

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1983

Social Interaction: The Relationship Between Facial Attractiveness and Verbal Influence Style

Laurie Jean Lee
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lee, Laurie Jean, "Social Interaction: The Relationship Between Facial Attractiveness and Verbal Influence Style" (1983). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 5924.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/5924>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



SOCIAL INTERACTION: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
FACIAL ATTRACTIVENESS AND
VERBAL INFLUENCE STYLE

by

Laurie Jean Lee

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Psychology

Approved:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1983

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I feel both great joy and great sadness at the completion of this paper. I wish to express my love and gratitude to my friends at Utah State University for the help, understanding, and affection given to me during this period of my life. My life has been greatly enriched by their friendships.

I want to thank Dr. Catherine Surra and Dr. Sharyn Crossman for their constructive feedback and valuable suggestions during the writing of this paper. Their commitment to quality was remarkable.

In addition, I wish to thank Chris Lutz, Randy Grover, and Laura Sturgis for their help in collecting data and Jill Christiansen for working so hard on the typing for this paper.

I am most grateful to co-chairperson Dr. William R. Dobson for his help and support. His professionalism and personal style served as a model that encouraged my professional growth.

I extend special thanks to co-chairperson Dr. Gerald R. Adams, whose dedication to quality and enthusiasm for my research provided creative stimulation in this endeavor. His special friendship will remain with me always.

To Dr. Charles Green, who was one of the first to trust in my ability and encourage my growth, I extend the greatest of affection.

Finally to my two children, Rena and Andy, who helped me to play, and to my husband, Dick, who shared my dreams and supported my work, I express my undying love.

Laurie Jean Lee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE	1
Attribution Theory	1
Persuasive Communication	4
Defining Persuasive Communication	5
II. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM	9
Purpose of Study	9
Hypotheses	10
III. METHODOLOGY	11
Sample	11
The Confederate	12
Procedures	13
Scoring Instrument	13
Training of Raters	16
Analysis of Data	16
IV. RESULTS	18
Demographics	18
Reliability	18
Factor Analysis	19
Sex by Experimental Condition	21
V. DISCUSSION	25
Evaluation of the Findings	25
Implications	27
Limitations	30
Recommendations	31

Chapter	Page
Summary	31
REFERENCE NOTES	32
REFERENCES	33
APPENDICES	36
Appendix A. Personal Data	37
Appendix B. Informed Consent	38
Appendix C. Confederate Responses	39
Appendix D. Attribution Questionnaire	40
Appendix E. Demographic Variables	41
Appendix F. Social Interaction Scoring System Manual (Revised)	42

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Reliability Estimates of Raters' Scores on the SISS Behavioral Categories	20
2. Factor Analysis on SISS Measure	22
3. <u>F</u> Values for Attribution Variables	24

ABSTRACT

Social Interaction: The Relationship Between
Facial Attractiveness and
Verbal Influence Style

by

Laurie Jean Lee, Master of Science
Utah State University, 1983

Major Professors: Dr. William R. Dobson
Dr. Gerald R. Adams
Departments: Psychology
Family and Human Development

The purpose of this study was to determine if male and female communicators utilize different styles of persuasion with an attractive versus an unattractive female target. Forty undergraduate students were asked to persuade a female confederate in either an attractive condition or an unattractive condition to eat M&M's. Perceptions of attractiveness and personality assessments were checked by a post-experimental questionnaire. Influence attempts were rated and categorized by the use of the Social Interaction Scoring System. Individual responses were then factor analyzed to identify profiles of persuasive communication. These behavioral profiles were then statistically compared across experimental conditions by analyses of variance.

No significant differences were found for sex or experimental condition. The subjects did, however, perceive the confederate as

significantly more attractive when in the attractive condition than when in the unattractive condition. Further, while the confederate was perceived as more curious and perceptive when in the attractive condition, she was perceived as more indifferent and insensitive when in the unattractive condition. From the results of this study, it was concluded that people do not necessarily alter their persuasive technique according to the attractiveness of the target person. Possible explanations for these findings are discussed, and suggestions for further research are given.

(66 pages)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The level of one's physical attractiveness has been demonstrated to affect almost all aspects of one's life. Parental and caretaker expectations (Adams & LaVoie, 1975; Corter, Trehub, Boukydis, Ford, Clehoffer, & Minde, 1978), choice of discipline style (Adams & LaVoie, 1975), and judgments made about misbehavior (Dion, 1972) are all in some way influenced by a child's physical attractiveness. Adams and Crane (1980) found that children as young as age four consistently evaluate persons of a high degree of physical attractiveness as having more desirable characteristics than persons of a low degree of physical attractiveness, while Adams and Huston (1977) have demonstrated similar stereotype effects in judgments of others by senior citizens.

During the adolescent and adult years, the effect of physical appearance becomes particularly salient in the context of dating. Both Walster, Aronson, Abrahams, and Rottman (1966) and a replication of their study by Brislin and Lewis (1968) have shown that there is a strong positive correlation between dating desirability and physical attractiveness. In fact, dating a person of a high degree of physical attractiveness is perceived as having an elevational effect on the social status of the less attractive other (Sigall & Landy, 1973).

Attribution Theory

In 1972 Dion, Berscheid, and Walster attempted to prove the existence of a physical attractiveness stereotype by investigating two

hypotheses. First, the researchers wanted to determine if persons of a high degree of physical attractiveness were perceived to have more socially desirable personality traits and, second, if they were expected to lead better lives than their physically unattractive peers. In the first part of the research process, subjects were asked to look at a photograph of a person and rate him or her on 27 different personality traits. For the second part of the process, the subjects were asked to make several predictions about the pictured person's future. The areas of prediction were marital happiness, likelihood of marriage, parental happiness, social and professional happiness, occupational success, and total life happiness.

The results of this study provided strong evidence that persons of a high degree of physical attractiveness are perceived to have more positive personality traits than persons of a low degree of physical attractiveness. In addition, a positive correlation was found between the level of physical attractiveness and the number of positive personality characteristics attributed. Predictions about the future were affected as well by physical appearance. The predicted occupational status, competency as spouses, and happiness in marriage were elevated by the perceived level of attractiveness. The only dimension in which high attractiveness appeared to have a negative effect was the potential for parental happiness.

According to Dion et al. (1972) the definition of the physical attractiveness stereotype, then, is the process whereby persons are evaluated on the basis of their appearance. Specifically, the more attractive a person is, the greater the amount of socially desirable characteristics he or she is perceived to possess. Other researchers

have conducted studies using similar methodology as that employed by Dion et al. (1972) in an attempt to further define the beautiful-is-good stereotype effect.

In the first of two studies, Miller (1970a) found that attractive persons are consistently associated with the desirable pole of adjective scales, while unattractive persons are consistently associated with the undesirable pole. In a second study (1970b), Miller examined the attribution of internal and external locus of control. Subjects were asked to look at a picture of a person and then complete Rotter's I-E Scale as they believed the pictured person would. The results indicated that physically attractive persons were viewed as being primarily internally controlled, while physically unattractive persons were seen as being primarily externally controlled. According to Miller, being internally controlled means to be sensitive to the environment, to be likely to seek self-improvement, to be concerned with skill and achievement, and to be independent. Further Seligman, Paschall, and Takata (1974) attempted to establish the existence of a physical appearance effect for the attribution of responsibility for life events. The results of their study showed that "for unattractive targets, bad outcomes resulted in greater attribution of responsibility than did good outcomes" and "for attractive targets . . . bad outcomes resulted in less attribution of responsibility than did good outcomes" (p. 294). Collectively, these and other studies (see Adams, 1982, for a review) support the notion that a beautiful-is-good stereotype attribution response operates in social interaction contexts.

Persuasive Communication

A practical extension of the attribution research is an attempt to assess in what way these attitudes actually affect social interactions. Several studies (Horai, Naccari, & Fatoullah, 1974; Mills & Aronson, 1965; Snyder & Rothbart, 1971) have shown that physical attractiveness usually enhances the persuasive ability of the communicator.

Chaiken (1979) decided to study this phenomenon in the field. Her study involved confederates approaching subjects on the street with a persuasive message. Her results showed that attractive communicators elicited greater agreement with the position than did unattractive communicators. The subjects also judged the attractive communicators to be more fluent and faster speakers than the unattractive communicators. These results may be attenuated by two factors, however. First, when asked to place themselves along several dimensions that were designed to assess self-concept, the attractive communicators placed themselves in more favorable positions than did the unattractive communicators. The difference in self-assessment by the communicators may have affected their ability to be persuasive. Second, it is unclear whether the subjects were actually persuaded or whether they were complying with the stated position of the attractive confederate in an attempt to gain approval. For example, Chaiken, Eagly, Sejwacz, Gregory, and Christensen (1978) have linked the ability to persuade directly to attribution theory by viewing physical appearance in the context of what it communicates about the personality of the individual. They stated that "physical attractiveness conveyed information about the warmth and social-emotional competence as well as expertise and intellectual competence" (p. 7).

A 1978 study by Dion and Stein has also attempted to explore the effect that physical appearance would have on children's ability to persuade peers to engage in a distasteful task. Influencers were placed in one of four groups: attractive males, attractive females, unattractive males, or unattractive females. The success and the verbal influence styles of the groups were compared. Attractive males made the most attempts to influence peers and were judged by peers to be assertive. They were more successful than the unattractive male influencers in persuading a female target but less successful in persuading a male target. Attractive female influencers made the fewest number of influence attempts and were judged to be the least persistent or forceful. They were generally more successful, however, than the unattractive female influencers when attempting to persuade a male target. Unattractive male influencers utilized commands more frequently than the other groups and were the only group to make use of physical threats. They were less successful with opposite-sex targets but more successful with same-sex targets than their attractive counterparts. The unattractive group of female persuaders were judged by peers to be more persistent and assertive than the attractive female group but were more successful only with same-sex targets.

In summary, then, these studies by Chaiken (1979) and Dion and Stein (1978) suggest that physically attractive children and adults are more effective at persuasion tasks than lesser attractive peers.

Defining Persuasive Communication

There have been three main thrusts in the general study of persuasive communication. The first of these is one in which researchers have attempted to define what personal characteristics make an

individual successful in persuading others. A large portion of the studies which have already been reviewed (Chaiken, 1979; Chaiken et al., 1978; Mills & Aronson, 1965; Snyder & Rothbart, 1971), for example, represent an effort to define how physical attractiveness affects a person's ability to influence others. In addition, a study conducted by Blass, Alperstein, and Block (1974) attempted to assess the relationship between a communicator's race and beauty, the observer's method of evaluating persons and objects, and the ability of the communicator to induce a change of attitude in the observer. The aim of these studies is to isolate those personal characteristics that enhance a communicator's persuasiveness.

In the second thrust of research, the behavior of the persuader is the focus. The question becomes one of what the person can do to be more persuasive, and attempts are made to define those techniques which produce the most success. Hare, Kritzer, and Blumberg (1979) attempted to systematically analyze persuasive communications in terms of form and content. Form could be dominant or submissive, positive or negative, serious or expressive, or conforming or nonconforming. The content was assumed to contain pressure to conform, and that pressure could be communicated in a number of different ways. Conforming could be urged on the basis of values, influence of reference group, power of leader or majority, or an offer of reward.

The third thrust of research defines persuasive interactions in terms of power. The act of influencing another person is viewed as a type of power. A 1977 study by Garrison and Pate examined the way in which this power is given to the influencer by the target. The work of these researchers grew out of McGuire's (1969) construct of source

valance. Source valance is defined as those perceived characteristics of an individual that determine the degree of affective bonding that occurs. The three components of source valance are credibility, attractiveness, and power. Garrison and Pate (1977) identified four categories contained in the component of power. Positive personal power was seen as the target's perception of the qualifications of the communicator. Negative personal power was the assessment that might be made about the incompetence of the communicator. Reward power was the perception of the communicator's ability to reward. Finally, coercive power was an assessment by the target of the communicator's ability to punish.

Savasta's (Note 1) work on developing the Social Interaction Scoring System represents an attempt to study communicator-based power rather than attributed power. She began her work on the assumptions that a person has power when he or she can get another person to do something they wouldn't ordinarily do and that the behaviors used in that effort demonstrate efforts to control information about the self, the other, and the world. From her work sprang categories of information control which will be discussed in a later section. These categories were synthesized from researchers in the area of social interaction theory including French and Raven (1956), Braginsky (1966), Murray (1938), Russell (1938), and Goffman (1959).

Read (Note 2) adapted Savasta's (Note 1) scoring system to the study of verbal persuasion, thereby eliminating all of the nonverbal categories. She used this power construct in studying how one's ego identity status would affect persuasive technique.

The present study utilized the revised form of the Social

Interaction Scoring System (Read, Note 2) and, as such, dealt only with verbal persuasion attempts. For the purpose of this study, verbal persuasion was defined in terms of Savasta's (Note 1) power construct.

Thus, the ability to persuade a person to engage in a task provided the persuader with some level of power. To gain that power, the communicator attempted to control information about the self, the other, and the world.

CHAPTER II

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The research shows strong evidence of a relationship between physical attractiveness and the attribution of personality characteristics. The related research in the area of persuasive communication has shown that the physical attractiveness of the communicator affects the ability to persuade a target to act. There are, however, no studies in the published literature at this time that explore the possible relationship between the attractiveness of the target and the influence style chosen by the communicator. The present study was conducted to explore that relationship.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the chosen persuasive style of a communicator varies according to the attractiveness of a female target. Specifically, the study was designed to address the following questions:

1. Do communicators utilize different persuasive styles when attempting to persuade a female of high physical attractiveness than when attempting to persuade a female of low physical attractiveness?
2. Do the persuasive styles of males and females differ when attempting to persuade a female target person?

An additional task of this study was to generate questions for further research.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses of this study were:

1. There are no significant differences in persuasive style utilized by communicators when attempting to persuade a female in a high attractiveness condition versus a female in a low attractiveness condition.

2. There are no significant differences in persuasive style utilized by male and female communicators when attempting to persuade a female target.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study examined differences in the social influence style of males and females when interacting with a female confederate in a high attractiveness condition versus a female confederate in a low attractiveness condition. The experimental task was to attempt to persuade the confederate to eat M&M's, and its duration was three minutes. The three-minute interaction time was chosen on the basis of information obtained in Read's (Note 3) pilot study. By listening to the audiotapes of the interactions, she found that a three-minute interaction period provided 90% of the information contained in the interaction. In addition, it was found that the process began to deteriorate when the interaction time was more than three minutes.

Sample

The sample for this study consisted of 20 male and 20 female volunteers from courses in the College of Education at Utah State University. Information on age, academic major, year of study, marital status, religion, and social class were collected from all subjects in an effort to clearly define the sample. This information was also used for the later comparison of data. See Appendices A and B for samples of the questionnaire and of the informed consent form that each subject was asked to fill out.

For assignment to one of the experimental conditions, the names of the 20 females were placed in a pool and drawn out one by one. All even

draws were placed in the high attractiveness condition, and all the odd draws were placed in the low attractiveness condition. The same procedure was followed to assign the 20 male subjects to an experimental group.

The Confederate

An attempt was made to remove effects for the personality of the confederate by using the same person to represent both the high and the low attractiveness conditions. The facial attractiveness of the confederate was manipulated by the use of cleanliness of hair, hair style, and make-up. Clothing worn was the same for both experimental conditions. No attempt was made to manipulate body attractiveness. It was felt that using unclean or disheveled clothing would confuse the issue of physical attractiveness with cleanliness or neatness.

The establishment of a significant difference between the high and low attractiveness conditions was accomplished through a process of peer evaluation. Ten women and 10 men were asked to rate a photograph of the confederate in the high attractiveness condition on a scale from 1 to 15 for facial attractiveness. Ten different men and 10 different women were asked to rate a photograph of the confederate in the low attractiveness condition, also on a scale from 1 to 15. A t -test for independent samples was calculated for the mean scores of the two rating groups, and significance was established at the .05 level.

The confederate was trained to respond in a standard way to all subjects. She was instructed to be warm but passive, and not to initiate any conversation. She was also given a list of responses to use when asked by the subject to eat M&M's (Appendix C). In addition, the

confederate was instructed to eat one M&M at the subject's first request and to refuse all other requests.

Procedures

Each subject was asked to fill out a personal data questionnaire and to sign a statement in which he or she agreed not to divulge any information about the experiment. The subject was then informed that the purpose of the experiment was to determine which academic major produces the most persuasive students. They were further instructed that they would have three minutes to get the confederate to eat as many M&M's as possible and that their conversations would be audiotaped. For extra incentive, they were told that they would receive 50¢ for each M&M the confederate ate. The experimenter further informed the subject that the confederate had been asked to wait in the room and was told nothing about the experiment except that the experimenter would return for him or her in a few minutes.

Following the instructions, the subject was escorted into the experimental room and introduced to the confederate. The researcher then left the room for a period of three minutes. Interactions were audiotaped. At the end of the three minutes, the researcher entered the room and terminated the interaction between the confederate and the subject. The confederate and the subject were then asked to rate each other on eight adjectives, one of which was physical attractiveness (Appendix D). This served as a post-experimental check to assess the subject's perceptions of the proposed differences in confederate attractiveness and personality across the two experimental conditions.

During the debriefing period, the subject was informed of the true

nature of the experiment, including the fact that the confederate's attractiveness had been manipulated. The subject was allowed as much time as was needed to ask questions. At the end of this period, the subject was reminded of the importance of not discussing the experiment with anyone and thanked for his or her participation.

Scoring Instrument

The instrument that was used to score the interactions was the Social Interaction Scoring System devised by Savasta (Note 1) and revised by Read (Note 2). As already discussed, it was developed as a mechanism to measure power through the social influence process. Savasta's assumptions were that a person is powerful if that person can convince another to do something he or she wouldn't ordinarily do and that these efforts represent attempts to control information received by the target about the self, the other, and the world.

This instrument divides influence attempts into the four general classifications of image control, resource control, sanctions control, and perception control. The image control classification measures efforts on the part of the subject to control information about the self. Attempts to control information, either positive or negative, about the other are classified as sanctions control. The categories entitled resource control and perception control represent efforts to control information about the world. Resource control measures efforts to establish an interdependent relationship as a means of persuasion, and perception control measures deceptive and manipulative behaviors. Each of these general categories was divided into more specific ratings and, with the addition of an "other" category for rating unusual responses,

the categories totalled 15 in all. These categories of information control were synthesized from social interaction behavior categories presented by other researchers including French and Raven (1956), Braginsky (1966), Murray (1938), Russell (1938), and Goffman (1959). The development of the perception control area, for example, utilized Goffman's (1959) writings on impression management as well as Braginsky's (1966) work on the modes of deception.

As part of Savasta's (Note 1) work, interrater reliabilities for each category were established. The 10 to 20 observations sampled from each of the 15 categories yielded interrater reliabilities ranging from .80 to 1.00. The overall interrater reliability for her study was .948.

Read (Note 2) adapted the Social Interaction Scoring System specifically for the experimental condition being used in this study. The researcher served as a rater for Read (Note 2) and aided in that revision. The revision added greater structure for scoring to improve the percentage of agreement, which reached an average case-by-case agreement of 88%. Interrater reliabilities ranged from .20 to .99, with only two categories not reaching significance at the .01 level. The mean Pearson correlation coefficient was .82.

Savasta (Note 1) established predictive validity for the Social Interaction Scoring System through her investigation into the relationship between social influence style and Machiavellian orientation. More relevant to this study, however, Read (Note 2; Adams & Read, Note 3) established predictive validity for the revised form of the Social Interaction Scoring System through investigations into the relationships between social influence style and facial attractiveness, social influence style and body type, and social influence style and feminine

identity development. For example, 68% of the cases of facial attractiveness were correctly identified through the use of the Social Interaction Scoring System to analyze social influence style. A higher percentage of cases was identified in the medium (71%) and high (78%) categories of facial attractiveness.

This particular scoring system was chosen for this study because of its ability to comprehensively categorize influence attempts. It provides a reliable way to judge the persuasive approach of communicators and has been shown to have predictive validity in related areas of research. In addition, the participation of this researcher on the Utah State University campus to revise the Social Interaction Scoring System and to adapt it specifically to this persuasive task makes it a logical choice.

For more detailed information about the revised form of the Social Interaction Scoring System (SISS) which was used in this study, please see Appendix D.

Training of Raters

Using sample protocols from Read's (Note 2) study, two student raters were trained in the use of the SISS by the experimenter. When the raters were able to independently rate the protocols with a percentage of agreement consistently reaching 80%, they were ready to score the interactions obtained through the present study. The mean interrater reliability required for this study was .75.

Analysis of Data

The present study measured only verbal attempts at persuasion with no provisions made for the measurement of nonverbal cues. Each

influence attempt was given a rating to place it in one of the 15 behavioral categories of the Social Interaction Scoring System.

Using the SISS, each of two raters independently scored one-half of the total 40 protocols. Ratings were accomplished by listening to audiotapes and utilizing typewritten transcripts of the interactions. The tapes were listened to once to check for tone and inflection, again to do the ratings, and a third time to review the ratings.

After all 40 protocols were scored, five from each rating group were randomly selected to be scored by the other rater. These 10 protocols were used to calculate interrater reliability.

Using a varimax rotation procedure, a process of factor analysis was done to identify particular combinations of responses that made up persuasive styles. Analyses of variance were computed on the factors using a 2 X 2 (sex-by-experimental condition) factorial design on factor scores derived from the factor analysis procedure.

In addition, analyses of variance were computed on each of the attribution variables to check for differences in perceived personality traits across the two experimental conditions.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Demographics

The sample for this study consisted of 20 males and 20 females whose mean age was 23 years with a standard deviation of 3.87 years. Eleven subjects fell in the 18- to 20-year-old range, 19 were between 21 and 25 years of age, and 10 were 25 years of age or older. Five of the subjects had freshman status, 3 were sophomores, 14 were juniors, and 18 were seniors. Of the total sample, 23 subjects were single and 17 subjects were married. While 33 subjects maintained LDS religious affiliation, 7 were non-LDS. Furthermore, approximately two-thirds of the sample came from homes where the mother and father had each received some college education. Appendix E provides further breakdown of the demographic variables.

In summary, the sample for this study consisted predominantly of upper-class students who were equally single and married and whose religious affiliation was predominantly LDS. Two-thirds of the subjects came from families where both parents had attended college.

Reliability

Reliability of the rating scores for the SISS was determined in two ways. The first of these methods was the computation of overall percentages of agreement for each of the 15 behavioral categories. The criterion used for this process was the total number of correct or

matching ratings divided by the total number of ratings possible and then multiplying that figure by 100. This criterion of reliability reached 87% for the two raters. The second method of determining reliability for the raters was to compute Pearson product moment correlation coefficients. Table 1 summarizes the correlations for each behavioral dimension. It can be seen that reliability assessments were high for five categories, modest for four, and nonsignificant for one behavior (abasement). In the remaining four categories, there were not enough responses scored to allow the computation of coefficients. Excluding these four categories, the remaining 11 produced an average correlation of .74. When the one outlying correlation ($r=.25$) was eliminated from the computations, the average reliability reached .79. Collectively, the percentage of agreement and reliability checks indicate the scoring of the behavioral categories was satisfactory but not isomorphic.

Factor Analysis

For data reduction purposes, and in an effort to decrease type I error in later analysis, the 11 SISS behavioral categories identified in the previous section were factor analyzed using a varimax rotation procedure. This procedure attempted to eliminate sporadic responses and, at the same time, establish a predictive relationship between responses in such a way as to identify profiles of responses. Using only the 11 categories that generated correlation coefficients, three factors were identified. These three factors accounted for approximately 45% of the shared variance.

The behavioral profile identified by Factor I indicated that as individuals provide negative sanctions (hostility or antagonism), they are

Table 1

Reliability Estimates of Raters' Scores
on the SISS Behavioral Categories

SISS Behaviors	<u>r</u>
Verbal Ascendancy-Dominance	.54*
Physical Ascendancy-Dominance	--
Provides Positive Structure	.97*
Provides Negative Structure	.88*
Asks for Structure	.90*
Abasement	.25
Submission-Compliance	--
Negative Sanctions	.74*
Positive Sanctions	--
Interdependency Strategies	1.00*
Resource Management	--
Explanation	.93*
Deception	.97*
Manipulation	.51**
Other	.41***

Note. On four behavioral categories, subjects did not manifest enough behavior during the experimental task to allow computation of correlations.

* $p < .05$ or better.

** $p < .06$.

*** $p < .10$.

likely to use interdependency strategies (compromise and combining purposes), explanations (accurate descriptions of the experiment), and show a wide range of novel influence behaviors (other category). Further, such individuals are likely to assume responsibility for the task and are unlikely to use techniques which ask the other person to provide structure or direction. Thus, Factor I appears to be measuring a type of negative interdependency.

Factor II identified a behavioral profile in which individuals use deception in their behavioral interaction. These persons are also likely to use abasement (pleading or belittling self) and attempt to provide positive structure (giving suggestions toward goals). Since the overriding emphasis is an attempt to deceive, the abasement and positive structuring may be potentially deceptive themselves. Therefore, Factor II appears to be measuring a deceptive influence style.

The behavioral profile identified in Factor III indicated that persons who are verbally domineering or commanding in their interaction style will use both positive and negative structuring strategies. Factor III, then, seems to be measuring verbal dominance.

Table 2 provides a breakdown of the factors and what individual response patterns are included in each. Table 2 also provides more detailed information about the shared variance accounted for by each factor.

Sex by Experimental Condition

Two hypotheses were tested by analysis of variance. The first stated that there would be no significant difference in verbal persuasion style between those attempting to persuade the female confederate

Table 2

Factor Analysis on SISS Measure

SISS Behavior	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III
Verbal Ascendency-Dominance			.84
Provides Positive Structure		.36	.41
Provides Negative Structure			.48
Asks for Structure	-.48		
Abasement		.46	
Negative Sanctions	.63		
Interdependency Strategies	.83		
Explanation	.56		
Deception		.90	
Manipulation			
Other	.55		
Percentage of Variance	19%	13.5%	10.7%

in the attractive condition and those attempting to persuade the female confederate in the unattractive condition. The second hypothesis stated that there would be no significant difference in verbal persuasion style between male and female influencers attempting to persuade a female target.

To test the proposed hypotheses, analyses of variance were computed on the three social influence behavioral profiles using a sex-by-experimental condition factorial. Factor scores were used for each of the factors as dependent variables. For all three analyses, the null hypothesis was accepted for the main effects of sex, $F(1, 36)=.47$, $p < .50$, and experimental condition, $F(1, 36)=.004$, $p < .85$, as well as the sex-by-experimental condition interaction, $F(3, 36)=.86$, $p < .47$.

To assess the subjects' perceptions of the proposed differences in perceived attractiveness and several personality variables, a post-experimental questionnaire was completed by each subject in which they rated the confederate. As expected, subjects in the attractiveness condition perceived the confederate as more facially attractive ($M=10.95$) than in the unattractive condition ($M=8.75$), $F(1, 36)=7.82$, $p < .008$. Further, when the confederate was in the attractive condition, she was perceived as being more curious, $F(1, 36)=17.11$, $p < .0001$, and perceptive, $F(1, 36)=4.75$, $p < .04$, than when she was in the unattractive condition. Table 3 lists F values for each of the attribution variables.

Table 3

F Values for Attribution Variables

Attribution Variable	<u>F</u>	Significance of <u>F</u>
<u>Active-Passive</u>		
Sex	3.754	0.061
Condition	2.403	0.130
<u>Assertive-Submissive</u>		
Sex	6.100	0.018
Condition	2.711	0.108
<u>Attractive-Unattractive</u>		
Sex	0.259	0.614
Condition	7.842	0.008
<u>Confident-Unsure</u>		
Sex	0.051	0.823
Condition	1.112	0.299
<u>Cooperative-Competitive</u>		
Sex	0.000	1.000
Condition	0.768	0.387
<u>Curious-Indifferent</u>		
Sex	3.401	0.073
Condition	17.113	0.000
<u>Flexible-Rigid</u>		
Sex	1.242	0.272
Condition	1.975	0.169
<u>Perceptive-Insensitive</u>		
Sex	0.012	0.914
Condition	4.752	0.036

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine if and in what manner a chosen persuasive style varies with the facial attractiveness of a female target. Twenty male and 20 female college students were asked to persuade a female target to eat M&M's. The target was in either a high facial attractive condition or a low facial attractive condition. After the three-minute interaction period, subjects were asked to make assessments of personality characteristics possessed by the target.

The persuasive attempts were scored by use of the Social Interaction Scoring System. Individual responses were factor analyzed to identify response patterns characterizing influence styles.

Analyses of variance were computed to compare influence styles utilized across the two experimental conditions. Personality attributions and attractiveness assessments were also compared by analyses of variance.

Evaluation of the Findings

Previous physical attractiveness research has found that persons of high physical attractiveness are consistently perceived more favorably than persons of low physical attractiveness. A study by Dion et al. (1972), for example, indicated that persons of high physical attractiveness are seen as more self-assertive, exciting, interesting, sensitive, kind, friendly, enthusiastic, trustworthy, modest, and outgoing. A study by Miller (1970a) found that highly attractive persons are

perceived as being curious, perceptive, cooperative, and flexible, while persons of low physical attractiveness are perceived as indifferent, insensitive, competitive, and rigid. A followup study by Miller (1970b) indicated that persons of a high degree of physical attractiveness are seen as more self-controlled and less influenced by others than their less attractive peers. Hill and Lando (1976) compared the applicability of these studies across sexes and found that women are judged more harshly on physical appearance than men.

Since the target person for the present study was a female, it would be expected that perceptions of her appearance and personality would differ across experimental conditions. In fact, the target female was judged to be significantly less attractive in the unattractive condition than when she was in the attractive condition. Neither condition reached the extremes of the attractiveness spectrum, however, and probably represented more fairly the low average range of attractiveness versus the attractive range. Two of the personality attribution measures differed significantly across the two experimental conditions. The target was perceived significantly more curious and perceptive when in the attractive condition and more indifferent and insensitive when in the unattractive condition.

It could be speculated that a greater difference in the attractiveness of the target in the two conditions would have yielded greater differences in the personality attributions. This was the case in previous attribution studies. Still, it is important to note that even though the same person represented both conditions, perceptions of her personality varied as her attractiveness level was manipulated.

There were two hypotheses tested by this study. The first stated

that there would be no significant differences in persuasive style utilized with a target of high facial attractiveness versus a target of low facial attractiveness. This hypothesis was accepted. The second hypothesis stated that there would be no significant differences between the persuasive style chosen by a female versus a male communicator when attempting to persuade a female target. This hypothesis was also accepted.

Implications

Previous research has shown that persons are judged on the basis of physical appearance. This study was an attempt to find out if those judgments translate into varying methods of persuading persons of high versus low facial attractiveness.

It was expected that the subjects would interact differently with the confederate when she was in the attractive condition versus the unattractive condition. Evaluation of the findings, however, indicates that there was no effect for the attractiveness condition. There are at least four possible explanations for these findings.

The first of these is the possibility that there was no a great enough difference between the level of attractiveness across the two experimental conditions. The unattractive condition was judged to be on the low end of average rather than truly in the unattractive range. It is possible that the difference in persuasive style would have been greater if the confederate in the unattractive condition would have reached further toward the unattractive pole.

Secondly, the definition of persuasive style may have affected the results of this study. Previous efforts at evaluating persuasive

technique have focused on individual responses. Dion and Stein (1978), for example, studied what type of influence style is utilized by persons of varying levels of physical attractiveness. They divided their subjects into four groups: attractive males, attractive females, unattractive males, and unattractive females. The attractive males used the most assertive techniques and also made use of pleading more often than the other groups. Attractive females were the most passive communicators. Unattractive males used commands more often than the other children and were the only group to make use of physical threats. Unattractive females were more assertive than attractive females. Generally, attractive children used more positive approaches and confronted the target on reasons for their position, while unattractive children more frequently asked for direction from the target. Hare et al. (1979) attempted to define persuasive technique in terms of the form and content of the message. The form could be either positive or negative, dominant or submissive, serious or expressive, or conforming versus nonconforming. The content of the message was the reason given or implied for complying. This could be to gain peer approval, to receive monetary reward, to adhere to values, or to receive other resources.

Both of these studies have looked at the type of message that is communicated by focusing on the individual response. As the reader will recall, a factor analysis procedure was used in the present study to identify profiles of responses. The procedure established a predictive relationship between individual responses. The three profiles of persuasive style which were identified were given the titles negative interdependency, deceptive, and verbal dominance. The negative interdependency persuasive style is made up of several different independent

strategies. As individuals tend to use hostility or antagonism in their persuasive attempts, they are also likely to use compromise, accurate descriptions of purpose, and a variety of novel influence behaviors. The deceptive influence style identifies a person who is likely to use a variety of deceptive strategies, including pleading and belittling themselves. The third persuasive profile, verbal dominance, is characterized by the predominant use of verbal commands along with both positive and negative structuring techniques.

This different approach to defining persuasive communication takes into consideration a more general style of interaction beyond individual responses. Individual comments may differ greatly, but general styles of persuasion may not be significantly altered according to the facial attractiveness of the target. This point may be of particular importance because it may indicate that the research needs to focus more on total behavior rather than isolated responses.

The third possibility is the effect of personality, either of the communicator or of the target. Snyder, Berscheid, and Tanke (1979) examined the effect of the communicator's perceptions of the attractiveness of the target on the target's behavior. Those targets who were perceived as attractive came to act in a friendly, likeable, sociable manner as compared to those targets who were perceived to be unattractive. This phenomenon may have been present in this study.

A fourth possibility is that attitudes may not be manifested in behavior. Dion (1972) evaluated assessments of children's misbehaviors and found that the misbehavior of unattractive children was more likely to be judged as a part of an enduring problem while the misbehavior of attractive children was more often seen as the function of having an off

day. The researcher did not, however, find evidence of differences in the expression of punishment.

Limitations

There are evident limitations in this study. The most obvious was the task itself. It was a highly artificial task and would not be likely to occur naturally. For that reason, one needs to be cautious when attempting to generalize the findings. Although the subjects were offered rewards for persuading the target, it is probable that they were only mildly motivated. Even with these limitations, this task and setting were chosen to provide information into the initial study of these questions. The setting provided good opportunity to control experimental conditions. The design had been used in a previous study on the Utah State University (Read, Note 3) campus in which this researcher participated in the adaptation of the Social Interaction Scoring System to this particular task. Also, in the previous study the three-minute interaction was found to be adequate. The Social Interaction Scoring System was chosen because of this researcher's familiarity with the instrument, as well as the fact that it was revised to use with this type of a task.

This study was intended to be a preliminary exploration of the effect of target attractiveness on the communicator's persuasive style. This project took the previous work on defining attitudes about physical appearance and began researching how those attitudes are actually affecting behavior. To isolate the behavior of the subject as much as possible, one person was chosen to represent both the attractive and unattractive conditions. A more careful choice of confederate may have

found someone whose attractiveness could be manipulated to a greater degree.

Recommendations

There have been a small number of research projects which attempted to generalize the attitudes possessed by communicators regarding physical attractiveness to actual behavior. This study raised many questions about actual effect of facial attractiveness of the target on the persuasive style utilized by the communicator. Listed below are suggestions for future research in this area.

1. Further investigation is needed into how a person's physical appearance affects their personality development.
2. Further efforts to define persuasive style would aid the study of social interaction as it relates to the target's level of physical attractiveness.
3. Greater efforts should be made to determine if a person's attitudes alter behavior or if a person's persuasive style is more constant and dependent on their personality.

Summary

This chapter has evaluated the research findings and discussed the implications and limitations of the study. Areas of suggested investigation have also been provided.

Generally, this study found no effect for facial attractiveness of the target person on the chosen influence style of the communicator. In addition, no sex differences were found between male and female communicators as they attempt to persuade a female target.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Savasta, D. M. The psychology of power: An empirical study of social influence of age, sex, and Machiavellian orientation. Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1977.
2. Read, D. A. Feminine development: The relationship between identity status, personality, and social influence style. Doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, 1981.
3. Adams, G. R., & Read, D. A. Personality and social influence style of attractive and unattractive college-age women. Submitted manuscript, 1983.

REFERENCES

- Adams, G. R. The physical attractiveness stereotype. In A. G. Miller (Ed.), In the eye of the beholder: Contemporary issues in stereotyping. New York: Praeger, 1982.
- Adams, G. R., & Crane, P. An assessment of parents' and teachers' expectations of preschool children's social preference for attractive or unattractive children and adults. Child Development, 1980, 51, 224-231.
- Adams, G. R., & Huston, T. Social perceptions of middle-aged persons varying in physical attractiveness. Developmental Psychology, 1977, 11, 657-658.
- Adams, G. R., & LaVoie, J. C. Parental expectations of educational and personal-social performance and childrearing patterns as a function of attractiveness, sex, and conduct of the child. Child Study Journal, 1975, 5, 125-142.
- Blass, T.; Alperstein, L.; & Block, S. H. Effects of communicator's race and beauty and of receiver's objectivity-subjectivity on attitude change. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1974, 1(1), 132-134.
- Braginsky, D. Machiavellianism and manipulative interpersonal behavior in children: Two exploratory studies. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1966.
- Brislin, R. W., & Lewis, S. A. Dating and physical attractiveness: Replication. Psychological Reports, 1968, 22, 976.
- Chaiken, S. Communicator physical attractiveness and persuasion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37(8), 1387-1397.
- Chaiken, S.; Eagly, A. H.; Sejwacz, D.; Gregory, W. L.; & Christensen, D. Communicator physical attractiveness as a determinant of opinion change. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1978, 8(1), 9.
- Cortner, C.; Trehub, S.; Boukydis, D.; Ford, L.; Clehoffer, L.; & Minde, K. Nurses' judgments of the attractiveness of premature infants. Infant Behavior and Development, 1978, 1, 373-380.
- Dion, K. Physical attractiveness and evaluation of children's transgressions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 24(2), 207-213.

- Dion, K.; Berscheid, E.; & Walster, E. What is beautiful is good. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 24(3), 285-290.
- Dion, K. K., & Stein, S. Physical attractiveness and interpersonal influence. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1978, 14, 97-108.
- French, J. R., & Raven, B. The bases of social power. Psychological Review, 1956, 63, 181-194.
- Garrison, J. P., & Pate, L. E. Toward development and measurement of the interpersonal power construct. The Journal of Psychology, 1977, 97, 95-106.
- Goffman, E. Presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1959.
- Hare, A. P.; Kritzer, H. M.; & Blumberg, H. H. Functional analysis of persuasive interaction in a role-playing experiment. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1979, 107, 77-88.
- Hill, M. K., & Lando, H. A. Physical attractiveness and sex-role stereotypes in impression formation. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1976, 43, 1251-1255.
- Horai, J.; Naccari, N.; & Fatoullah, E. The effects of expertise and physical attractiveness upon opinion agreement and liking. Sociometry, 1974, 37, 601-606.
- McGuire, W. J. The nature of attitude and attitude change. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology (Vol. 3). Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- Miller, A. G. Role of physical attractiveness in impression formation. Psychonomic Science, 1970a, 19, 241-243.
- Miller, A. G. Social perception of internal-external control. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1970b, 30, 103-109.
- Mills, J., & Aronson, E. Opinion change as a function of the communicator's attractiveness and desire to influence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 193-197.
- Murray, H. A. Explorations in personality. New York: Oxford, 1938.
- Russell, G. Power. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1938.
- Seligman, C.; Paschall, N.; & Takata, G. Effects of physical attractiveness on attribution of responsibility. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 1974, 6(3), 290-296.
- Sigall, H., & Landy, D. Radiating beauty: The effects of having a physically attractive partner on person perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 28, 218-224.

- Snyder, M.; Berscheid, E.; & Tanke, E. D. Social perception and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1977, 35(9), 656-666.
- Snyder, M., & Rothbart, M. Communicator attractiveness and opinion change. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 1971, 3, 377-387.
- Walster, E.; Aronson, V.; Abrahams, D.; & Rottman, L. Importance of physical attractiveness in dating behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 308-316.

APPENDICES

Appendix APersonal Data

NAME _____

AGE _____ SEX (M or F) _____

ACADEMIC MAJOR _____

YEAR OF STUDY (FR, SO, JUN, SEN) _____

MARITAL STATUS _____ Single _____ Married

RELIGION _____ LDS _____ Non-LDS

FORMAL EDUCATION COMPLETED BY FATHER

Eighth grade or less
 Part of high school
 High school graduate
 Part of college
 Received bachelors degree
 Graduate or professional degree beyond bachelors

FORMAL EDUCATION COMPLETED BY MOTHER

Eighth grade or less
 Part of high school
 High school graduate
 Part of college
 Received bachelors degree
 Graduate or professional degree beyond bachelors

Appendix BInformed Consent

I have been informed that the purpose of this study is to determine which academic major produces the most persuasive students. I understand that my interactions will be audiotaped. I further understand that the personal data information will be held in confidence and that it will be destroyed at the completion of the study.

I hereby give my consent to participate in this study, which includes my consent to being audiotaped. I further agree not to divulge information regarding this experiment prior to the completion of this study.

Researcher _____

Subject _____

Date _____

Date _____

Appendix CConfederate Responses

"No, thank you."

"I don't care for any more."

"I'm not hungry."

"I really don't want any."

"I've just had breakfast (lunch)."

"I don't think I want any more."

"I don't know. I just don't feel like eating candy right now."

"Thanks for the offer, but . . ."

Appendix DAttribution Questionnaire

Please rate your partner on the following characteristics. We are interested in your true perceptions, so please rate him or her honestly. Ratings of 15 indicate that your partner possesses the most possible of that characteristic, and ratings of 1 indicate that your partner possesses the least possible of that characteristic. Please circle the appropriate number.

Partner's first name _____

ACTIVE	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	PASSIVE
ASSERTIVE	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	SUBMISSIVE
ATTRACTIVE	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	UNATTRACTIVE
CONFIDENT	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	UNSURE
COOPERATIVE	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	COMPETITIVE
CURIOUS	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	INDIFFERENT
FLEXIBLE	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	RIGID
PERCEPTIVE	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	INSENSITIVE

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!!

Appendix EDemographic VariablesSex

Male subjects	20
Female subjects	20

Age

18- to 20-year-old range	11
21- to 25-year-old range	19
25 years of age and older	10

Class Standing

Freshmen	5
Sophomores	3
Juniors	14
Seniors	18

Marital Status

Single	23
Married	17

Religious Affiliation

LDS	33
Non-LDS	7

Formal Education of Father

Eighth grade	4
Part of high school	5
High school	5
Part of college	7
Bachelors degree	11
Graduate degree	8

Formal Education of Mother

Eighth grade	1
Part of high school	2
High school	9
Part of college	12
Bachelors degree	12
Graduate degree	4

Appendix F

Social Interaction Scoring System Manual (Revised)

The social influence behaviors in this scoring system have been clustered into 15 major categories. The criteria for inclusion into each category are listed below with examples. The following scoring procedures are being used in order to improve interrater consensus.

1. Audiotapes of the social influence situation will be transcribed.
2. Before sitting down to score, each rater will read over the entire scoring system in order to warm up.
3. Scoring will be done while reading the transcriptions and listening to the tapes. Only one page at a time will be scored after listening to that section of the tape in order to emphasize voice inflections.
4. Each sentence will be scored as a separate statement, unless its meaning is unmistakably determined by a previous statement.
5. These procedures will be followed until the judges consistently achieve 80% agreement on sample protocols. The judges will then each score 16 randomly chosen protocols from the treatment group for a reliability check. The remaining 24 protocols will be divided between the two judges and scored.

Image Control

1. Verbal Ascendency-Dominance

A strategy should be scored as ascendency-dominance when it is

of such strength that it does not imply autonomy, choice, or non-compliance on the part of the other. A verb or a verb phrase will generally begin the main portion of the statement. In this category, the influencer makes it explicit what the other is to do by self-righteousness and superiority of self over other, demands, directive comments implying no autonomy for the other, orders, commands, bossing, giving explicit instructions, or asserting one's own authority.

The influencer interrupts or "overtalks" (increased volume or overlap of statements) the other as a sign of ascendancy.

Important in this category is the tone of voice or emphasis with which the statement is issued. Commands are scored in this category even if softened by "Okay?." The tone overrides the content of the statement.

Examples:

"Eat!"
 "Here, have a brown one."
 "Help yourself."
 "Take some home."
 "Try it!"
 "Eat some!"
 "Okay, now start eating the M&M's and I'll count them."
 "I want you to stuff them all in your mouth."

Exceptions:

Directive comments issued with a pleading tone are scored 6A.

2. Physical Ascendancy-Dominance

This category includes all verbal statements of physical dominance or superiority. This includes threats of physical punishment and reminders of physical strength.

Examples:

"Remember, I'm bigger than you are."
 "If you don't eat them, I'm going to feed them to you!"
 "I'm going to shove them in your mouth. Here, open up!"
 "I'm just asking you, will you eat the M&M's? Or I'll
 beat your face in."
 "You want me to feed you, here!"

3. Provides Positive Structure

The criteria for inclusion in this category are as follows:

- A. Gives suggestions for organization, procedure, orientation, or solution to the problem. Also included in this category is providing information about the task of eating M&M's. The influencer performs actions towards organizing or attaining her goal or makes procedural suggestions of a normative nature directed towards some immediate action. This includes the influencer eating M&M's if accompanied by verbalizations indicating that she is doing so. Score 3A if the influencer follows a true statement with an emphasis or a clarification phrase, such as "seriously" or "no joke."

Examples:

"You can have them all."
 "Why don't you try just one."
 "I like to eat M&M's whenever I can."
 "I guess I'll just have some of these myself."
 "Please feel free to eat as many of those as you
 like."
 "They're here for us to enjoy."
 "I'm going to eat more of these and try to persuade you."
 "I'm not supposed to eat them, you are."
 "Don't be shy, have more than one."

- B. Gives opinion, evaluation, analysis, or expression of

feeling or wish. These are general evaluative or opinion-expressing comments of the influencer, generally in the form of drawing a conclusion or expressing opinions that lead to influencing the other. Any opinions about candy or about eating the candy belong in this category. A distinction should be made between statements of opinion and deceptive statements.

Examples:

"I hope you aren't on a diet."
 "They're really good."
 "There's nothing wrong with them."
 "One is not very many."
 "I wish you would eat more of them."
 "They do psychological studies of strange things."

Exceptions:

Deceptive statements ("They don't have any calories.") will be scored 13A.

- C. Gives agreement or concurrence. This category includes all items which indicate agreement with the other, voting to accept a decision, indicating that the other is correct in her assertion, or indicating that the assertion is correct. Distinction should be made between giving agreement and submitting or complying.

Examples:

"That sounds right to me."
 ("I like the green ones best.") "I do, too."
 "I agree."
 ("They taste good.") "I know."
 ("This is weird.") "It sure is!"

Exceptions:

Statements implying submission ("Okay, but I

just thought that you might want some.")
are scored 7.

- D. Draws attention, repeats, clarifies. The influencer draws attention to the problem, statement, or the person about to make the statement. Also scored here are clarifications of the meaning of a previous comment; returning the other's attention to the task after having clearly been on a tangent; maintaining attention on the task, such as talking about M&M's and repeating, because the other didn't hear or asks for repetition.

Examples:

"Here. Do you see this candy?"

"I'll tell you what . . ."

"I'll come right to the point."

("What did you say?") "I said that you should eat them."

("I could be rich when I walk out of here.")

"Well, comparatively to right now, which is broke."

"No, I am just teasing."

4. Provides Negative Structure

- A. All contradictions are included in this category.

The influencer gives disagreement, maintains contrary position. Influencer disagrees with the content of the statement or position of the other. This category includes refusal to eat M&M's; resistance to suggestions, opinions, or alternatives offered by the other; direct contradictions; and disagreeing that is not hostile/antagonistic.

Examples:

"I don't want any."
 "I can't eat them because I am on a diet."
 "I've had so many that I can't eat any more."
 ("You have some.") "No."
 ("I don't want any more.") "Yes, you do."

- B. Negative exclamations. This category is reserved for negative exclamations that have no relevant meaning. If there is a hostile note to the statement, the item is scored 8A.

Examples:

"Oh, my God!"
 "Shut!"
 "Goll."
 "One M&M."
 "Is that all?"

Exceptions:

If there is a hostile note to the statement, the item is scored 8A.

5. Asks for Structure

The criteria for inclusion in this category are as follows:

- A. Asks for opinions; affective evaluations; analysis; or expression of wish or feeling, including opinions about M&M's. The definitions for category 3B hold here, except that the influencer is asking for the other's opinions, evaluations, analysis, and expressions rather than giving these statements.

Examples:

"What do you think about this?"
 "Tell me how you feel about doing this."
 "I wish you'd give me your thoughts."
 "Do you think they're good?"
 "Do you like M&M's?"
 "They're kind of tempting, aren't they?"

"Do you feel weird here with a stranger?"

"Okay?"

Exceptions:

Asking for structure out of personal inadequacy is scored 6B.

Asking for structure implying interdependency is scored 10. ("Do you think we could both finish off this bowl?")

Asking for structure which implies suspicion is scored 8C. ("Do you think anyone is watching us from behind that window?")

- B. Asks for solution, direction, possible ways of action, orientation, or information. Influencer asks for direction, solutions, or procedural suggestions regarding the eating of the M&M's. Includes all requests to eat the M&M's. The influencer solicits information or confirmation from the other.

Examples:

"Do you want some M&M's?"

"Are you sure you don't want any more?"

"How did you get chosen to do this?"

"How could I get you to do this?"

"Are you sure?"

"Are you going to eat any more of these?"

"Is there anything I could do to get you to eat these?"

"So, do you want to eat?"

"Do you want a brown one?"

Exceptions:

Asking for solutions, etc. that imply interdependency is scored 10. ("If I split the money with you, will you eat these?")

Asking for motives or questions that imply suspicion is scored 8C. ("Why aren't you eating these?" "Did she tell you not to eat any?")

- C. Asks for repetition or clarification. This category is the same as 3D, except that the influencer is asking the other for the repetition, clarification, or

redirection of attention. If the tone has a pleading quality, the statement is scored 6A.

Examples:

"What do you mean by that?"
 "What?"
 "What did you say just then?"
 ("Do you like this candy?" "Yes.") "Really?"
 "Huh?"

6. Abasement

Criteria for inclusion in this category are as follows:

- A. Supplicates, asks for succorance, implores, entreats, begs. The influencer entreats, begs humbly, implores, asks the permission of the other, pleads, or appeals to the other for help. The meta-content in terms of intonation is very critical in this category. The tone could be characterized as any one of these: childlike, crying, begging, or whining. All "come-on" statements belong in this category, unless the tone is definitely a command.

Examples:

"Come on."
 "Please."
 "Please, do it just for me."
 "You've got to do this for me."
 "I'm begging you."
 "Won't you eat some, please?"

- B. Blames or belittles the self, asks for help by virtue of inadequacy. The influencer's requests for assistance carry connotations of inadequacy of a personal nature. This category includes statements of self-blame and derogation and strong statements of

self-doubt.

Examples:

"I feel so weird doing this!"
 "I feel silly sitting here eating these all by myself."
 "I'll bet others did this better than me."
 "I'm really not very persuasive, am I?"
 "I'm embarrassed."
 "I don't know . . ."
 "I don't know what to say."
 "I've never been one to try to be first."
 "You try to talk seriously, and all I can do is talk about M&M's."
 "I'm such a munch gut!"
 "Do you think that I'm weird for offering you all this candy?"

7. Submission-Compliance

The influencer exhibits behavior which the other requests, an indication that he or she will comply with behavior requested of him or her. A response is scored compliance if the behavior of the target person is exhibited or agreed to. A response is scored submission-compliance if, when the target person refuses candy, the influencer makes no further attempts or complies for even a short time.

Examples:

("I don't feel like eating any.") "Okay."
 ("Let's not do this anymore.") "Okay."
 "I'll give you 5¢ to eat each M&M." ("No, 25¢.") "How about 10¢?" ("No, 25¢.") "Okay, okay, 25¢."

Sanctions Control

8. Negative Sanctions

Negative sanctions imply an active negative evaluation of the target person. Criteria for inclusion in this category are as follows:

- A. Verbal antagonism, hostility, aggression, disapproval. This category includes a wide variety of verbal behaviors which are either socially or psychologically destructive to the other or his or her position. The statements are delivered personally and aggressively. The following behaviors are included: ad hominum attacks or arguments about the other's character to discredit him or her; suggestions implying that the other has no reasonable grounds on which to stand; personal negativism; harassing or taking advantage of the other, even if cloaked in humor; confrontation or challenge done in an aggressive fashion; personal rejection; sarcastic, bitter, or cutting remarks; ridicule; making fun of; blaming the other for the influencer's failures to convince. Attempts to make the other person feel guilty are included here.

Examples:

"Just eat it, you idiot!"

"What's the matter with you? Are you afraid to try it?"

"So what if you gain a few pounds!"

"You're the one who is losing out, you know."

Listen for tones with statements such as:

"Boy, if it was me, I'd eat them." (put-down)

"Do I have to eat all these myself?"

"Is that all you're going to have?"

"That's okay. It doesn't bother me if you don't want any." (guilt)

"My, my. How polite!" (sarcasm)

"Oh, I wouldn't want you to feel bad." (guilt)

"Go ahead and be like that. I don't care!"
(sarcasm and guilt)

B. Excludes or withdraws. This behavior is less direct than the verbal antagonism mentioned above but is, nonetheless, an expression of negative affect. This category involves verbally moving away or withdrawing from the other: ignoring what the other says; avoiding talking with the other; and statements implying exclusion of the other, including silences of 10 seconds or more.

C. Suspicion; questioning motives. This category includes any form of suspicion manifested by the influencer, such as asking about target person's motives, asking what the other wants in return for the behavior requested, trying to find out why the other is so nice. Any question that asks, in essence, "Why aren't you eating these?" This category includes any suspicious behavior directed toward the examiner.

Examples:

"Did she tell you not to eat any?"

"Are you on a diet?"

"I think you've been told ahead of time."

"Don't you like chocolate?"

"Did you know about this before today?"

"Why don't you want anymore?"

"Are you sick?"

"You just don't like M&M's?"

"Any particular reason why you don't want some?"

"Why are you here?" (suspicion)

"What did she tell you?" (suspicion)

D. Redirected aggression. This category includes negative aggressive expressions directed towards the external situation or the experimenter. This would include all aggression, hostility, etc. directed out of

the field, negative feelings expressed towards a third person outside the dyad, hostile jokes, and aggression toward objects.

Examples:

"This is really weird."
 "I feel like I'm on a dating show!"
 "Doris, get me out of here!"
 "They put you in this room and make you feel weird."
 "This puts you on a level of being really stupid."
 "I'd expect them to make us do something like this."
 "Goll, this is so stupid!"

9. Positive Sanctions

These behaviors imply positive evaluation of some behavior or interaction within the observational field, regardless of whether the referent is the self or the other. These are supportive acts; they are assertive, supportive acts which imply initiative beyond mere responsiveness.

A. Shows affection, acceptance, attention, or approval.

This category includes expressions of sympathy; concerned or solicitous behavior toward the other; supportive, positive nurturance; instrumental and emotional support; offers of assistance; appreciation; praises, encourages, or compliments; feels good and says so; tries to cheer up the other; recognizes resourcefulness of other in an area of skill or knowledge.

Examples:

"You must have a lot of self-control."

"I was going to tell you that you didn't need to be on a diet if you are."
 "You're doing really well!"
 "I hope you don't feel too funny doing this."
 "I'm glad I'm not in your place. It's hard to just sit there."
 "That's really a nice necklace."
 ("It looks like the cameras are on.") "Don't worry, they aren't on. It's okay."

- B. Raising the status of the other. The influencer deliberately attempts or effectively raises or enhances the status of the other. This can be done through individual praise or acceptance of the other, buttering up or casting the other in a positive light, flattering or ingratiation. If this is done with "we," then it is scored interdependency, 10.

Examples:

"I wish I could phrase it as well as you have."
 "You certainly have an excellent point there."
 "You're so smart!"
 "You're so sweet, but you won't do it?"

Exceptions:

Flattering or ingratiation done with a "we" is scored 10.

Resource Control

10. Interdependency Strategies

Interdependency implies working together for the benefit of both parties. Criteria for inclusion in this category are as follows: compromise, combining purposes, cooperation, equal distribution of advantages and disadvantages. This category includes offers of working together in a more collaborative way, coordinating activities to alleviate any conflict that may exist, appeals to

distributive justice or fairness to deal with the situation, coordination of activities to assist one another, and suggestions for reciprocal exchange. This category also includes joint operation or action which fairly and equally distributes the advantages and disadvantages of the situation.

Examples:

- "I get 50¢ for each M&M you eat. If you eat some, I'll give you half the money."
 "I'll split the money with you. You shouldn't get a raw deal."
 "If I eat one, will you?"
 "We'll each eat half and each get half of the money."

Exceptions:

"I'll give you 50¢ if you eat them all" is scored 11, since no combining of resources is indicated.

11. Resource Management

The influencer uses his or her resources as part of the influence attempt, with no attempt to deceive or exploit the other.

- A. Depriving of resources. This includes depriving the other of resources, privileges, advantages, or help. A resource is something which the influencer believes the other person wants.

Examples:

- "If you don't eat them, I'll never speak to you again."
 "I'm not going to share the money with you."
 "If you don't eat them, I won't tell you what this experiment is about."

Exceptions:

If the response includes an obvious lie, then score 13 (deception).

- B. Offering of resources. The behaviors observed in

this category include giving tangible objects such as gifts, goods, money, information; giving intangible objects such as promises of events, errands, etc.; bargaining with resources in a nonreciprocal way.

Examples:

"I'll give you 50¢ an M&M."

"If you eat one, I'll tell you what this is all about."

"If you'll eat them, I'll give you a kiss for each one."

"Here, would you like a mint? I'll give you one for each M&M you eat."

"I'll tell you what this is about. Eat some of these first."

Perception Control

12. Explanation

This category, explanation, implies straightforward and accurate descriptions of the experimental parameters in order to influence the target person to eat candy. The descriptions are an accurate version of what the subject was told by the experimenter at the beginning of the session, although it need not be lengthy or complete. The subject is attempting to present an undistorted picture of reality as he or she sees it.

Examples:

"I'm supposed to get you to eat these."

"I'm getting judged on persuasiveness according to how many of these I can get you to eat."

"They are going to pay me 50¢ for every one of these you eat, so I'd like you to eat as many of these as you can."

"They came into my class and gave a survey test and called me up to come here. That's how I got chosen."

"These are here for you to eat."

"This study is about how women convince other people to do things."

"I'm trying to get you to eat as many of these as you can in three minutes."

"She said she would come back in three minutes."

"She called me up last night and asked me to come in."

"She said they're there for us to eat."

13. Deception

Deception implies conscious attempts to distort the perceptions of the other. Criteria for inclusion are:

- A. Commissive lying. This category includes distortion or creation of new information presented to the other. Commissive lies need not follow a question from the other to be scoreable. Commissive lies may relate to the motives the influencer communicates to the other, the benefits he or she may receive from the requested behaviors, the cost of inducing the behavior of the other, or any other statements that keep the other in the dark. This category also includes comments such as "honest" or "seriously" when following a lie, which are scored as a separate response.

Examples:

"Trust me." (following a lie)

"Candy is nutritious."

"They're calorie-free."

"Orange ones make you sexy."

"She didn't tell me why we're doing this."

"I won't have to work this summer, if you just eat all these candies."

Exceptions:

"They give you energy," or any such true statement, is scored 3A.

- B. Omissive lying. This category of manipulative

behavior is defined as the selective disclosure or omission of information. However, because there is no check in the experiment of the subject's retention of information, it would be difficult to differentiate between deceit and unintentional failure to provide information (Braginsky, 1966). Therefore, omissive lies will be scored only after the other requests information of the influencer and the influencer evades, ignores, or simply does not furnish the other with the requested information. Omissive lies must be preceded by a question. Multiple lies may be scored following one question.

Examples:

("How many of these candies must I eat?") "I don't know."
 ("Are the candies plain or peanut M&M's?")
 "Have some candy."
 ("Why are we doing this? Do you know what this is all about?") "Well, no, not really."

14. Manipulation

- A. Two-sided arguments. The influencer presents not only the positive aspects of the task, but also the negative in an attempt to influence the other (Braginsky, 1966).

Examples:

"They are fattening, but think how good they'll taste."
 "They are not so good for you, but they're free!"
 "Even though you're full after lunch, you can think of these as dessert. Free dessert!"
 "They give you zits, but they taste good."

B. Attribution of responsibility to the experimenter.

In this influence strategy, the subject denies his or her responsibility for behavior and shifts it to the experimenter. Whenever the influencer refers to the experimenter as part of the plea to get the other to eat an M&M, it is counted as attribution of responsibility (Braginsky, 1966). This category includes responses which say, in essence, "She wants you to eat them, and I don't really care."

Examples:

"She says you should eat the M&M's."

"I don't really care, but she wants you to do it for the experiment."

"She said you have to eat them all."

Exceptions:

There are times when explanations will necessitate the use of "she." If these are descriptive and accurate statements, as opposed to denial of responsibility, then they are scored 12. ("She said we would be in here for three minutes." "She said this was an experiment about how people influence other people." "She said you were chosen from a class and were in the next room taking tests.")

15. Other

This category includes influence attempts which do not fit into any other category.