



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1972

Perception and Awareness of Manipulative Intent

Joseph P. Reser
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Reser, Joseph P., "Perception and Awareness of Manipulative Intent" (1972). *Dissertations*. Paper 1225.
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/1225

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).
Copyright © 1972 Joseph P. Reser

PERCEPTION AND AWARENESS

OF MANIPULATIVE INTENT

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the
Graduate School of Loyola University in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.

Submitted May 22, 1972

by Joseph P. Reser

Biographical Note

The author was born on May 11, 1946, in Chicago, Illinois. He attended highschool at Loyola Academy in Wilmette, graduating in 1964. He began studies as an undergraduate at Loyola University that same year, and received a Bachelor of Science degree, with a major in English, in February, 1968.

The author commenced his graduate studies at Loyola in September of 1968, and qualified for a Master of Science degree in Psychology in February of 1971. Requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree were completed in May, 1972. His studies at Loyola were supported by a research assistantship from the Department of Psychology. He is a member of the American Psychological Association and the Midwest Psychological Association.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to express his gratitude to his research director, Homer Johnson, and the other two members of his dissertation committee, Thomas Petzel and Emil Posavac, for their very helpful advice and guidance during the course of this research. Particular thanks are due Emil Posavac for his time and invaluable assistance at all stages of this endeavor.

Abstract

This research investigated the perception and attitudinal consequences of interpersonal manipulative behavior. The empirical questions asked were three: a) are people generally aware of manipulative tactics on the part of others? b) how do these manipulative attempts influence the person perception process? and c) are there resistive consequences? The experiment involved the actual manipulation of naive target individuals in dyadic interactions with chosen manipulators. The 'manipulation' consisted of an influence attempt in which the chosen manipulator tried to persuade a target subject to agree to an extreme joint position regarding a current and controversial issue (the population problem). This dyadic interaction was followed by measures of awareness, perception, and effectiveness. The chronic manipulateness (Machiavellianism) of subjects was assessed beforehand, and all possible combinations of those scoring high and low on this dimension were represented in the dyads. Predictions based upon Machiavellian configuration and theoretical considerations were generally not supported. The significant and general findings were that individuals engaged in an actual manipulation attempt are viewed no less positively than those not so engaged; that the behaviors associated with a manipulative attempt actually enhance the perception of a chronic manipulator, but detract from the perception of a not-very-manipulative individual; and that manipulators, both chronic or otherwise, are generally quite successful, at least in the limited interaction situation investigated.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract	iv
Introduction	1
Method	15
Results	19
Discussion	32
Conclusion	39
Bibliography	40
Appendix	42

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Mean Manipulator Effectiveness Scores	20
2. Analyses of Variance for Mean Ratings of Manipulators	22
3. Target Individual Response Pattern to Post-interaction Questionnaire	27
4. Point-biserial Correlations between Awareness and Other Dependent Measures	29
5. Mean Ratings of Manipulator by Condition	31

Introduction

A growing number of recent investigations have been addressed to the topic of interpersonal manipulation (Christie & Geis, 1970). This has been conceptualized as a dimension of behavior on which people tend to differ considerably, and which has its base in the actual personality style of the individual. Those individuals who are relatively sophisticated in the processing and use of interpersonal and situational cues are characterized as having a "Machiavellian" orientation toward their fellowman, and even the world at large. Interpersonal manipulation is, however, only another name, or perhaps one facet of the whole area of social influence--the analysis is simply made on the level of individual differences, and with respect to the individual who undertakes the influence attempt. The somewhat altered perspective is, nonetheless, a very heuristic one.

Several questions which immediately arise concern the dynamics of the social influence situation comprised of individuals of varying degrees of Machiavellianism. How, for example, does the relative and chronic manipulativeness of two individuals involved in a social influence circumstance affect their assessment and evaluation of each other, and the success of the influence attempt? One might also inquire as to the "typical" reaction to a relatively skilled and subtle manipulative assault. Is awareness of intent on the part of the target person a salient factor in this regard? To what extent are both awareness and reaction dependent upon the Machiavellian characteristics of the individual who is the target of the manipulative attempt, and his possible familiarity with manipulative strategems?

The present investigation was directed to the perception and attitudinal consequences of manipulative behavior. The specific questions asked were whether people are generally aware of manipulative tactics on the part of others, and how these manipulative attempts might influence the person perception process. A person's characteristic Machiavellian orientation was deemed an important consideration, as those individuals who typically manipulate others would theoretically score rather high on this dimension, and it would presumably be a relevant situational factor in any influence attempt. Two ongoing areas of research are particularly relevant to the questions posed. These are the ingratiation studies of Jones et al. (1964, 1965), and the Machiavellian research initiated by Christie and Geis (1970). While the findings from these two areas make some rather contrary predictions regarding the manipulation circumstance, the research nonetheless addresses itself to two important aspects of the social influence situation.

The Jones research falls under the general heading of "person perception". This area is principally concerned with how an individual perceives other persons in his social environment, i.e., how he places them in a meaningful context, interprets cues, and infers enduring dispositions and ad hoc intentions. A principal notion covered in any discussion of person perception is the attribution process, or how one goes from behavioral cues to inferences and conclusions about another person. The theoretical model upon which the Jones research is based is that of attribution theory, which suggests that one's evaluation or liking of another depends not on his behavior per se, but on the inferences we make about his intentions with regard to that behavior. Ingratiation can be seen as one type of

manipulative strategy which will affect this attribution process. The Christie and Geis literature is more particularly concerned with manipulativeness as a personality characteristic, and individual differences in this regard. The High Machiavellian is typically a very successful strategist and opportunist in any open-ended interpersonal situation in which it is advantageous for him to use his manipulative skills. Also, he is held in relatively high esteem by those on whom he works his machinations. In general, the Machiavellian research indicates that manipulative types are viewed fairly positively; the Jones model suggests a very negative reaction. It would seem reasonable, however, to suppose that a target person's perception of a manipulator would depend upon awareness, situational constraints, and the particular Machiavellian configuration involved. It would be helpful to make an intuitive analysis of the typical manipulative situation, in the light of the above factors, before reviewing those research findings relevant to the initial questions posed.

The question of awareness of manipulative intent on the part of the target individual is somewhat complex. The degree of awareness will undoubtedly depend upon at least three factors: a) the skill of the particular manipulator, b) the sensitivity and perceptual acuity of the target individual, and c) any situational constraints which might prejudice perception. If, for example, the perceiver's reaction or behavior is potentially instrumental to the attainment of salient rewards by the stimulus person (high dependency), the perceiver may well be cued in to possible ulterior motives. If, on the other hand, the perceiver has no control over possible rewards for the stimulus party, he is unlikely to suspect manipulative intent. Quite often, of course, a person is not

aware that he is a principal in the attainment of desired consequences for another. In this case one might talk about the perception of "being used", and its slow, or possibly instantaneous, dawning. There is also the consideration of whether the perceiver is simply a bystander or an involved party to the manipulation attempt. This analysis limits itself to involved perceivers (i.e., actual targets to influence attempts), with the concomitant assumption that these individuals will tend to be more susceptible to ego-directed manipulative attempts.

With the above considerations in mind, a general hypothesis which is hazarded is that those individuals who do manipulate others are of necessity skilled in the manipulative arts and are relatively astute observers of human nature. A reasonable conclusion would be that people in general are not very aware of the manipulative strategies employed by the more select population of manipulators. An exception to this would be that those who are themselves of a manipulative disposition would be more alert for, and less susceptible to, manipulative tactics on the part of others. Hence one hypothesis which is tendered is that people are not generally aware of manipulative intent and tactics unless constrained by obvious circumstance to be suspicious of their fellowman.

What is the typical reaction to manipulative intent if detected? The Jones rationale would argue for a rather negative appraisal of the perceived manipulator. This conclusion admits to several qualifications (to be discussed later), but in general possesses an intuitive validity. What are the attitudinal consequences, however, of manipulative strategies which are not detected? One would suspect that these might even enhance

evaluation of the manipulator. Successful flattery would be an obvious example of how a manipulative strategy might positively influence person perception. An attempt to assess the affective consequences of undetected manipulative strategies, however, would have to make finer distinctions than simply positive or negative. An individual might be unaware of an influence attempt on the part of another, but may not particularly like this person. The manipulator, however, may well be respected, and be perceived as being knowledgeable, credible, or forceful. Whereas the undetected manipulative strategy of flattery might lead to increased liking for the flatterer, the tactics of forced compliance might result in perceived strength and respect. The general hypothesis related to these considerations is that, when manipulation is not detected, the manipulator will be viewed positively. This positive perception may be in terms of liking, respect, or both.

A final intuitive consideration has to do with the success of the typical manipulator. A number of factors suggest that he would be quite effective in his influence attempts. Perhaps the principal reason would be that people in general tend to accede to the demands of others, particularly strangers, and even more particularly in the case of implicit rather than explicit demands. [The one qualification which must be ammended here is that the demands must not be viewed as extreme, and must not be too great in number.] Whether this phenomenon is a result of prevailing social norms, or simply a generalized desire to maintain pleasant relationships in social interaction situations, its end result is accomodation. A further consideration is that an individual who has developed a basic manipulative approach to his social environment has most probably

acquired the requisite skills. If not, this behavior would receive little reinforcement from the environment, and would not be developed as an effective strategy for coping with the individual's social world. Hence the general hypothesis with respect to manipulator effectiveness is that the typical manipulator is relatively skilled and subtle in his influence attempts, and would be expected to be reasonably successful.

There are a number of research findings which are relevant to the above analysis of the social influence situation. As mentioned, they stem chiefly from two areas of investigation, the ingratiation studies of Jones et al. (1963, 1964, 1965, 1968) and the Machiavellian research of Christie and Geis (1970). Relevant evidence from the Jones et al. literature has to do with the attribution of ulterior motives to one who employs the strategy of ingratiation. This research stems in part from the hypothesis that slavish agreement or obvious flattery should substantially reduce perceived credibility and sincerity, and subsequent liking for one who would employ such techniques. While the literature has generally supported this hypothesis, the data are not entirely clear. Several of these studies are germane to the initial hypotheses concerning awareness and perception in the typical social influence situation. Jones, Jones, and Gergen (1963) found that uninvolved observers to a filmed ingratiation attempt disliked the speaker who slavishly agreed in a dependent situation, but predicted that the other participant would be taken in by the ingratiator. Jones, Stires, Shaver, and Harris (1968) tested the hypothesis that those who find themselves the targets of ingratiation attempts may be less sensitive to implications of ulterior motives than bystanders exposed to the same interpersonal episodes. This hypothesis was

supported, although there was some tenuous evidence that the actual target individual was able to perceive ingratiation. In addition, agreeable persons (possible manipulators) were liked better than autonomous ones (no suspect behavior), and were perceived as more similar to the perceiver. There was an apparent reluctance on the part of the target person to condemn the other party by inferring ulterior motives, even though circumstantial evidence made this quite likely.

Additional evidence which relates to perception of manipulative attempts stems from a suggestion by Hovland, Janis, and Kelly (1953) that a desire to influence on the part of a communicator will decrease his effectiveness by making him appear relatively untrustworthy. Walster and Festinger (1962) demonstrated that a communication was more effective if the members of an audience felt that the communicator was unaware of their presence, and thus offered some support for Hovland, Janis, and Kelly's suggestion. Mills and Aronson (1965), however, found that an openly stated desire to influence the views of the audience will actually increase the effectiveness of the communicator--if the communicator is attractive. A final and pervasive research finding which is suggestive for the problem of perception is a reported positive correlation between the intended persuasiveness of a communicator, and the judged or perceived persuasiveness of his communication (Mehrabian & Williams, 1969). According to these authors, this is a finding which has found substantial confirmation in the area of attitude communication research. One might conclude from these studies that, while perceived ingratiation or persuasive attempts do not necessarily create a favorable impression, target persons tend to be less aware of these tactics than might be initially supposed, and do not react

as unfavorably as has been thought. In addition, target persons tend to like those individuals more who agree with them; they perceive these persons as more similar to themselves; and they tend to see intended persuasive communications as indeed persuasive.

The literature concerned with Machiavellian personality types reports little which is directly relevant to the perception of actual manipulation attempts, but what is reported is quite suggestive. A general synopsis of current findings is that High Machiavellians (those who score relatively high on the Christie and Geis Machiavellian Scale) manipulate more, win more, are persuaded less, persuade others more, and otherwise differ significantly from Low Machiavellians in situations in which subjects interact face to face with others and there is latitude for improvisation and sufficient incentive for exerting oneself. In addition, High Machiavellians will initiate and control the social structure of mixed-Machiavellian groups; they are preferred as partners, chosen and identified as leaders, judged more persuasive, and appear to direct the tone and content of interaction--as well as the outcome. These characteristics appear to be more true in open-ended situations in which subjects have greater choice of content and strategy, and true only when the High Machiavellians are intrinsically motivated by the situation. There are several studies which bear upon the perception of the High Machiavellian. Geis, Krupat, and Berger (1965) report that High Machiavellians were rated significantly higher than Lows on all of a number of task performances (e.g., effectiveness in presenting ideas) by Low Machiavellian members separately as well as by other Highs in the group, but were not preferred to Lows on a sociometric choice rating by either Highs or Lows. In a further study, in

which High and Low Machiavellian judges judged all possible pairs of High and Low Machiavellian debaters, it was found that Low Machiavellians significantly prefer High Machiavellian over Low Machiavellian debaters, whereas High Machiavellian judges did not discriminate (Novielli, 1968).

An interesting difference between High and Low Machiavellians has to do with accuracy of person perception. High Machiavellians appear to be more accurate in their ability to judge the generalized other (stereotype accuracy), while Low Machiavellians tend to be more sensitive to individual differences (differential accuracy). This difference has been attributed to the cool, detached, and rational orientation of the High Machiavellian as compared to the more personal, empathizing style of the Low Machiavellian. The greater detachment of the High Machiavellian supposedly makes him better able to process situational cues and exploit whatever resources a situation provides. The Low Machiavellian's more personal orientation makes him less successful as a strategist in the course of an interpersonal situation, but more sensitive to others as individual persons. One study which was addressed to these differences concerned detection of deception (Geis & Leventhal, 1966). It was found that Low Machiavellians were superior at discriminating truth from lies in others, and that High Machiavellians were not more successful deceivers. An additional finding, however, was that High Machiavellians were significantly more credible as truth-tellers than were Lows.

In an additional study concerning the accuracy of person perception, Geis, Levy, and Weinheimer (1966) had High and Low Machiavellians predict the Mach scores of target individuals by filling out the Mach IV Scale

as the target person would have. They found that High Machiavellians were more accurate than Lows in assessing another individual's Machiavellianism, and that Lows consistently underestimated the Machiavellianism of the target persons. This finding is somewhat discrepant with the general description above concerning individual differences in accuracy, but may simply reflect the fact that stereotyping can sometimes lead to more accurate inferences about others than does the processing of more detailed information (Tagiuri, 1969). An additional finding reported in this study was that High and Low Machiavellians differed as target persons. High Machiavellians were estimated as less Machiavellian than they actually were, and they were perceived as more transparent, understandable, and predictable, although in fact they were less so, particularly for the Low Machiavellian perceivers.

A final difference between High and Low Machiavellians which is quite relevant to the present consideration is the High Machiavellian's greater resistance to social influence attempts. This was a consistent finding in the Machiavellian research reviewed by Christie and Geis (1970). In three reported social influence situations which involved live, ongoing interactions (Geis, Krupat, & Berger, 1965; Rim, 1966; Harris, 1966), Low Machiavellians privately reported opinion change after face-to-face discussion, whether fellow discussants were High or Low Machiavellians, while High Machiavellians showed no change at all. Christie and Geis attribute this differential susceptibility, in part, to the High Machiavellians generalized suspiciousness towards other people. In another two of the studies reviewed which involved face-to-face influence attempts, and also included a measure of suspiciousness, High Machiavellians were significantly more

suspicious of the confederate than were Lows (Geis, Bogart, & Levy, 1967; Marlowe, Gergen, & Doob, 1966). A further, general, finding and qualification was that High Machiavellians could be persuaded to change their beliefs or comply with requests when given rational justification, or when it was to their obvious advantage to do so, but not when it was a matter of sheer social pressure (Christie & Geis, 1970).

A number of research findings which are indirectly related to the research cited above have to do with Rotter's (1966) construct of "locus of control". It appears that this is a relatively stable personality dimension that has much in common with Christie and Geis' concept of Machiavellianism. The basic notion behind Rotter's construct of Internal/External control relates to whether an individual ascribes behavior-reinforcement contingencies to either himself (hence, "Internal" control) or to the chance factors in an uncontrollable world ("External" control). "Internal" individuals and High Machiavellians share a number of common characteristics. The two most important of these are that they both tend to be very alert and attentive to environmental cues for action, and they are both resistive to subtle influence attempts. It is quite possible that the manipulative orientation of the High Machiavellian may be but a social application of the Internal's predisposition to control the contingencies of reinforcement in his environment. Principal among the research findings related to Rotter's construct are a number of studies concerned with awareness on the part of the perceiver in a social influence attempt. Four such studies strongly supported Rotter's conclusion that "if suggestions or manipulations are not to (the Internal's) benefit, or if he perceives them as subtle attempts to influence him without his awareness,

he reacts resistively" (Rotter, 1966; Crowne & Liverant, 1963; Getter, 1962; Gore, 1962; Strikland, 1962). Doctor (1971), in a subtle behavior shaping experiment, found no difference between Internals and Externals in awareness of the relevant cues involved, but did find that aware Internals resisted the conditioning attempt whereas aware Externals did not. This finding tended to support Rotter's qualification that the Internal individual may only tend to resist subtle influence attempts; if the response demands are explicit, and it is to the Internal's advantage to cooperate, he will readily do so. A reasonable conclusion which might be drawn from these findings is that the High Machiavellian or Internal individual would be relatively successful in the role of manipulator (as he could quickly process and utilize salient cues), but would be both aware and resistive in the role of a target individual under manipulative assault.

The evidence from the various studies cited would seem to be fairly supportive of the initial analysis and the general hypotheses advanced concerning the perception, awareness, and success of manipulative attempts. These general hypotheses were three: a) that people are not generally aware of manipulative attempts, b) that, in the absence of awareness on the part of the target person, manipulators are perceived positively, and c) the typical manipulator is relatively successful in his endeavors. Perhaps the most tenuous of these hypotheses is the first one, as several studies have been cited which suggest that people may be generally aware of influence attempts, but are reluctant to act upon their suspicions (Jones et al., 1968; Rotter, 1966; Doctor, 1971). Also, all of these predictions assume both a skilled manipulator and a "typical" target individual. The evidence from the Machiavellian research would suggest that more

accurate predictions might be made if one was aware of the chronic manipulativeness of the individuals involved in an influence attempt, and the exact nature of the situation.

The experiment designed to test these more specific predictions involved the actual manipulation of naive target individuals in dyadic interactions with chosen manipulators. The "manipulation" consisted of an influence attempt in which a subject chosen to be the manipulator attempted to persuade a naive target subject to agree to a rather extreme position regarding a controversial issue (the current population problem). Machiavellianism was controlled as an independent variable for both the manipulators and the target subjects in the experiment. There were four treatment conditions reflecting the four possible permutations of Machiavellianism (High or Low) and behavioral role (target person or manipulator), and four similar control conditions in which no influence attempt was made. The predictions concerning awareness, perception, and effectiveness for the different experimental conditions were based on the initial analysis made with respect to the social influence situation, and the experimental data cited regarding Machiavellianism.

The predictions for the different experimental conditions depended upon the particular Machiavellian configuration involved. In the case in which both the target person and the manipulator were High Machiavellians, it was predicted that the sensitivity of the target person to manipulative tactics would cancel out the interpersonal skills of the manipulator. Hence it was thought that the target individual would be aware of the manipulative attempt and would negatively appraise the would-be manipulator. It was also expected that the manipulator would not be very effective in

his persuasive attempt.

In the experimental condition in which the target person was a High Machiavellian and the manipulator was Low on this dimension, it was again expected that there would be awareness of the manipulative attempt on the part of the target person, and a negative evaluation of the manipulator. This evaluation was predicted to be even less positive than that in the previous circumstance, as the Low Machiavellian manipulator would presumably be seen as less competent and knowledgeable than his High Machiavellian counterpart. For these same reasons the Low Machiavellian manipulator was not expected to be very successful in his manipulative attempt.

In the situation in which a Low Machiavellian target person was paired with a High Machiavellian manipulator, the prediction was that there would be little or no awareness of the manipulation attempt, and a relatively positive evaluation of the manipulator. It was felt that the positive evaluation might not hold for liking, but would be true for rating scales such as competency, knowledgeableness, and persuasiveness. It was also assumed that the High Machiavellian manipulator would be quite effective in his influence attempt.

The prediction for the final experimental condition, in which the target individual and the manipulator were both Low Machiavellians, was that the target person would be aware of the manipulation attempt and would negatively evaluate his would-be manipulator. This prediction also assumed that the manipulation attempt would be relatively unsuccessful.

Method

Subjects

Subjects were 140 male undergraduates enrolled in the introductory psychology courses offered at Loyola University, and were participating in the experiment for course credit. Students signed up for the experiment on sheets which allowed two unacquainted students to register for each available time slot. These pairs of students were randomly assigned to experimental treatment just prior to their arrival at the location of the experiment, and individuals within each pair were randomly assigned to the role of target person or manipulator. The experiment necessitated dyadic interactions of all possible combinations of High and Low Machiavellian individuals for each treatment group of the experiment. The procedure employed was such that determination of Machiavellian status was made post-experimentally, and it was only at this point that each pair of subjects could be designated as fitting a particular experimental condition. Balancing out of conditions necessitated that some pairs of subjects be dropped from the analysis. The following data and discussion is based on the performance of 112 subjects.

Design

The experiment entailed a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design. The three independent variables investigated were: A) the presence or absence of a manipulation attempt (henceforth referred to as treatment or control), B) the Machiavellian status of the target individual in each dyad (High or Low as determined by a median split of the scores on the Christie

and Geis Mach V Scale), and C) the Machiavellian status of the actual or designated "manipulator" in each dyad. The experiment also involved three principal dependent measures. These were: a) awareness of the manipulation attempt on the part of the target individual, b) evaluation of the manipulator by the target individual, and c) effectiveness of the manipulator.

Procedure

Subjects in both treatment groups of the experiment were individually administered the Christie and Geis Mach V Scale either immediately preceding the experiment proper (this was the case for the majority of the subjects), or at a previous testing session (some pre-experiment scores were necessary in order to balance out experimental conditions). Following the administration of the Mach V Scale, each subject was presented with a short statement which summarized two differing views regarding the current population controversy (see appendix), and was asked to familiarize himself with the issue prior to a discussion involving another student. At this juncture two separate procedures were followed for the treatment and control conditions of the experiment. Those subjects in the experimental treatment were randomly assigned the role of manipulator or target person, and an additional set of instructions was given to the chosen manipulator (see appendix). These instructions consisted of a short statement of the desirable characteristics and advantages accruing to those persons with developed persuasive skills (e.g., a lawyer), and an explanation of the subject's experimental role as manipulator. The wording of these instructions was designed to enhance the social desirability of persuasive skills

and thus serve as an incentive for the subject to actually manipulate his fellow student. The chosen manipulator was then asked to cooperate with the experimenter and attempt to persuade the other subject participating in the experiment to take a quite extreme position with regard to the population controversy. The subject was then shown a sheet containing a set of eight statements and proposals relating to the population issue (see appendix), was asked to examine it, and was then told that he and the other student participating in the experiment were going to be discussing the population issue and would be asked to come to a joint decision as to how much they both agreed or disagreed with each of the statements and proposals.

It was then explained that it was the subject's task, in his role as confederate, to attempt to persuade the other student to agree completely (or disagree completely) with all of the statements and proposals. The direction in which the manipulator was asked to sway the target person was evenly balanced for all conditions, and statements were worded such that if one either agreed or disagreed with all of the statements, he would be taking a very consistent and credible position. After it was determined that the subject understood his assigned role, and he had been assured that the other subject in the experiment knew nothing of his intended persuasive attempt, the two subjects (target person and manipulator) were brought into the same room, introduced to each other, and asked to come to a joint decision concerning their agreement or disagreement with the set of statements and proposals regarding the population problem. Extent of agreement was indicated by a seven-point, agree/disagree rating scale. The target person was casually given an IBM pencil and asked to do the actual rating

of their joint decision, thus placing the burden of persuasion on the manipulator. The experimenter left the experimental room after explaining the subjects' joint task, and returned only when the subjects indicated that they were finished by opening their door. Subsequent to this forced interaction, both subjects were individually asked to rate their impressions of each other on eight evaluative rating scales (see appendix) and to state the purpose of the experiment. The target individual was also asked, on separate sheets, whether he was at all suspicious of the behavior of the other student, and whether he thought this person to be a very manipulative type of individual.

The procedure for the control group of the experiment differed only to the extent that there was no initial selection of a manipulator and target person for each experimental session, and, of course, no separate instructions to a manipulator. Both subjects were simply introduced to each other following an initial reading of the statement concerning the population controversy, and were then asked to come to a joint decision regarding their agreement or disagreement with the set of statements and proposals related to the population problem. Following the interaction, each subject was individually asked to rate his impressions of the other student and to answer the same questions given to the target persons in the treatment conditions concerning the suspiciousness and manipulateness of this other student. Designation of the control subjects as either "target persons" or "manipulators" was done after the experiment proper and on a random basis. The only limitation was that it was necessary to designate equal numbers of Low and High Machiavellians as either "target persons" or "manipulators".

Results

Data Analysis

Analysis of the data entailed significance tests (t tests) for the success of the experimental manipulation (instructions and incentive to manipulate), analyses of variance for mean ratings of manipulators on each of the rating scales, and a multivariate analysis of variance for three of the principal dependent measures: rated sincerity, rated likableness, and manipulator effectiveness. A further correlation analysis was made of the relation between acknowledged suspicions concerning the manipulator and ratings of the manipulator on the evaluative scales.

Experimental Manipulation

The experimental manipulation (instructions and incentive to manipulate a naive target subject) was judged successful on the basis of Manipulator effectiveness. Effectiveness was determined by extremity of rated agreement or disagreement with the set of statements and proposals concerning the population issue (see appendix). Each manipulator was asked to attempt to persuade a naive target subject to either agree completely or disagree completely with the set of eight controversial statements and proposals. Each of these statements was prescaled on a similar population of subjects, and mean individual agreement for all statements was 4 (i.e., at the midpoint of a seven-point agree/disagree rating scale). The experimental results indicated that mean joint agreement ratings for the subjects in the control conditions of the experiment, however, differed substantially from the individual mean ratings of the pilot group, and, in

addition, differed considerably from condition to condition. These differences may well have been due to a social desirability effect, which caused the joint ratings of agreement by pairs of subjects to be less favorable toward the statements than the individual agreement ratings of the pilot group. Also, particular Machiavellian configuration appeared to affect mean rated agreement with the statements; High Machiavellians appeared to agree more strongly with the rather extreme set of statements and proposals than did Low Machiavellians.

The above control differences in mean joint agreement with statements precluded a simple extremity measure of manipulator effectiveness, and necessitated a measure which took into account both the mean agreement position of the appropriate control group, and the direction of the influence attempt for each subject. A proportion effectiveness score was obtained for each subject by dividing the difference between joint agreement ratings and respective mean control rating, by the difference between mean control rating and advocated position (i.e., complete agreement or disagreement). The mean proportion effectiveness scores for each treatment condition are given in Table 1.

Table 1

Mean Manipulator Effectiveness Scores

Experimental Condition:
(Machiavellian configuration of target person versus manipulator)

<u>High vs High</u>	<u>High vs Low</u>	<u>Low vs High</u>	<u>Low vs Low</u>
.60** $\underline{t} = 1.95$.54* $\underline{t} = 1.71$.44	.67** $\underline{t} = 1.97$

* $p < .1$
** $p < .05$

The significance of the manipulator effectiveness scores was determined by testing the null hypothesis with regard to effectiveness, i.e., was the effectiveness score for each experimental group significantly greater than zero (the corresponding parameter for the population). Significance tests for the difference between sample and population means were run, and two of the effectiveness scores achieved significance. The percent effectiveness score for High Machiavellian target individuals versus High Machiavellian manipulators was .60 ($p < .05$, $df = 6$), and the corresponding score for Low Machiavellian target individuals versus Low Machiavellian manipulators was .67 ($p < .05$, $df = 6$). The percent effectiveness score for the High Machiavellian target individuals versus Low Machiavellian manipulators approached significance, .54 ($p < .1$, $df = 6$), but the corresponding score for Low Machiavellian target individuals versus High Machiavellian manipulators did not. It is noteworthy that the manipulator effectiveness scores for the treatment conditions involving individuals of similar Machiavellian orientation were significant; those scores for the mixed Machiavellian conditions were not. Also, it can be concluded that the experimental manipulation was successful in at least three of the treatment conditions of the experiment.

Analyses of Variance

The ratings of the manipulators were analyzed by individual analyses of variance. The cell means for those effects which approached or achieved significance are given in Table 2 (following page). No main effects were demonstrated for the presence or absence of the manipulation attempt (Factor A) or for Machiavellian status of target person or manipulator

Table 2

Analyses of Variance for Mean Ratings of Manipulators
(Significant and marginally significant interactions)

Factors: (2 x 2 x 2)

- A: Presence or absence of a manipulation attempt
(Treatment/Control)
- B: Machiavellian status of target person¹
(High or Low)
- C: Machiavellian status of manipulator
(High or Low)

	sincere (A x B*)			sincere (B x C**)	
	(A)			(C)	
	Tr	Co		H	L
(B)	H	2.36 1.71	(B)	H	1.57 2.50
	L	2.14 2.57		L	2.57 2.14
	likable (A x B*)			trustworthy (A x B*)	
	(A)			(A)	
	Tr	Co		Tr	Co
(B)	H	2.57 2.14	(B)	H	3.14 2.50
	L	2.29 3.00		L	2.57 3.07
	strong (A x B**)				
	(A)				
	Tr	Co			
(B)	H	3.71 2.93			
	L	3.07 3.79			

* $p < .1$
 ** $p < .05$

(Factors B and C). Significant interaction effects were found in only two instances. A significant interaction ($F = 4.63$, $df = 1/48$, $p < .05$) was demonstrated between Machiavellian status of target person and manipulator (B x C) for rated sincerity of manipulator, and a significant interaction was found ($F = 4.47$, $df = 1/48$, $p < .05$) between presence or absence of a manipulative attempt (Factor A) and Machiavellian status of the target individual (Factor B) for rated strength of manipulator.

The results of these analyses offer very slight support for the initial analysis and predictions with regard to perception of manipulators. This initial analysis, based upon Machiavellian configuration and theoretical considerations, would have predicted main effects for Factors B and C, a possible main effect for Factor A, and probable A x B and A x C interaction effects. It was predicted that High Machiavellian individuals would perceive manipulators more negatively than would Low Machiavellians (main effect for Factor B), and that High Machiavellian manipulators would elicit a more favorable reaction than would Low Machiavellian manipulators (main effect for Factor C). These differences were expected to be substantial in the context of an actual influence attempt, but not necessarily very large in the control dyads (possible A x B and A x C interactions). Also, it was thought that the presence or absence of an actual manipulation attempt (Factor A) would make for at least some difference in ratings of "manipulators", and that all manipulation attempts would achieve some measure of success.

As indicated, no main effects were found for either the Machiavellian status of the target individual (Factor B) or the Machiavellian status of

the manipulator (Factor C). This might still be considered consonant with predictions if substantial A x B and A x C interactions could be demonstrated. A significant A x B interaction was found for only one of the dependent measures, although similar interactions for four of the measures approached significance ($p < .1$; see Table 2). Consideration of the cell means for the significant and marginally significant A x B interactions (the lower the mean rating, the more positive the evaluation) indicates that actual manipulators were rated more positively by Low Machiavellian target individuals than were control subjects, but that High Machiavellian target individuals rated actual manipulators less positively than they did control individuals. Inspection of the data for all other dependent measures indicated that, with the exception of rated competence, the anticipated A x B interactions were in the hypothesized direction, but did not achieve even marginal significance, i.e., actual manipulators were rated more negatively than control individuals by High Machiavellians, but more positively than the controls by Low Machiavellians.

No significant A x C interactions were demonstrated for any of the dependent measures. This was contrary to prediction, as it was expected that High Machiavellian manipulators would elicit a rather positive reaction as compared to their Low Machiavellian counterparts, when there was an incentive for them to employ their skills (i.e., the treatment condition); but that the more empathic Low Machiavellians might well be favored in a nonmanipulative situation. Inspection of the data indicated that High Machiavellian manipulators were rated more favorably than Low Machiavellian manipulators on six of the evaluative scales (exceptions were rated competence and knowledgeableness), but these differences did not approach

significance, and cannot be considered supportive of the initial predictions.

No significant main effects for Factor A (presence or absence of a manipulation attempt) were found for any of the evaluative ratings. This was somewhat unexpected, but would offer considerable support for the proposition that people are not generally aware of manipulative attempts. It is quite evident from the data, however, that manipulative attempts were successful. Two of the percent effectiveness scores were significantly greater than zero ($p < .05$), and one approached significance ($p < .1$). Also, the measures for the dyads composed of individuals similar in Machiavellian orientation were slightly greater (indicating greater effectiveness) than the effectiveness scores for the mixed Machiavellian dyads. Thus, even though the manipulative attempts were quite successful, the presence or absence of these attempts made for no substantial differences in mean evaluative ratings. In addition, similarity on the dimension of Machiavellianism appeared to enhance effectiveness.

A final significant interaction was that between Machiavellian status of target individual and manipulator (B x C) for the ratings of sincerity. This was not predicted, and again evidences a rather noteworthy similarity effect. Individuals similar to the target individual in Machiavellian orientation were seen as significantly more sincere than those who differed from target subjects in this respect. Inspection of the data indicated that this similarity effect was noticeable in six of the eight evaluative ratings (exceptions were rated likableness and pleasantness), but did not approach significance.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance

A multivariate analysis of variance was used to analyze three of the principal dependent measures simultaneously. These were: rated likableness of the manipulator, rated sincerity, and manipulator effectiveness. Likableness was chosen as it was the strongest measure of affective appraisal, and rated sincerity was deemed an indirect measure of awareness of the manipulation attempt. This analysis evidenced no significant relationship among these three dependent measures. It therefore did not support the predicted negative relationship between awareness, and manipulator appraisal and effectiveness.

Correlation Analysis

While the above analysis indicated no relationship between the indirect measure of awareness employed (rated sincerity) and the other dependent measures, it was possible to utilize the more direct measure of awareness which was recorded in the experiment, and determine if this was at all related to either manipulator ratings or effectiveness. Each of the target individuals in the experiment was asked to reply to a post-interaction questionnaire regarding the purpose of the experiment, possible suspicions regarding his fellow student, and his estimation of how manipulative this other student was. The results of the questionnaire are given in Table 3 (following page).

A point-biserial correlation analysis was made of individual ratings of the manipulators and target individual responses to the post-interaction question regarding suspicions about the manipulator (a more direct measure

Table 3

Target Individual Response Pattern to Post-interaction Questionnaire

Questions:

- #1. What do you think was the purpose of this experiment?
- #2. Where you at all suspicious of the behavior of the student with whom you have just been talking?
- #3. Do you feel that this student is a very manipulative type of person, i.e., one who often manipulates other people?

Condition: (target person versus manipulator)	No. of approximately correct answers to question #1		No. of affirmative responses to question #2		No. of affirmative responses to question #3	
High vs High	2	(0)	1	(0)	0	(1)
High vs Low	2	(2)	1	(2)	2	(1)
Low vs High	3	(2)	3	(1)	3	(0)
Low vs Low	0	(0)	1	(3)	0	(2)

Note.—There were 7 pairs of subjects in each of the 8 experimental conditions; hence, each of the frequencies cited is out of a possible 7. Response frequencies for the subjects in the control conditions of the experiment are given in parentheses.

of awareness). These analyses were made across both treatment and control conditions of the experiment, as suspicions regarding a fellow subject would presumably have the same effect upon subsequent rating, whether or not this fellow subject actually undertook a manipulative attempt. The one exception to this was the measure of effectiveness, for which there were only treatment scores. The correlation coefficients between awareness (an affirmative answer to question #2: see Table 3) and the individual ratings of the manipulator are given in Table 4 (following page). Three of these correlations were significant at the .01 level ($df = 54$), indicating that awareness of the manipulative attempt, or at least the presence of suspicions, was negatively related to subsequent appraisal of the manipulator. The qualification which must be ammended to this finding is that suspicions regarding a fellow subject, in the context of an experiment, need not be related to the awareness that one is the target of an influence attempt. This may have been the case, but there were as many subjects in the control conditions of the experiment (i.e., no manipulation attempt) who acknowledged suspicions as there were in the treatment conditions, and the same negative relationship between suspicions and appraisal appeared to hold for them.

Specific Predictions

The specific predictions, based upon Machiavellian configuration, for the four treatment conditions of the experiment found no support. The predictions were made relative to the measures of awareness, perception, and effectiveness for the respective control groups of the experiment; they were therefore evaluated on the basis of differences between treatment and

Table 4

Point-biserial Correlations between Awareness¹ and Other
Dependent Measures

(Individual ratings of manipulators and manipulator
effectiveness)

<u>Rating Scale</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
likable	-.41*
pleasant	-.06
sincere	-.35*
trustworthy	-.41*
competent	-.12
well-informed	+.02
persuasive	-.13
strong	-.12
Effectiveness	-.19 (df = 26)

* $p < .005$, $df = 54$

¹Note.— Awareness = an affirmative response to post-Interaction question #2 concerning suspicions about the manipulator.

respective control measures. The mean ratings of the manipulators, for both the treatment and control conditions of the experiment, are given in Table 5 (following page). This table also includes several combined mean ratings for the different experimental conditions. No significant differences were found between any mean treatment and control ratings for any condition of the experiment.

Table 5

Mean Ratings of Manipulator by Condition

Condition: (Machiavellian configuration of target person versus manipulator)

<u>High vs High</u>	<u>High vs Low</u>	<u>Low vs High</u>	<u>Low vs Low</u>		
2.28 (2.28)	2.86 (2.00)	2.43 (2.86)	2.14 (3.14)		likable
2.00 (2.00)	2.71 (1.86)	2.00 (2.57)	2.28 (2.71)		pleasant
1.71 (1.42)	3.00 (2.00)	2.29 (2.86)	2.00 (2.28)		sincere
2.86 (2.29)	3.43 (2.71)	2.57 (3.14)	2.57 (3.00)		trustworthy
3.14 (2.57)	3.71 (2.57)	3.28 (3.28)	2.57 (2.28)		competent
3.28 (2.71)	3.86 (2.57)	3.57 (3.14)	2.71 (3.28)		well-informed
3.71 (3.71)	4.14 (3.28)	3.43 (4.28)	3.43 (3.28)		persuasive
3.28 (3.00)	4.14 (2.86)	3.00 (4.14)	3.14 (3.43)		strong
2.14 (2.14)	2.78 (1.93)	2.20 (2.72)	2.21 (2.92)	(Attraction)	likable + pleasant
2.28 (1.86)	3.22 (2.36)	2.43 (3.00)	2.28 (2.64)	(Awareness)	sincere + trustworthy
3.21 (3.21)	3.78 (2.57)	3.42 (3.21)	2.64 (2.78)	(Respect)	competent + well-informed
2.54 (2.21)	3.26 (2.29)	2.68 (2.97)	2.38 (2.78)	(Combined)	Attraction + Awareness + Respect

Note.—The mean ratings of the designated "manipulators" in the control conditions of the experiment are given in parentheses. The lower the mean ratings in the table, the more favorable was the evaluation.

Discussion

Awareness

The suggestion that people are not generally aware of manipulative attempts by others appeared to be strongly supported by the data. Only six of the 28 target individuals in the treatment conditions of the experiment (see Table 3) answered yes to the post-interaction question concerning suspicions about their fellow student. This ratio was exactly the same as that for the subjects in the control conditions of the experiment in which no influence attempt was made. In addition, seven of the target subjects in the treatment conditions were able to make an approximately accurate guess as to the nature of the experiment; the comparable figure for the control conditions was six. It is quite possible that these figures even exaggerate the awareness which is actually present, as several of the subjects who answered yes to the question about suspicions, qualified their response by saying that their suspicions were due to the nature of the situation. One subject, for example, cited the experimental procedure of individual administration of the initial Mach V Scales as being responsible for his suspicions. Several other subjects mentioned previous acquaintance with experiments involving deception as being the reason for their suspicions. If one also considers the possibly leading nature of a question regarding suspicions about a fellow student, and the fact that there was no difference between the treatment and control groups in number of affirmative responses to this question, it is evident that there was little awareness on the part of the target individuals in the face of actual influence attempts. The validity of this conclusion is further supported by recent

evidence (Doctor, 1971) that the awareness assessment device itself may bias reports by suggesting awareness to some subjects.

The rating scales of sincerity and trustworthiness also constituted less direct measures of awareness on the part of the target individuals. Actual manipulators in the treatment conditions of the experiment were rated only slightly and nonsignificantly less sincere and trustworthy than were the arbitrarily designated "manipulators" in the control conditions. This would further support the general absence of suspicions in the present manipulative situation. There was, however, a marginally significant interaction ($p < .1$) between the Machiavellian status of the perceiver (Factor B) and whether or not an actual manipulation attempt was made (Factor A) for the ratings of the sincerity and trustworthiness of the manipulator (see Table 2). These ratings were considered to be indirect measures of awareness. High Machiavellian target individuals in the treatment conditions of the experiment rated the actual manipulator as less sincere and less trustworthy than they rated the arbitrarily designated "manipulators" in the control conditions. Low Machiavellian target individuals, however, consistently rated the actual manipulator as more sincere and more trustworthy than they did their control counterparts. This would suggest that, while general awareness of manipulative attempts might have been minimal, High Machiavellian individuals tended to be more sensitive to such tactics than did those individuals of a less Machiavellian orientation.

Evaluation of the Manipulator

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Appraisal of the manipulator appeared to me affected by a number of factors. The most noteworthy of these was one which was not really taken

Into sufficient account in the initial analysis of the social influence situation; this was similarity of the target person to the manipulator on the dimension of Machiavellianism. In both the treatment and control conditions of the experiment, actual and designated manipulators who were similar to the target individuals in Machiavellian disposition were consistently rated more favorably than were manipulators who differed from the target persons in this respect. These differences did not approach significance, but the effect is at least apparent if one examines the mean evaluative ratings of the manipulators in Table 5. More substantial support for this effect is provided by the significant ($p < .05$) interaction between Machiavellian status of target person and manipulator (B x C) for rated strength of the manipulator, and the fact that manipulators were only significantly successful in only those dyads comprised of subjects who were similar to each other in Machiavellian inclination. This relation between attraction and similarity is, of course, not a novel one. Byrne (1970) has reported considerable evidence that attraction results not simply from specific response similarity (as his reinforcement model would predict), but also from similarity at more abstract and generalized levels (Byrne, Griffit, & Stefaniak, 1967). This would, of course, include any characteristic way of relating to the social environment, such as Machiavellian orientation, and is a plausible explanation for the present findings.

Whether or not an actual influence attempt was made also appeared to influence the target individual's rating of his fellow student, although the direction of this influence seemed to depend upon the Machiavellian configuration involved. This A x B interaction was significant for rated sincerity ($p < .05$), approached significance ($p < .1$) for rated likableness,

trustworthiness, and strength, and was noticeable in three of the remaining four rating scales. High Machiavellian target individuals perceived actual manipulators less positively than they did control "manipulators", while Low Machiavellian target individuals perceived the actual manipulators more positively than they did the controls.

Relation between Awareness and Manipulator Appraisal and Effectiveness

It was suggested in the initial analysis of the social influence situation that perception and evaluation of a manipulator might well depend upon whether or not there was some awareness of this attempt on the part of the target individual. While no such relationship was indicated by the multivariate analysis of variance in terms of the three principal dependent measures (rated likableness, sincerity, and effectiveness of the manipulator), such a relationship was suggested by the correlation analysis of individual evaluative ratings and target individual responses to the post-Interaction question concerning suspicions about the manipulator. There was at least some evidence then, that awareness of the manipulative attempt is a salient factor in the evaluation of a manipulator, and leads to a fairly negative appraisal. In a more natural setting it might also lead to greater resistance than was indicated in the present circumstances. Also, it appeared that rated sincerity was not a completely adequate measure of awareness, given the nonsignificant results of the multivariate analysis of variance, although, it correlate significantly ($p < .01$: see Table 4) with acknowledged suspicions. In summary it would seem that few conclusions can be drawn concerning the relationship between awareness and person perception in a social influence context, largely because of

the questionable validity of the awareness measures used. While it is fairly evident that suspicions regarding a fellow subject will lead to a negative evaluation, it has not been demonstrated that these suspicions can be equated with the awareness that one is the target of a manipulation attempt.

Posthoc Considerations

There appear to be a number of reasonable explanations for the limited success of the present experiment. A principal consideration has to do with the strong and unanticipated influence of similarity. That this can be a very important determinant of attraction has, of course, been amply demonstrated by Byrne (1970); that it would be even more important to the person perception process of the target person than those cues associated with an actual manipulation attempt was unexpected. Perhaps an individual is more sensitized to those cues which tell him whether another party is similar to himself or not, than he is to those cues more directly associated with the attribution process. There is also the alternative possibility that one is more reluctant to judge an individual who is similar to himself as having ulterior motives or designs. This might lead to a dismissal of potentially damning evidence, even though the target individual is in no way unaware of these considerations. In any case, the fact that similarity was a more salient factor than the presence of an actual manipulation attempt may be a partial explanation for the disconfirmed predictions.

Another matter which perhaps attenuated the present findings was that the manipulator attempted to persuade the target individual to agree to a rather extreme position. Elsingher and Mills (1968) have shown that

Individuals who take a relatively extreme position in a situation may well be seen as more sincere and involved than one who holds a more moderate stance. If this were the case in the present experiment, it may have worked to the manipulator's advantage, making him appear more sincere and likable than does the average individual out to serve his own ends. It is of course difficult to disentangle this phenomenon from what may simply be a general reluctance to negatively appraise a fellow subject in a temporary and forced interaction. That such a leniency effect does often occur has been demonstrated in a number of person perception studies (Tagluri, 1969).

Several final considerations may help to explain the disconfirmation of some of the initial predictions. A perhaps important factor was that the target persons in the experiment really had no reason to suspect the manipulators. They controlled no resources or rewards which the manipulator might be desirous of, and further, they could readily interpret the experiment as a competitive type of situation, i.e., who is the best debater given the initial data from the "personality test" (Machiavellian Scale). Hence, the target persons could dismiss even obvious influence attempts as a flair for argumentation or debate on the part of the other, in the context of an "issue" to be discussed. These factors, in addition to the artificial atmosphere of an experimental setting, and experimenter demands to "reach a joint decision" may well have induced subjects to "go along" with the somewhat incaltrant position of the manipulator.

A further investigation of person perception in a manipulative circumstance would have to overcome a number of difficulties encountered in the present experiment. A more valid measure of awareness would have to

be devised in order to unambiguously assess the actual awareness that one is the target of an influence attempt, and not other peripheral suspicions. The actual manipulation attempt should perhaps be something other than an interaction in which a controversial issue is discussed, as this can provide a "legitimate" rationale for any type of persuasive appeal, and a possible interpretation of the manipulator as one who is "committed" or "involved". If rating scales are to be used as a measure of manipulator effectiveness in a dyadic situation, they will have to be prescaled on pairs of subjects, as joint ratings on a scale may differ considerably from individual ratings. The principal difficulty, however, is not one which can be readily overcome; it stems from the multiple three-way interactions which undoubtedly take place among the stimulus characteristics of the manipulator, the cue processing idiosyncracies of the target individual, and the situational cues and constraints which are operative. Secord and Backman note that the most salient interpersonal cues often derive from a person's relationships with others (1964); attribution theory rests heavily on those situational cues which allow a perceiver to infer motivation or intent. Machiavellian configuration is undoubtedly a determinant of perception and success in a social influence situation, but the accurate apportioning of variance to this and other equally important determinants is obviously not a simple affair.

Conclusion

This research was concerned with the perception and attitudinal consequences of interpersonal manipulative behavior. The empirical questions asked were: a) whether people are generally aware of manipulative tactics on the part of others, b) how these manipulative attempts influence the person perception process, and c) whether or not there are resistive consequences. The significant and general findings of this study were that individuals engaged in a manipulation attempt are viewed no less positively than individuals not so engaged; that the behaviors associated with a manipulative attempt actually enhance the perception of a chronic manipulator, but detract from the perception of a not-so-manipulative individual; and that manipulators, both chronic or otherwise, were generally quite successful in the limited interaction situation investigated.

Bibliography

- Christie, R. and Geis, Florence L. Studies in Machiavellianism. New York: Academic Press, 1970.
- Byrne, D. Attitudes and attraction. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. Vol. 4. New York: Academic Press, 1970.
- Byrne, D., Griffit, W. and Stefaniak, D. Attraction and similarity of personality characteristics. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 82-90.
- Crowne, D.P. and Liverant, S. Conformity under varying conditions of personal commitment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 547-555.
- Doctor, R.M. Bias effects and awareness in studies of verbal conditioning. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1971, 5, 243-256.
- Doctor, R.M. Locus of control of reinforcement and responsiveness to social influence. Journal of Personality, 1971, 39, 542-551.
- Eislinger, R. and Mills, J. Perception of the sincerity and competence of a communicator as a function of the extremity of his position. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1968, 4, 224-232.
- Geis, Florence L., Bogart, Karen and Levy, Marguerite. No dissonance for Machiavellians? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Boston, April, 1967.
- Geis, Florence L. and Leventhal, Ellen. Attempting to deceive and detecting deception. Unpublished manuscript, New York University, 1966.
- Geis, Florence L., Levy, Marguerite and Weinheimer, S. The eye of the beholder. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, New York, April, 1966.
- Geis, Florence L., Krupat, E. and Berger, D. Taking over in group discussion. Unpublished manuscript, New York University, 1965.
- Getter, H. Variables affecting the value of the reinforcement in verbal conditioning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962.
- Gore, Pearl Mayo. Individual differences in the prediction of subject compliance to experimenter bias. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962.

- Harris, T.M. Machiavellianism, judgement, independence, and attitudes toward teammate in a cooperative judgement task. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966.
- Jones, E.E. Ingratiation: A Social Psychological Analysis. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.
- Jones, E.E. and Davis, K.E. From acts to dispositions: The attribution process in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.
- Jones, E.E., Jones, R.G. and Gergen, K.J. Some conditions affecting the evaluation of a conformist. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 270-288.
- Jones, E.E., Stires, L.K., Shaver, K.G. and Harris, V.A. Evaluation of an ingratiator by target persons and bystanders. Journal of Personality, 1963, 30, 165-179.
- Hovland, C.I., Janis, I.L., and Kelly, H.H. Communication and Persuasion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Marlowe, D., Gergen, K.J. and Doob, A.N. Opponent's personality, expectation of interaction and interpersonal bargaining. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 206-213.
- Mehrabian, A. and Williams, M. Nonverbal concomitants of perceived and intended persuasiveness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 37-58.
- Mills, J. and Aronson, E. Opinion change as a function of the communicator's attractiveness and desire to influence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 173-177.
- Novielli, J. Who persuades whom. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Delaware, 1968.
- Rotter, J.B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, Vol. 80, No. 1, 1966.
- Strickland, Bonnie R. The relationships of awareness to verbal conditioning and extinction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962.
- Tagluri, R. Person perception. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology. Vol. 3. Addison-Wesley: Reading, Massachusetts, 1969.
- Walster, Elaine and Festinger, L. The effectiveness of "overheard" persuasive communications. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 65, 395-402.

Appendix

(Containing: the statement of the population issue (two views); the instructions to the manipulator (incentive); the set of statements and proposals upon which joint agreement was to be reached (measure of manipulator effectiveness); and the post-interaction rating scales and questionnaire.)

Statement of the Population Issue

The Population Bomb

An imminent crisis facing the world today is the exponential increase in population growth, particularly in Asia, Africa, and in the underdeveloped countries of Latin America. The very alarming predictions by distinguished biologists, ecologists, and demographers about inevitable and widespread starvation and civil turmoil within the next twenty years, and the threatened devastation of the world's ecological system attest to the urgency of the problem. While spectres of widespread famine and anarchy seem hardly credible to the average citizen of Europe or the United States, they are everpresent preoccupations of the residents of Calcutta and Dacca, Lima and La Paz. The technological and agricultural innovations which have been largely responsible for the current explosion can no longer keep pace with the needs and wants of a world population which is presently doubling every thirty years, and they have done perhaps irreparable damage to the world's environmental equilibrium. If one cares to reckon population strain in terms of this environmental exploitation, then the population crisis is even more indigenous to Europe and the United States than it is to less prosperous regions of the world. Dr. Paul Ehrlich of Stanford states that "if we don't do something dramatic about population and environment, and do it immediately, there's just no hope that civilization will persist....The world's most serious population-growth problem is right here in the United States among affluent white Americans....we're about to breed ourselves right into oblivion." George Wald, Nobel prize winning biologist at Harvard, has recently said that

life on earth is threatened with extinction within the next 15 to 20 years. The present situation has been likened to a ship which is fast sinking, whilst the captain forms a committee to consider the problem. Better start bailing or abandon ship. The population crisis is not ten generations into the future, or even tomorrow--it is today!

The Nonsense Explosion

One of the crisis fads in the world today is the so-called population explosion, particularly so in the U.S., where there is a somewhat continuous resurrection of similar crises, both on behalf of public self-vindication and political astuteness. The population crisis is neither as real, nor as immediate a problem, as dire predictions would indicate. What, for example, is the population density of the U.S.? About 205 million people spread over 3,615,123 square miles, including huge tracts of empty, but eminently habitable land. This is less than that for almost any country in the world. Holland is 18 times as dense; scenic Switzerland 7 times as dense. In the last eight years one out of three counties in America actually lost population, and the population in four states declined. Rather than a population explosion the U.S. and other countries are seeing a population redistribution to cities and suburbs, to industrial jobs and urban living. What of the spectre of mass starvation? In the U.S. and Canada hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat and other grains rot in elevators and fields, or are processed into livestock feeds for lack of a market. Current agricultural techniques could quadruple yields in the U.S. alone if government restrictions were lifted, and these advances have doubled and tripled the yields in India,

Pakistan, and Mexico. This is to say nothing of the largely untapped resources of the world's oceans and seas, or the very real possibility of synthetic foodstuffs. The population of the U.S. is undeniably increasing-- at a present rate of two million people per year--but the problem is hardly an imminent or even an unsolvable one, and it certainly does not necessitate the radical measures proposed by present day alarmists. The environmental problem, admittedly a symptom of an expanding and technologically based society, has likewise not reached the exaggerated proportions of a devastated and wasted planet. In fact the expected increase in population may well provide the needed economic resources and ecological knowhow to remedy what damage has been done.

Note.--Order of the two views was counter-balanced for all conditions of the experiment, and both views were presented on a single sheet of paper (single-spaced).

Procedure

Instructions to Manipulator

This experiment has to do with how effective different people are at getting other people to agree with them. The ability to persuade others is a very important asset; it reflects an individual's insight and experience both in dealing with people and in clearly and accurately assessing an issue or problem. This ability perhaps finds its best expression in the day to day challenges of a successful lawyer, who is trained by profession to see the strong and weak points of any position, to convince others of the reasonableness of his conclusions. For the purposes of the present experiment, we would like you to take a certain position on the issue which you have just read, and attempt to convince another student that your view is the more reasonable and acceptable one. It will be necessary that you be as persuasive as possible in convincing your partner, as he will be doing the actual recording of the extent to which you both agree or disagree with certain statements. This other student will be familiar with the issue which you have just read, but will be completely unaware that you've been asked to persuade him that a certain position is the better one. Both of you will simply be introduced to each other and asked to come to a joint decision as to how much you agree or disagree with certain statements concerning the issue. The success of this experiment depends on your cooperation and your willingness to use your persuasive skills.

Set of Statements and Proposals upon Which Joint
Agreement Was to Be Reached

Instructions:

"Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with
each of the following statements."

1. The present population crisis demands immediate and concerted effort on the part of all responsible world governing bodies.
Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Disagree
2. An enforced limitation on the number of children which could be born to married couples might be a reasonable population control measure.
Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Disagree
3. Population control measures should be made compulsory by international agreement, particularly for those underdeveloped nations which have no means of providing for their rapidly growing populations.
Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Disagree
4. Exportation of surplus grain to India is not only ruinous to India's economy, but is also a rather futile measure, as it only exacerbates an already critical population problem.
Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Disagree
5. Almost any population control measures, however restrictive, are necessary and even humanitarian in terms of the future of the human race, and in terms of those who are spared an inhuman existence.
Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Disagree
6. It is fairly obvious that adequate population control measures cannot rely on the education of people to the problem and voluntary limitation of number of children, both from the standpoint of time and from the fact that most couples want a minimum of two or three children.
Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Disagree
7. Since the average American, in his lifetime, uses up about 50 times the amount of natural resources used by the average citizen of India, the population problem is just as critical in the U.S. as it is in India.
Agree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Disagree

Post-Interaction Rating Scales and Questionnaire

Instructions:

This is a short questionnaire concerning your impressions of the student with whom you have just been discussing the population problem. Please be frank in your evaluations. This information will remain completely confidential.

Simply rate this person on the following characteristics:

e.g., Very tall	___	___	___	___	X	___	___	Not very tall
Very likable	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Not very likable
Very sincere	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Not very sincere
Very persuasive	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Not very persuasive
Very competent	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Not very competent
Very strong	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Not very strong
Very trustworthy	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Not very trustworthy
Well-informed	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Not well-informed
Very pleasant	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	Not very pleasant

Was this student a previous acquaintance of yours? yes no

If yes, do you know him very well? yes no

What do you think was the purpose of this experiment?

(Two additional questions were asked on separate sheets.)

Additional questions:

Were you at all suspicious of the behavior of the student with whom you have just been talking? yes no

If yes, explain:

(Please turn page and do not go back to any of your previous responses.)

(On following sheet:)

Do you feel that this student was a very manipulative type of person, i.e., one who often manipulates other people? yes no

(The questionnaire was followed by a debriefing of each subject individually and a discussion of the experiment.)

APPROVAL SHEET

The Dissertation submitted by Joseph P. Reser has been read and approved by members of the Department of Psychology.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the Dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the Dissertation is now given final approval with reference to content and form.

The Dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

May 22, 1972
Date

Homer H. Johnson, Ph.D.
Signature of Director