

Summer 1974

ATTITUDE AGREEMENT, TASK
COMPETENCE, INFORMATION SEARCH
AND THE CHOICE OF WORK PARTNERS
IN THE ATTRACTION-SIMILARITY
PARADIGM

ALAN LEE CARSRUD

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.unh.edu/dissertation>

Recommended Citation

CARSRUD, ALAN LEE, "ATTITUDE AGREEMENT, TASK COMPETENCE, INFORMATION SEARCH AND THE CHOICE OF WORK PARTNERS IN THE ATTRACTION-SIMILARITY PARADIGM" (1974). *Doctoral Dissertations*. 1057.
<https://scholars.unh.edu/dissertation/1057>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact nicole.hentz@unh.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

75-43

CARSRUD, Alan Lee, 1946-
ATTITUDE AGREEMENT, TASK COMPETENCE, INFORMATION
SEARCH AND THE CHOICE OF WORK PARTNERS IN THE
ATTRACTION-SIMILARITY PARADIGM.

University of New Hampshire, Ph.D., 1974
Psychology, general

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

ATTITUDE AGREEMENT, TASK COMPETENCE, INFORMATION
SEARCH AND THE CHOICE OF WORK PARTNERS IN
THE ATTRACTION-SIMILARITY PARADIGM

by

ALAN L. CARSRUD

B. A., Texas Christian University, 1968

M. A., University of New Hampshire, 1972

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the University of New Hampshire

In Partial Fulfillment of

The Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate School

Department of Psychology

July, 1974

This thesis has been examined and approved.

Daniel C. Williams
Daniel C. Williams, Assistant Professor of Psychology,
Thesis Chairman

Gregory J. Bertsch
Gregory J. Bertsch, Assistant Professor of Psychology

Leslie A. Fox
Leslie A. Fox, Assistant Professor of Psychology

Stephen J. Weber
Stephen J. Weber, Assistant Professor of Psychology

Phyllis A. Hoff
Phyllis A. Hoff, Associate Professor of Physical
Education

Murray A. Straus
Murray A. Straus, Professor of Sociology

John Terninko, III
John Terninko, III, Assistant Professor of Business
Administration

Date *July 24, 1974*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Daniel C. Williams, Committee Chairman, for his guidance and patience in the development of this research. I wish also to thank Dr. Gordon A. Haaland, who served as the chairman of my master's committee, and who directed this dissertation in its early stages.

I wish to express my thanks to Drs. Bertsch, Fox, Weber, Hoff, Straus, and Terninko, who served as committee members, for their constructive criticism, advice, and support during the formulation and execution of this research project. In addition, I wish to thank the departmental secretaries Ms. Doreen Garland and Ms. Bonnie Moore for their help in preparing the experimental materials.

Finally I wish to thank my wife, Karen, for her constant interest, concern and help during these years in graduate school and my son, Victor, who reminded me of the world outside of academic psychology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES v
ABSTRACT vi
INTRODUCTION 1
METHOD 20
RESULTS 27
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS 41
BIBLIOGRAPHY 52
APPENDICES 56

LIST OF TABLES

1. Analyses of Variance for Maintenance of
Information Seeking 29
2. Attraction Scores and Attraction Certainty
Scores Analysis of Variance 33
3. Social Perception Task Choice and Social
Perception Task Choice Certainty Scores
Analysis of Variance 37
4. Business Decision Task Choice and Business
Decision Task Choice Certainty Scores
Analysis of Variance 40

ABSTRACT

ATTITUDE AGREEMENT, TASK COMPETENCE, INFORMATION
SEARCH AND THE CHOICE OF WORK PARTNERS IN
THE ATTRACTION-SIMILARITY PARADIGM

by

ALAN L. CARSRUD

This study explores the relationship of information seeking to interpersonal attraction as measured by statements of liking and behavioral choices. Specifically, the study examines the effects of attitude similarity (high or low) and type of task salience (high or low) on search for information concerning another's competence to perform a complex business task. In addition, the study examines the effects of attitude similarity (high or low), type of task salience (high or low) and type of task competence information available (high, low, or none) on: 1) statements of attraction, 2) behavioral choice for general social interaction, 3) behavioral choice for interaction on a complex business decision task, and 4) the certainty of the participant as to the correctness of each behavioral choice and the correctness of the participant's statement of attraction.

The results for the information seeking data were inconclusive, although information seeking did occur when participants were allowed to seek information. The results

for statements of attraction yielded no significant main effects nor interpretable interactions. Thus, there was a failure to replicate Byrne's traditional finding that statements of attraction are a linear function of attitude similarity. Several explanations were advanced for this failure to replicate including possible measurement bias in the traditional measurement tool. The certainty measure for the correctness of the statement of attraction also was not significantly influenced by any of the manipulations.

The data analysis for choice behavior for general social interaction yielded inconclusive results. The analysis for choice behavior for the complex business task demonstrated that the type of competence information available affected choice behavior. Incompetent others were chosen less often than were competent others. The measures of certainty of choices were found to be directly influenced by the level of attitude similarity. One explanation advanced to handle the data concerned the traditional measure of attraction used in previous studies. It was argued that this traditional measure may have been more a measure of decisional certainty than a measure of interpersonal attraction.

INTRODUCTION

The earliest studies on interpersonal attraction correlated values, attitudes, personality traits, and behavioral similarity with marriage success and friendship choices (Schiller, 1932; Kirkpatrick and Stone, 1935; Morgan and Remmers, 1935; Newcomb and Svehla, 1937). In general, the results of these studies demonstrated that attitudes provided the most consistent positive relationship to the measures of interpersonal attraction (Richardson, 1939).

Balance Model. The recent history of psychological research on interpersonal attraction started with the studies of Heider (1958) and Newcomb (1961). Heider's (1958) systematic analysis of the influence of pleasure, environmental variables, etc. on verbal statements of attraction, along with Newcomb's (1961) analysis of the acquaintance process in a field setting, have set the tone for the majority of experimentation on attraction for over a decade. Their chief influence can be described in terms of the use of mediational variables and a balance model theoretical approach. With respect to attraction, the balance model states that the relationship of two individuals is determined by the perceived similarity of each person's evaluation of a given object. Individuals are expected to be highly attracted to each other when there is perceived agreement in their evaluations. They are not expected to be attracted to each

other when there is disagreement in their perceived evaluations.

The term "attraction" has taken on a variety of meanings in the research cited above. Heider (1958) measured attraction in terms of responses to scales of liking; Newcomb (1961) used the selection of roommates and sociometric choices; while Walster, Aronson, Abrahams, & Rottman (1966) used dating preferences. Because of increasing concern about the measurement of interpersonal attraction and the desire for systematic observation of the phenomenon, Byrne and his students began a series of research projects which have produced a succession of systematic investigations of attraction. Based initially on the models of cognitive balance proposed by Heider (1958) and Newcomb (1961), Byrne formulated a mathematical model for interpersonal attraction using, as the independent variable, attitude similarity and, as the dependent variable, subjects' responses to scales on the liking and desirability of another as a work partner. These two dependent variables have been grouped together with filler items and labeled the "Interpersonal Judgment Scale" (Byrne, 1971).

Byrne demonstrated in a series of innovative experiments (Byrne and Wong, 1962; Byrne and Nelson, 1965; Byrne and Clore, 1967; Clore and Baldridge, 1968; Byrne, Griffitt, Hudgins, and Reeves, 1969) that attraction as defined by his Interpersonal Judgment Scale is linearly

related to attitude similarity. The original mathematical formulation is (Byrne, 1971, page 70);

. . . $Y = mX + k$, in which Y is attraction, X is (the) proportion of similar attitudes, and m and k are empirically derived constants. Since X is defined as $\Sigma S / (\Sigma [S + D])$ with S and D representing similar and dissimilar attitudes,

$$Y = m \left[\frac{\Sigma S}{\Sigma (S + D)} \right] + k$$

Thus, attraction is seen as a function of the ratio of similar items to the total information available. Byrne and Rhamey (1965) subsequently modified this statement so that the attitude items could be multiplied by a coefficient (M) which corresponded to any particular item's effect on attraction. Thus:

$$Y = m \left[\frac{\Sigma (S \times M)}{\Sigma (S \times M) + \Sigma (D \times M)} \right] + k$$

Attraction is described as a positive linear function of the sum of the weighted similar attitudes divided by the total number of weighted similar and dissimilar attitudes (Byrne, 1971, page 71).

Reinforcement Model. Byrne and Rhamey (1965) demonstrated that other stimuli could have the same effect on attraction that similar and dissimilar attitudes had. Generally, these items were given different weightings than attitudes. For example, attitudes about objects and others were assigned a value of ± 1 , while personal evaluations of oneself were assigned a value of ± 3 . Photographs,

on the other hand, were given only the value of +4. In expanding the original model to allow for a variety of stimuli, Byrne modified the model again. This time instead of labeling items in terms of similarity or dissimilarity which could limit stimuli to a cognitive interpretation, Byrne used a reinforcement notation adapted from Capaldi's (1967) sequential theory of instrumental learning. Thus, any stimulus which had a reinforcement value could be fitted into the model as a determinant of attraction responses, and the following mathematical model was derived:

$$A_X = m \left[\frac{\Sigma(PR_X \times M)}{\Sigma(PR_X \times M) + \Sigma(NR_X \times M)} \right] + k$$

. . . attraction towards X is a positive linear function of the sum of the weighted positive reinforcements (Number x Magnitude) associated with X divided by the total number of weighted positive and negative reinforcements associated with X (Byrne, 1971, p. 104).

In this formula P represents positive reinforcers, N represents negative reinforcers, and M stands for magnitude of reinforcement value. Note that all of the above are mathematical statements for linear regression, and that M and k are constants determined for each study in a post hoc manner. In this sense, the model is better characterized as a descriptive tool than a predictive one.

Byrne's conceptualization of attraction in terms of a traditional reinforcement model, instead of a balance model, allowed examination of possible solutions to the

proverbial question: Are people attracted to each other because they are similar or because they complement each other? Moreover, a reinforcement model allowed for a consistent definition of attraction despite various stimuli of varying values. Likewise, it allowed for a variety of causal variables to be conceptualized and integrated under one theoretical framework. Finally, it enabled the results of various attraction studies (Lamberth, 1970) to be interpreted in learning theory terms (i.e. in terms of a sequential theory of instrumental conditioning, Capaldi, 1967).

Three Concerns with the Attraction-Similarity Paradigm

The traditional model that Byrne has proposed for the attraction-similarity paradigm has done much to unify the area. However, three basic concerns arise concerning the model and some of the assumptions behind it. These concerns are: 1) the emphasis on the trans-situationality of attitudes as reinforcing stimuli; 2) Byrne's use of a scale measure of attraction as the sole indication of "attraction"; and 3) the assumption that the subject is essentially static or passive.

Trans-situationality Concern. Byrne's (1971) conceptualization of attraction in terms of reinforcement requires certain assumptions which generally have been characteristic of some learning theories (Moehl, 1950; Spence, 1956; Capaldi, 1967). For example, many of Byrne's experiments have focused on the trans-situationality of attitude

similarity/dissimilarity as positive and negative reinforcers in discrimination learning tasks (i.e., Golightly and Byrne, 1964; Byrne, Young, & Griffitt, 1966; Byrne and Ervin, 1969). Byrne (1971) has argued that there are three elements involved in attraction:

. . . an independent variable (any stimulus with reinforcing properties), an intervening variable (an implicit affective response), and a dependent variable (any evaluative response such as attraction)(Byrne, 1971, p. 280).

Further, he has argued that:

Any stimulus that can determine evaluative responses has reinforcing properties and hence, can alter the probability of the occurrence of any response with which it is associated (Byrne, 1971, p. 280).

In summarizing the results of many of his experiments, it can be concluded that attitudes are assumed to have reinforcement value independent of the situation in which they occur, even outside the attraction paradigm (Golightly and Byrne, 1964; Byrne, et al., 1966). Essentially Byrne has implied a trans-situationality of reinforcers by fitting together the results of many studies and many subjects.

Premack (1965) has discussed several basic but tenuous assumptions in traditional formulations of reinforcement theory that seem particularly germane to attraction. One of these is the assumption that reinforcers are trans-situational. Attempts to show that a reinforcer is always a reinforcer have usually been pieced together from a variety

of experiments, a process with which Premack (1965) has taken issue. An adequate account of reinforcement requires consideration of situational variables as well. For example, the number of hours an organism is deprived of food would be a situational variable which would significantly effect the probability of various behaviors. Unfortunately, if one demands that reinforcers be trans-situational then these variables are overlooked and, as Premack has argued, one is confronted with a sudden increase in the number of reinforcers and/or the equally confusing expansion of a variety of mediational variables. These mediational variables are used to explain why a reinforcer failed to increase the probability of the occurrence of a given behavior. Both the use of multiple reinforcers or mediators are post hoc attempts to account for the variance introduced by situational variables.

This latter device has been used by Byrne and Clore (1967) in the development of the concept of "effectance" as the motivational state preceding any attraction response. Effectance has been defined as the desire on the part of the participant to make order and sense out of his environment. Palmer (1969) later divided this motivational state into two aspects--the need for vindication (reduced by defending one's position) and the need for evaluation (reduced by seeking correct information regardless of one's previous position). By adopting the vindication aspect of effectance

Palmer (1969) attempted to explain why individuals would ignore similar attitudes held by another when they had information concerning another's intellectual incompetence. That is, when an individual finds an incompetent person with whom he holds common attitudes he ignores the attitudinal information and uses only that information related to incompetence. Palmer (1969) proposed that no one wants to see himself similar to an incompetent, therefore the participant feels vindicated in disliking that person.

Such mediators remain after the fact and can only delay the realization that a trans-situational conception of reinforcement simply cannot handle the data. A solution to this problem has been suggested by Premack (1965). He has argued that reinforcement should not be conceptualized as the property of an object. If instead, it is conceptualized as the relationship between two responses varying in response probability, then the response that is the more probable should reinforce the one that is the less probable if a contingency is arranged so that to perform the more probable response one must perform the less probable response (Premack, 1965). With this operationalization, the need for mediational variables is eliminated and it becomes clear that many reinforcing relationships may be investigated in terms of their situational properties.

In summary, Byrne's model is limited in that it implies that an attitudinal stimulus will have a consistent

effect on attraction in spite of the circumstances in which the attitude is utilized as information. However, it is reasonable to expect that attitude items that appear to be important in some situations will be less important than other types of information in other situations and perhaps might even be ignored in the decisional process as Byrne (1971) as himself shown.

The Measurement Concern. In addition to the trans-situationality concern is the concern of Byrne's reliance on the "Interpersonal Judgment Scale" (Byrne, 1971) as the sole measure of attraction. An important assumption of Byrne's whole series of experiments is that responses to the Interpersonal Judgment Scale are predictive of future behavior. Unfortunately, as a measure, the Interpersonal Judgment Scale may suffer from the very problems faced by attitude measures in general--namely, that of demonstrating a correspondence between measured attitudes and overt behaviors. Both Bem (1972) and Wicker (1969) have discussed this problem fully. Wicker (1969) has argued that in social research there is a need for the study of sources of control of overt behaviors such as situational constraints. Too much emphasis, he feels, has been placed on attitudes. Mischel (1968) has made much of the same argument but in the criticism of the use of "personality traits" to predict behavior.

The Static-Proactive Concern. If individuals were handed all the information concerning others with whom they came into contact, then the study of information seeking behavior would not be needed. Typical of the attraction studies done by Byrne and his students has been the presentation of a set of attitudinal information, with no further information available.

Thus, the active search for information has been a neglected aspect of most of Byrne's studies. However, participants in everyday life rarely receive all the information available concerning another's attitudes or intellectual competence. A method often employed by the individual to gain additional information about another is information search. In no study on interpersonal attraction until Carsrud and Haaland (1972) has the participant been able to determine the amount of information he would receive about another's attitudes.¹ But, active information search on the part of the participant becomes of prime importance if one is to understand the process of attraction.

Carsrud and Haaland (1972) allowed participants to

¹Thibaut and Kelly (1959) have noted that the moment that the participant in an experiment is allowed to determine the type and/or amount of interaction he would have with another individual (real or not), the experimenter loses control over the experimental situation, in exchange for realism. The distinction between the dependent and independent variables becomes weak, and the analysis of the data becomes more difficult, yet more interesting.

seek attitudinal information in addition to that presented to them initially. Essentially, Carsrud and Haaland (1972) attempted to combine the information seeking studies of Lanzetta and Driscoll (1966) with the Byrne attraction research. Byrne and Clore (1967) in their monograph on the hypothesized motivational variables involved in the attraction process, equated their "effectance" motive with Lanzetta and Driscoll's (1966) "uncertainty" motive. Both were seen as the motivation of the organism to organize his environment in an effective manner. Note that uncertainty and effectance were mediational factors. They were inferred from the responses of the individual to given situations and then were used to explain either information search or a given attraction response.

The Carsrud and Haaland (1972) study consisted of two experiments. Study I (Carsrud and Haaland, 1972) examined information seeking within the Byrne attraction-similarity paradigm and found that if the participants were allowed to seek an additional collection of attitude statements supposedly of another student, significantly more would do so than would not. There was no significant correlation between the measures of motivational states (effectance and uncertainty) and information seeking. Nor was the initiation of seeking behavior differentially effected by the degree of attitude similarity. In line

with the research of Byrne (1971), Carsrud and Haaland (1972) identified a significant effect due to attitude agreement (similarity) indicating that attraction was a positive linear function of attitude similarity. Specifically, high agreement led to greater liking. Significantly more participants in Study I stated that the task of making a judgment about another affected their information seeking more than any other factor.

The second study of Carsrud and Haaland (1972) found that statements of attraction were positively related to the percentage of agreement on the attitudes, again in line with the previous Byrne results. However, confusion arose from a significant four way interaction, which indicated that other variables were significantly contributing to the accountable variance. Clearer results were to be found in the data on variables effecting information search: 1) the fewer the number of initial items of information an individual had, the greater the search and 2) the lower the level of interest, the greater the information search. The variables which effected information search and attraction were not the same as those significantly effecting the two motivational states. This raised doubts as to whether uncertainty (or effectance) mediated either attraction or information seeking behaviors. Information seeking was clearly related to the situational factors of amount and type of information and not to any of the mediational constructs examined in the study.

In summary, Carsrud and Haaland (1972) were able to demonstrate that search for additional attitudinal information would occur in the attraction-similarity paradigm. In addition, they found that information-search had a complex effect on attraction. Their results indicated that information seeking and attraction were effected by common variables such as amount of initial information that a person had about another, and whether or not that information had any relevance to the task the participant was asked to do concerning the other person. For example, statements of attraction were negative and the amount of information sought increased when the information available was of low personal interest (low relevance) to the subjects. Carsrud and Haaland (1972) were unable to show any relationship between statements of attraction and the hypothetical motivational states. Likewise, they demonstrated no relationship between the amount of information seeking and the hypothetical motivational states. As Byrne (1971) has shown, a variety of information can affect attraction responses (e.g. attitudes, personal evaluations, adjectives, photographs, etc.). Haaland (1969) has attempted to categorize such information in terms of its sources. Specifically, he has conceptualized information as a source of social influence. Thus, when one seeks information he places himself in a position to be socially influenced. Under this conceptualization, attraction can be viewed as

a response that might better be studied in a social influence paradigm.

Attitudes are one source of information related to the attraction response. There are others that are of interest to this current investigation. Darley and Berscheid (1967) and Berscheid, Boye, & Darley (1968) demonstrated that a change in the situational aspect of an interaction could have a strong influence on attraction. One source of influence here concerned the anticipation of future interaction. Attraction responses toward ambiguously and/or negatively described individuals were evaluated in a more positive manner, when future interaction with those persons was anticipated.

Another type of information that is of interest to this current project is competence information. Both Palmer (1969) and Griffitt and Jackson (1970) have shown that information concerning an individual's scholastic and intellectual competence has a strong influence on the attraction responses of their college subjects. The influence is much the same as Byrne demonstrated for attitude similarity. Griffitt and Jackson (1970) demonstrated that attitude similarity as well as task ability significantly effect the selection of individuals for work positions.

The results of Palmer's (1969) dissertation are of particular interest. They indicated that only when attitudes

were important, did both competence and attitudinal information influence statements of attraction. However, when attitudinal information was irrelevant or unimportant, competence information alone determined the verbal response of attraction. Results also indicated that a highly competent person was seen as less attractive when his attitudes were included, than when they were not included. This occurred even if the other individual's attitudes were highly similar to those of the participant in the experiment. This result raises a question about the additive nature of the mathematical model Byrne (1971) postulated.

Palmer (1969) used a set of mediational variables to account for the non-constant effects of attitudes and competence information. As noted above, such procedure is questionable. In addition, Palmer (1969) did not allow the participants in his experiment to determine if they wanted information on competence. In Palmer's study, subjects were just given information on scholastic and intellectual competence simultaneously with attitudes, a procedure similar to Griffitt and Jackson (1970).

The Attraction Concept Reconsidered. Interpersonal attraction is a classing concept for behavior. It is not a "cause" for that behavior as Jones and Sigall (1971) have implied. While Byrne and Griffitt (1973) have argued that attraction must be viewed as a naming concept for classes of behavior, their argument is often forgotten. Typically,

a response to a verbal questionnaire is labeled as an attraction response while attraction is used as an explanatory variable to account for that response. Clearly, the use of the concept of attraction to explain the behavior initially used to infer the concept is not acceptable. The present study makes a distinction between statements of attraction or liking and overt behavioral choices for social interaction. If there is a relationship between the two, it must be demonstrated and not assumed.

CURRENT STUDY

This study attempts to examine the relationship between scaled verbal statements of attraction and the selection of individuals with whom to interact in both a situation of a general social nature and a situation involving interaction on a complex task. Specifically, it is asked to what extent are attitudes and the search for task competent information important to (1) statements of attraction, (2) the selection of someone with whom to interact socially, and (3) the selection of someone with whom to interact on a complex decision task related to business.

If situational variables control the importance of various types of information, then information search would be controlled not by what effects statements of attraction, but by situational constraints such as the amount of

available information and the importance of the task (Carsrud and Haaland, 1972). In contrast with Palmer (1969), Griffitt and Jackson (1970), and Byrne (1971) it would seem unlikely that all information is processed together. If situations control search behavior, they should likewise control the type of information used in various decision tasks. One need not postulate a set of mediational variables to explain the use of different sets of information in different ways by the same person. Attraction statements require attitudinal information, while task partnership requires competence information.

HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses were tested. An .05 level of significance was observed with respect to the support of these hypotheses unless otherwise stated.

Information Search

- (1) Individuals will seek more task-related competence information when the task is high in salience than when it is low in salience.
- (2) Individuals will seek more task-related competence information when the degree of attitude similarity is high than when it is low.

Verbal Statements of Attraction

- (3) Statements of attraction will be a direct function of degree of attitude similarity.
- (4) For those seeking competence information, the degree of attitude similarity and level of competence information will interact. Specifically, under high attitudinal similarity statements of attraction will be less positive when low competence information is presented than when high competence information is presented. Under low attitudinal similarity, competence information will not influence statements of attraction.

Choice of Other for General Social Interaction

- (5) When an individual is shown to be high in attitude similarity, he/she will be chosen for general social interaction over an individual about whom no such information has been given. By contrast, when attitude similarity is shown to be low, the unknown other will be chosen. In short, choice of another for general social interaction will be a function of attitude similarity alone.

Choice of Other for Specific Decision Task

- (6) When those seeking competence information are shown that another individual is highly

competent, they will choose him/her over an individual about whom they have no information. By contrast, when the individual is shown to be incompetent they will choose the unknown other. In short, for those who seek information, choice of another for the specific decision task will be a function of competence information alone.

METHOD

Design

The experiment took the form of a 2 x 2 x 3 design. There were two levels of attitude similarity (76% agreement; 24% agreement), two levels of task salience (high; low), and three types of task competence information available (high, low, none).

Materials

All participants responded to an initial attitude questionnaire containing 80 attitudinal statements (see Appendix A). The participants received the first portion of that questionnaire containing 34 attitudinal statements allegedly made by another student in the second half of the experiment (see Appendix B).

The competence information about the other student, when available to the participant, consisted of either 31 high competence items, or 31 low competence items similar to those used by Palmer (1969)(see Appendix C). These items were presented via tape recording. Interspersed between each item was an electronically produced sound lasting thirty seconds.²

²The sound had the following physical characteristics: 1) .27 millivolts/ or -11.4 decibels re 1 volt
2) white noise, band limited 10 cycles, 20 KC
3) sweep intensity -19 decibels re 1 volt, center 875 cycles per minute

The sound was generally obnoxious, but not painful to the listener. The sound could be described as a fast whoopee-whoop sound. This particular sound was created in order to make information search somewhat difficult for the participant in the study.

At the end of the second session the experimenter presented each participant with a response booklet. Each booklet contained a sign-up sheet for a business decision task, a certainty measure related to that choice behavior, a sign-up sheet for a social interaction task, a certainty measure related to that choice behavior, a verbal measure of like/dislike, and a certainty measure related to that behavior. The order of these measures were counterbalanced (see Appendix D).

Equipment

The equipment consisted of four individual cubicles each having a separate tape recorder with ear-phones for presentation of competence information. There was an additional tape recorder used for presentation of the experimental instructions. Also located in the room was an urn perking with coffee, cups, sugar, cream, and spoons.

Participants

The participants in the experiment were 120 students at the University of New Hampshire selected from Introductory Psychology classes and advanced Physical Education classes. Ten participants were randomly assigned to each cell of the design (five males and five females). Participants were run in mixed sex groups of four.

Procedure

Session I. Participants were asked to come to a large lecture hall where they filled out the 80 item attitude questionnaire and then were told to sign up for the second portion of the experiment, to be held within the following two weeks. All participants were told that the second portion of the experiment would require an hour and a half of their time.

Session II. Participants arrived at the psychology laboratory building and were seated in a waiting room. Located on the wall were the following three signs:

ALL PARTICIPANTS IN EXPERIMENT 27 WITH
MR. ALAN (TEX) CARSRUD PLEASE BE SEATED
AND WAIT UNTIL CALLED.

ALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION SEMINAR 795
STUDENTS GO TO THE SEMINAR ROOM IN THE
BASEMENT.

ANY PARTICIPANT WHO IS LATE WILL BE
RESCHEDULED.

Each participant was then met by the Experimenter, who, after noting those present, excused himself on the pretext of having to brief some other individuals in the basement seminar room. Shortly thereafter he returned and escorted the participants to the second floor of the building where the second portion of the experiment transpired.

The participants were told to be seated. While the general instructions were being presented by tape

recording, the experimenter gave each participant a set of 34 attitude statements (Appendix B) to which responses had already been made, supposedly by another student. The taped instructions for each experimental condition can be found in Appendix E.

Briefly, the instructions for this section informed the participants that they had been given a portion of an attitude questionnaire filled out by a business administration major. They were then told about two tasks in which they would be participating. One was a complex business task, the other was a general social interaction while having coffee. For those participants who were in the high salience condition, the business task was described as a measure of intellectual ability. For those in the low salience condition, no mention was made of the business task as a measure of intellectual ability. Those participants who were allowed to seek information were told they could do so if they wished, and the information available was related to the other student's ability to perform the business decision task. At the end of the taped instructional set and after all information search had ceased, the experimenter distributed the response booklet. One name on each of the sign up sheets in the booklet was identical to the signature on the 34 item attitude questionnaire. The other signatures were different from each other and from the signature of the student who supposedly

filled out the 34 item questionnaire. If the participant were a male, all the names on the sheets were male; if the participant were a female, all the names on the sheets were female.

After the participant had completed his (her) response booklet (Appendix D) the experimenter offered each participant coffee and then gave a prepared debriefing on the nature of the experiment.

Independent variables

Attitude Similarity. Each individual in the experiment received a bogus 34 item questionnaire, supposedly filled out by a senior business administration major. Either 26 randomly selected items on this questionnaire were similar to the responses made by the participant, or only eight items were similar to those of the participant. Similarity was defined as any response within one unit on the seven point scale (see Appendix A) of the response given by the participant. The greater the similarity, the higher the percentage agreement there was, thus giving the experiment two levels of attitude agreement--76% or 24%.

Task Salience. The salience of a task related to complex business decisions was manipulated by providing half of the participants with the statement that the task was a measure of general cognitive ability and a predictor of academic success. For the remainder of the participants,

the business task had no such salience information. Thus, two levels of salience related to the business task were produced: high (known) salience and low (unknown) salience.

Type of Competence Information Available. The experimental apparatus permitted the control of the type of task competence information available to the participant about the person who supposedly filled out the 34 item attitude questionnaire. Possible information search on the part of two of three groups of participants provided those individuals with information related to the other's ability to perform the business task. These individuals received either high competence information or low competence information. The remaining one-third of the participants had no opportunity to seek and thus received no information as to the competence of the individual who filled out the attitude questionnaire.

Dependent Variables

Instigation of Information Search. This dependent measure was the number of individuals in each search condition that initiated information search. This measure could only be a consequence of the influence of task salience and/or percentage of attitudinal agreement.

Maintenance of Information Seeking. The number of competence related items that the participant sought (0-31) was the measure of the maintenance of search

behavior. This measure could be a consequence of the influence of all three independent variables.

Attraction. The attraction measure was the response to a seven point Likert scale on possible liking for an individual about whom the participant had attitudinal information.

Certainty of Attraction Decision. The certainty measure was the response to a seven point Likert scale pertaining to the certainty of the participant that the attraction decision he or she made was correct.

Social Perception Task (Coffee Session) Choice. This dependent measure was a behavioral choice between a known (i.e. the individual described by the initial questionnaire) and an unknown other for social interaction.

Certainty of Social Perception Task Choice. This measure was a response to a seven point Likert scale pertaining to the certainty of the participant that the choice made was the best one for this task.

Business Decision Task Choice. This measure was the choice between the known (i.e. the individual described by the initial questionnaire) and an unknown other for completing a complex business task.

Certainty of Business Decision Task Choice. This measure was the response to a seven point Likert scale pertaining to the certainty of the participant that the choice made was the best one for that task.

RESULTS

The data analyses for this experiment were grouped into six areas: Saliience Manipulation Check; Information Search; Statements of Attraction; Social Perception Task Choice; Business Decision Task Choice; and General Analyses. Some areas were sub-divided for explanatory purposes.

Saliience Manipulation Check

A separate check was made on the saliience manipulation of the Business Decision Task (N=42). In addition, a comparison was made as to the importance participants imparted to doing well in both tasks. A two way analysis of variance (ANOVA) having two levels of saliience (high and low) and two types of tasks (complex business decision task and social interaction task) yielded no differences between the two tasks (social task-- $\bar{X}=5.1$, business task-- $\bar{X}=4.7$) or between the two saliience manipulations in terms of their rated importance to the participants (low saliience-- $\bar{X}=5.1$, high saliience-- $\bar{X}=5.2$). A copy of the instrument used in this check can be found in Appendix F. This finding makes difficult a test of the first hypothesis which argues that information search should be a direct function of task saliience.

Information Search

Initiation of Information Search. Analysis of those participants who were allowed to seek additional information indicated that significantly more sought

information than did not (57 of 80 participants) ($x^2=14.46$; $p<.001$; $df=1$). When the data for the initiation of search was further analyzed, it indicated a weak but nonsignificant tendency for more males to seek information about task competence than females ($x^2=2.14$; $p<.15$; $df=1$). Even though this tendency was weak, sex was considered as a factor in the subsequent data analyses because of concern with possible differences in information acquisition and processing that might effect other dependent measures. No other factors significantly effected the initiation of information search.

Maintenance of Information Search. Analyses of variance for those who did seek information indicated that the type of competence information available, attitude agreement level, salience manipulation, and sex differences, had no clear cut effects on the maintenance of information search. The significant four-way interaction proved extremely difficult to interpret. Appendix G contains the cell means for information search. The complete analyses for those who did seek information can be found in Table 1. Clearly, the hypothesis (hypothesis 1) that those in the high salience condition would exhibit the greatest search for competence information was not confirmed. However, since the high and low salience preconditions were not successfully established, it cannot be concluded that salience (importance of a task) does not influence search behavior. Likewise, the hypothesis that the greater the attitude

Table 1

Analyses of Variance for Maintenance of Information Seeking

Source	F	df
Competence (A)	1.33	1/64
Sex (B)	.08	1/64
Agreement (C)	1.45	1/64
Saliency (D)	.11	1/64
AB	.24	1/64
AC	2.15	1/64
AD	.42	1/64
BC	2.55	1/64
BD	.22	1/64
CD	.50	1/64
ABC	1.15	1/64
ABD	.61	1/64
ACD	.36	1/64
BCD	.89	1/64
ABCD	3.76*	1/64

* $p < .05$

similarity the more competence information would be sought was not confirmed.

Statements of Attraction

Results for all participants indicated a significant interaction between salience and agreement on statements of attraction ($F=4.65$; $p<.05$; $df=1/96$). This result is interpretable through a simple main effects analysis. This analysis indicated that there was a significant difference between the 76% ($\bar{X}=5.1$) and 24% ($\bar{X}=4.5$) agreement levels in the high salience condition ($F=7.58$; $p<.01$; $df=1/58$), but not in the low salience condition ($\bar{X}=4.7$). In addition, there was a significant four way interaction of sex by competence by salience by agreement ($F=4.62$; $p<.05$; $df=2/96$). This four way interaction makes meaningful interpretation of the results very difficult in terms of the causal effects on statements of attraction. The complete analyses can be found in Table 2.

Statements of attraction for those participants who sought information differed from the results for all participants. There was a significant salience by agreement interaction ($F=8.56$; $p<.01$; $df=1/64$), and a significant three way interaction of sex by agreement by salience ($F=7.24$; $p<.01$; $df=1/64$). These interactions must

be viewed cautiously.³ Although they do not confirm the third or fourth hypothesis they do indicate a possible effect of the importance of situations (salience) on the decisional process involved in verbal statements of attraction.

A simple main effects analysis of the salience by agreement interaction for seekers indicated a significant difference between the high and low salience conditions at the 76% agreement level ($F=5.60$; $p<.05$; $df=1/26$). Attraction scores were higher for the high salience condition ($\bar{X}=5.1$) than for the low salience condition ($\bar{X}=4.6$). A simple, simple main effects analysis on the three factor interaction indicated that for females at the 76% agreement level, high salience led to greater stated attraction ($\bar{X}=5.4$) than did low salience ($\bar{X}=3.9$, $F=8.13$; $p<.05$; $df=1/9$). As has been noted, these results must be viewed

³Because of information search one often obtains unequal cell N's and in the process raises questions concerning the assumption of orthogonality. This violation of the assumption makes interpretation of complex interactions in the ANOVA's extremely difficult. That is, where seekers were the sample ($N=57$) analysis problems could occur because the frequency of seekers in some cells of the design were two and in others five. This caution is noted for all those data analyses where seekers are the sample and where the analyses are concerned with interpretation of various complex interactions.

cautiously. In short, attraction statements appeared to be complexly determined and not a simple function of similarity and competence as predicted in hypotheses 3 and 4.

Attraction Certainty Scores. The results of an analysis of the attraction certainty scores across all participants yielded a significant three factor interaction of salience by agreement by sex ($F=4.10$; $p<.05$; $df=1/96$). These results were difficult to interpret because none of the simple or simple-simple main effects analyses yielded an interpretable result. It is possible that the properties of this scale are questionable. Byrne (1971) noted that simple verbal measures of liking are susceptible to effects such as experimenter demands and subject bias. In addition the current measures of attraction and certainty of the attraction decision have not been correlated with Byrne's traditional measures. The complete analyses can be found in Table 2. When just those participants who sought information were included in the analysis of certainty, there was a significant salience by agreement interaction ($F=4.44$; $p<.01$; $df=1/64$) which likewise was difficult to interpret. The interpretation of the above results for those seeking information was made more difficult because of a significant salience by agreement by sex interaction ($F=7.46$; $p<.01$; $df=1/64$). The simple-simple main effects analyses did not yield interpretable results. This might have been due to unequal numbers of subjects in each cell.

Table 2
 Attraction Scores and Attraction Certainty Scores Analysis of Variance
 All Participants Participants Allowed to Seek
 Information

Source	Attraction		certainty		attraction		certainty	
	F	df	F	df	F	df	F	df
Competence (A)	1.04	2/96	.93	2/96	.34	1/64	.05	1/64
Sex (B)	.61	1/96	.45	1/96	.12	1/64	.05	1/64
Agreement (C)	2.46	1/96	.00	1/96	1.10	1/64	.15	1/64
Salience (D)	.03	1/96	1.66	1/96	.12	1/64	.05	1/64
AB	.70	1/96	2.15	2/96	1.10	1/64	2.68	1/64
AC	1.68	1/96	.27	2/96	3.08	1/64	.00	1/64
AD	.06	2/96	1.16	2/96	.01	1/64	.29	1/64
BC	.15	1/96	.00	1/96	1.10	1/64	.05	1/64
BD	.03	1/96	.84	1/96	1.10	1/64	1.03	1/64
CD	4.65*	2/96	1.66	2/96	8.56**	1/64	4.44*	1/64
ABC	1.45	2/96	.27	2/96	1.10	1/64	.49	1/64
ABD	1.45	2/96	.89	2/96	.34	1/64	1.76	1/64
ACD	2.66	1/96	1.91	1/96	.67	1/64	1.03	1/64
BCD	1.88	1/96	4.10*	1/96	7.24**	1/64	7.46**	1/64
ABCD	4.62*	2/96	2.68	2/96	1.10	1/64	2.68	1/64

* p<.05

**p<.01

The complete analyses summary tables for both the attraction statement scores and for the related certainty measure can be found in Table 2.

It could be concluded that the attraction certainty scores were being influenced in much the same manner as the statements of attraction; namely, that attraction certainty is a complex behavior and/or the scale devised to measure it may not be adequate.

Social Perception Task Choice

The analysis of the choice data for all participants in the experiment demonstrated that significantly more (78 participants) chose the person about whom they had attitudinal and possible competence information ($\chi^2=12.04$; $p<.001$; $df=1$) than chose the person about whom they had no information (42 participants). A chi square for all participants yielded no other significant effects. However, when the same data were analyzed by an analysis of variance, three significant interactions emerged each one more complex than the previous. There was a sex by competence interaction ($F=3.36$; $p<.05$; $df=2/96$), an agreement by sex by competence interaction ($F=3.10$; $p<.05$; $df=2/96$) and a salience by agreement by sex by competence interaction ($F=3.87$; $p<.05$; $df=2/96$). The means for each cell of the design can be found in Appendix G.

The data for only those participants who sought

information yielded different results. Significantly more chose the person with known attitudes (N=39) than chose the unknown other as a partner in the Social Perception Task (N=18, $\chi^2=19.13$; $p<.001$; $df=1$). The chi square analysis yielded a marginally significant sex main effect ($\chi^2=3.62$; $p<.06$; $df=1$). Males who sought information chose the person with known attitudes more often than did the females who sought information. This effect may be related to the aforementioned tendency for more males to initiate search behavior than females.

The sex main effect was not confirmed in the analysis of the data for seekers only. However, two interactions, both having sex as a factor were significant with respect to the choice behavior of those seeking information. There was an agreement by sex interaction ($F=4.90$; $p<.05$; $df=1/64$), and a salience by agreement by sex by competence interaction ($F=4.90$; $p<.05$; $df=1/64$). The latter interaction made meaningful interpretation of the former interaction difficult.

The results failed to confirm the first part of hypotheses 5 that when an individual is shown to be high in attitude similarity he/she will be chosen for general social interaction over an individual about whom no such information has been given. The results likewise did not confirm the second part of the hypothesis: when attitude similarity is shown to be low, the unknown other will be

chosen. In short, the choice of another for general social interaction as a function of attitude similarity alone was not confirmed. It can be concluded from the data that the choice behavior is more complex than previous research has indicated.

Social Perception Task Choice Certainty. The data for all participants yielded a significant effect for agreement ($F=13.51$; $p<.01$; $df=1/96$) and for sex. These results indicated that those participants at the 76% agreement level were more certain of their choices ($\bar{X}=4.8$) than were those at the 24% agreement level ($\bar{X}=3.9$). Likewise, males were more certain of their choices ($\bar{X}=4.6$) than were females ($\bar{X}=4.1$; $F=2.87$; $p<.05$; $df=1/96$).

When the analysis of the certainty measure for the Social Perception Task Choice was limited to those who sought information, the results were similar to those reported above. There was a sex main effect ($F=6.44$; $p<.05$; $df=1/64$). Males were higher in certainty ($\bar{X}=4.9$) than were females ($\bar{X}=3.8$). An agreement main effect ($F=11.65$; $p<.01$; $df=1/64$) was also significant where those at 76% agreement were more certain ($\bar{X}=5.0$) than those at 24% agreement ($\bar{X}=3.9$). A simple-simple main effects analysis indicated that certainty was higher for high competence information ($\bar{X}=4.5$) than for low competence information ($\bar{X}=2.9$) when the task was of high salience and agreement was at the 24% level ($F=6.15$; $p<.05$; $df=1/12$). The complete analyses for the choice behavior

Table 3
 Social Perception Task Choice and Social Perception Task Choice Certainty Scores
 Analysis of Variance

Carsrud

Source	All Participants				Participants Allowed To Seek Information			
	Choice		Certainty		Choice		Certainty	
	F	df	F	df	F	df	F	df
Competence (A)	.55	2/96	.85	2/96	.54	1/64	1.29	1/64
Sex (B)	.17	1/96	3.87*	1/96	.54	1/64	6.44*	1/64
Agreement (C)	.68	1/96	13.51**	1/96	.06	1/64	11.65**	1/64
Saliency (D)	1.53	1/96	.15	1/96	.06	1/64	.19	1/64
AB	3.36	2/96	.78	2/96	2.96	1/64	.00	1/64
AC	1.31	2/96	1.45	2/96	.06	1/64	3.37	1/64
AD	2.68	2/96	.01	2/96	.54	1/64	.00	1/64
BC	.17	1/96	.27	1/96	2.96	1/64	.62	1/64
BD	.68	1/96	.84	1/96	.06	1/64	.37	1/64
CD	.17	1/96	.06	1/96	.54	1/64	1.29	1/64
ABC	3.10*	2/96	.21	2/96	.06	1/64	.19	1/64
ABD	1.57	2/96	.08	2/96	.54	1/64	.06	1/64
ACD	.55	2/96	2.74	2/96	.54	1/64	4.05*	1/64
BCD	2.72	1/96	.27	1/96	4.90*	1/64	.19	1/64
ABCD	3.87*	2/96	1.29	2/96	4.90*	1/64	.62	1/64

* p<.05
 **p<.01

and the related certainty measure can be found in Table 3. It appears that it can be concluded that as attitude similarity increases so does the certainty associated with the decision about general social perception.

Business Decision Task Choice

Significantly more of the participants chose the person about whom they had information as a work partner on the business task than chose the unknown other. That is, 82 of 120 subjects (68%) chose the known other ($\chi^2=16.142$; $p<.01$; $df=1$). When the same choice data for all participants was analyzed by means of an analysis of variance, competence information had a significant effect on choice behavior for the Business Decision Task ($F=3.79$; $p<.05$; $df=2/96$). That is, the low competence person was chosen less often than the high competence person. No other variables affected that choice behavior.

When the choice behavior for the business decision task was analyzed for only those persons seeking information the results were slightly different from those above. The selection of the known other over the unknown other approached significance ($\chi^2=2.982$; $p<.08$; $df=1$). That is, 61% of those that sought information chose the known other. Moreover, competence information significantly affected choice behavior. When competence was high, the choice of the known person was greater; when competence was low, the choice was less frequent ($\chi^2=6.457$; $p<.05$; $df=1$). That is,

when competence information was high the known other was chosen by 78% of the subjects. When competence information was low, the known other was only chosen 40% of the time. The choice data for those seeking information was examined by means of an analysis of variance. Competence had a significant effect on choice behavior ($F=6.06$; $p<.05$; $df=1/64$, low competence $\bar{X}=1.3$; high competence $\bar{X}=1.7$). No other effects proved significant. In conclusion the hypothesis that competence information alone would effect choice behavior in the business decision task was confirmed. When competence was high, choice of the known other was high. When competence was low, the reverse was true.

Business Decision Task Choice Certainty.

Attitudinal agreement significantly affected choice certainty when all participants were included in the analysis ($F=6.54$; $p<.01$; $df=1/96$, 76%- $\bar{X}=4.5$; 24%- $\bar{X}=3.9$). No other effects were demonstrated. For participants who sought information, the results were similar. Agreement significantly affected certainty of the choice behavior ($F=5.94$; $p<.05$; $df=1/64$). The mean score for the 76% agreement subjects was 4.57; for the 24% group the mean score was 3.97. The complete analyses for both the Business Task Choice behavior and the related certainty measure can be found in Table 4. It can be concluded that as attitude similarity increases so does the certainty associated with the decision about the business decision task.

Table 4

Business Decision Task Choice and Business Decision Task Choice Certainty Scores
Analyses of Variance

Carsrud

Source	All Participants (Seekers and Nonseekers)				Participants Allowed To Seek Information			
	choice		certainty		choice		certainty	
	F	df	F	df	F	df	F	df
Competence (A)	3.79*	2/96	.42	2/96	6.06*	1/64	.57	1/64
Sex (B)	1.50	1/96	3.20	1/96	.00	1/64	2.55	1/64
Agreement (C)	1.50	1/96	6.54**	1/96	2.18	1/64	5.94*	1/64
Salience (D)	.00	1/96	.26	1/96	.00	1/64	.85	1/64
AB	1.62	2/96	.37	2/96	.24	1/64	.85	1/64
AC	.87	2/96	.12	2/96	.96	1/64	.17	1/64
AD	.12	2/96	.66	2/96	.24	1/64	.85	1/64
BC	1.49	1/96	.06	1/96	.24	1/64	.00	1/64
BD	2.66	1/96	2.35	1/96	3.87	1/64	.06	1/64
CD	.66	1/96	.06	1/96	.24	1/64	.17	1/64
ABC	2.37	2/96	.81	2/96	3.87	1/64	1.59	1/64
ABD	1.79	2/96	2.07	2/96	2.18	1/64	1.19	1/64
ACD	.54	2/96	.56	2/96	.96	1/64	.06	1/64
BCD	2.66	1/96	.26	1/96	2.18	1/64	2.55	1/64
ABCD	.54	2/96	1.79	2/96	.96	1/64	.17	1/64

* p<.05

**p<.01

40.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This section is organized into four areas: 1) information seeking behavior, 2) statements of attraction and their relationship to information search, 3) the relationship of statements of attraction to choice behavior, and 4) implications for a trans-situational reinforcement model of attraction and the future course of attraction research.

Information Seeking Behavior

The first hypothesis that the greatest information search would occur under the known salience condition was not supported by the analysis of variance results. Thus the causal factors with regard to search behavior remain conjectural, although search behavior obviously occurred. If the Darley and Berscheid (1967) and Berscheid, et al., (1968) findings are correct that future anticipated interaction increased positive attraction ratings, then it is conceivable that future anticipated interaction might increase the subjective evaluation of any task related to that interaction and thus eliminate any information seeking differences. The failure to confirm the second hypothesis that information search would be greatest under high attitude similarity is consistent with Carsrud and Haaland (1972) who found that information search occurred only when there was little information, or if the information held was irrelevant to the task to be performed.

An effect of passing interest is the apparent sex difference in the initiation of information search and the lack of such an effect in the maintenance of this behavior. The difference between males and females in terms of the initiation of search behavior could be related to the nature of the experiment. That is males could be more at ease with the electrical equipment involved in the experiment than are females. Also, the difference could be a cultural norm in which females are not supposed to be concerned with this type of task. However, the latter explanations would not be consistent with the results in terms of the maintenance of search behavior, for there is no main effect for sex. The former explanation would be consistent. Crawford, Williams, and Haaland (1973) found a sex difference with respect to information sending which they related to the norm of reciprocity. There is increasing evidence that in social situations, males and females differ in their information search and sending behaviors.

No matter what gave rise to search behavior on the part of the participants in this experiment, most did seek information about task related competence. It should be noted that competence level did not effect the amount of information search. Thus, if low competence information were perceived to be a negative statement about the other and high competence information were perceived to be a positive statement, the greatest information search

should have occurred in the high competence condition which was not the case. This finding would seemingly be in contradiction to the findings of Golightly and Byrne (1964) that items that elicit positive or negative statements of attraction could be used as positive or negative reinforcers in simple discrimination learning tasks. Likewise, if the attitude items were trans-situational reinforcers, then one should assume greater information search about a similar person than for a dissimilar one. This too was not the case. It is possible that in this study there was differentiation in search behavior because there was no lack of information and that the information sought was relevant to the tasks at hand, an interpretation consistent with Carsrud and Haaland's (1972) results.

Statements of Attraction

The lack of an agreement main effect in this study failed to confirm the hypothesis that attraction is a linear function of attitude similarity. The complex effects of sex, salience, competence, and agreement on statements of attraction are bewildering compared to the rather clear cut agreement effects found by Byrne (1971). This apparent inconsistency might be accounted for by the differences in the scaling of attraction used in this study versus those used by Byrne. Byrne's scale is a summative measure of two, one to seven scales which ask a subjective probability estimate on the part of the participant. The

types of statements used are as follows: 1) "I feel that I would probably like this person very much (Byrne, 1971)" and 2) "I believe that I would very much dislike working with this person (Byrne, 1971)". These two statements are stated much like the certainty measures in this experiment for the attraction decision and the two task choices (see Appendix D). It is conceivable that Byrne is measuring the participant's attribution of certainty with respect to some decision of liking and choice of a work partner, rather than measuring an "attraction decision" per se. That is, the more similar one is to the participant in his attitudes, the better able the participant feels he (she) can predict this other person's behaviors, and thus the more certain he (she) is that he (she) has made a good decision.

This interpretation of Byrne's agreement effect is upheld by the certainty measures related to the two task choices in this experiment. In both cases agreement had a significant effect in the direction predicted for the attraction measure. Also, each certainty measure corresponds to a task that is similar to a part of Byrne's traditional measure. The Social Perception Task's Choice certainty measure related to general liking, while the Business Decision Task's Choice certainty measure relates to the desirability of the other as a work partner. The two phases of Byrne's measure of attraction are important.

This multi-dimensional summative aspect could obscure differences in general liking versus specific preferences for a work partner, which a simple set of behavioral choices would pick up.

This current study did not confirm the hypothesized interaction of agreement and competence which Palmer (1969) found. High attitude agreement combined with low competence information did not yield low verbal attraction ratings. However, this study did find that the competence manipulation influenced choice behavior in the business task, regardless of agreement level. This latter effect tends to weaken the potential criticism that the low competence level was not really perceived as lower in competence than the high competence level. Participants chose the low competent individual less often than they chose the high competent individual for the business decision task. It is possible that the present scale used for measuring verbal attraction was not sensitive. However, this interpretation must remain at the level of conjecture and further work must be done to clarify the interpretation.

Another finding of interest concerns information use. Participants did not use all the information available to them in the manner that Byrne's model might imply. That is, participants did not average all the information together in order to make a decision concerning a verbal statement of attraction or as the basis of behavioral

choices. They did appear to seek and process a variety of information items but not in terms of a model such as Byrne's. It is as if participants catagorized information for use in specific situations rather than "lumping it all together." Participants in the study used competence information as their basis for a behavioral choice in the business decision task. However, that same information seemed to have little consistent effect on the choice behavior for the social perception task. Likewise, competence information had no effect on decisional certainty; yet, attitude agreement did have this effect even when the subject had both attitude and competence information available. In Byrne's averaging model for attraction, if the subject has the information it is all averaged together and plays a role in the decisional process. Yet participants seem able to differentiate situations and utilize information differently in situations asking for different kinds of responses.

Choice Behaviors

Any clear understanding of the choice behavior in the Social Perception Task is unlikely. The results did not confirm the hypothesis that high attitude similarity would cause greater selection of a known other while low similarity would cause less selection of a known other. The results indicated that there were complex interaction effects of the independent variables on the behavior. In addition, there was no clear relationship between verbal

statements of attraction and the behavioral selection for the social perception task. Participants tended to choose the person about whom they knew something. This occurred despite their agreement or disagreement with them and despite the nature of the competence information available. There was a tendency for males who sought information to pick the known person more often than did females. The certainty measures indicated that males were also more certain that they had made good choices than females. Moreover, the higher the agreement level, the more certain the participants were of their choice.

The choice behavior in the Business Task was influenced by competence information regardless of attitudinal agreement. This result indicated that at least for this specific choice agreement on attitudes was irrelevant information. Note that the choice behavior had little relationship to the attraction ratings. Thus, the hypothesis was confirmed that those seeking competence information are most likely to choose the highly competent individual over an unknown other regardless of attitude similarity. By contrast, when the known other is low in competence the subjects will choose the unknown other. It should be noted that in the Social Perception Task, competence interacted with other variables to affect the choice behavior, whereas in the Business Task it had the only significant main effect. The results indicate that while

participants did not use attitudinal agreement as the sole data base for choice behavior in either task, they did use it as a major determinant of decisional certainty. Simply, each choice situation dictated which information was appropriate for that particular decision concerning a behavioral commitment. Information was not processed in terms of the averaging model proposed by Byrne (1971).

Relationship of Statements of Attraction to Choice Behavior

Findings from this experiment support the view of Wicker (1969) and Bem (1972) that verbal measures of attitudes have imperfect correspondence to related nonverbal behavior such as commitment to a behavioral act. The attraction measure in the study did not correlate with the choice in the Social Perception Task, and its correlation with the behavioral choice in the Business Task accounted for only seven percent of the variance, a questionable result in terms of meaningfulness. Also, there was no relationship demonstrated between the choice in one task and the choice in the other. The only relationship between tasks seemed to be that a known individual was preferred to an unknown person. These results create doubt as to the reliability of a single verbal measure of attraction as a predictor of overt behavioral choices, although Moss (1969) has reported a relationship between Byrne's traditional measure of attraction and social choice in a potential dating situation.

In summary, when faced with an unknown alternative participants generally chose someone about whom they knew something, regardless of the nature of that knowledge. However, one exception to this finding occurred. If the known other was of low competence, participants chose him less often than the unknown other in the Business Task.

The certainty measures provided little information about any pre-decisional uncertainty that might have effected the search behavior and subsequent choice behavior. The certainty measures did, however, tend to support the contention that the traditional Byrne measure of attraction might be more a measure of post-decisional certainty than it is a measure of attraction.

Implications

The results of this experiment do not support the concept of an averaging model of information processing as it relates either to statements of attraction or to choice behavior in two specific tasks. Likewise serious doubts have been raised concerning the generalization from verbal statements of attraction to nonverbal behaviors of attraction.

Future research is needed to explore how the concept of reinforcement as an empirical relationship between responses might facilitate research on attraction. This research should focus on those variables that influence both verbal statements of attraction and related nonverbal

behavior. In addition, researchers need to examine the differences between information search when there is anticipated future interaction and when there is not. If the participant in the experiment is to be studied as an active organism the study of attraction will have to expand to include information sending as well as seeking. Byrne (1971) and Carsrud and Haaland (1972) have set the course for a new approach to the study of attraction, one which allows for the richness of the data to be appreciated and analyzed.

If the reinforcement model of attraction is to be useful, studies must be done that focus clearly on the question of the trans-situationality model. This model assumes consistent reinforcement values and does not take into account situational variables. If a Premack model of reinforcement can be applied to attraction research the need for a variety of motivational states currently in vogue may become unnecessary.

Specifically, the next study should be concerned with the role anticipated future interaction has on information search and subsequent attraction behaviors. This could allow for a better understanding of the role that various situations play in search behavior as well as for a better understanding of the decisional behavior involved in interpersonal attraction. Subsequent studies should focus on information sending behavior. What situations cause individuals to send information? How does this information

influence others' attraction toward the sender and the information transmitted in return? This current study, and future studies, should be seen as only the initial steps in the development of a situational model of attraction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, T. W. Introduction to multivariate statistical analysis. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Bem, D. Self-perception: an alternative interpretation of cognitive dissonance phenomena. Psychological Review, 1967, 74, 183-200.
- Bem, D. J. Self-perception theory. In L. Berkowitz (ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 6, New York: Academic Press, 1972, 1-62.
- Berscheid, E., Boye, D., & Darley, J. M. Effect of forced association upon voluntary choice to associate. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 8, 13-19.
- Byrne, D. The attraction paradigm. New York: Academic Press, 1971.
- Byrne, D. Personal communication to author, 1972.
- Byrne, D. and Clore, G. L. Effectance arousal and attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 6, (4, Whole No. 638).
- Byrne, D. and Ervin, C. R. Attraction toward a negro stranger as a function of prejudice, attitude similarity, and the stranger's evaluation of the subject. Human Relations, 1969, 22, 397-404.
- Byrne, D. and Griffitt, W. Interpersonal attraction. In P. H. Mussen and M. R. Rosenzweig (eds.) Annual review of psychology. Palo Alto, California: Annual Reviews Inc., 1973.
- Byrne, D., Griffitt, W., Hudgins, W. & Reeves, K. Attitude similarity-dissimilarity and attraction: generality beyond the college sophomore. Journal of Social Psychology, 1969, 72, 155-161.
- Byrne, D. and Nelson D. Attraction as a linear function of proportion of positive reinforcements. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 659-663.
- Byrne, D. and Rhomey, R. Magnitude of positive and negative reinforcements as a determinant of attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 884-889.

- Byrne, D. and Wong, T. J. Racial prejudice, interpersonal attraction, and assumed dissimilarity of attitudes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 65, 246-253.
- Byrne, D., Young, R. K., & Griffitt, W. The reinforcement properties of attitude statements. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1966, 1, 266-276.
- Capaldi, E. J. A sequential hypothesis of instrumental learning. In K. W. Spence and J. T. Spence (Eds.), The psychology of learning and motivation: advances in research and theory. Vol. 1., New York: Academic Press, 1967, 67-156.
- Carsrud, A. L. and Haaland, G. A. Attraction similarity and information seeking. Eastern Psychological Association Meeting, Boston, April, 1972.
- Clore, G. L. and Baldridge, B. Interpersonal attraction: the role of agreement and topic interest. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 340-346.
- Crawford, J. L., Williams, D. C., & Haaland, G. A. Motivation orientation, sex and the norm of reciprocity as determinants of communication in dyads. American Psychological Association Meeting, Montreal, Canada, August, 1973.
- Darley, J. M., and Berscheid, E. Increased liking as a result of the anticipation of personal contact. Human Relations, 1967, 20, 29-40.
- Golightly, C. and Byrne, D. Attitude statements as positive and negative reinforcements. Science, 1964, 146, 798-799.
- Griffitt, W., and Jackson, T. The influence of information about ability and non-ability on personnel selection decisions. Psychological Reports. 1970, 27, 959-962.
- Haaland, G. A. Information-seeking behavior and sources of influence and conformity. Behavioral Science. 1968, 13, 238-239.
- Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Jones, E. E. and Sigall, H. The bogus pipeline: a new paradigm for measuring affect and attitude. Psychological Bulletin. 1971, 76, 349-364.

- Kirkpatrick, D. and Stone, S. Attitude measurement and the comparison of generations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1935, 19, 564-582.
- Lanzetta, J. T. and Driscoll, J. M. Preference for information about uncertain but unavoidable outcomes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, (1), 96-102.
- Lamberth, J. The effect of sequential variables on performance using attitudinal reinforcers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1970.
- Meehl, P. E. On the circularity of the law of effect. Psychological Bulletin, 1950, 47, 52-75.
- Mischel, W. Personality and assessment, New York: Wiley, 1968.
- Morgan, C. L. and Remmers, H. H. Liberalism and conservatism of college students as affected by the depression. School and Society, 1935, 41, 780-784.
- Moss, M. K. Social desirability, physical attractiveness and social choice. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, 1969.
- Newcomb, T. M. The acquaintance process. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.
- Newcomb, T. M. and Svehla, G. Intra-family relationships in attitudes. Sociometry, 1937, 1, 180-205.
- Overall, J. E. and Klett, C. J. Applied multivariate analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Palmer, J. Vindication, evaluation, and the effect of the stranger's competence on the attitude similarity-attraction function. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1969.
- Premack, D. Reinforcement theory. In D. Levine (ed.) Nebraska symposium on motivation. 1965, Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, Vol. 13, 123-179.
- Richardson, H. M. Studies of mental resemblance between husbands and wives and between friends. Psychological Bulletin, 1939, 36, 104-120.

- Schiller, B. A. A quantitative analysis of marriage selection in a small group. Journal of Social Psychology, 1932, 3, 297-319.
- Spence, K. W. Behavior theory and conditioning. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956.
- Thibaut, J. W. and Kelly, H. H. The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley, 1959.
- Walster, E., Aronson, C., Abrahams, D., & Rottman, Z. Importance of physical attractiveness in dating behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 508-516.
- Wicker, A. W. Attitudes versus actions: the relationship of verbal and overt behavioral response to attitude objects. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 41-78.

APPENDIX A

COLLEGE STUDENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME _____ SEX _____ AGE _____

CAMPUS ADDRESS _____

ACADEMIC STATUS _____

COLLEGE STUDENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

	Disagreement/ Agreement Scale							General/Specific Scale						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I enjoy playing handball and tennis with friends.														
The father should discipline a child physically.														
I would never get a divorce.														
I am against a Catholic being elected President of the United States.														
Men should handle financial matters.														
I opposed the Vietnam war as being murderous.														
I dislike British films with Michael Caine.														
Freshmen should not be allowed cars on campus.														
French is a horrible language to learn.														
An education is a necessity today.														
I like "Oklahoma" and "The King and I"														
Red China should not have been admitted to the U.N.														
I like to read novels.														
I like Picasso's blue period paintings														
I'm opposed to women in military careers as officers.														

COLLEGE STUDENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

	Disagreement/ Agreement Scale							General/Specific Scale						
No woman could handle being a leader.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I never tip a waiter more than 10% of the bill.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I dislike the "Gunsmoke" TV series.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I believe in political parties.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I'm in favor of an emphasis on the social aspects of life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I believe the American way of life is best.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I am in favor of the current grading system in this college.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I believe letter grades in courses should be abolished.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I am in favor of a military draft for women.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I am in favor of smoking for pre-teens.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Fresh air and exercise are important.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Children in a family should be disciplined.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Women today are too aggressive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I feel wars solve world problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I am opposed to state income taxes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

COLLEGE STUDENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

	Disagreement/ Agreement Scale	General/Specific Scale
I enjoy foreign movies.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
One should learn a foreign language.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
A person should have a college education to be successful.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
There is no one true religion.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G

COLLEGE STUDENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

	Disagreement/ Agreement Scale							General/Specific Scale						
Student rebels are traitors to the U.S.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Birth control pills should be available to female students.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Drug users should not be treated as criminals.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Bussing students to integrate eliminates racial attitudes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
There should be a liquor store closer to campus.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Politics is no place for a student.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Course requirements should be made easier.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
The governor should have the power to veto campus speakers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
There should be free bus service to surrounding cities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I feel it is better if people always act on impulse.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I enjoy sports.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
One should ignore group opinions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
College teachers have the right to strike for higher wages.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I am against necking and petting among couples in college.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

COLLEGE STUDENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

	Disagreement/ Agreement Scale							General/Specific Scale						
Racial integration in elementary schools is a mistake educationally.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I think everyone should walk a mile a day.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
It is bad to raise taxes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Science is responsible for many social ills.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Pollution is bad.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Red China should be formally recognized by the U.S.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
The country needs a social revolution.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Marijuana should be legalized in the U.S.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Tax exemptions should be given only for two children.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
The U.S. should grant amnesty to draft dodgers in Canada.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Students should be able to attend college trustee meetings.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Sex should be encouraged.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Universities and colleges are unable to meet student needs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I enjoy comedians who use political satire.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I like music.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I enjoy pets.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

COLLEGE STUDENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

	Disagreement/ Agreement Scale	General/Specific Scale
I enjoy working.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
I disliked "War and Peace" by Tolstoy.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
I dislike art.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
I dislike cigars.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
If I were married I would never take money from my parents.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
Politicians are honest people.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
I like to watch "I LOVE LUCY" reruns on TV.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
Students should be allowed to smoke in lecture halls.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
Education needs additional support.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
President Nixon should silence Spiro Agnew on press matters.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
Colleges should not get involved in political issues.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
Capitalism is the best possible economic system for the U.S.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
The Student Union should be open 24 hours a day.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
Capital punishment is bad.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
The war in Vietnam could have ended a long time ago.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
I believe leaders are right.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G

APPENDIX B

COLLEGE STUDENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME _____ SEX _____ AGE _____

CAMPUS ADDRESS _____

ACADEMIC STATUS _____

COLLEGE STUDENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

	Disagreement/ Agreement Scale	General/Specific Scale
I enjoy playing handball and tennis with friends.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
The father should discipline a child physically.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
I would never get a divorce.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
I am against a Catholic being elected President of the United States.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
Men should handle financial matters.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
I opposed the Vietnam war as being murderous.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
I dislike British films with Michael Caine.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
Freshmen should not be allowed cars on campus.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
French is a horrible language to learn.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
An education is a necessity today.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
I like "Oklahoma" and "The King and I".	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
Red China should not have been admitted to the U.N.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
I like to read novels.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
I like Picasso's blue period paintings.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
I'm opposed to women in military careers as officers.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G

COLLEGE STUDENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

	Disagreement/ Agreement Scale							General/Specific Scale						
No woman could handle being a leader.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I never tip a waiter more than 10% of the bill.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I dislike the "Gunsmoke" TV series.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I believe in political parties.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I'm in favor of an emphasis on the social aspects of life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I believe the American way of life is best.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I am in favor of the current grading system in this college.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I believe letter grades in courses should be abolished.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I am in favor of a military draft for women.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I am in favor of smoking for pre-teens.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Fresh air and exercise are important.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Children in a family should be disciplined.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Women today are too aggressive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I feel wars solve world problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I am opposed to state income taxes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

COLLEGE STUDENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

	Disagreement/ Agreement Scale	General/Specific Scale
I enjoy foreign movies.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
One should learn a foreign language.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
A person should have a college education to be successful.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G
There is no one true religion.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A B C D E F G

APPENDIX C

High Competence Items (31)

Grade in Introduction to Psychology Course A
 Grade in Investments Course A
 In top ten percent of high school class
 Grade in Marketing Course B+
 Grade in International Trade Course A
 Has a dominant profile on Leary's Interpersonal Checklist
 Has helped run a small business
 Grade in Statistical Decision Making Course A
 Has been accepted in Graduate School
 Demonstrated ability to start and finish projects
 related to major area
 Grade in Business Law course A
 In top quarter of majors in Business Administration
 Grade in Organizational Psychology course B+
 Grade in Calculus course A
 Is high in self confidence as shown on the California
 Personality Test
 Grade in Introduction to Government course B+
 Family owns a business
 Has a grade point average of 3.6
 Grade in Business Policy course A
 Did well in Junior Achievement in High School
 Grade in Labor Economics course B
 Grade in Introduction to Political Science course A
 Scholastic Aptitude Test verbal score 720
 Can speak two languages other than English
 Grade in Quantitative Analysis course A
 Has been elected to the honor society in major area
 Grade in Philosophy of Ethics course A
 Had a 3.5 grade point average for the freshman year
 Grade in Introduction to Economics course A
 Grade in Financial Management course B+
 Scholastic Aptitude Test mathematics score 730

Low Competence Items (31)

Grade in Introduction to Psychology course C+
 Grade in Investments course C-
 In bottom fifty percent of high school class
 Grade in Marketing course C
 Grade in International Trade Course C-
 Has a submissive profile on Leary's Interpersonal Checklist
 Has never helped run a small business

Low Competence Items (continued)

Grade in Statistical Decision Making course D+
Has not been accepted to Graduate School
Demonstrated inability to start and finish projects
related to major area
Grade in Business Law Course C-
In bottom quarter of majors in Business Administration
Grade in Organizational Psychology course D
Grade in Calculus course C+
Is low in self confidence as shown on the California
Personality Test
Grade in Introduction to Government course D+
Family does not own a business
Has a grade point average of 2.3
Grade in Business Policy course C-
Did poorly in Junior Achievement in High School
Grade in Labor Economics Course C
Grade in Introduction to Political Science Course C
Scholastic Aptitude Test verbal score 420
Can speak no languages other than English
Grade in Quantitative Analysis course C
Has not been elected to the honor society in his major
area
Grade in Philosophy of Ethics Course C+
Had a 1.8 grade point average for the freshman year
Grade in Introduction to Economics Course C+
Grade in Financial Management Course D
Scholastic Aptitude Test mathematics score 400

APPENDIX D

SIGN UP SHEET FOR BUSINESS DECISION MAKING TASK

Please sign your name below the name of the student with whom you wish to participate in this task.

1. _____	1. _____
2. _____	2. _____

How certain are you that the choice you have just made is the best one for this task?
Respond by checking the space that corresponds to your degree of certainty.

very certain _____; _____; _____; _____; _____; _____; _____; very uncertain

When you have made your responses continue to the next page.

SIGN UP SHEET FOR THE SHORT TERM SOCIAL PERCEPTION TASK
(Coffee session)

Please sign your name below the name of the student with whom you wish to participate in this task.

- | | |
|----------|----------|
| 1. _____ | 1. _____ |
| 2. _____ | 2. _____ |

How certain are you that the choice you have just made is the best one for this task?

Respond by checking the space that corresponds to your degree of certainty.

Very certain _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ very uncertain

When you have made your responses continue to the next page

How do you feel you would like or dislike the person about whom you have attitudinal information?

Respond by checking the space that corresponds to your possible feelings of liking or disliking.

Complete Dislike _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Complete Liking

How certain are you that your judgment on your liking for the other person is an accurate one?

Respond by checking the space that corresponds to your degree of certainty.

very certain _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ very uncertain

APPENDIX E.

VIA TAPE

The study in which you are about to participate has three parts. During the first section we will be concerned with how you as an individual judge others with whom you come into contact. You have been handed a portion of an attitude questionnaire similar to the one that you filled out earlier this semester. However, this questionnaire has been filled out by another student. You will find the name of the student who filled out the questionnaire on the top of the questionnaire. It is most important that you read very carefully each and every attitude statement with the response given by the other student. We have provided you with a copy of the instruction sheet for the questionnaire so that you can determine the meanings of the responses to each item. You now have a few minutes to examine the attitude statements of the other student. Again, be sure to read carefully each and every attitude statement and the student's responses to that statement.

(Pause for four minutes)

Now, I would like to describe the rest of the experiment to you briefly. You have almost completed the first part of this experiment. In the other two parts of this study you will be involved in two different face to face interactions with senior business administration majors

from the Whittemore School of Business and Economics at the University of New Hampshire. One of the interactions will be concerned with making decisions about the operation of a specific company. You will be expected to come to a joint decision with another individual on answers to questions such as:

How much capital should the company invest in raw materials?

How should the company deal with various government regulations on business practices?

How can the company best settle a labor strike in its factory?

Should the company invest in foreign markets?

Many other types of questions relating to business operations will be asked. We are concerned with how people make decisions in this type of task. Are there any questions with respect to this task?

(Pause for ten seconds)

The task I have just described is a measure of general cognitive ability to solve complex decision problems. It is being developed for use by the Whittemore School of Business and Economics as a predictor of undergraduate student success in college and in post-graduation employment. However, the use of this task as a predictor of academic success is not limited to business administration and economics majors as it is a measure of general cognitive

ability. (This paragraph omitted if participant does not receive the known salience manipulation.)

The other task that you will be asked to participate in is one which involves you simply in the interaction with another individual over a cup of coffee in a cubicle in the seminar room in the basement of this building. After you have interacted for fifteen minutes we will ask you to describe the other individual along the dimensions of intelligence, knowledge of current events, personal adjustment, poise, etc. This task is concerned with the accuracy of short term social perception. Are there any questions with respect to this portion of the experiment?

(Pause for ten seconds)

The order in which you will participate in these tasks will be determined by a toss of a coin, half of you will first participate in the business decision making task and the remainder in the social perception task. Each of you will participate in both tasks.

Before participating in these tasks, however, each of you will have to choose another person with whom to interact. You will not be interacting with the other individuals in this room. You will be interacting with students enrolled in Business Administration Seminar 795 who have been asked by their instructor to participate in this experiment. These students, like you, have been given instructions concerning the nature of the experiment. For each of you, three

persons have been selected. All of these persons are senior business administration majors at the University of New Hampshire. One of these persons has given answers to the same attitude questionnaire you answered during the first session of this experiment. You have already seen this person's responses to a portion of that questionnaire. You will be given no information about the other two individuals.

You must choose with whom you wish to interact during each of the two tasks. It is important that you realize that you may choose one person to interact with for both of the tasks, or you may choose a different person for each of the tasks. What you decide to do is completely up to you. You choose the person with whom you wish to interact. The person who has given answers on the attitude questionnaire may be chosen for either or both of the tasks. Or, you may decide not to choose this person for either task. Two other persons have been selected randomly from the business administration seminar as alternative choices. One of these persons has been chosen as an alternative to the student who filled out the questionnaire for the business decision task and the other has been chosen as the alternative for the social perception task.

You will be presented with two sign up sheets, one for the coffee or social perception session, and the other for the business decision task. On each sign up sheet two names appear. One name on each is the same as the name of the

person who filled out the attitude questionnaire. The other is the name of a person randomly selected from the business administration seminar class. When given the two sign up sheets you must place your name below the name of the person with whom you choose to interact.

Again, you are free to decide which of the two individuals you wish to interact with during each task.
(Pause ten seconds)

Before you make your decision you have the opportunity to seek information about the student who filled out the questionnaire you have in your possession. This additional information is related to the student's ability to perform the business decision task that I described earlier. If you feel that you know the student well enough on the basis of the attitudes you have already read, you do not have to seek any additional information. If, however, you would desire to have additional information concerning the student, you may have it. You seek additional information one item at a time. You do not have to seek information if you do not desire to do so. What we are concerned with is that you do what you desire with respect to seeking or not seeking additional information.

To seek additional information, if that is your desire, you must do the following. Note the switch taped to the desk in front of you. This switch controls a tape recorder on which information has been recorded pertaining

to the individual who filled out the attitude questionnaire in your possession. To seek information you turn the switch on your desk till it clicks. There will be a short delay before you will receive the first information item through the earphones on your desk. Interspersed between each item is an electronic timing sound. Please do not be concerned about it as it is used only to pace the information presentation. If you have decided to seek information and have obtained all you desire, then turn the switch off. Once you have turned off the switch, do not turn it on again.

Please note that you should seek only as much information as you desire. You need not seek any additional information or you can seek all the information. Again, seek the amount of information about the other person that you desire.

(Pause until search is completed)

(If the participant does not receive the information seeking alternatives the last three paragraphs are omitted from the instructions.)

The experimenter will now present you with the two sign up sheets, one is for the social perception or coffee session, and the other is for the business decision task. Again, feel free to choose the person with whom you would like to interact for each task. Half of you will perform the decision task first and the other half the social perception task first. Please sign below the name of the student with whom you would like to work. In addition you

will find some questions following each of the sign up sheets, please respond to those questions. Once you have responded to a question, do not go back and examine your previous responses. When you are ready to make your choices for the remainder of the sessions of this experiment, fill out the response booklet and await further instructions.

APPENDIX F
(KNOWN SALIENCE)

Evaluation of Two Interpersonal Tasks

Below you will find two tasks described. You are to rate each task by responding to the scale that follows the description of each task. In responding to these tasks consider yourself a participant in an experiment where you are to interact with another individual on each of these two tasks. These will be two face to face interactions with seniors from the Whittemore School of Business and Economics.

TASK I

One of the interactions will be concerned with making decisions about the operation of a specific company. You will be expected to come to a joint decision with another individual on answers to questions such as:

How much capital should the company invest in raw materials?

How should the company deal with various government regulations on business practices?

How can the company best settle a labor strike in its factory?

Should the company invest in foreign markets?

Many other types of questions related to business operations will be asked. We are concerned with how people make decisions in this type of task. The task I have just described is a measure of general cognitive ability to solve complex decision problems. It is being developed for use by the Whittemore School of Business and Economics as a predictor of undergraduate student success in college and in post-graduation employment. However, the use of this task as a predictor of academic success is not limited to business administration and economics as it is a measure of general cognitive ability.

To do well on this task would be:

- _____ very important to me
- _____ moderately important to me
- _____ slightly important to me
- _____ neither important nor unimportant to me
- _____ slightly unimportant to me
- _____ moderately unimportant to me
- _____ very unimportant to me

TASK II

The other task that you will be asked to participate in is one which involves you simply in the interaction with another individual over a cup of coffee in a cubicle in the seminar room in the basement of the experimental building (Hersey House). After you have interacted for fifteen minutes we will ask you to describe the other individual along the dimensions of intelligence, knowledge of current events, personal adjustment, poinsse, etc. This task is concerned with the accuracy of short term social perception.

To do well on this task would be: (check one)

- very important to me
- moderately important to me
- slightly important to me
- neither important nor unimportant to me
- slightly unimportant to me
- moderately unimportant to me
- very unimportant to me

(UNKNOWN SALIENCE)

Evaluation to Two Interpersonal Tasks

Below you will find two tasks described. You are to rate each task by responding to the scale that follows the description of each task. In responding to these tasks consider yourself a participant in an experiment where you are to interact with another individual on each of these two tasks. These will be two face to face interactions with seniors from the Whittemore School of Business and Economics.

TASK I

One of the interactions will be concerned with making decisions about the operation of a specific company. You will be expected to come to a joint decision with another individual on answers to questions such as:

How much capital should the company invest in raw materials?

How should the company deal with various government regulations on business practices?

How can the company best settle a labor strike in its factory?

Should the company invest in foreign markets?

Many other types of questions related to business operations will be asked. We are concerned with how people make decisions in this type of task.

To do well on this task would be: (check one)

- very important to me
- moderately important to me
- slightly important to me
- neither important nor unimportant to me
- slightly unimportant to me
- moderately unimportant to me
- very unimportant to me

TASK II

The other task that you will be asked to participate in is one which involves you simply in the interaction with another individual over a cup of coffee in a cubicle in the seminar room in the basement of the experimental building (Hersey House). After you have interacted for fifteen minutes we will ask you to describe the other individual along the dimensions of intelligence, knowledge of current events, personal adjustment, poise, etc. This task is concerned with the accuracy of short term social perception.

To do well on this task would be: (check one)

- very important to me
- moderately important to me
- slightly important to me
- neither important nor unimportant to me
- slightly unimportant to me
- moderately unimportant to me
- very unimportant to me

APPENDIX G.

Information Seeking Amounts - Cell Means (0-31 items)
(five subjects per cell)

Competence		76% agreement		24% agreement	
		male	female	male	female
known salience	high	7.6	13.0	11.4	7.8
	low	8.8	1.6	4.4	11.2
unknown salience	high	13.4	3.0	6.6	9.2
	low	4.4	2.2	8.8	13.0

Attraction Scores - Cell Means (one to seven scale)

known salience	high	4.6	5.0	4.2	4.8
	low	5.2	5.8	4.6	3.6
	no	5.4	4.6	5.0	4.6
unknown salience	high	4.8	3.8	4.6	5.2
	low	4.8	4.0	4.6	5.0
	no	4.8	5.6	5.0	4.4

Attraction Certainty Scores - Cell Means (one to seven scale)

known salience	high	4.6	3.6	4.6	3.2
	low	3.0	5.4	3.8	2.8
	no	4.4	3.0	4.2	3.6
unknown salience	high	3.6	3.4	3.6	4.4
	low	3.6	3.0	3.6	5.2
	no	3.6	3.0	3.0	2.4

Social Perception Task Choice - Cell Means (two point scale;
1=choice of unknown other; 2=choice of known other)

		compe-	76% agreement		24% agreement	
		tence	male	female	male	female
Known Sali-	high		1.8	1.8	1.8	1.4
	low		1.6	1.6	1.4	1.6
	no		1.8	2.0	1.8	1.6
Unknown Sali-	high		2.0	1.2	1.6	2.0
	low		1.8	1.6	1.6	1.8
	no		1.2	2.0	1.2	1.4
<hr/>						
Social Perception Task Certainty - Cell means (1-7 scale)						
Known Sali-	high		5.0	4.0	4.8	3.8
	low		6.4	5.4	3.8	3.2
	no		5.0	4.0	4.0	4.2
Unknown Sali-	high		5.2	4.0	3.8	4.0
	low		5.2	4.6	4.6	4.0
	no		4.4	5.4	3.8	3.4
<hr/>						
Business Task Choice - Cell Means (two point scale 1=choice of unknown other; 2=choice of known other)						
Known Sali-	high		1.8	2.0	1.4	2.0
	low		1.4	1.8	1.6	1.2
	no		2.0	1.6	1.8	1.6
Unknown Sali-	high		2.0	1.4	1.8	1.8
	low		1.8	1.6	1.4	1.4
	no		2.0	1.4	1.8	1.8
<hr/>						
Business Task Choice Certainty Score - Cell Mean (1-7 scale)						
Known Sali-	high		5.0	4.6	4.4	3.8
	low		4.8	5.0	4.6	3.4
	no		5.0	3.2	4.6	3.4
Unknown Sali-	high		5.0	4.2	3.6	4.8
	low		4.8	3.8	4.0	3.0
	no		4.0	5.4	3.8	3.6