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Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

Cialdini, Levy, Herman and Evenbeck recently observed that experimental subjects moderated their opinions when they expected to engage in a face-to-face discussion with a peer. This occurred regardless of the position which the subject expected the peer to take (Cialdini, Levy, Herman and Evenbeck, 1973). The authors hypothesized that such a "moderation shift" occurred because the subject was worried about how favorably his performance in the forthcoming discussion would be evaluated by the other discussion participant and the experimenter. In their view, the subject -- fearful of losing status in the eyes of his audience -- moved to the middle of the opinion scale to achieve flexibility in dealing with an opponent's position, and to associate himself with the apparent "broadmindedness and rationality" of someone who is moderate (Cialdini et al., 1973).

Cialdini chose not to consider the "moderation shift" to be "attitude change" at all, since it was transitory and not stable and enduring. However, in the research that is reported here, attempts were made to create situations conceptually similar to Cialdini's, and to use them as vehicles for inducing permanent attitude change. That is, during what is called here the "evaluation apprehension" period (Rosenberg, 1965), in which the subject was anxious about presenting his views on an issue to someone else, counterattitudinal
information was made available to him. It was hypothesized that the subject, concerned about the apparent rationality of his views, would be motivated to reevaluate all available information in a less biased manner. As a result, he would moderate his opinions permanently.

THE ANTICIPATORY ATTITUDE CHANGE PHENOMENON

The term "anticipatory attitude change" has been used in the literature explicitly to denote a change in expressed opinion prior to receiving a persuasive communication (Cooper and Jones, 1970). In this review, however, the term will be extended to include attitude change that results from the anticipation of any event, not necessarily the receipt of a persuasive communication. This extension seems appropriate if, as is argued here, evaluation apprehension intervenes in all anticipatory situations which produce opinion change without the interjection of counterattitudinal material.

There are at least two examples of anticipatory attitude change: Polarization of opinion; and accommodation or moderation of opinion. The usual experimental paradigm in these situations involves exposing subjects to crucial dependent measures prior to presenting counterattitudinal information. In most cases, subjects are never actually exposed to such information.

Polarization of opinion

Polarization of opinion occurs experimentally when subjects have strongly committed themselves to a position prior to an expected persuasive attack. Sears, Freedman and O'Connor (1964) found that subjects who had taken a public stand on an issue (the guilt or innocence of a defendant in a trial) became more polarized
in their view when expecting to debate the issue. Cohen (1962) in a similar situation, also found that subjects bolstered their beliefs against a coming attack. Jellison and Mills (1969) found that subjects who expected to simply tape-record their views took a more extreme position than their initial opinion would have indicated.

Publicly committed subjects may feel apprehensive about a negative evaluation from individuals who have observed them make a public statement and then apparently retract it. That subjects in the Sears et al. and Cohen experiments polarized their opinions does not contradict an evaluation apprehension explanation. The last case (Jellison and Mills) may not fit the paradigm, but may be an example of subjects trying to clarify relatively moderate views by polarizing them slightly before expressing them on tape.

**Accommodation or moderation of opinion**

The largest body of literature directed toward the anticipatory attitude change phenomenon deals with an apparent moderation of opinion. It was the conclusion of Papageorgis (1968) and Cooper and Jones (1970) that moderation of opinion would occur only in an explicit persuasion context. However, other research, notably McGuire and Millman (1965) and Cialdini et al. (1973) have observed the effect in disguised persuasion contexts. McGuire and Millman told subjects they were taking a "test of analytic thinking ability", while Cialdini's subjects believed that the experimenter was interested in studying the structure of speech.
A stronger moderation effect is generally observed among high self-esteem subjects (Cooper and Jones, 1970; Deaux, 1972) and when subjects expect to hear a persuasive communication from a low credible communicator (Deaux, 1972). These results have been interpreted from the point of view of "self-esteem"—subjects feel they will lose face more if they are persuaded by a low credible communicator than a high credible communicator, so they show a greater pre-communication moderation shift prior to being exposed to the persuasive communication. As would be expected according to this interpretation, high self-esteem subjects show anticipatory change to a greater degree than do low self-esteem subjects, and do so more on issues with which they have high familiarity (Dinner, Lewkowitz and Cooper, 1972). Although this explanation is parsimonious, and also is well-suited to an evaluation apprehension reinterpretation, it still seems puzzling that a truly high self-esteem individual, or one in an induced state of high self-esteem, would believe that he would be so easily persuaded by a low credible communicator.

Finally, moderation of initial opinion has been observed in instances where subjects do not expect to be exposed to counter-attitudinal information, but rather anticipate participating in a debate with another individual. Cialdini et al. (1973) found that subjects who merely expected to listen to a tape-recording of another subject's views did not exhibit the moderation shift, and thus concluded that the shift must be the result of the imminent debate situation. Deaux (1968) found similar results when her subjects
expected to be called on later to defend their views. As discussed earlier, Cialdini explained this sort of result by saying that the subject, fearful of losing face, moved to the middle of the opinion scale to associate himself with broadmindedness and rationality, and to achieve flexibility in dealing with an opponent's position.

Thus far in this review, the terms "moderation" and "accommodation" have both been used to describe anticipatory movement toward neutrality. However, Cialdini et al. (1973) have conceptualized moderation and accommodation as two rival hypotheses, and have interpreted their data as supporting the moderation hypothesis.

The moderation hypothesis. Cialdini et al. observed that subjects moderated their views in preparation for a discussion with an opponent, regardless of the position they expected the opponent to take. Therefore they interpreted movement to neutrality as a "tactical maneuver" designed to avoid a public "loss of face". According to this view, subjects apparently believed that a moderate person would be evaluated more positively by the other person, regardless of the extremity of the other person's views on an issue. The transitory nature of such behavior was shown by the fact that when subjects learned that they would not, after all, have to publicly defend their views, they immediately returned to a more extreme position on the issue.

The accommodation hypothesis. The rival "accommodation hypothesis" was rejected on the basis of this experimental result. The accommodation hypothesis posited a change toward the opponent's
position in order to reduce the possibility of social friction, dissonance, or damage to self-esteem. A closer examination of the data and previous literature suggests that the accommodation hypothesis may not have been fairly tested. First of all, subjects in previous situations have certainly taken their opponent's views into account before expressing their own views. The ingrati­ation literature supports the view that people often try to appear more similar to an attractive other person in order to become more familiar with that person (Jones, 1965). Byrne has demonstrated that similarity leads to attraction among people (Byrne & Griffitt, 1966). Cialdini himself has found that people positively bias their assessments of the intelligence of a person whom they are able to persuade easily, apparently out of a desire to "promote a sense of internal control" (Cialdini, Braver & Lewis, in press). More important, in the Cialdini et al. (1973) experiment, the subjects who moderated their view in response to an extreme peer were never told the point of view which was held by the experimenter. There is a body of literature (Rosenberg, 1965; Orne, 1962) which documents the salience of the experimenter's presence to subjects. Whether or not subjects would moderate their views in response to an opinionated experimenter is a testable empirical question, and the validity or invalidity of the accommodation hypothesis cannot be decided until this question is answered.
Evaluation apprehension

Whether the moderation or accommodation hypothesis ultimately receives the most empirical support, both ideas incorporate the subjects' concern with being "evaluated" by someone — either by the experimenter or by (other) observers. Greenwald (1972) has suggested that Rosenberg's (1965) idea of "evaluation apprehension" may be the most accurate concept through which to integrate the bodies of literature now separately classified under the headings of "anticipatory attitude change", "objective self-awareness" (Wicklund and Duval, 1971), and "openmindedness" (Greenwald, 1969). These three concepts may be considered as special cases of "evaluation apprehension" if the term "evaluator" is extended from Rosenberg's original meaning (the experimenter) to include all actual or potential observers of the subject's behavior.

On the other hand, by combining these concepts, important distinctions may be lost. If attitude change can be considered to be a temporal process with successive "stages" (Hovland, Janis and Kelley, 1953), it may be more correct to also consider each of the four concepts of evaluation apprehension (evaluation apprehension itself, anticipatory attitude change, objective self-awareness, and openmindedness) to occur in temporal succession, with appropriate feedback loops. For example:

Stage I Stage II Stage III Stage IV
objective self-awareness evaluation apprehension (openmindedness) anticipatory attitude change

↑ time →
"Objective self-awareness" may result in evaluation apprehension. Wicklund and Duval (1971) have defined objective self-awareness as "a state in which the individual evaluates himself and attempts to attain correctness and consistency in his beliefs and behaviors". In the diagram above, objective self-awareness was represented as the first stage of a process resulting in anticipatory attitude change. According to this model, the experience of seeing himself as an object in the environment will induce anxiety in the subject over how his views will be evaluated by other persons (evaluation apprehension). This in turn will result in a greater willingness on the part of the subject to consider counterattitudinal information more objectively, if it is presented to him at this point, resulting in permanent attitude change. Evaluation apprehension is illustrated with a feedback loop to objective self-awareness because an individual may become more motivated to evaluate himself if he is concerned with how he is being evaluated by others. Such an assumption is supported by deindividuation studies (e.g., Festinger, Pepitone, and Newcomb, 1952) in which, to the extent that one cannot be identified as a member of a group, self-consciousness decreases.

In turn, evaluation apprehension, because it may result in "open-mindedness", may cause the subject to evaluate new information more objectively, and therefore a subject who had been exposed to counterattitudinal information when he moderated his views would show durable attitude change even after he was removed from the
situation which produced evaluation apprehension. He would not revert to his original more extreme opinion in this case, in contrast to the observations of Cialdini et al. (1973). On the other hand, it is possible, as the above diagram suggests, that State III (openmindedness) need not always, or ever, precede anticipatory attitude change. A vague knowledge that a moderate stance is easier to maintain may be sufficient to produce a "moderation shift" without any necessary re-evaluation of opposing arguments. If so, level of evaluation apprehension would not be expected to interact with the counterattitudinal information variable.

The purpose of the research reported in this paper was two-fold. In attempting to begin the theoretical investigation it was found that persuasive communications containing effective arguments for both sides of an experimental issue were unavailable. Therefore, a total of forty argument-counterargument pairs (and opinion items) were written, and pretested in order to determine their persuasive effectiveness.

After this was done, the theoretical phase of the research was begun, in which situations conceptually similar to that of Cialdini et al. (1973) were created, and used as vehicles for attempting to induce durable attitude change. That is, during what is called here the "evaluation apprehension" period, in which the subject was anxious about presenting his views on an issue to someone else, counterattitudinal information was made available to him. It was
hypothesized that the subject, concerned about his audience's evaluation of the rationality of his views, would be motivated to reevaluate all available information in a less biased manner. As a result, he would moderate his opinions permanently. A test of whether or not "openmindedness" intervened in the moderation shift phenomenon would be whether or not the level of "evaluation apprehension" interacted with exposure to counterattitudinal information. It was predicted that counterattitudinal information would have greater impact under conditions of high evaluation apprehension, because a higher degree of "openmindedness" would exist.

The precedent for expecting the interjection of counterattitudinal information during a period of openmindedness to be effective was established in a previous experiment by Greenwald, in which it was observed that subjects accepted the validity of nearly equal numbers of arguments on both sides of an issue, when expecting to advocate the opposing position (Greenwald, 1969). Greenwald hypothesized that this "openmindedness" resulted from a suspension of persuasion-resistant responses (e.g. counterarguments or discounting responses; Greenwald, 1970) which usually accompany the presentation of counterattitudinal information. Previous literature (e.g. McGuire, 1964) has documented the increased attitude change which accompanies suspension of persuasion-resistant processes. It is suggested here that suspension of persuasion resistant processes may also have been part of an intervening process resulting in the moderation of a subject's opinion prior to a face to face discussion (e.g. Cialdini et al., 1973).
Chapter 2

DEVELOPMENT OF EXPERIMENTAL VARIABLES

Pretest I

A total of twenty arguments, counterarguments, and opinion items were pretested for their effectiveness on 82 male and female introductory psychology students at The Ohio State University. Subjects were run in four groups of between nineteen and twenty-four subjects each, and within each group, subjects heard a tape-recorded argument, counterargument, both an argument and counterargument, or neither an argument nor counterargument for each topic. Topics were rotated around experimental conditions. Subjects responded on a 15-point scale, from strong agreement to strong disagreement, to the communications themselves, and to the opinion items. For example, if a subject heard the counterargument, followed by the argument for a topic, followed by the opinion item, the subject would have generated three scores for that topic, each ranging from one to fifteen. The data were analyzed by a 2 X 2 analysis of variance (Counterargument, Yes vs. No by Argument, Yes vs. No). The topics tested are listed in Appendix A.

Pretest II

A second twenty topics were pretested using a total of 72 subjects recruited by an advertisement in the Ohio State University
student newspaper, and were paid for their participation. The procedure used was similar to that employed in Pretest I, and the topics tested in Pretest II are listed in Appendix B.
Chapter 3

EXPERIMENTS I AND II: CONCEPTUAL REPLICATIONS OF CIALDINI'S (1973) MODERATION SHIFT SITUATION WITH THE INTERJECTION OF COUNTERATTITUINAL MATERIAL

Method

Subjects. In the first experiment, subjects were recruited through an advertisement in The Ohio State University student newspaper, "The Lantern", and were paid for their participation in the experiment. Both male and female subjects were used, and were assigned randomly to conditions. One subject, after hearing of the apparent nature of the experiment (forming first impressions), elected to leave after all subjects had been assured that they could leave the experiment at any time if they did not wish to continue with it. Thirty-seven other subjects elected to participate in the experiment, and the data reported here were contributed by them.

A total of 154 male and female subjects participated in the second experiment, in order to fulfill a course requirement in introductory psychology at The Ohio State University. No potential subjects in this experiment elected not to participate. Two subjects omitted questionnaire items, and so their responses could not be analyzed. Complete data were provided by 152 subjects and the analyses were based on these data.
Design. Both experiments reported here used the same factorial design, consisting of three within-subjects factors and a fourth within-subjects factor nested within one level of the first factor. There were two levels of each factor.

Factor 1 was expectation of evaluation (Yes vs. No). A total of twelve pretested opinion topics was used in both experiments. The topics were rotated around the conditions; for eight of these topics, the subject initially expected that he might be evaluated by another subject on the basis of his opinions on these issues. The subject believed that the other four issues were control topics, and that no one would see his responses to these issues.

Factor 2 was counterattitudinal information. For four of the eight topics for which the subject expected to be evaluated by another subject, the subject was provided with counterattitudinal information. Counterattitudinal information was also provided for two of the four control topics. No information was provided for the other six topics.

Factor 3 was time of opinion measurement (After Evaluation Expectation Manipulation vs. End of Session).

The nested factor, Factor 4, was cancellation of expectation of evaluation (Yes vs. No). For obvious reasons, this factor was nested in the "Yes" level of Factor 1. For four of the eight opinion issues on which the subject originally expected to be evaluated, the subject was told that these issues would not be used. For the other four issues, the subject retained the expectation of being evaluated at the time of the end of session opinion measure.
Unique procedural characteristics of the first and second experiment. The most important difference between the first and second experiment was that in the first experiment, both moderate and extreme opinion issues were used. Data trends in this experiment indicated that subjects shifted to a more moderate position after being informed they would be evaluated by another subject only on topics for which that subject population, on a pretest, had shown polarized attitudes. This trend was not observed on neutral issues, where in fact subjects shifted to a slightly partisan position. For this reason, in the second experiment, opinion issues to which pretest subjects had responded with relatively extreme views (1-4 or 12-15 on a 15-point scale) were used exclusively, in an attempt to maximize the opportunity for a significant moderation shift to be observed. Otherwise, the procedures in the two experiments were identical.

General setting and instructions. Subjects were run in groups of two, three, or four persons. Subjects seated themselves at tables equipped with dividers, so that once seated, subjects could see the experimenter, but could not see one another clearly. The experimenter stated that the experiment was designed to try to "understand just how people go about forming 'first impressions' of other people with whom they come in contact in a group-discussion situation." In order to provide a rationale for the persuasive communications which subjects would hear later, subjects were told that in the course of the experiment they would hear simulated discussions between two people on an audiotape, and would then be
asked to indicate their opinions, as the third person in the discussion, on some of the topics that were mentioned, and on some others which were not mentioned. They were told that some of the opinions they gave would be used by another subject to form a first impression of them. The experimenter explained that subjects were being asked to respond to all issues at once, at the conclusion of the tape, in order to maintain experimental control, across all conditions, of the sort of information all subjects would have been exposed to before they participated in the "discussion."

Establishment of evaluation apprehension. At this point, the experimenter distributed the Crowne and Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (Crowne and Marlowe, 1964) to all subjects. Two additional questions appeared at the bottom of the scale:

(1) In general, I find making new friends (Very easy = 1, Very hard = 15)

(2) Generally, the first impression I make on people is (Very good = 1, Very bad = 15)

The experimenter stated that later in the experiment, the other subject with whom the subject had exchanged views on several topics would be given a blank "personality questionnaire" such as that, and on the basis of the views the subject had expressed, would attempt to fill out the personality questionnaire as he thought the subject had filled it out.
It was hoped that the realization by subjects that they would later be rated by another person along these various dimensions of "social desirability" on the basis of their written opinion statements would enhance the "evaluation apprehension" inherent in the procedure of the experiment. Accordingly, subjects were also required to print their full names at the top of the page on the social desirability questionnaire.

Expectation of evaluation manipulation (Factor 1), and opinion measurement after manipulation. After the experimenter collected the Social Desirability Scale, she distributed a questionnaire containing Likert-type opinion items on eight different topics. Subjects were asked to print their names, and write their signatures, at the top of the questionnaire, and were notified that the essay topics for use by the other subject would be selected from these eight topics.

After this questionnaire had been collected, subjects were given a "control" questionnaire consisting of opinion items about four additional topics. Subjects were not allowed to print or to write their name on this questionnaire, and it was emphasized, both verbally by the experimenter, and on the questionnaire itself, that the subject's responses to these four items would provide control data, and would never be shown to the other subject.

Counterattitudinal information (Factor 2). The tape-recorded discussion was then played. It consisted of a two-person discussion of six topics. The arguments presented in the discussion of each topic were adapted from a persuasive communication which had been
pretested for effectiveness. In each discussion a male and a female speaker spoke in general agreement on a topic, but stated different arguments supporting that point of view.

Cancellation of expectation of evaluation (Factor 4), and end of session opinion measure. At the conclusion of the tape, the experimenter stated that the information subjects would now provide would be that which another subject would use to form a "first impression" of the subject. Subjects were told that time limitations would allow them to write essays on only four topics, explaining their point of view as if they had been in the group discussion. Subjects also filled out the Likert-type item for each of the four topics. Subjects were given two minutes to complete each essay.

The experimenter then asked subjects to fill out opinion measures on the eight remaining topics; it was stressed that only the issue for which subjects had written essays would be shown to the other subject. Subjects were not allowed to place their names on this questionnaire.

First impression judgments. The four essays were then exchanged among the subjects by the experimenter. Each subject was given a blank copy of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale and was asked to form an overall "impression" of the other subject on the basis of the four essays that the subject had written. He was told to try to fill out the "personality questionnaire" as he thought the other subject had filled it out.
The Social Desirability Scale was collected after it had been filled out, and subjects were allowed to compare the Social Desirability Scale that they had filled out with that filled out for them by the other subject. Subjects were either paid (first experiment) or given credit (second experiment) for their participation in the experiment, thanked, and allowed to leave.

Results

First experiment. The effectiveness of the counterattitudinal information manipulation in inducing opinion change was supported by a statistically significant interaction between the counterattitudinal information variable and time of opinion measurement ($F=20.45, df=1/36, p < .001$). Subjects who had heard a counterattitudinal communication after the first opinion measure were more in agreement with the position taken in the communication at the time of the second opinion measure than were subjects who had not heard the counterattitudinal communication. A summary of the complete analysis of these data is presented in Table 1.
Table 1
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY
EXPERIMENT I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Analysis</th>
<th>F (1/36)</th>
<th>P &lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time of Opinion Measurement (A)</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information (B)</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval. Appreh. Retained vs. Canc. (C)</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval. Ap. (Ret. &amp; Canc.) vs. None (D)</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X D</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X D</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F (1/36)</th>
<th>P &lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F (1/36)</th>
<th>P &lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between subjects who retained the expectation of being evaluated by a peer and those for whom this expectation had been cancelled, when subjects had received counterattitudinal information. When counterattitudinal information had not been made available, subjects for whom the expectation of evaluation had been cancelled became slightly more polarized in the direction of their original opinion, while subjects who retained the expectation of being evaluated showed a movement in opinion toward the neutral point (Figures 1 and 2).

The expected "moderation shift" in anticipation of evaluation by another subject did not occur (or was not confined to only the issues for which evaluation was expected). At the time of the immediate opinion measure, no statistically significant difference occurred between the attitude position of subjects on the issues for which they expected to be evaluated, and on the issues for which they had no expectation of evaluation. Nevertheless, these means are illustrated separately on Figures 1, 2, and 3 to illustrate that the trend, in fact, was in the opposite direction. However, the means for the issues which were later assigned to the various counterattitudinal information and expectation conditions were combined at Time 1,
Figure 1: EXPERIMENT 1: MEAN OPINION MEASURES, COUNTER-ATTITUINAL INFORMATION CONDITIONS. SCALE RANGE 1-15.

Time 1 = Before Information
Time 2 = After Information
----- = Experimental Topics
----- = Control Topics
Ret = Expectation Retained
Canc = Expectation Cancelled
Figure 2: EXPERIMENT I: MEAN OPINION MEASURES, NO INFORMATION CONDITIONS. SCALE RANGE 1-15.

- Time 1 = Before Information Received on Other Topics
- Time 2 = After Information Received on Other Topics
- = Experimental Topics
- = Control Topics
- Ret = Expectation Retained
- Canc = Expectation Cancelled
since there was no significant difference between them (see Figure 3).

It was observed that subjects did tend to shift to a more moderate position after being informed they would be evaluated by another subject on topics for which that subject population, on a pretest, had shown polarized attitudes (1-4 or 12-15 on a 15-point scale). This effect was apparently masked in the data analysis by the shift to a slightly partisan position on topics for which subjects held an initially neutral attitude. Unfortunately an internal analysis of the data was not possible because of topic distribution among experimental conditions.

The latter effect, in which subjects were motivated to take a side on an issue rather than remain neutral, is an anomaly to the evaluation apprehension interpretation only if one assumes that people believe that a neutral "fence straddler" is more attractive than a person who takes a (moderate) stand. If one assumes that people believe that "moderate" (rather than neutral) people are the most attractive, the data are predictable, for on an issue for which subjects held an initially neutral position, moving slightly in one direction or the other on the scale could be construed as a shift from neutrality to "moderation".

Because of the opposite data trends for neutral and extreme
Figure 3: EXPERIMENT I: MEAN OPINION MEASURES, ALL CONDITIONS. SCALE RANGE 1-15.

- Time 1 = Before Information
- Time 2 = After Information
- ____ = Experimental Topics
- ___ = Control Topics
- Ret = Expectation Retained
- Canc = Expectation Cancelled
- x__x = Information Topics
- ___ = No Information Topics
issues in the first experiment, in the second experiment the procedure of the first experiment was replicated, using attitude topics for which the subject population, on a pretest, had shown attitudes uniformly polarized in the same direction. In addition, the sample size was increased from N=37 to N=154.

**Second experiment.** As in the first experiment, at Time 1 there was no statistically significant difference between the attitude position on topics for which subjects expected to be evaluated, and on topics for which they had no expectation of evaluation. Nevertheless, the means are illustrated separately on Figures 4, 5, and 6 to illustrate data trends. The means for the issues which were later assigned to the various counterattitudinal information and expectation conditions were combined at Time 1, since there was no significant difference between them.

Again, in the second experiment, the counterattitudinal information manipulation was effective in inducing opinion change. This was reflected by the statistically significant interaction between counterattitudinal information and time of opinion measurement (F=17.63, df=1/151, p<.001; see Table 2).

In conformity with predictions, at the time of the End-of-Session opinion testing, for issues on which subjects had received counterattitudinal information, there was no difference in opinion whether
Table 2

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY

EXPERIMENT II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Analysis</th>
<th>( F(1/36) )</th>
<th>( p &lt; )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time of Opinion Measurement (A)</td>
<td>29.16</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information (B)</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval. Appreh. Retained vs. Canc. (C)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval. Ap. (Ret. &amp; Canc.) vs. None (D)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>17.63</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X D</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X D</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within Time 1

| B | 0.01 | 0.913 |
| C | 1.10 | 0.295 |
| D | 0.02 | 0.902 |
| B X C | 0.03 | 0.855 |
| B X D | 1.57 | 0.212 |

Within Time 2

| B | 8.46 | 0.004 |
| C | 1.18 | 0.280 |
| D | 1.11 | 0.294 |
| B X C | 1.60 | 0.222 |
| B X D | 0.01 | 0.935 |
or not expectation of evaluation had been retained or cancelled on an issue (see Figure 4).

---

Insert Figure 4 about here
---

For topics on which subjects had received no information, when expectation of evaluation was cancelled, subjects retained their initial, more extreme opinion at the time of the End-of-Session opinion measure. For topics on which expectation of evaluation was retained, subjects shifted their opinion toward neutrality— a "moderation shift" (see Figure 5).

---

Insert Figure 5 about here
---

However, the effect of counterattitudinal information on the evaluation apprehension topics was an anomaly. The expected opinion moderation shift on the experimental topics immediately following the evaluation expectation manipulation did not occur, but the effect of the manipulation may have been visible in the End-of-Session opinion measure. Here, opinion measures both for topics on which expectation had been retained and cancelled showed less effect of counterattitudinal information that control topics (Figure 4). This was an unexpected result, and did not conform to predictions that counterattitudinal information would be more effective under high evaluation apprehension because of greater "openmindedness". Figure 6 presents a graphical representation of the pre- and postest meas-
Figure 4: EXPERIMENT II: MEAN OPINION MEASURES, COUNTER-ATTITUDINAL INFORMATION CONDITIONS. SCALE RANGE 1-15.

- Time 1 = Before Information
- Time 2 = After Information
- = Experimental Topics
- = Control Topics
- Ret = Expectation Retained
- Canc = Expectation Cancelled

Neutral Point
Figure 5: EXPERIMENT II: MEAN OPINION MEASURES, NO INFORMATION CONDITIONS. SCALE RANGE 1-15

Time 1 = Before Information Received on Other Topics
Time 2 = After Information Received on Other Topics

--- = Experimental Topics
--- = Control Topics
Ret = Expectation Retained
Canc = Expectation Cancelled
Discussion

It is interesting that the evaluation apprehension manipulation was not effective in creating a moderation shift at Time 1; it nevertheless apparently (in the second experiment) did have an unexpected effect on subjects' responses to counterattitudinal information, "immunizing" them to it in some way.

The evaluation apprehension manipulation used in these two experiments was designed to capitalize on the processes presumed to be operating in the Cialdini et al. "moderation shift", by making explicit the reasons for "evaluation apprehension" which were only implied in the Cialdini et al. procedure. However, the within-subjects nature of the design, and some aspects of the procedure, may have altered the psychology of the situation. For example, the fact that subjects were told, in the evaluation apprehension manipulation, that they would be evaluated on the basis of their responses to some of (i.e. not all) the topics to which they were responding on the questionnaire may have made the evaluation seem less imminent. In addition, although this was not made explicit, subjects may have assumed that they would get a second chance to respond to the evaluation apprehension topics, and assumed they could alter their responses at that time.

Secondly, because of the nature of the experimental procedure,
Figure 6: EXPERIMENT II: MEAN OPINION MEASURES, ALL CONDITIONS. SCALE RANGE 1-15.

Time 1=Before Information
Time 2=After Information
- - =Experimental Topics
— — =Control Topics
Ret =Expectation Retained
Canc =Expectation Cancelled
x__ =Information Topics
_._. =No Information Topics
subjects were aware that the individuals who would be evaluating them had been exposed to the counterattitudinal information simultaneously with themselves. Subjects may have felt that to alter their opinion on the basis of this information might make them seem too easily influenced, and thus they were less, not more, easily influenced by the information when it was given on non-evaluation topics, and resisted information on these topics as they heard it presented. Cialdini, Braver, and Lewis (in press) have found, for example, that observers do tend to derogate the intelligence of yielders to persuasion. If subjects were acting on this assumption, it might explain the lessened impact of counterattitudinal information for the high evaluation apprehension topics, as compared with the information-only topics (Figure 4).

The shift toward neutrality on the End-of-Session opinion measure on the no information, expectation retained topics (Figure 5) can probably be considered a conceptual replication of the "moderation shift" observed by Cialdini et al. Apparently, when it is made clear to subjects on which topics they will be evaluated, they do assume the strategy of opinion moderation. It had been hypothesized here that transitory moderation shifts might be used as vehicles for inducing permanent attitude change, by interjecting counterattitudinal information after the moderation shift had occurred. However, subjects seem to be especially on guard against persuasive influences at the time of moderation. Unless this tendency to
resist counterattitudinal information can be circumvented in some way, the technique of inducing evaluation apprehension in subjects could probably not be used as a strategy for permanently moderating extreme views. One method which may be used for reducing persuasion resistance at this time is to expose the subject to counterattitudinal information privately, so that he believes that his evaluators will not be aware of his changing his views in response to this information. In Experiments III and IV, this procedural change was incorporated. Additionally, the evaluation apprehension manipulation at Time 1 was modified to a between-subjects variable, so as to conform more closely to the manipulation used by Cialdini et al. (1973).

EXPERIMENT III: THIRD CONCEPTUAL REPLICATION OF THE MODERATION-SHIFT SITUATION, WITH COUNTERATTITUDINAL INFORMATION PRESENTED TO SUBJECTS PRIVATELY

Method

Subjects. A total of 44 male and female subjects participated in the third experiment, in order to fulfill a course requirement in introductory psychology at The Ohio State University.

Design. Experiment III used a factorial design, consisting of two between-subjects variables (Topic Order and Experimental Condition); two within-subjects variables (Counterattitudinal Information and Time of Opinion Measurement); and a fifth within-subjects variable (Expectation Retained versus Expectation Cancelled) nested within one of the Experimental Conditions.
Procedure. The general setting of Experiment III was the same as the setting for Experiments I and II. The counterattitudinal information manipulation differed, however, in that subjects were given printed scripts in the form of simulated discussions between two people. Although all subjects in any group actually received the same information, they were told that they were each reading different scripts. This was done to overcome the phenomenon observed in Experiments I and II, where subjects appeared reluctant to change their opinion on the basis of a public persuasive communication in front of a group that had also been exposed to that communication.

The second difference between the procedure of Experiment III and the two previous experiments was that Expectation of Evaluation was a between subjects variable in Experiment III. The control group was told that the experiment was concerned with "how people communicate to each other in a group-discussion situation". No mention was made to these subjects that their essays would be evaluated by any other subject, and at no point did they fill out a Social Desirability Scale. Otherwise, the procedures for both the experimental and control groups was similar to that used in Experiments I and II.

Results

A summary of the complete analysis of the data obtained in Experiment III is presented in Table 3 and in Figure 7, Figure 8, and Figure 9. As in the previous two experiments, the means

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---
Table 3
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY

EXPERIMENT III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall analysis</th>
<th>F (1/36)</th>
<th>p &lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time of Opinion Measurement (A)</td>
<td>12.113</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information (B)</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Appreh. Ret. vs. Canc. (C)</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Condition (E; Evaluation Apprehension)</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X A</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X B</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X C</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X A X B</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X A X C</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X B X C</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X A X B X C</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for the high and low evaluation apprehension conditions are represented separately to illustrate data trends. However, the means for the issues which were later assigned to the various counterattitudinal information and expectation conditions were combined at Time 1 since there were no significant differences between them. The overall analysis of variance showed a strong main effect of time of opinion measurement ($F=12.11, df=1/36, p<.001$), and an interaction between time of opinion measurement and information ($F=7.25, df=1/36, p<.011$). This supports a conclusion that the counterattitudinal information was indeed effective in causing attitude change, even though the main effect of information was only marginally significant.

Again, no main effect of the Expectation of Evaluation variable was observed.

Discussion

The failure to replicate Cialdini's moderation shift was disappointing. Because the manipulation used had seemed so close conceptually to that used by Cialdini, its effectiveness had been assumed. However, in retrospect it was realized that the fact
Figure 7: EXPERIMENT III: MEAN OPINION MEASURES, COUNTERATTITUDINAL INFORMATION CONDITIONS. SCALE RANGE 1-15. 8=NEUTRAL POINT

Time 1=Before Information
Time 2=After Information
--- =Experimental Groups
--- =Control Groups
Ret =Expectation Retained
Canc =Expectation Cancelled
Figure 8: MEAN OPINION MEASURES, NO INFORMATION CONDITIONS.
SCALE RANGE 1-15. 8=NEUTRAL POINT.

Time 1=Before Information Received on Other Topics
Time 2=After Information Received on Other Topics
- =Experimental Groups
- =Control Groups
Ret =Expectation Retained Topics
Canc =Expectation Cancelled Topics
Figure 9: MEAN OPINION MEASURES ALL CONDITIONS. SCALE RANGE 1-15. 8 = NEUTRAL POINT.
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x_x = Information Topics
xxx = No Information Topics
that it was ineffective could not be confidently attributed to a failure of the manipulation to induce differential levels of evaluation apprehension, since subjective levels of evaluation apprehension had not been measured. It was possible that evaluation apprehension had indeed been manipulated, but that it had no effect on the dependent measures used in this experiment.

Therefore, in Experiment IV, it was decided both to adopt Cialdini's manipulation more explicitly, and also to add a check on the evaluation apprehension manipulation.

EXPERIMENT IV: EXACT REPPLICATION OF CIALDINI'S MODERATION-SHIFT PARADIGM WITH THE INTERJECTION OF COUNTERATTITUINAL MATERIAL

Method

Subjects. The subjects in Experiment IV were males and females recruited by an advertisement in the Ohio State University student newspaper, and paid for their participation in the experiment. Subjects were run in groups of two to five persons.

Design. The design of Experiment IV was identical to that of Experiment III.

Procedure. The procedural order that was followed was identical to Experiment III, with the exception that at the conclusion of the experiment, subjects filled out a manipulation check on the evaluation apprehension variable. The manipulation check consisted of two questions, each rated on a 15-point scale:

"Before you learned you were in a control condition in this experiment,
at the time you expected to (participate in the discussion/listen to the tape), how concerned were you about the kind of impression you would make on the experimenter or the other subjects? (Very concerned to Not concerned at all)" and "How greatly did you feel your performance on the experimental task (participating in the discussion/listening to the tape) would have reflected on your intellectual ability (Very much to Not at all)". The evaluation apprehension manipulation itself was considerably different from that of previous experiments, however. Subjects in the evaluation apprehension conditions were told the following information:

"Later in this session, each of you will be asked to participate in a discussion of these topics with one of the other subjects present here. In this discussion, you will each be asked to publicly express your views to the other subject as clearly and concisely as you can."

Subjects in the control condition were told that they would be required to listen to a tape-recording of another person's opinions on the four topics.

Results

The results of Experiment IV are illustrated in Figure 10.

The manipulation checks showed the first, but not the second, of the checks to be affected by the manipulation ($t=2.208$, $p<.05$).
Figure 10: EXPERIMENT IV: MEAN OPINION MEASURES, ALL GROUPS. SCALE RANGE 1-15.

Time 1=Before Information
Time 2=After Information
___  =High Evaluation Apprehension Conditions
____ =Low Evaluation Apprehension Conditions
x_x  =Counterattitudinal Information Topics
_.__ =No Information Topics
Ret  =Expectation Retained Topics
Canc =Expectation Cancelled Topics
Also, an effect of the evaluation apprehension manipulation was observed at Time 1, in the expected direction ($F=1.47$, $df=1/32$, $p<.04$). The effect of counterattitudinal information was also statistically significant, and this fact was reflected in the strong effect of Time of Measurement ($F=33.23$, $df=1/32$, $p<.001$) and by an interaction between counterattitudinal information and Time of Measurement ($F=4.28$, $df=1/32$, $p<.001$). However, contrary to the hypothesis supporting "openmindedness" as an intervening variable in the "moderation shift" phenomenon, there was no differential acceptance of counterattitudinal information between the High and Low Evaluation Apprehension Conditions at Time 2. Again, no effect of the Expectation Retained vs. Expectation Cancelled variable was observed (see Table 4).

Discussion

Apparently it is crucial to the creation of a "moderation shift" that subjects expect that they will actually have to discuss their views with another subject. Although Cialdini et al. (1973) have assumed that they have removed apprehension over the experimenter's evaluation from the psychology of the situation by putting subjects in a non-explicit persuasion context situation, this does not seem certain in the light of the findings of the previous three experiments and Experiment IV. In the previous three experiments, subjects expected to express their views to
Table 4

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY

EXPERIMENT IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall analysis</th>
<th>F (1/32)</th>
<th>p&lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time of Opinion Measurement (A)</td>
<td>33.23</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information (B)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Appreh. Ret. vs. Canc. (C)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>42.78</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High vs. Low Experimental Condition (E; Evaluation)</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X A</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X B</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X C</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X A X B</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X A X C</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X B X C</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E X A X B X C</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within Time 2

| E X B                                         | 0.40     | 0.531|
another subject in writing, and to be evaluated on that basis. Yet no moderation shift was observed, or one was observed equally under all conditions. This suggests that subjects are at least partly concerned with what the experimenter hears them say. On the other hand, subjects may be most apprehensive over having their views publicly challenged. Further research will have to be done to sort out these two interpretations.

In Experiment V, the evaluation apprehension manipulation of Experiment IV was repeated. In addition, a Public vs. Private Information variable was added. On the basis of the findings of Experiments I, II, and III, it was hypothesized that subjects would be less willing to change their views in response to counterattitudinal information which is available to the other subjects, for fear of appearing easily persuaded, than to information to which they alone are privy. It was expected that the Public vs. Private opinion variable would create greater differences under high evaluation apprehension (expectation of a discussion) than under low evaluation apprehension (expectation of listening to a tape). Therefore, an interaction was expected between the manner in which counterattitudinal information was presented to subjects, and the evaluation apprehension level.

EXPERIMENT V: PUBLIC VS. PRIVATE ADMINISTRATION OF PERSUASIVE MATERIAL
Method

Subjects. The subjects were forty-eight persons recruited by either The Ohio State University student newspaper or by an announcement at the conclusion of an introductory psychology class period. All subjects were paid for their participation in the experiment. Subjects were run in groups of three to six.

Design. Three between-subjects factors (Experimental Condition, Public vs. Private Information, and Topic Order) and three within-subjects factors (Repeated Measures, Information, and Expectation Retained vs. Cancelled) were included in the experimental design.

Procedure. The procedure followed was identical to the procedure of Experiment IV with the following exception: Immediately before subjects were presented with counterattitudinal information, subjects in the Public Information condition were told that all subjects in the experiment would be reading identical material. Subjects in the Private Information condition were told that several different communication sets had been made up and they would not all necessarily be reading the same material. The experiment then proceeded in the manner of Experiment IV.

Results.

The effectiveness of the evaluation apprehension manipulation was documented by the statistically significant difference ($t=2.29$, $p<.05$) between the expectation of discussion (High Evaluation Apprehension) vs. expectation of listening to a tape (Low Evaluation Apprehension) on the first manipulation check measure.
As in Experiment IV, however, no significant differences were observed on the second manipulation check measure. The differences between the evaluation apprehension conditions was again reflected in a "moderation shift" by subjects in the High Evaluation Apprehension condition ($F=7.69$, $df=1/32$, $p<.001$). Contrary to the findings of Cialdini et al., but in line with findings reported earlier in this paper, no difference in opinion scores was observed between topics for which expectation of discussion was retained and topics for which expectation was cancelled (see Table 5). As in Experiment IV, contrary to the hypothesis supporting "openmindedness" as an intervening variable in the moderation shift, there was again no differential acceptance of counterattitudinal information between the High and Low Evaluation Apprehension Condition at Time 2.

---

Insert Table 5 about here
---

The variable of greatest interest in Experiment V was Public vs. Private exposure to counterattitudinal information. The overall effect of exposure to counterattitudinal information was illustrated by an interaction between counterattitudinal information and time of opinion measurement ($F=32.232$, $df=1/32$, $p<.001$). It was expected that counterattitudinal information would have a greater persuasive effect when administered privately than when administered publicly, especially under High Evaluation Apprehension. This hypothesis was not supported. At Time 2,
| Source of Variation                              | F (1/32) | p<  
|------------------------------------------------|----------|-----
| Overall analysis                                | 24.29    | 0.001
| Time of Opinion Measurement (A)                 | 5.53     | 0.029
| Information (B)                                 | 0.53     | 0.474
| Evaluation Appreh. Ret. Vs. Canc. (C)           | 32.23    | 0.001
| A X B                                            | 0.34     | 0.562
| A X C                                            | 0.43     | 0.519
| B X C                                            | 0.59     | 0.447
| A X B X C                                        | 7.66     | 0.009
| Experimental Condition (E; Evaluation)          |          |     
| High vs. Low                                     |          |     
| E X A                                            | 0.00     | 0.950
| E X B                                            | 0.02     | 0.887
| E X C                                            | 0.01     | 0.935
| E X A X B                                        | 0.51     | 0.478
| E X A X C                                        | 0.02     | 0.884
| E X B X C                                        | 0.54     | 0.467
| E X A X B X C                                    | 0.96     | 0.334
| P (Public vs. Private Info.) X A                 | 2.70     | 0.110
| Within Time 2                                    |          |     
| P (Public vs. Private Information)               | 0.29     | 0.597
| P (Within Information Only)                      | 0.80     | 0.377
| E X B                                            | 0.01     | 0.917
| P X B                                            | 0.60     | 0.445
| E X P X B                                        | 0.07     | 0.788
whether or not subjects had been exposed to counterattitudinal information publicly or privately did not alter the persuasive effectiveness of this information ($P \times B$, not significant). This was true regardless of subjects' level of evaluation apprehension ($E \times P \times B$, not significant). These results are summarized in Table 5 and illustrated graphically in Figure 11.

-----------------------------
Insert Figure 11 about here
-----------------------------
Figure 11A: Public Information

Figure 11B: Private Information

Figure 11: EXPERIMENT V: MEAN OPINION MEASURES, ALL GROUPS.
SCALE RANGE 1-15.

Time 1 = Before Information
Time 2 = After Information
___ = High Evaluation Apprehension Conditions
__  = Low Evaluation Apprehension Conditions
_x_x = Counterattitudinal Information Topics
     = No Information Topics
Ret = Expectation Retained
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Chapter 4

CONCLUSIONS

Creation of the "moderation effect"

In Experiments IV and V, subjects moderated their opinion when they expected to participate in a discussion on a topic. It has been hypothesized here that this "moderation shift" was accompanied (or preceded) by an intervening psychological state which has been called "evaluation apprehension." That this intervening state actually occurred is documented by subjects' assertions that they were indeed concerned about the sort of impression they would make on the other subjects or the experimenter during the discussion period (i.e. as reported in the manipulation check).

On the other hand, in Experiments I, II, and III, no "moderation shift" occurred. In these experiments, an attempt had been made to replicate conceptually (but not exactly) the Cialdini et al. (1973) paradigm which had produced the "moderation shift".

The crucial difference however between Experiments I, II and III versus Experiments IV, V and Cialdini et al. was that the manipulation which was successful in inducing a "moderation shift" was one in which subjects expected to participate in a public
discussion in the presence of the experimenter. Whether or not
the presence of the experimenter was an important element cannot
be determined from the available data. The first manipulation
check question mentioned both the subject's concern with the
impression he would make on the other subjects and on the
experimenter during the discussion.

Although subjects in all five experiments believed that both
peers and experimenter were going to be present throughout all
experimental tasks, only the task of participating in a discussion
(Experiments IV and V) resulted in a moderation shift. Thus,
although participating in a discussion in front of an authority
figure (the experimenter) may be the crucial combination of
circumstances that produces the "moderation shift", the mere
threat of ongoing criticism of verbally stated ideas by anyone
may be sufficient.

**Public vs. private interjection of counterattitudinal information**

It had been hypothesized that when subjects were exposed
to persuasive information which they knew other subjects also
were reading (Public Condition) they would resist changing their
opinions so as not to appear easily persuaded. When subjects
believed that no one was aware of the contents of their reading
material (Private Condition), they would be less resistant to
changing their views on the basis of this material. It was further
hypothesized that the difference between the Public and Private Information Conditions would be enhanced under high evaluation apprehension.
Type of design

Evaluation apprehension was manipulated as a within-subjects variable only in Experiments I and II. In the other three experiments reported here, and in the research of Cialdini et al., it was manipulated as a between-subjects variable. Although no conclusion can be drawn about the effectiveness of the within-subjects vs. between-subjects design from the present data, one might expect that a psychological state such as "evaluation apprehension" might be generalized in its effect, and would be difficult to attach to some topics (and not others) as required in a within-subjects design. In support of this interpretation, for ten out the twelve topics used in Experiment II and eight out of twelve in Experiment I, Control responses on a topic were more neutral than mean pretest responses on the same topic.

Cialdini et al. observed a return to initial, more extreme opinion when the expectation of discussion on a topic was cancelled. This phenomenon was not observed in any of the five experiments reported here. One important difference in the design of the Cialdini et al. experiment, as compared to the five experiments reported here, was that Cialdini et al. performed a repeated measure on the same topic after expectation of discussion was cancelled on that topic. In the experiments reported here, each subject responded to different topics after expectation of discussion was cancelled than during the period prior to this
(when he still expected to participate in a discussion). Since Cialdini et al. were able to replicate the "expectation cancelled" effect in a later experiment using the same repeated measures design (personal communication), the effect is probably a "real" one that may be specific to the procedure of repeated measurement on a single topic.

**Does evaluation apprehension affect "openmindedness"?**

As illustrated in the diagram on page 7, it was expected that "evaluation apprehension" might have a complex effect on responses to counterattitudinal information. Specifically, it had been hypothesized that evaluation apprehension might create a state of "openmindedness" and thereby facilitate opinion change. Support of this interpretation would be reflected in a three-way interaction involving level of evaluation apprehension, exposure to counterattitudinal information, and time of opinion measurement. An interaction between level of evaluation apprehension and counterattitudinal information at Time 2 would also lend support to this interpretation.

An examination of the statistical analyses of Experiments I-V revealed that in no case did the experimental results confirm these predictions. It was concluded, therefore, that a high level of evaluation apprehension, although resulting in a shift to more moderate opinions, does not create an intervening state of "openmindedness". As concluded by Cialdini et al. (1973),
the moderation shift may be tactical in nature, and not necessarily accompanied by an increased receptivity to counterattitudinal information. This conclusion must remain tentative, however. Cialdini et al. based much of their explanation of the "moderation shift" on the fact that subjects returned to their original positions when expectation of discussion was cancelled. This result was not observed here.
APPENDIX A

List of Topics Tested in Pretest I

(Codes in parentheses refer to names used for topics in Appendix C-1)
1. The percentage of the United States budget allocated to defense spending should be maintained at its present level.

2. The system of faculty tenure for university professors should be abolished. (Faculty Tenure)

3. A government should maintain secrecy in the formulation of its domestic and foreign policies.

4. Education should be supported by property taxes. (Property Taxes for Schools)

5. The average taxpayer would benefit by a major reform in the income tax law, reducing most deductions.

6. Federal support for programs of "pure" or basic research should be reduced.

7. Strict legal limits should be placed on campaign spending.

8. Busing is a good way to achieve equal educational opportunity. (Busing)

9. The United States should replace the military draft with an all-volunteer army.

10. Financial support for liberal arts programs in universities should be increased so as to be equal to support in the sciences. (Liberal Arts vs. Sci.)

11. When a person who is seriously ill asks to die, he should not be kept alive. (Incurable Illness)

12. Minority group students should be judged for admission to graduate and professional schools using more lenient criteria. (Disadv. Adm. to Prof. Schools)
13. Education courses should continue to be required for teaching in the high schools.

14. Animals should not be used for research purposes if pain is inflicted on them.

15. People should be forced to retire when they reach a certain age, for example, 65.

16. More emphasis should be placed on teaching ability, rather than on research publications, for promotion of university faculty. (Promotion of Faculty)

17. The university should allocate funds to support day-care centers for children of university students, faculty, and staff. (Day Care)

18. Government funds should be diverted from the construction of new highways, and invested in the development of mass transit systems. (Mass Transit)

19. Increased restrictions should be placed on the use of oral contraceptives.

20. The Ohio State University should discontinue Open Admissions, and institute selective admissions of only the more highly qualified high school graduates. (Open Admissions)
APPENDIX B
List of Topics Tested in Pretest II
(Codes in Parentheses refer to names used for topics in Appendix C-1)
1. The Ohio State University should retain general university course requirements for the bachelor's degree.

2. Disarmament would be a step toward world peace.

3. High schools should have codes for student dress (Dress Codes)

4. All federal construction should be done by a racially integrated work force, even if persons from minority groups have to be specially trained for jobs.

5. Consumers should boycott cereals containing chemical additives. (Cereals)

6. Stricter ordinances against sound amplification systems should be enforced on The Ohio State University campus.

7. Personal income in the United States should be redistributed and made more equal. (Personal Income)

8. If they hold the same job, a female employee should be paid the same amount as a male employee.

9. Couples should engage in "trial marriages" before becoming legally married.

10. It would a good idea for all couples to have no more than two children.

11. The practice of daily prayers should be returned to the greater schools.

12. Flouride should be added to the public water supply.

13. Aerosol sprays should be taken off the market. (Aerosol Sprays)
14. More federal funds should be allocated specifically for beautification of the environment.
15. All new universities should be built in suburban locations.
16. More federal funds should be allocated to finding new roles for the elderly.
17. The United States should continue to send aid to underdeveloped countries.
18. All large university lectures should be divided up into smaller classes. (Large Lectures)
19. A"battered" or abused child should be taken away from his parents and placed in a foster home.
20. Cross-sex dressing by homosexuals should be prohibited by law.
APPENDIX C

1. Pretest Scores and Variability of Control Subjects' Responses
   To Topics Used in Experiments I, II, III, IV and V

2. Means for Experimental Conditions; Experiments I, II, III, IV, and V
1. Pretest Scores and Variability of Control Subjects' Responses

To Topics Used in Experiments I, II, III, IV, and V
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>Experimental Issue for</th>
<th>Mean (Ranges 1-15; Low Score indicates agreement with statement in Appendix A or B)</th>
<th>Pretest Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Transit</td>
<td>X - - - -</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Tenure</td>
<td>X X X - -</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of Faculty</td>
<td>X X X - -</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes for Schools</td>
<td>X - - - -</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadv. Adm. to Prof. Schools</td>
<td>X - - - -</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts vs. Sci.</td>
<td>X - - - -</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals for Research</td>
<td>X - - - -</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Admissions</td>
<td>X X - - -</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Courses, Educat.</td>
<td>X X - - -</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busing</td>
<td>X X X - -</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incurable Illness</td>
<td>X - - - -</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income</td>
<td>X X - X X</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerosol Sprays</td>
<td>X - - - -</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress Codes</td>
<td>X X - - -</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rac. Integ.</td>
<td>X X - X X</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereals</td>
<td>X - - - -</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Lectures</td>
<td>X X - X X</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. X = Topic used in experiment, - = Topic not used.
2. Means for Experimental Conditions;
Experiments I, II, III, IV and V
MEANS FOR EXPERIMENTAL CONDITIONS*

**EXPERIMENT I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental Topics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>Expectation Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>Expectation Cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Topics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPERIMENT II**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental Topics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>Expectation Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>Expectation Cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Topics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPERIMENT III**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>Expectation Retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>Expectation Cancelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Information</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All univariate F ratios and standard deviations across topics and conditions were derived from applications of the program Multivariate Analysis of Variance on Large Computers (Clyde, 1969).*
### EXPERIMENT IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehension Group</td>
<td>9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehension Group</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPERIMENT V

#### Public Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehension Group</td>
<td>9.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehension Group</td>
<td>10.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Private Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehension Group</td>
<td>9.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehension Group</td>
<td>10.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

1. Experimental and Pretest Procedures

2. Dependent Measures
1. Experimental and Pretest Procedures
Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. In the next forty-five minutes or so, you will be asked to state your opinion on a total of twenty topics. These topics are summarized on the answer sheet. You will hear one or two brief statements about some of the topics, and you will be asked to respond to these statements, as well as to the Opinion Item on that topic. For some topics, you will only be asked to respond to the opinion item. Please be sure to place your responses in the appropriate columns. If you are responding to the first message you heard on a topic, place your response in the column for Message 1 on that topic. If you are responding to the second message, place your response in the column for Message 2 on that topic. If you are responding to the Opinion Item, place your response in the Opinion Item column for that topic. At the conclusion of the tape, you should have placed a response in each blank on the answer sheet which does not contain an "X". Do not write anything in the blanks containing "Xs".

You are to respond to each item in the following manner: At the top of your answer sheet you will see an opinion scale which ranges from the number 1 to the number 15. For each message and opinion item, place a number, from 1 to 15, in the appropriate space on the answer sheet. Your numerical response should reflect your degree of agreement or disagreement with the item. Any
number from 1 to 15 can be used.

It would be better if the tape did not have to be stopped during the experiment, so if you have any questions, please ask them now.
Thank you very much for agreeing to participate in this experiment. Let me tell you more about the purpose of this research. I'm sure that often each of us has thought about how important the "first impression" that we make on other people is. The outcome of job and school interviews often depends on it, and in our daily lives it is also important that at least some people -- potential friends, after all -- evaluate us in a positive way when they first meet us.

We are trying to understand just how people go about forming first impressions of other people with whom they come in contact in a group-discussion situation. To understand the process, it is necessary to break it down, experimentally, into its component parts. That is what we will try to do here.

Later in this session, after several simulated discussions between two people, each of you will be asked to write down your views on several of the topics that were mentioned. You will then exchange these views with another subject. On the basis of this information, the other subject will try to guess some other things about you -- that is, to form an "impression" of you. At the conclusion of the experiment, you will be brought together to discuss your impressions of each other, and to assess their accuracy.

Of course, in order to know just how accurate another subject was in forming an impression of you, we must know more about you.
We will now distribute a personality questionnaire to you which we ask you to fill out honestly and completely. Later in this session, the other subject with whom you have exchanged views on several topics will be given a blank personality questionnaire such as this, and on the basis of the views you have expressed, will attempt to fill you the personality questionnaire as he thinks you have filled it out. We will later see how accurate the other subject has been in forming a "first impression" of you.

Before we distribute these questionnaires, we would like to say this: The kinds of judgments in which we are interested are made every day -- and the purpose of this experiment is to try to understand how and why they occur. However, it's possible that some subjects might object to being rated by another person in this way, or to rating another person. If you do not wish to continue with the experiment, you are free to leave now, or at any other time during the experiment.

All right, I will distribute the personality questionnaire now. First, please print your full name at the top of the page in the appropriate place. Write your signature below your printed name. Let me explain to you now how to fill out this scale: You will find, at the top of the scale, a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally. There are also a few additional questions at the bottom of the page. Fill them out as the directions indicate.
All right. Thank you very much. Now let me describe the rest of the experimental procedure in a little more detail. As we said before, in order to understand how people go about forming impressions of other people with whom they come in contact in a group discussion situation, it is necessary to break the process down, experimentally, into its component parts. As you have seen, people will be forming a first impression of you along the specific dimensions that were included on the personality inventory which you just filled out. We have to also place certain restrictions on the information that will be available to them in forming a first impression of you.

First of all, in a group discussion of several people, each person hears the ideas of several persons on any given topic, either before or after he states his own view. Accordingly, in this experiment you will hear ideas which two additional members of several three-person group discussions might have. In order for us to maintain experimental control, it is necessary that this information be the same for all subjects, and that you all express your points of view as the third person in each discussion at the same time during the procedure of the experiment. Therefore, we have tape-recorded very brief samples of the different sorts of ideas that other members of several group discussions might have on several issues, and you will all hear the same tape. You will get a chance to express your own point of view on all topics after you hear the complete tape. This should make your information-
processing task more realistic, while still preserving our experimental control.

Secondly, you will form first impressions of each other on the basis of both scaled opinion responses on topics, and written essay-type statements of your opinions. These scaled responses, and essay-type statements, will be obtained at the conclusion of the simulated discussion. Some of the particular topics you will write essays on may not have been mentioned on the tape at all. That is not important, as long as you respond as if you were in a group discussion on each issue. You will be asked to indicate your opinions on several other issues also at the conclusion of the discussion, but these responses will not be available to the other subject when he makes his evaluation of you. Your responses to these topics will only provide control data. You will not be asked to write an essay-type statement of your opinion to these control topics. Only the issues for which you write an essay-type statement of your opinion will be used by the other subject in forming his impression of you. Before you make any responses, we will let you know for which topics your views will later be shown to another subject. Do you have any questions?

All right, before we start the discussion tape we'd like to get a preliminary idea of your opinions on eight issues. Later in the session the responses you give to some of these eight issues, combined with the essays you later write on these issues, will be shown to another subject to assist him in forming his impression
of you as a person.

**Distribute questionnaire 2**

Please print your name at the appropriate place on the top of the page. Please sign your name below your printed name. Your responses on some of these issues will be used by the other subject in forming his impression of you. All right, please begin to fill out the questionnaire.

**Distribute questionnaire 3**

All right, now I would like you to fill out a questionnaire on four control topics which will not be shown to the other subject at any time. Your responses to these topics will provide control data for subjects in other experimental conditions in this research. Your responses to these topics are completely anonymous, will never be shown to the other subject, and he will receive no information on your views on these four control issues. Remember, the topics you will respond to now are only control topics in the experiment. Please do not put your name on this questionnaire. Your responses must be completely anonymous.

All right, it is now time for you to hear the tape. It contains brief segments of several simulated discussions on various topics. Please listen carefully to the points raised by each of the two different speakers. Try to imagine that you are the third participant in each discussion, and try to imagine the point of view you might express on each of the issues that is raised. At the end of the tape, you will actually get an opportunity to
express your point of view, in essay form, on some of the issues that were discussed, and on some others which were not mentioned. The essays you write on these specific issues will be used by another subject in forming a "first impression" of you. Do you have any questions? All right, I will begin the tape now.

Play tape-recorded discussion

All right. Thank you for listening to the tape. It's now time for you to provide the information which will be used by another subject in forming a "first impression" of you. As we indicated earlier, you are now asked to write brief essays stating your views on several of the topics that were discussed on the tape, and on several that were not discussed. In order to give you enough time to think about how you want to express your views to the other subject, we have limited the number of brief essays you will write to a total of four. We have randomly selected these four from the eight possible experimental topics. Other subjects, who will be run later, will be responding to different topics, so that we can get information on all eight experimental topics. I will give you a four-page booklet in a moment. Each of the topics you are to respond to is listed at the top of a separate page in this booklet. Under each topic statement is a rating scale, on which you are asked to summarize your overall feeling about the issue by circling the response that most closely corresponds to your point of view on that issue. You are then asked to write a brief essay, explaining your views on the issue. You will only
be given two minutes to respond to each topic, so work as quickly as you can. These instructions are repeated in the booklet.

Distribute questionnaire 4

Please review the instructions written in the booklet. Be sure and print your name at the top of each page, and then sign your name. Please write legibly. Remember, your essays and your responses on the rating scale at the top of each page will be read by the other subject, and used by him to form his "first impression" of you. All right, you may begin.

Thank you very much. Now I would like you to also provide some more control data, by stating your views on the eight other topics. Only your views on the four topics for which you wrote brief essays will be shown to the other subject. The responses you will give now to these eight items are completely anonymous, and will not be available to the other subject in forming his first impression of you. Please do not put your name anywhere on this page.

Distribute questionnaire 5

As we indicated earlier in the experiment, you will each be given the four essays which (one of) the other subject(s) wrote on the four experimental topics. You will also receive that subject's overall rating of his or her opinion on each of these four topics, at the top of each page. I will now distribute this information to you.

Redistribute questionnaire 4
Now, on the basis of this information, try to form an overall "impression" of the other subject. Please read all the information you have in front of you very carefully. You have a few minutes to complete this task. I will also now distribute the final questionnaire to you.

Distribute questionnaire 6

You probably recall that at the beginning of the experiment, each of you filled out a similar personality inventory, where you gave your own opinion on each of these items. On this questionnaire, however, we would like you to do the following: You have in front of you information another subject has given you about his beliefs and views on several topics. On the basis of this information, we would like you to try to fill out the personality questionnaire as you think the other subject has filled it out. Place that person's name at the top of the page. We realize that this is a difficult task, but we ask you to perform it as carefully and honestly as you can. Do you have any questions? All right, you may begin.
EXPERIMENT III
PROCEDURE — EXPERIMENTAL CONDITIONS

Thank you very much for agreeing to participate in this experiment. Let me tell you more about the purpose of this research. I'm sure that often each of us has thought about how important the "first impression" that we make on other people is. The outcome of job and school interviews often depends on it, and in our daily lives it is also important that at least some people — potential friends, after all — evaluate us in a positive way when they first meet us.

We are trying to understand just how people go about forming "first impressions" of other people with whom they come in contact in a group discussion situation. To understand the process, it is necessary to break it down, experimentally, into its component parts. That is what we will try to do here.

Later in this session, after reading several simulated discussions between two people, each of you will be asked to write down your views on several of the topics that were mentioned. You will then exchange these views with another subject. On the basis of this information, the other subject will try to guess some other things about you — that is, to form an "impression" of you. At the conclusion of the experiment, you will be brought together to discuss your impressions of each other, and to assess their accuracy.

Of course, in order to know just how accurate another subject
was in forming an impression of you, we must know more about you. We will now distribute a personality questionnaire to you which we ask you to fill out honestly and completely. Later in this session, the other subject with whom you have exchanged views on several topics will be given a blank personality questionnaire such as this, and on the basis of the views you have expressed, will attempt to fill out the personality questionnaire as he thinks you have filled it out. We will later see how accurate the other subject has been in forming a "first impression" of you.

Before we distribute these questionnaires, we would like to say this: The kinds of judgments in which we are interested are made every day, and the purpose of this experiment is to try to understand how and why they occur. However, it's possible that some subjects might object to being rated by another person in this way, or to rating another person. If you do not wish to continue with the experiment, you are free to leave now, or at any other time during the experiment.

All right, I will distribute the personality questionnaire now.

Distribute questionnaire 1

First, please print your full name at the top of the page in the appropriate place. Let me explain to you how to fill out this scale: You will find, at the top of this scale, a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it
pertains to you personally. There are also a few additional questions at the bottom of the page. Fill them out as the directions indicate. You have three minutes to complete the scale.

Now let me describe the rest of the experimental procedure in a little more detail. First of all, in a group discussion of several people, each person is exposed to the ideas of several persons on any given topic, either before or after he expresses his own view. Accordingly, in this experiment you will read ideas several people might have on a given issue. However, each of you will read a different set of discussions between two people, on various topics. Subjects in this experiment are reading different discussions so that we can be sure that there is no special effect of any particular discussion. The printed discussions will be distributed randomly among the subjects. By using many different discussion sets, we can have more confidence that our experimental results are generalizable to situations outside the laboratory.

After you read the discussion, you will be asked to write your views on several topics, and another subject will form a first impression of you on the basis of the views which you express. Some of the particular topics you will write essays on may not have even been mentioned in the discussion set at all. That is not important, as long as you respond as if you were in a group discussion on each issue. In fact, this is why we are varying the specific discussion segments from subject to subject --
so that responses to any specific discussion will not affect the experimental results.

All right, we would like to first get a preliminary idea of your opinions on eight issues. Later in the session the responses you give to some of these eight issues, combined with your essays, will be shown to another subject to assist him in forming his impression of you. Please indicate your opinion on these eight issues on the answer sheet I will give you now. Print your name at the top of the answer sheet.

**Distribute questionnaire 2**

All right, it is now time for each of you to read the discussion sets. Each set contains brief segments of several simulated discussions on various topics. Please read the points raised by each of the different speakers carefully. Try to imagine that you are the third participant in each discussion, and try to imagine the point of view you might express on each of the issues that is raised. Later in the session, you will actually get an opportunity to express your point of view, in essay form, on some of the issues that were discussed, and on some others that were not mentioned. The essays you write on these specific issues will be used by another subject to form a "first impression" of you.

**Distribute discussion sets**

Please read the particular discussion set which you have received very carefully.

All right, it's now time for you to provide the information
which will be used by another subject in forming an impression of you. As we indicated earlier, you are now asked to write brief essays stating your views on some of the topics that were mentioned in the discussion set, and on some that were not discussed. Each of the topics you are to respond to is listed at the top of a separate page in this booklet. Under each topic statement is a rating scale, on which you are asked to summarize your overall feeling about the issue by circling the response that most closely corresponds to your point of view on that issue. You write your essay underneath. You will only be given one minute to respond to each topic, so work as quickly as you can. These instructions are repeated in the booklet.

Distribute questionnaire 3

Please review the instructions written in the booklet. Be sure and print your name at the top of each page.

Thank you very much. Now I would like you to also provide some control data, by stating your views on the four other topics. Only your views on the four topics for which you wrote brief essays will be shown to the other subject. The responses you will give now to these four items are completely anonymous, and will not be available to the other subject in forming his first impression of you. Please do not put your name on this page.

Distribute questionnaire 4

As we indicated earlier in the experiment, you will each be given the four essays which (one of) the other subject(s) wrote
on the four experimental topics. You will also receive that
subject's overall rating of his or her opinion on each of these
four topics, at the top of each page. I will now distribute this
information to you.

Redistribute questionnaire 3

Now, on the basis of this information, try to form an overall
"impression" of the other subject. Please read all the information
you have in front of you very carefully. You have a few minutes
to complete this task. I will also now distribute the final
questionnaire to you.

Distribute questionnaire 5

You probably recall that at the beginning of the experiment,
each of you filled out a similar personality inventory, where you
gave your own opinion on each of these items. On this question­
naire, however, we would like you to do the following: You have
in front of you information another subject has given you about
his beliefs and views on several topics. On the basis of this
information, we would like you to try to fill out the personality
questionnaire as you think the other person has filled it out.
We realize that this is a difficult task, but we ask you to
perform it as carefully and honestly as you can. Do you have
any questions? All right, you may begin.
EXPERIMENT III
PROCEDURE -- CONTROL CONDITIONS

Thank you very much for agreeing to participate in this experiment. Let me tell you more about the purpose of this research.

We are trying to understand how people communicate to each other in a group discussion situation. To understand the process, it is necessary to break it down, experimentally, into its component parts. That is what we will try to do here.

First of all, in a group discussion of several people, each person is exposed to the ideas of several persons on any given topic, either before or after he expresses his own views. Accordingly, in this experiment you will read ideas several people might have on a given issue. However, each of you will read a different set of discussions between two persons. Subjects in this experiment are reading different discussions so that we can be sure that there is no special effect of any particular discussion. The printed discussions will be distributed randomly among the subjects. By using many different discussion sets, we can have more confidence that our experimental results are generalizable to situations outside the laboratory.

After you read the discussion, you will be asked to write your own views on several topics, expressing your views as if you were actually in a group discussion. Some of the particular topics you will write essays on may not have even been mentioned in the
discussion set at all. That is not important, as long as you respond as if you were in a group discussion on each issue. In fact, this is why we are varying the specific discussion segments from subject to subject -- so that responses to any specific discussion will not affect the experimental results.

All right, we would like to first get a preliminary idea of your opinions on eight issues. Please indicate your opinion on these eight issues on the answer sheet I will give you now.

Distribute questionnaire 1

All right, it is now time for each of you to read the discussion sets. Each set contains brief segments of several simulated discussions on various topics. Please read the points raised by each of the two different participants carefully. Try to imagine that you are the third participant in each discussion, and try to imagine the point of view you might express on each of the issues that is raised. Later in the session, you will actually get an opportunity to express your point of view, in essay form, on some of the issues that were discussed, and on some others that were not mentioned.

Distribute discussion sets

Please read the particular discussion set which you have received very carefully.

All right. Thank you for reading the discussion. It's now time for you to write essays expressing your views on various topics. As we indicated earlier, you are now asked to write brief essays
stating your views on the two topics that were mentioned in the discussion set, and on two that were not discussed. Each of the topics you are to respond to is listed at the top of a separate page in the booklet. Under each topic statement is a rating scale, on which you are asked to summarize your overall feeling about the issue by circling the response that most closely corresponds to your point of view on that issue. You are then asked to write a brief essay, explaining your views on the issue. You will only be given one minute to respond to each topic, so work as quickly as you can. These instructions are repeated in the booklet.

Distribute questionnaire 2

Please review the instructions written in the booklet. Be sure and print your name at the top of each page, and then sign your name. Please write legibly. All right, you may begin.

Distribute questionnaire 3

Please respond now to the other four control items.
EXPERIMENT IV
PROCEDURE -- EXPERIMENTAL CONDITIONS

Thank you very much for agreeing to participate in this experiment. Through this experiment and others in this series we hope to learn more about language and particularly about how people structure verbal communications which they intend to transmit to other people.

I will now distribute a two-page booklet to you. On page 1 of the booklet are listed four topics. Later in this session, each of you will be asked to participate in a discussion of these topics with one of the other subjects present here. In this discussion you will each be asked to publicly express your opinions to the other subject as clearly and concisely as you can.

Now, before you participate in these two-person discussions, we would like you to indicate your opinion on each of these four issues in the space that is provided on page 2 of your answer sheet.

We have found that it is helpful sometimes before participating in a discussion to provide brief illustrations of how other people have decided to structure their communications to someone else, when they are trying to transmit a maximum amount of information in a short time. I will now distribute samples of these types of communications to you. Some of them are not directly related to the topics you will be dealing with but they may still be helpful to you. In order to insure that there is no special effect of any particular communication set, we have
made up several different sets and you will not all be reading the same material. Pay particular attention to whether or not topic sentences are used at the beginning of the statements, and try to decide which statements communicate their ideas most clearly.

All right, thank you very much. It is now time for you to participate in brief discussions on two of the topics which were pointed out to you earlier. We have decided to limit the discussions to two topics because of time considerations. In these discussions, as you recall, you will each be asked to publicly express your opinions to another subject as clearly and concisely as you can. Before you do this, however, we would like to get a final reading on your opinions on these two topics.

Distribute questionnaire 2

I can now tell you that before the experiment began, your group had been randomly assigned to a control condition. You will not be required to participate in any discussion on any of the four topics. All I would like you to do now is to state your final opinion on the remaining two topics of the original four, and answer a few questions about your feelings about the experiment. Please respond on this questionnaire.

Distribute questionnaire 3
EXPERIMENT IV
PROCEDURE -- CONTROL CONDITIONS

Thank you very much for agreeing to participate in this experiment. Through this experiment and others in this series, we hope to learn more about language and particularly about how people structure verbal communications which they intend to transmit to other people.

I will now distribute a two-page booklet to you. On page 1 of the booklet are listed four topics. Later in this session, each of you will be asked to listen to a tape-recording of another person's opinion on each of the four topics. Now, before you listen to a recording of someone else's views, we would like you to indicate your opinion on each of these four issues, in the space that is provided on page two of your answer sheet.

We have found that it is helpful sometimes before hearing someone else express his views to provide brief illustrations of how other people have decided to structure their communications to someone else, when they are trying to transmit the maximum amount of information in a short time. I will now distribute samples of these types of communications to you. Some of them are not directly related to the topics you will be dealing with, but they may still be helpful to you. In order to insure that there is no special effect of any particular communication set, we have made up several different sets, and you will not all be reading the same material. Pay particular attention to whether
or not topic sentences are used at the beginning of the statements, and try to decide which statements communicate their ideas most clearly.

Distribute essays

All right, thank you very much. It is now time for you to listen to a tape-recording of another person's opinions on two of the four topics which were presented to you earlier. We have decided to limit the presentation to two topics because of time considerations. Before you do this, however, we would like to get a final reading on your opinions on these two topics. Please respond to these two topics on the answer sheet I will give you now.

Distribute questionnaire 2

I can now tell you that before the experiment began, your group had been randomly assigned to a control condition. You will not be required to listen to any tapes on any of the four topics. All I would like you to do now is to state your final opinion on the remaining two topics of the original four, and answer a few questions about your feelings about this experiment.

Distribute questionnaire 3
EXPERIMENT V
PROCEDURE

Thank you very much for agreeing to participate in this experiment. Through this experiment and others in this series we hope to learn more about language, and particularly about how people structure verbal communications which they intend to transmit to other people.

I will now distribute a two-page booklet to you. On page 1 of the booklet are listed four topics. Later in this session, each of you will be asked to (participate in a discussion of these topics with one of the other subjects present here. In this discussion, you will each be asked to publicly express your opinions to the other subject as clearly and concisely as you can/listen to a tape-recording of another person's opinions on four topics).

Now, before you (participate in these two-person discussions/listen to the tapes), we would like you to indicate your opinion on each of the four items listed on page 1. Turn to page 2, and under each item, circle the response on the scale that best indicated your response to that item.

We have found that it is helpful sometimes before (asking subjects to participate in these discussions/asking subjects to evaluate a tape) to provide brief illustrations of how other people have decided to structure their communications to someone else, when they were trying to transmit a maximum amount of infor-
Private information condition

I will now distribute samples of these types of communications to you. Some of them are not directly related to the topics you will be dealing with, but they may still be helpful to you. In order to insure that there is no special effect of any particular communication set, we have made up several different sets. Keep in mind that you will not all be reading the same materials.

Public information condition

I will now distribute identical samples of these types of communications to you. Some of them are not directly related to the topics you will be dealing with, but they may still be helpful to you. Keep in mind that you will all be reading the same material.

All conditions

Pay particular attention to whether or not topic sentences are used at the beginning of the statements, and try to decide which statements communicate their ideas most clearly.

All right, thank you very much. It is now time for you to (participate in brief discussions on two of the topics which were pointed out to you earlier. We have decided to limit the discussions to two topics because of time considerations. In these discussions, as you recall, you will each be asked to publicly express your opinions to another subject as clearly and
concisely as you can/listen to a tape-recording of another person's opinions on two of the four topics which were presented to you earlier. We have decided to limit the presentation to two topics because of time considerations). Before you do this, however, we would like to get a final reading on your opinions on these two topics. Please respond to these topics on the answer sheet I will give you now.

**Distribute questionnaire 2**

I can tell you now that before this experiment began, your group had been randomly assigned to a control condition. You will not be required to (participate in any discussions on any of the four topics/listen to any tapes on any of the four topics). All I would like you to do now is to state your final opinion on the remaining two topics of the original four, and answer a few questions about this experiment.

**Distribute questionnaire 3**
2. Dependent Measures
Pretest I and II Format

Dependent Measure

Instructions: For each response you are to make, after each message or opinion statement you hear, give a single number between 1 and 15 as defined below. The higher the number, the greater is your agreement. Indicate responses in the appropriate spaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic # and name</th>
<th>Reaction to arguments and conclusions of first message (if any)</th>
<th>Reaction to arguments and conclusions of 2nd message (if any)</th>
<th>Reactions to opinion statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mass transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Admissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Income tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gov't research support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teaching at the univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Campaign spending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Research use of animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Busing &amp; the schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Retirement age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Defense spending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Univ. day-care service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Oral contraceptives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. All-volunteer army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic # and name</td>
<td>Reaction to arguments and conclusions of first message (if any)</td>
<td>Reaction to arguments and conclusions of 2nd message (if any)</td>
<td>Reactions to opinion statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Faculty tenure</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Admissions to univ.</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Government secrecy</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Treatment of incurable illness</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Taxation for education</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Support of univ. programs</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experiments I and II

Dependent Measures

Questionnaire #2

First Impression Topics

Directions: Please indicate your opinion on the eight issues below, by circling the number on each scale which best represents your opinion on each item. Your responses to some of these eight issues will be used by another subject to help him form a first impression of you.

1. The Ohio State University should discontinue open admissions, and institute selective admission only of the more highly qualified high school graduates.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree

2. Aerosol sprays should be taken off the market.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree

3. The system of faculty tenure is unnecessary and should be abolished so that professors who become ineffective may be dismissed.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree

4. High schools should have codes for student dress.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree

5. Formal coursework in theory and practice of education need not be required of those who teach in high schools.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree

6. All federal construction should be done by a racially integrated work force, even if persons from minority groups have to specially trained for jobs.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree

7. Busing children in and out of ghetto school districts is not a satisfactory solution to the problem of providing equal education opportunity for all children.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree
8. Consumers should boycott cereals containing chemical additives.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

Strongly agree

Strongly disagree
Questionnaire #3

ANONYMOUS! NO NAME PLEASE! ANONYMOUS

Control Topics

YOUR VIEWS ON THESE ISSUES WILL NOT BE SHOWN TO THE OTHER SUBJECT

1. Greater emphasis should be placed on teaching ability than on research publications in considering university faculty members for promotions and tenure.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

2. All large university lectures should be divided up into smaller classes.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

3. Ohio State University should provide free day-care service for children of university students and staff.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

4. Personal income in the United States should be redistributed and made more equal.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
Strongly agree Strongly disagree
First Impression Topics

Directions: The issues which you respond to now are the ones which the other subject will use in forming his "first impression" of you. The only information the other subject will have about you in forming his judgment is what you write in this booklet. Please do this task carefully. Remember, the other subject will form his impression of you only on the basis of what you write now.

Topic 1: The Ohio State University should discontinue open admissions, and institute selective admission only of the more highly qualified high school graduates.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

Circle response (above)

Explain your response below; confine your essay to this page:
Topic 2: Aerosol sprays should be taken off the market.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

Circle response (above)

Explain your response below; confine your essay to this page;
Topic 3: The system of faculty tenure is unnecessary and should be abolished so that professors who become ineffective may be dismissed.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
Strongly agree          Strongly disagree

Circle response (above)

Explain your response below; confine your essay to this page:
Topic 4: High schools should have codes for student dress.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
Strongly agree            Strongly disagree

Circle response (above)

Explain your response below; confine your essay to this page:
Questionnaire #5

1. Formal coursework in theory and practice of education need not be required of those who teach in high schools.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree

2. All federal construction should be done by a racially integrated work force, even if persons from minority groups have to be specially trained for jobs.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree

3. Busing children in and out of ghetto school districts is not a satisfactory solution to the problem of providing an equal educational opportunity for all children.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree

4. Consumers should boycott cereals containing chemical additives.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree

5. Greater emphasis should be placed on teaching ability than on research publications in considering university faculty members for promotion and tenure.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree

6. All large university lectures should be divided up into smaller classes.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree

7. Ohio State University should provide free day-care service for children of university students and staff.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree

8. Personal income in the United States should be redistributed and made more equal.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree
Experiments IV and V
Dependent Measure
Time 1

1. All federal construction should be done by a racially integrated work force, even if persons from minority groups have to be specially trained for jobs.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree

2. All large university lectures should be divided up into smaller classes
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree

3. Ohio State University should provide free day-care service for children of university students and staff.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree

4. Personal income in the United States should be redistributed and made more equal.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
   Strongly agree Strongly disagree
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