>	0.11	NS
	Implied	4.5500		
Invite Her to Meet My Friends	Direct	<u>4.8750</u>	-0.04	NS
	Implied	4.9000		
Discuss My Personal Problems with Her	Direct	3.8125	-0.25	NS
	Implied	<u>4.0000</u>		
Spend Time with Her on a Regular Basis	Direct	3.8125	-0.81	NS
	Implied	<u>4.3000</u>		
<u>Part III: Composite Variable</u>				
Total of Willingness to Interact Variables	Direct	26.4375	-0.26	NS
	Implied	27.2500		

¹A higher score indicates a more positive rating.
²The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

TABLE 3a
 COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SCALE RATINGS OF LIKING REPORTED BY
 MALE SUBJECTS FOR A MALE IN THE WHEELCHAIR AS A FUNCTION
 OF DIRECT AND IMPLIED METHODS OF REQUESTING HELP

(Hypothesis 3a)

N= 19 DIRECT, 20 IMPLIED

VARIABLES	METHOD	MEANS ¹	T-SCORE	SIG.
<u>Part I: Personality Characteristics</u>				
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.3684</u> ²		
Friendly	Implied	5.3500	0.05	NS
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>3.6316</u>		
Less Complaining	Implied	3.4500	0.37	NS
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.6842</u>		
Feels Good About Self	Implied	4.0500	1.32	NS
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>3.3684</u>		
Less Selfish	Implied	3.1500	0.46	NS
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.5789</u>		
Interesting	Implied	4.3500	0.59	NS
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>3.0000</u>		
Less Manipulative	Implied	1.9500	2.51	.016
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.9474</u>		
Pleasant	Implied	4.7000	0.56	NS
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.1053</u>		
Less Touchy	Implied	3.4000	1.81	NS

¹A higher score indicates a more positive rating.

²The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

TABLE 3a (Cont.)

VARIABLES	METHOD	MEANS ¹	T-SCORE	SIG.
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.2632</u> ²		
Caring			0.72	NS
	Implied	4.0000		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>2.9474</u>		
Less Dependent			0.95	NS
	Implied	2.3500		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.1579</u>		
Kind			0.93	NS
	Implied	4.8000		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>2.6842</u>		
Less Bossy			-0.23	NS
	<u>Implied</u>	<u>2.8000</u>		
<u>Part II: Direct Question</u>				
Liking of the Person in the Wheelchair	Direct	4.0526		
			-0.43	NS
	<u>Implied</u>	<u>4.2500</u>		
<u>Part III: Composite Variable</u>				
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>52.7895</u>		
Total of Liking Variables			1.28	NS
	Implied	48.6000		

¹A higher score indicates a more positive rating.
²The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

TABLE 3b

COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SCALE RATINGS OF WILLINGNESS TO
ASSOCIATE REPORTED BY MALE SUBJECTS FOR A MALE IN
THE WHEELCHAIR AS A FUNCTION OF DIRECT AND
IMPLIED METHODS OF REQUESTING HELP

(Hypothesis 3b)

N= 19 DIRECT, 20 IMPLIED

VARIABLES	METHOD	MEANS ¹	T-SCORE	SIG.
<u>Part I: Direct Question</u>				
Willingness to get to Know the Person in the Wheelchair	Direct	4.0526	-0.76	NS
	Implied	<u>4.4000</u> ²		
<u>Part II: Ratings of Willingness to</u>				
Be partners in a Game with Him	Direct	<u>4.9474</u>	1.26	NS
	Implied	4.2000		
Go Out to Eat at a Restaurant with Him	Direct	<u>4.4737</u>	0.61	NS
	Implied	4.1000		
Invite Him to Meet My Friends	Direct	<u>4.5263</u>	1.46	NS
	Implied	3.7500		
Discuss My Personal Problems with Him	Direct	<u>3.5789</u>	0.45	NS
	Implied	3.3000		
Spend Time with Him on a Regular Basis	Direct	<u>3.7895</u>	1.15	NS
	Implied	3.2000		
<u>Part III: Composite Variable</u>				
Total of Willingness to Interact Variables	Direct	<u>25.3684</u>	0.87	NS
	Implied	22.9500		

¹A higher score indicates a more positive rating.

²The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

All of the liking variables had greater mean scale rating scores for the female in the wheelchair as predicted by hypothesis 5a. Only two, however, were significant by T-tests. Personality characteristic Less Manipulative was significant at the .003 level and the composite liking variable was significant at .044. (See Table 5a)

All the variables for reported willingness to interact for the indirect method of requesting help also had greater mean rating scores for the female in the wheelchair. T-tests for three of the seven variables were significant: Willingness to Invite Her(Him) to Meet My Friends was significant at .04; Willingness to Spend Time with Her(Him) on a Regular Basis at .015; and the composite variable at .05. (See Table 5b)

Results for the Direct Method of Requesting Help Comparing the Sex of the Person in the Wheelchair

Almost all liking variables in the direct condition had slightly greater mean scale ratings for the female in the wheelchair in opposition to hypothesis 6a. T-tests showed that one personality characteristic, Less Complaining, was significant in opposition to the hypothesis at .02. (See Table 6a)

All Willingness to Associate variables for the direct method of requesting help were nearly equal for the female or the male in the wheelchair. None were significant by T-tests. (See Table 6b)

Results for Female Ss when a Female was in the Wheelchair

Females differed significantly in their rating of the female confederate on only one of the reported liking variables, the personality characteristic Less Complaining (sig = .03). (See Table 7a) The means as a whole, tended to lean towards the direct condition; but only very slightly.

None of the variables for reported willingness to interact were significant. (See Table 7b)

TABLE 4a

COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SCALE RATINGS OF LIKING REPORTED BY
FEMALE SUBJECTS FOR A MALE IN THE WHEELCHAIR AS A FUNCTION
OF DIRECT AND IMPLIED METHODS OF REQUESTING HELP

(Hypothesis 4a)

N= 12 DIRECT, 12 IMPLIED

VARIABLES	METHOD	MEANS ¹	T-SCORE	SIG.
<u>Part I: Personality Characteristics</u>				
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.8333</u> ²		
Friendly	Implied	5.0833	2.12	.046
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.0000</u>		
Less Complaining	Implied	3.1667	1.24	NS
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.8333</u>		
Feels Good About Self	Implied	3.3333	2.30	.032
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>3.7500</u>		
Less Selfish	Implied	2.6667	1.82	NS
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.0000</u>		
Interesting	Implied	4.0833	1.37	NS
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>2.2500</u>		
Less Manipulative	Implied	1.9167	0.54	NS
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.4167</u>		
Pleasant	Implied	4.1667	3.17	.004
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.0833</u>		
Less Touchy	Implied	4.0000	0.12	NS

¹A higher score indicates a more positive rating.
²The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

TABLE 4a (Cont.)

VARIABLES	METHOD	MEANS ¹	T-SCORE	SIG.
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.8333</u> ²		
Caring			2.60	.016
	Implied	3.5833		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>2.4167</u>		
Less Dependent			0.19	NS
	Implied	2.2500		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.3333</u>		
Kind			1.54	NS
	Implied	4.7500		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>3.5000</u>		
Less Bossy			1.24	NS
	Implied	2.6667		
Part II: Direct Question				
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.6667</u>		
Liking of the Person in the Wheelchair			1.32	NS
	Implied	3.8333		
Part III: Composite Variable				
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>55.9167</u>		
Total of Liking Variables			2.62	.016
	Implied	45.5000		

¹A higher score indicates a more positive rating.

²The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

TABLE 4b
 COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SCALE RATINGS OF WILLINGNESS TO
 ASSOCIATE REPORTED BY FEMALE SUBJECTS FOR A MALE IN
 THE WHEELCHAIR AS A FUNCTION OF DIRECT AND
 IMPLIED METHODS OF REQUESTING HELP

(Hypothesis 4b)

N= 12 DIRECT, 12 IMPLIED

VARIABLES	METHOD	MEANS ¹	T-SCORE	SIG.
<u>Part I: Direct Question</u>				
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.5833</u> ²		
Willingness to get to Know the Person in the Wheelchair	Implied	3.9167	0.86	NS
<u>Part II: Ratings of Willingness to</u>				
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.8333</u>		
Be Partners in a Game with Him	Implied	3.4167	1.67	NS
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.9167</u>		
Go Out to Eat at a Restaurant with Him	Implied	4.6667	0.35	NS
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.0833</u>		
Invite Him to Meet My Friends	Implied	4.3333	1.12	NS
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>3.3333</u>		
Discuss My Personal Problems with Him	Implied	2.4167	1.11	NS
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.1667</u>		
Spend Time with Him on a Regular Basis	Implied	3.0000	1.43	NS
<u>Part III: Composite Variable</u>				
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>26.9167</u>		
Total of Willingness to Interact Variables	Implied	21.7500	1.36	NS

¹A higher score indicates a more positive rating.
²The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

TABLE 5a

COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SCALE RATINGS OF LIKING FOR THE
 IMPLIED METHOD OF REQUESTING HELP REPORTED BY ALL
 SUBJECTS AS A FUNCTION OF THE SEX OF THE
 PERSON IN THE WHEELCHAIR

(Hypothesis 5a)

N= 32 FEMALE, 32 MALE

VARIABLES	SEX ¹	MEANS ²	T-SCORE	SIG.
<u>Part I: Personality Characteristics</u>				
	<u>Female</u>	<u>5.3750</u> ³		
Friendly	Male	5.2500	0.44	NS
	<u>Female</u>	<u>3.7188</u>		
Less Complaining	Male	3.3438	0.84	NS
	<u>Female</u>	<u>4.3125</u>		
Feels Good About Self	Male	3.7813	1.33	NS
	<u>Female</u>	<u>3.7500</u>		
Less Selfish	Male	2.9688	1.84	NS
	<u>Female</u>	<u>4.5313</u>		
Interesting	Male	4.2500	0.82	NS
	<u>Female</u>	<u>3.2188</u>		
Less Manipulative	Male	1.9375	3.05	.003
	<u>Female</u>	<u>4.9688</u>		
Pleasant	Male	4.5000	1.45	NS

¹Refers to the sex of the person in the wheelchair.

²A higher score indicates a more positive rating.

³The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

TABLE 5a (Cont.)

VARIABLES	SEX ¹	MEANS ²	T-SCORE	SIG.
	<u>Female</u>	<u>4.1250</u> ³		
Less Touchy	Male	3.6250	1.27	NS
	<u>Female</u>	<u>4.2500</u>		
Caring	Male	3.8438	1.35	NS
	<u>Female</u>	<u>2.4063</u>		
Less Dependent	Male	2.3125	0.20	NS
	<u>Female</u>	<u>4.9375</u>		
Kind	Male	4.7813	0.47	NS
	<u>Female</u>	<u>3.3125</u>		
Less Bossy	Male	2.7500	1.47	NS
Part II: Direct Question				
	<u>Female</u>	<u>4.4688</u>		
Liking of the Person in the Wheelchair	Male	4.0938	1.02	NS
Part III: Composite Variable				
	<u>Female</u>	<u>53.3750</u>		
Total of Liking Variables	Male	47.4375	2.05	.044

¹ Refers to sex of the person in the wheelchair.

² A higher score indicates a more positive rating.

³ The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

TABLE 5b
 COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SCALE RATINGS OF WILLINGNESS TO
 ASSOCIATE FOR THE IMPLIED¹ METHOD OF REQUESTING
 HELP REPORTED BY ALL SUBJECTS AS A FUNCTION OF
 THE SEX OF THE PERSON IN THE WHEELCHAIR

(Hypothesis 5b)

N=32 FEMALE, 32 MALE

VARIABLES	SEX ¹	MEANS ²	T-SCORE	SIG.
<u>Part I: Direct Question</u>				
Willingness to get to Know the Person in the Wheelchair	Female	<u>4.6563</u> ³	1.07	NS
	Male	4.1288		
<u>Part II: Ratings of Willingness to</u>				
Be Partners in a Game with Her (Him)	Female	<u>4.6250</u>	1.45	NS
	Male	3.9063		
Go Out to Eat at a Restaurant with Her (Him)	Female	<u>4.7500</u>	0.94	NS
	Male	4.3125		
Invite Her (Him) to Meet My Friends	Female	<u>4.8750</u>	2.09	.041
	Male	3.9688		
Discuss My Personal Problems with Her (Him)	Female	<u>3.9063</u>	1.76	NS
	Male	2.9688		
Spend Time with Her (Him) on a Regular Basis	Female	<u>4.2813</u>	2.50	.015
	Male	3.1250		
<u>Part III: Composite Variable</u>				
Total of Willingness to Interact Variables	Female	<u>27.0938</u>	2.01	.049
	Male	22.5000		

¹ Refers to the sex of the person in the wheelchair.

² A higher score indicates a more positive rating.

³ The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

TABLE 6a

COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SCALE RATINGS OF LIKING FOR THE
 DIRECT METHOD OF REQUESTING HELP REPORTED BY ALL
 SUBJECTS AS A FUNCTION OF THE SEX OF
 THE PERSON IN THE WHEELCHAIR

(Hypothesis 6a)

N= 33 FEMALE, 31 MALE

VARIABLES	SEX ¹	MEANS ²	T-SCORE	SIG.
<u>Part I: Personality Characteristics</u>				
Friendly	Male	5.5484	-1.18	NS
	Female	<u>5.8485</u> ³		
Less Complaining	Male	3.7742	-2.39	<u>.020</u> ⁴
	Female	<u>4.6667</u>		
Feels Good About Self	Male	<u>4.7419</u>	0.20	NS
	Female	4.6667		
Less Selfish	Male	3.5161	-1.65	NS
	Female	<u>4.1818</u>		
Interesting	Male	4.7419	-0.71	NS
	Female	<u>4.9697</u>		
Less Manipulative	Male	2.7097	-0.51	NS
	Female	<u>2.9091</u>		
Pleasant	Male	5.1290	-0.07	NS
	Female	<u>5.1515</u>		

¹ Refers to sex of the person in the wheelchair.
² A higher score indicates a more positive rating.
³ The higher mean of the pair is underlined.
⁴ Underlined significance scores indicate a reversal of the hypothesis.

TABLE 6a (Cont.)

VARIABLES	SEX ¹	MEANS ²	T-SCORE	SIG.
Less Touchy	Male	<u>4.0968</u> ³	-0.60	NS
	Female	<u>4.3030</u>		
Caring	Male	<u>4.4839</u>	0.68	NS
	Female	<u>4.2727</u>		
Less Dependent	Male	<u>2.7419</u>	-0.90	NS
	Female	<u>3.2121</u>		
Kind	Male	<u>5.2258</u>	0.79	NS
	Female	<u>5.0303</u>		
Less Bossy	Male	<u>3.0000</u>	0.07	NS
	Female	<u>2.9697</u>		
Part II: Direct Question				
Liking of the Person in the Wheelchair	Male	<u>4.2903</u>	-0.72	NS
	Female	<u>4.5455</u>		
Part III: Composite Variable				
Total of Liking Variables	Male	<u>54.0000</u>	-0.99	NS
	Female	<u>56.7273</u>		

¹ Refers to sex of the person in the wheelchair.

² A higher score indicates a more positive rating.

³ The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

TABLE 6b

COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SCALE RATINGS OF WILLINGNESS TO
ASSOCIATE FOR THE DIRECT METHOD OF REQUESTING HELP
REPORTED BY ALL SUBJECTS AS A FUNCTION OF THE
SEX OF THE PERSON IN THE WHEELCHAIR

(Hypothesis 6b)

N= 33 FEMALE, 31 MALE

VARIABLES	SEX ¹	MEANS ²	T-SCORE	SIG.
<u>Part I: Direct Question</u>				
Willingness to get to Know the Person in the Wheelchair	Male	4.2481	-0.85	NS
	Female	<u>4.5758</u> ³		
<u>Part II: Ratings of Willingness to</u>				
Be Partners in a Game with Her (Him)	Male	<u>4.9032</u>	0.47	NS
	Female	4.6970		
Go Out to Eat at a Restaurant with Her (Him)	Male	4.6452	-0.64	NS
	Female	<u>4.9394</u>		
Invite Her (Him) to Meet My Friends	Male	4.7419	-0.67	NS
	Female	<u>5.0303</u>		
Discuss My Personal Problems with Her (Him)	Male	<u>3.4839</u>	0.13	NS
	Female	3.4242		
Spend Time with Her (Him) on a Regular Basis	Male	3.9355	-0.08	NS
	Female	<u>3.9697</u>		
<u>Part III: Composite Variable</u>				
Total of Willingness to Interact Variables	Male	25.9677	-0.31	NS
	Female	<u>26.6364</u>		

¹ Refers to sex of the person in the wheelchair
² A higher score indicates a more positive rating.
³ The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

TABLE 7a

COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SCALE RATINGS OF LIKING REPORTED BY
FEMALE SUBJECTS FOR A FEMALE IN THE WHEELCHAIR AS A FUNCTION
OF DIRECT AND IMPLIED METHODS OF REQUESTING HELP

(Hypothesis 7a)

N= 17 DIRECT, 12 IMPLIED

VARIABLES	METHOD	MEAN ¹	T-SCORE	SIG.
<u>Part I: Personality Characteristics</u>				
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.8235</u> ²		
Friendly			0.54	NS
	Implied	5.5833		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.0588</u>		
Less Complaining			2.30	.029
	Implied	3.5833		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.0588</u>		
Feels Good About Self			1.34	NS
	Implied	4.3333		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.0000</u>		
Less Selfish			0.78	NS
	Implied	3.4167		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.0000</u>		
Interesting			1.77	NS
	Implied	4.2500		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>3.2941</u>		
Less Manipulative			1.18	NS
	Implied	2.5000		
	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.2353</u>		
Pleasant			-0.20	NS
	<u>Implied</u>	<u>5.3333</u>		

¹ A higher score indicates a more positive rating.
² The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

TABLE 7a (Cont.)

VARIABLES	METHOD	MEAN ¹	T-SCORE	SIG.
Less Touchy	Direct	4.3529	-0.10	NS
	<u>Implied</u>	<u>4.4167</u> ²		
Caring	Direct	4.4118	0.49	NS
	Implied	4.1667		
Less Dependent	Direct	3.0588	-0.03	NS
	<u>Implied</u>	<u>3.0833</u>		
Kind	Direct	5.2941	0.48	NS
	Implied	5.0833		
Less Bossy	Direct	3.2353	1.09	NS
	Implied	2.5000		
<u>Part II: Direct Question</u>				
Liking of the Person in the Wheelchair	Direct	4.5294	0.22	NS
	Implied	4.4167		
<u>Part III: Composite Variable</u>				
Total of Liking Variables	Direct	58.3829	1.21	NS
	Implied	52.6667		

¹ A higher score indicates a more positive rating.

² The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

TABLE 7b
 COMPARISONS OF THE MEAN SCALE RATINGS OF WILLINGNESS TO
 ASSOCIATE REPORTED BY FEMALE SUBJECTS FOR A FEMALE IN
 THE WHEELCHAIR AS A FUNCTION OF DIRECT AND
 IMPLIED METHODS OF REQUESTING HELP
 (Hypothesis 7b)

N= 17 DIRECT, 12 IMPLIED

VARIABLES	METHOD	MEANS ¹	T-SCORE	SIG.
<u>Part I: Direct Question</u>				
Willingness to get to Know the Person in the Wheelchair	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.5882</u> ²	0.30	NS
	Implied	4.4767		
<u>Part II: Ratings of Willingness to</u>				
Be Partners in a Game with Her	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.6471</u>	0.19	NS
	Implied	4.5000		
Go Out to Eat at a Restaurant with Her	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.2353</u>	0.24	NS
	Implied	5.0833		
Invite Her to Meet My Friends	<u>Direct</u>	<u>5.1765</u>	0.53	NS
	Implied	4.8333		
Discuss My Personal Problems with Her	<u>Direct</u>	<u>3.0588</u>	-0.97	NS
	Implied	3.7500		
Spend Time with Her on a Regular Basis	<u>Direct</u>	<u>4.1176</u>	-0.20	NS
	Implied	4.2500		
<u>Part III: Composite Variable</u>				
Total of Willingness to Interact Variables	<u>Direct</u>	<u>26.8235</u>	-0.00	NS
	Implied	26.8333		

¹ A higher score indicates a more positive rating.
² The higher mean of the pair is underlined.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

In the previous chapter, results from the data analyses were presented. This chapter will be a discussion of the implications of those results. The results will be examined first in relation to the original hypotheses, and then possible confounding factors will be considered. Finally, implications for future research will be discussed.

Tests of Hypotheses

Even though there is some support for the original hypotheses, it is obvious that these predictions are not strongly supported. Both parts of each hypothesis will now be examined individually.

Hypotheses 1a and 1b

Hypothesis 1a states that Ss will report more favorable impressions (liking) of a person with a disability who makes direct requests for help than one who makes implied requests. There is some support for this hypothesis since significant differences were found between conditions for five of the 14 variables, including the composite variable. Also, the remaining means generally favored the direct condition, although they were not significant. Even though the difference in the means was always slight (.7 on a 7-point scale was the maximum difference), the large number of Ss (64 in each condition) and the high significance of the total of the variables (.015) lend support for this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1b is that Ss will report more willingness to interact with persons with a disability who makes direct requests than one whom makes implied requests. There was no support for this hypothesis.

Hypotheses 2a and 2b

These hypotheses predicted a result in the opposite direction from the main hypothesis due to sex-role expectations. They dealt with male Ss evaluating the female in the wheelchair. Hypothesis 2a states, males will report more favorable impressions of a female with a disability who makes implied requests than one who makes direct requests. The results for this hypothesis did not support this prediction; although the fact that males reported the female in the wheelchair making implied requests was less bossy and less manipulating but more dependent needs a closer look. In some ways, these results may appear contradictory; but if dependency is desirable, the person who takes responsibility for their own needs (i.e. is less dependent on others) may be thought to be more bossy and manipulative. Apparently sex-role expectations are exerting an influence.

Hypothesis 2b says that male subjects will report more willingness to associate with a female with a disability who makes implied requests than one who makes direct requests. There was no support for this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3a and 3b

These hypotheses state that male Ss will report more favorable impressions (willingness to associate) for males with a disability who make direct requests than for those who make implied requests. With the exception of one liking variable, the personality characteristic Less Manipulative, there was no support for either of these hypotheses. It is an interesting fact that the male Ss significantly (.016) rated the male in the direct condition as less manipulative, yet they rated the female in the implied condition as less manipulative (significance .061).

Hypotheses 4a and 4b

These hypotheses deal with the descriptions of a male with a disability by female Ss. The female subjects rated the male using direct requesting, significantly higher than those who rated the male using implied requests on four personality characteristics; Friendly, Feels Good About Self, Pleasant, and Caring. The total liking variable was also significantly higher for the direct condition. The means of all variables in both hypotheses were greater in the direct condition. It may be noteworthy that the significant personality characteristics for female subjects when rating cross-sex are the positive traits i.e. Friendly, Feels Good About Self, Pleasant, Caring; while the significant variables for males rating cross-sex are all negative personality characteristics i.e. Less Bossy, Less Dependent. Though there is some support for hypothesis 4a, there is none for hypothesis 4b.

Hypotheses 5a, 5b, 6a and 6b

These hypothesis are also based on sex-role expectations. Hypothesis 5a (5b) states, Ss will report more favorable impressions of (willingness to associate with) a female with a disability who makes implied requests than one who makes direct requests. All variables in 5a and 5b had greater mean scale ratings for the female in the wheelchair as predicted. Personality characteristic Less Manipulative and the composite variable were significant for 5a. Three willingness variables for hypothesis 5b: Willingness to Invite Her (Him) to Meet My Friends, Willingness to Spend Time With Her (Him) on a Regular Basis, and the composite willingness variable was significant. Even though there is some support for hypotheses 5a and 5b, hypotheses 6a and 6b were not supported. Hypothesis 6a (6b) says that Ss will report more favorable impressions of (willingness to

associate with) a male with disability who makes direct requests than one who makes implied requests. The only variable that was significant for either hypothesis, the personality characteristic Less Complaining, was significant in opposition to the hypothesis (for the female).

Hypotheses 7a and 7b

According to these hypotheses, female Ss will report more favorable impressions of or more willingness to interact with, a person with a disability who makes direct requests than one who makes implied requests. The only significant variable for either of these hypotheses, was the personality characteristic Less Complaining. Although this variable supported the hypothesis, nothing else was noteworthy and no trend was evident. Hypotheses 7a and 7b were not supported.

Summary

Even though there is some support for some of these hypotheses, it is obvious that these predictions are not strongly supported. The amount of difference in the results of the conditions raises doubts about effect on impression formation of persons with a disability making direct requests. For females it could combine with sex-role expectations and result in a more negative first impression. Even for males, the slightly more positive impression may not justify the effort expended. Female Ss do seem to be more aware of the difference between the methods of requesting help. The greatest increase in positive impressions was when female Ss evaluated males. As mentioned before, female Ss rate more strongly on positive personality characteristics while male Ss rate more strongly on negative personality characteristics. Since direct requesting does more to emphasize positive traits such as independence and self-responsibility, the concentration on positive aspects may help to explain the increase of the effect of direct requesting of female Ss.

The only time Ss reported more willingness to interact with the person in the wheelchair was when the person in the wheelchair was female and conforming to sex-role expectations (indirect method, hypothesis 5b). This could imply the importance of being comfortable because of the interaction progressing along familiar lines; or it could point out a weakness in this study.

Possible Confounding Factors

The possible weaknesses of this study that will be examined in detail are: belief that the person in the wheelchair had a disability, nonverbal messages, and defects in the measurement of first impressions.

Belief that the Person in the Wheelchair had a Disability

The experimenter had expected this factor to be a confounding element in advance. Due to this expectation, a question was included in the information sheet filled out after the impression ratings had been made. Ss who reported they did not believe that the actor in the videotape was disabled, were to be discarded. After the results had been gathered, such a large number (40%) of Ss reported disbelief that it was deemed necessary to examine the possible reasons. The persons who reported that they did not believe may not have understood the full intent of the question, which was to determine whether the Ss at the time of the rating felt that the behaviors reflected the actual personality of the person they were rating. The experimenter believed that the Ss who reported that they did not believe were persons who were reluctant to indicate that they had been fooled (since the question on the information sheet implied that the person in the videotape was only acting). Also, it was believed that these Ss may have felt they were rating a fictitious personality portrayed by an actor. Based on these possible interpretations and the fact that the ratio of

those who reported belief to those who reported disbelief was nearly equal in both conditions, data from both groups were included in the results. Reported belief, however, still remains a possible source of error.

Nonverbal Messages

Use of a written dialogue is the only way to totally eliminate non-verbal variances. Using actors in a videotape is trading realism for a certain amount of extraneous variables. External validity is gained; internal validity is lost. Unfortunately, in this trade it is often impossible to determine the amount of gain or harm. In this study, attempts were made to reduce the possible harm. Experienced actors were used to make the videotape. The actors, who traded roles in the different segments, were old friends who were comfortable with each other. The actors were coached on the necessity of remaining equally assertive in all of the segments so that the only thing varied was the method of requesting help. The actors were allowed to improvise on nonessential dialogue to increase the realism and believability of the videotape segments. In spite of these efforts, it is possible that the segments differed in undesirable ways. The person in the wheelchair may have used voice inflections or mannerisms which convey an attitude of helplessness, resulting in a more negative impression. The person in the wheelchair may have had an attitude which could have been seen as aggressive and commanding which resulted in a more negative impression. The physical attractiveness of the actors both same-sex and cross-sex may have affected the findings, especially hypotheses 5 and 6. If the person in the wheelchair was more confident or more comfortable in one condition than in the other, a higher or lower rating could have resulted. In hypotheses 5 and 6, the female in the wheel-

chair generally was rated higher than the male, although the difference was greater in the implied method condition. Though the experimenter was not aware of any of these confounding elements, their absence cannot be guaranteed.

Defects in the Measurement of First Impressions

First impressions were defined, for the purposes of this study, as reported liking and reported willingness to interact with the subject in the future. If reported liking and reported willingness to interact were components of a first impression, some consistency between the two would be expected. Only for hypothesis 5, did the willingness to interact variables show any significance.

Almost all of the variables that showed significant results were personality characteristics which were thought to indicate liking. It was believed that the possession of the positive aspects of these traits helped produce liking. The correlation of these personality characteristics to liking has not been verified.

Willingness to interact and actual interacting behavior may be quite different. It can be argued that behavioral intentions do not predict future behavior. Therefore, the extent one could generalize the results of this study to the outside world would be questionable.

Implications for Further Research

These results are inconclusive regarding the question of whether direct requesting will help persons with a disability evoke a more positive first impression. These results do, however, point to the possibility of this conclusion. More research is needed to assess the effectiveness of using direct requesting. Some of the problems of this study, such as not believing the direct requesting to be a part of the personality being rated,

can be reduced by improving the methodology. Persons who actually have a disability could be used in the videotape. Erroneous nonverbal messages might be eliminated by videotaping a specific situation, establishing a baseline of first impressions, training the person with a disability to use direct requesting, and then repeating the situations in the first videotape for final evaluation. Components of a first impression, can be determined by a pilot study designed for that specific purpose. Willingness to interact in the future, at least reported willingness to interact as used in this study, may not be a meaningful measurement of actual behavioral intentions and could be dropped or replaced with a measure of actual behavior in a future social encounter.

References

- Comer, R. J., & Piliavin, J. A. The effects of physical deviance upon face-to-face interaction: The other side. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 23 (1), 33-39.
- Davis, F. Deviance disavowal: The management of strained interaction by the visibly handicapped. Social Problems, 1961, 9 (2), 120-132.
- English, R. W. Correlates of Stigma Towards Physically Disabled Persons. In R. P. Marinelli & A. E. Dell Orto (Eds.), The Psychological and Social Impact of Physical Disability. New York: Springer Publishing Company, 1977a.
- English, R. W. The Application of Personality Theory to Explain Psychological Reactions to Physical Disability. In J. Stubbins (Ed.), Social and Psychological Aspects of Disability. Baltimore, Md.: University Park Press, 1977b.
- Goffman, E. Stigma. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Higgs, R.W. Attitudes toward persons with physical disabilities as a function of information level and degree of contact. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1971.
- Katz, I. Stigma: A Social Psychological Analysis. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc., 1981.
- Kleck, R., Ono, H., & Hastorff, A. H. The effects of physical deviance upon face-to-face interaction. Human Relations, 1966, 19 (4), 425-436.
- Richardson, S. A. Handicap, appearance and stigma. Social Science and Medicine, 1971, 5, 621-628.
- Schneider, D. J., Hastorff, A. H., & Ellsworth, P. C. Person Perception. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1979.
- Shears, L. M., & Jensema, C. J. Social acceptability of persons. Exceptional Children, 1969, 36 (2), 91-96.
- Siller, J., Chipman, A., Ferguson, L., & Vann, D. H. Studies in Reactions to Disability XI: Attitudes of the Non-disabled Toward the Physically Disabled. New York: New York University, 1967.
- Snyder, M., Tanke, E. D., & Berscheid, E. Social Perception and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1977, 35 (9), 656-666.
- Stroebe, W., Insko, C. A., Thompson, V. D., & Layton, B. D. Effects of physical attractiveness, attitude similarity, and sex on various aspects of interpersonal attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 18 (1), 79-91.

- Triandis, H. C. Exploratory factor analysis of the behavioral components of social attitudes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 420-430.
- Walster, E., Aronson, V., Abrahams, D., & Rottman, L. Importance of physical attractiveness in dating behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4 (5), 508-516.
- Williams, J. A. Psychological Androgyny and Mental Health. In O. Hartnett, G. Boden & M. Fuller (Eds.), Sex-role Stereotyping. London: Tavistock Publications Ltd, 1979.
- Wright, B. A. Physical Disability-A Psychological Approach. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

APPENDIX A
VIDEOTAPE SCRIPT

VIDEOTAPE SCRIPT

DIRECT METHOD OF REQUESTING HELP

(W) Person in the wheelchair

(N) Physically Normal Person

(N) I don't know! I just hope I'm not too lost.

(W) Well he lost me for the first 15 minutes. (books slide off lap & under table) I dropped my books! Will you pick them up for me?

(N) Sure! (Picks up books and puts them on table.)

(W) Thanks! (Continuing) I thought I was understanding him and then he started going off and when he got into structure, I just got lost.

(N) I did too. When he was talking about structure, do you remember the graph he put on the board? (Turns around and begins to write on the chalkboard.) It began with point of attack and outlined the progression to the climax.

(W) Angela, (or Jim), when you write at the board we're at different levels. Will you sit down beside me?

(N) Sure! (Sits down behind table) Point of attack comes with the addition of characters.

(W) Right, I got that.

(N) Okay, thats the first rule. Now, lets use "The Miser" as an example. The progression starts with the point of attack.

(W) "The Miser" is in that book on the end of the table. (Pointing at the far end of the table) Will you bring it over here?

(N) (Gets up, gets book, gives book to person in the wheelchair and sits down)

(W) (Paging thru book) Thanks! Okay, we're talking about the addition of characters and I guess it's when more people come in, like on the seventh or eighth page or so. Lets see, this is the point of attack.

(N) Which follows the progression to the climax of Act I, when the father comes in with the money box. (Both laugh loudly from tired frustration)

(W) I'm thirsty! There's a coke machine out in the hall. Will you get us some cokes? I'll buy!

(N) I would rather get one later.

(W) Okay, lets go ahead and get this done.

(Videotape segment ends)

VIDEOTAPE SCRIPT

IMPLIED METHOD OF REQUESTING HELP

(W) Person in the wheelchair

(N) Physically normal person

(N) I don't know! I just hope I'm not too lost.

(W) Well he lost me for the first 15 minutes. (books slide off lap and under table) I dropped my books!

(N) Would you like me to pick them up for you?

(W) Sure, if you don't mind?

(N) (Picks up books and puts them on table)

(W) Thanks! (Continuing) I thought I was understanding him and then he started going off and when he got into structure, I just got lost.

(N) I did too. When he was talking about structure, do you remember the graph he put on the board? (Turns around and starts writing on the chalkboard) It began with point of attack and outlined the progression to the climax.

(W) Angela, (or Jim), when you write at the board we're at different levels.

(N) Would you like me to sit down?

(W) If you don't mind?

(N) Sure! (Sits down behind table) Point of attack comes with the addition of characters.

(W) Right, I got that.

(N) Okay, thats the first rule. Now, lets use "The Miser" as an example. The progression starts with the point of attack.

(W) "The Miser" is in that book on the end of the table. (Pointing at the far end of the table)

- (N) Would you like me to get it for you?
- (W) Yes, please!
- (N) (Gets up, gets book, gives book to person in the wheelchair and sits down)
- (W) Thanks! Okay we're talking about the addition of characters and I guess its when more people come in, like on the seventh or eighth page or so. Let's see, this is the point of attack.
- (N) Which follows the progression to the climax of Act I when the father comes in with the money box. (Both laugh loudly from tired frustration)
- (W) I'm thirsty! There's a coke machine out in the hall.
- (N) Would you like a coke?
- (W) Yeah, I'll buy!
- (N) I would rather get one later.
- (W) Okay, let's go ahead and get this done.

(Videotape segment ends)

APPENDIX B

MATERIALS

CODE # _____

Consent Form

The Department of Communication Studies supports the proposition that participants in studies should be informed about the nature of the studies in which they participate. The following information is provided so that you can decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should recognize that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time, entirely without prejudice.

This is a study to investigate initial impressions. You will be asked to watch a short videotape and answer a questionnaire about your impressions of the persons in the videotape.

This study is interested in group differences and not the performance of any one particular individual. Response measures will be identified by a code number. Your name will not be associated with the research findings in any way. Do not hesitate to ask any questions about the study.

Sincerely,

Tom Davis-Bissing
Principal Investigator
(913) 541-8636

Signature of subject agreeing to participate

A copy of this consent form is available upon request.

Below are a number of characteristics that describe people's personalities. For each one, please check the degree that you think Angela has that characteristic.

- | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|
| 1. Friendly: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely | |
| | friendly | | | | not friendly | |
| 2. Complaining: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely | |
| | complaining | | | | not complaining | |
| 3. Feels good
about self: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely | |
| | feels good | | | | does not feel | |
| | about self | | | | good about self | |
| 4. Selfish: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely | |
| | selfish | | | | not selfish | |
| 5. Interesting: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely | |
| | interesting | | | | not interesting | |
| 6. Manipulative: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely | |
| | manipulative | | | | not manipulative | |
| 7. Pleasant: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely | |
| | pleasant | | | | not pleasant | |
| 8. Touchy: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely | |
| | touchy | | | | not touchy | |
| 9. Caring: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely | |
| | caring | | | | not caring | |
| 10. Dependent: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely | |
| | dependent | | | | not dependent | |
| 11. Kind: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely | |
| | kind | | | | not kind | |
| 12. Bossy: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely | |
| | bossy | | | | not bossy | |

CODE # _____

II. Do you think you would like or dislike Angela?

Like very _____
much

Dislike
very much

III. Do you think you would like to get to know Angela better?

Yes, very _____
much

No, not
at all

IV. Frequently we meet someone for the first time, talk with them briefly, and then must make some decisions about whether or not we want to spend more time with that person. Please take a few minutes to think about Angela in this way. Imagine you have just met her, and you are thinking about whether you would like to spend more time with her. Then please check how much you feel you would or would not choose to spend time with Angela in the following ways.

Concerning Angela, I:

would _____ would not
be partners in a game with her

would _____ would not
go out to eat at a restaurant with her

would _____ would not
invite her to meet my friends

would _____ would not
discuss my personal problems with her

would _____ would not
choose to spend time with her on a regular basis

CODE # _____

I. Below are a number of characteristics that describe people's personalities. For each one, please check the degree that you think Jim has that characteristic.

- | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|------------------|
| 1. Friendly: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely |
| | friendly | | | | not friendly |
| 2. Complaining: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely |
| | complaining | | | | not complaining |
| 3. Feels good
about self: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely |
| | feels good | | | | does not feel |
| | about self | | | | good about self |
| 4. Selfish | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely |
| | selfish | | | | not selfish |
| 5. Interesting: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely |
| | interesting | | | | not interesting |
| 6. Manipulative: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely |
| | manipulative | | | | not manipulative |
| 7. Pleasant: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely |
| | pleasant | | | | not pleasant |
| 8. Touchy: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely |
| | touchy | | | | not touchy |
| 9. Caring: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely |
| | caring | | | | not caring |
| 10. Dependent: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely |
| | dependent | | | | not dependent |
| 11. Kind: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely |
| | kind | | | | not kind |
| 12. Bossy: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | Definitely | | | | Definitely |
| | bossy | | | | not bossy |

CODE # _____

II. Do you think
you would like
or dislike Jim?

Like very _____ Dislike
much very much

III. Do you think
you would like
to get to know
Jim better?

Yes, very _____ No, not
much at all

IV. Frequently we meet someone for the first time, talk with them briefly, and then must make some decisions about whether or not we want to spend more time with that person. Please take a few minutes to think about Jim in this way. Imagine you have just met him, and you are thinking about whether you would like to spend more time with him. Then please check how much you feel you would or would not choose to spend time with Jim in the following ways.

Concerning Jim, I:

would _____ would not
be partners in a game with him

would _____ would not
go out to eat at a restaurant with him

would _____ would not
invite him to meet my friends

would _____ would not
discuss my personal problems with him

would _____ would not
choose to spend time with him on a regular basis

CODE # _____



AGE _____

SEX _____

1. Have you ever seen the persons in the videotape before?

Yes _____

No _____

If yes please explain.

2. Did you believe that the person in the wheelchair had a physical disability?

Yes _____

No _____

If no please explain.

3. Have you ever had a family member or close friend who used a wheelchair?

Yes _____

No _____

If yes please explain.