# THE EFFECTS OF VARIATIONS IN EXPECTANCY FULFILLMENT AND GOAL DEPENDENCY ON IMPRESSION FORMATION

by

MAXINE WOLFE

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1969

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the University Committee in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April 30 1969
date

Harold Proshansky
Chairman of Examining Committee

5/1/69
date

Leonard S. Kogan
Executive Officer

Harold Proshansky, Ph.D.

William Ittelson, Ph.D.

Milton Horowitz, Ph.D.
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere and heartfelt appreciation to Dr. H. Proshansky for his continual support and encouragement throughout the preparation of this dissertation and for his guidance and friendship throughout my years in graduate school. He has helped me grow as a person and as a psychologist. I am also indebted to Dr. Proshansky for providing the conceptual framework from which this dissertation was derived.

I would also like to thank Dr. W. Itteleson and Dr. M. Horowitz for their helpful criticisms and suggestions and for their efforts in serving on my committee. The assistance of Mimi Leibman, Howard Friedman, Tibor Weiss, Frank Stallone, and Ronald Barazani in the collection and analysis of the data is also gratefully acknowledged.

I am especially and deeply grateful to my husband, Jerry, for the help, understanding and moral support he has always given to me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

# I

## Formulation of the Problem

By the late 1940's investigators of first impression formation exhibited a significant shift in their definition of this cognitive problem. Questions concerning the extent of and determinants in the accuracy of these impressions, gave way to the more fundamental task of understanding their underlying cognitive processes. New questions were asked which, in effect, focused on establishing the relationships between the properties of the stimulus, perceiver, and situational context on the one hand, and selected content and structural attributes of the impression itself on the other. Of course, some questions were asked much sooner than others. And they were asked in ways which limited both theory and method in the study of impression formation to particular variables and problems at the expense of others of no less importance or relevance. It was Asch's now classic 1946 study that set the stage for a series of later investigations focused on the relationships between various combinations and types of stimulus information and the organizational properties of the impression. And even this particular research concern was narrowed down considerably by Asch (and those investigators who followed his lead), to the problem of the degree to which contradictory stimulus information in the form of verbally presented trait names, was integrated by the perceiver (P) to form a unified impression of the stimulus person (SP).

The present investigation is concerned with the interaction of perceiver expectancy and goal dependency in determining P's first impressions of an SP whose behavior varies on a friendly-unfriendly continuum. Coming some twenty years after Asch's original work, it differs sharply in many basic respects from this pioneer study. By the same token the present approach to the formation of first impressions is rooted in the now patent limitations of theory and method that characterized the earlier investigations. For this reason we shall look first at Asch's study and similar investigations in some detail in the discussion that immediately follows. In the process of critically evaluating these investigations -- particularly from a methodological point of view -- we shall lay bare the more general assumptions underlying the present approach to the formation of first impressions. Following this discussion we will turn our attention to the task of formulating the present research problem in terms of its specific assumptions, organizing concepts, and derived hypotheses.

## The Asch Paradigm

For Asch (1946) the crucial task in understanding the formation of first impressions was to reveal how the pattern of relevant stimulus information determined the organizational properties of such impressions; and in the process, thereby, to establish the basic cognitive principles underlying this and other perceptual phenomena involving complex social stimuli. His method was surprisingly simple. He read his subjects a list of traits describing a hypothetical stimulus person and instructed

them to listen carefully "and try to form an impression of the kind of person described." The subjects were also told that they would be asked soon after "to give a brief characterization of the person in just a few sentences."

Asch's method and the particular stimulus variables he selected for study reflected a number of more general assumptions he made about the process involved in the formation of first impressions. This process was organized to the extent that what emerged in the perception of the other was a unified structure in which all traits, contradictory or otherwise, mutually interacted to produce a viable, meaningful, and integrated conception of the stimulus person. It follows, therefore, that no trait exists and has influence in isolation. Its meaning and consequences for the perceiver's impression of the other person depends on its patterned context of other traits with which it is presented. It is this trait context which determines the direction and degree of influence of any single trait, that is, traits may either be central or peripheral in their effects on the impression of others.

In most respects Asch's results seem to confirm his conceptions of the cognitive processes underlying the formation of first impressions. Significant in this regard was his report that his subjects provided gestalt-like, unified, and consistent impressions of the hypothetical person. Other findings demonstrated the central or peripheral character of various traits as a function of stimulus context; and still others, the sharply varying impressions produced by the same set of

traits when their order of presentation to one group of subjects was reversed in its presentation to a second group. Of course, it should be noted that in actual fact these findings only confirmed Asch's predictions about what would happen in the formation of first impressions as a function of order, centrality, and the like. Whether these properties of first impression formation were indeed a function of the cognitive principles espoused by Asch (e.g., the cognitive tendency to form unified structures; the dynamic interaction of traits, etc.) was still an open question. Asch's results could be accounted for in other terms, both theoretical and methodological.

More than a few investigators immediately attempted to replicate Asch's work, particularly with respect to his finding that first impressions of others generally tended to be unified and consistent. Confirmation in this respect was reported by Mensh and Wishner (1947), Haire and Grunes (1950), and Kelly (1950). On the other hand, Luchins (1948), Kastenbaum (1951), and Gollin (1954) reported that a unified and consistent first impression was by no means the general rule. Luchins (1948), using the same method of a list of traits as stimuli, found that some Ss formed a unified and integrated picture of the other, whereas other perceivers did not exhibit this property in their impressions. Gollin's study readily demonstrated that individuals differ in their organization of first impressions. He had his subjects write impressions of the SP after being presented with a motion picture in which the latter's behavior in two successively presented film strips was more or less contradictory. His analysis of the written impressions

revealed not one, but three organizational patterns of impression formation: 1) related impressions -- Ss mentioned the two contradictory qualities and attempted to relate them in some meaningful way; 2) simplified impressions -- only one of the two traits was accepted as a basis for the impression while the other was ignored; 3) aggregated impressions -- the two contradictory qualities are cited in the impression without any attempt to reconcile their inconsistency.

Less than a decade later considerable credence is given to Gollin's findings by studies of cognitive complexity-simplicity as a cognitive style in the perceiver in relation to how he organizes his impressions of others (Bieri, 1961; Mayo and Crockett, 1964). The cognitively complex person (he has many rather than few constructs for viewing his social world), for example, is better able to tolerate ambiguity and inconsistency when confronted with contradictory information about the SP, than the cognitively simple perceiver (Nidorf, 1961; Mayo and Crockett, 1964). The relatively impoverished cognitive structure of the latter -- because he has relatively few traits available for describing others -- makes it difficult for him to recognize and attribute both favorable and unfavorable qualities to a single person. This hypothesis was confirmed by Campbell (1960) who found that low cognitive complexity was accompanied by univalence in the descriptions of others. Furthermore, the cognitively complex person not only has a greater capacity to recognize and tolerate contradictory traits in the other, but given a richer source of discriminable traits to draw upon, he is better able to reconcile potentially conflicting themes in

his description of the SP (Nidorf, 1961; Crockett, 1965).

In Nidorf's research, for example, he divided his Ss into those who were more or less cognitively complex on the basis of the number of constructs they utilized in the free descriptions of eight people. Subsequently they were presented with six contradictory traits supposedly describing a particular individual, and asked to think about the person and then write an impression of him. Nidorf's findings clearly indicated that cognitively complex individuals, compared to the cognitively simple subjects, were better able to integrate the contradictory traits in their impression.

In passing it is important to stress that the concern with personality factors in particular, and individual differences generally, in the formation of first impressions, has not been confined solely to the cognitive complexity-simplicity variable. Hays (1958), Kelly (1955), and Bruner and Tagiuri (1954) have all emphasized that individual perceivers may have unique conceptions of what traits go together or are associated in other persons. And both Jones (1954) and Berkowitz (1959) have demonstrated how specific personality characteristics of the perceiver, e.g., authoritarianism, influence what information he uses and the evaluations he makes in his impressions of the SP. Finally, more than a few investigators have revealed the significance of age and/or sex differences in the structure and content of first impressions of others (Shrauger and Altrocchi, 1964; Radke-Yarrow and Campbell, 1963; Secord and Muthard, 1955; Sarbin, 1954, Shapiro and Tagiuri, 1959; Nidorf and Crockett, 1964). Thus Nidorf and Crockett (1964) found that

college females used significantly more traits than college males in describing both male and female acquaintances; and that the women sought more information about an SP than the men.

Turning our attention back to Asch's (1946) study, it is important to consider at this point why he and other investigators who confirmed his findings (Mensh and Wishner, 1948; Haire and Grunes, 1950; Kelly, 1950) found that impression structures were unified and consistent. Why didn't the individual differences in impression formation described above appear in their results? To answer this question we must take a closer look at the Asch paradigm for studying first impressions formation. Such an analysis will provide a basis for answering the more general question of the extent to which the findings derived from the paradigm are generalizable to the phenomenon of first impression formation as we know it in day-to-day social interactions.

There are three distinguishing characteristics of Asch's methodological approach that have clear implications for the specific nature of his findings and their generalizability beyond the laboratory setting: the use of trait names; the instruction given the S that he form an impression of the SP; and finally, the fact that the SP was presented as a "particular" but otherwise unidentificable person.

Are trait names the consequence of impression formation or the basic stimuli on the basis of which impressions of others are formed? The fact that Asch patently assumes the latter was criticized initially be Luchins (1948). In a replication of Asch's study he found that his Ss encountered difficulty in writing impressions of the other from a

trait list. Furthermore, in the free descriptions his Ss wrote they used few trait names -- rather they described the "behaviors" of the SP. Radke-Yarrow and Campbell (1963) found that children describe other children by behaviors rather than traits. Given the fact that Asch's paradigm does involve the use of a list of discrete trait names, the possibility arises that the consistency Asch found was a function of this particular procedure in his study of impression formation. Thus, it is of interest to note that in the studies by Luchins (1948), Kastenbaum (1952), and Gollin (1954), where unified impressions were generally not found, the stimuli presented were sequences of actual behaviors and not trait lists. Luchins utilized descriptions of the SP's behavior in a variety of situations; Gollin presented motion picture sequences; and Kastenbaum employed tape recordings of a "warm" and a "cold" person. On the other hand, in the studies by Mensh and Wishner (1948) and Haire and Grunes (1950), both of which employed lists of traits, consistency in impression formation is reported.

In the study reported by Kelly (1950), however, such consistency was reported in free impressions written after the subjects were first given some information about a substitute instructor they would have in class, and who they subsequently observed in this setting. Yet, Kelly's investigation is hardly comparable methodologically to any of the others including Asch's. Given a substitute teacher previously identified as "warm" or "cold" amidst other less relevant background information, it is small wonder that his "students" wrote integrated impressions of him. One may well ask if the degree of consistency in impression formation is

not just a function of perceiver background and personality variables as we noted above, but also of who is being observed and in what particular interaction context. We shall deal with this significant question somewhat later on in the present discussion.

At this point, let us consider the fact that in Asch's and other investigations Ss were instructed to form an impression of the SP so they could give a brief characterization of him. Was the resultant consistency or unity of impressions a function of this instruction? Are there other instructions which might lead to inconsistent impressions? An affirmative answer to these questions was provided by Zajonc (1960) and Cohen (1961). Zajonc demonstrated that subjects told they would have to convey their impression of the SP to another person -- "transmitters" -- formed more unified impressions than subjects told that after forming their impressions they would receive additional information about the SP -- "receivers." Cohen's subjects were given these transmitting or receiving instructions in relation to contradictory information about an SP and told to write a sketch of the latter. His findings indicated that transmitters wrote more consistent impressions than receivers. Thus, the consistency and unity of impressions Asch reported may have been due to the "transmitting" type of instructions his Ss were given.

Actually, we may even say that transmitters and receivers had two different reasons, or needs, for forming their impressions. Therefore, in a more general sense, Zajonc and Cohen demonstrated that consistency and unity were a function of the perceiver's motivation to form

a coherent picture and there may be situations in which a lack of coherence is necessary. However, even in these studies, subjects were instructed to form an impression. Does this compare to a life situation or is the process of impression formation initiated by the importance of forming an impression, the nature of the situation, and other motivational factors inherent in the social context in which interactions normally occur? Would subjects form any impression, or a similar impression, if they had interacted with the SP in a day-to-day situation?

As early as 1933, Murray provided support for the notion that the evaluative direction of an impression was affected by the perceiver's motivational or affective state. He found that fearful subjects tended to project their fear onto others. Feshback and Singer (1957) and Singer and Feshback (1962) found evidence of Ss' projection of their fear, aggression, and anxiety onto descriptions of neutral stimulus persons. More recent studies (Berkowitz and Rawlings, 1963; Berkowitz et al., 1963; Berkowitz, 1965) have confirmed the concept of projected emotion and have demonstrated that the extent to which emotion is projected is related to the SP's behavior and role definition. In the case of projected hostility, for example, Berkowitz (1965) found that angered men who had seen a prize fight film showed more aggression toward an SP when he was described as a "speech major." Furthermore, the degree of aggressive response was affected by the extent to which the SP was liked or disliked. Disliked people elicited a higher volume of aggression from strongly angered Ss (Berkowitz and Holmes, 1960). Pepitone (1950) also demonstrated that the perceiver's motivational state could

distort his perception of an SP. He reported that a perceiver highly motivated to obtain a goal will distort his perception, of the individual controlling the goal, in a facilitative direction, that is, in a direction beneficial to his goal achievement.

These studies emphasize that Asch's findings, being the result of one type of instruction and resulting from a paradigm which not only ignored individual differences, but also ignored the questions of set, needs, and direction due to the nature of the situation, have limited application to an explication of day-to-day impression forming behavior.

Furthermore, the Berkowitz and Pepitone studies bring us to the third methodological limitation of Asch's study: the fact that the SP was presented as a "particular" but otherwise unidentifiable person. Essentially, evaluation of the SP took place in a vacuum. No situational context was provided against which the SP's behavior could be evaluated. Neither the SP's role nor the social relationship between the perceiver and the SP were specified. Yet, "in order to be more faithful to the typical situation of social interaction we should recognize that in many interaction situations considerable information is conveyed by cues about the situation and the roles of the participants (Jones and Thibaut, 1958)."

For example, simply defining the SP in terms of status has consequences for the evaluation of his behavior. The high status person, influenced by another to change his attitude, is perceived as changing his own ideas whereas the low status person, in the same situation, is perceived as having been coerced to change his ideas (Thibaut and Rieken,

1955). Non-conforming behavior is more acceptable in the high status individual (Iverson, 1964) and the higher the status of the individual, the greater the tendency to attribute good intentions with respect to both his positive and negative acts (Pepitone and Wallace, 1958). Evaluation, then, can be a function of the individual's role and not of his specific personal characteristics. Further confirmation of this point is provided by Jones (1954) who demonstrated that authoritarians, as compared to non-authoritarians, tend to positively evaluate any "leader" regardless of his personal characteristics.

In 1958, Jones and Thibaut presented a systematic theoretical approach to the study of the social interaction context in impression formation. They contend that interaction situations can be classified in terms of the contingency of behavior of the participants and the purpose or goal of the interaction. The extent to which the perceiver is dependent on the actor (contingency of behavior) will affect the continuity and intensity of perceptual searching, and to some extent the type of information sought by the perceiver. The greater the interdependence of behavior, the greater the importance of the actor's behavior, and the more intense the perceiver's search for cues. Given a certain degree of dependence, the type of cues sought will depend on the extent to which the actor's behavior is constrained by role requirements and on the purpose of the interaction. The less constrained the actor's behavior, the greater the perceiver's need for information about the actor's personal characteristics, intentions, and "true nature" as opposed to information about role characteristics. Different purposes or goals create different

"inferential sets." The set will then determine the cues the perceiver focuses upon and on which he will subsequently evaluate the actor. For example, a situation in which the perceiver seeks to facilitate his own goal attainment gives rise to a set in which the perceiver will be concerned chiefly with those characteristics of the actor which give cues as to whether his attainment of the goal will be facilitated or inhibited. To the extent that the actor facilitates goal achievement he will be evaluated positively.

Several studies can be cited which provide, or attempt to provide, support for these theoretical notions. Jones and DeCharms (1957), for example, demonstrated that when an individual's behavior -- in this instance, failure -- affected a group goal, he was evaluated as less dependable by members of the group than when the identical behavior affected only his own receipt of reward. Thus, when the actor's behavior could inhibit another's personal goal attainment, the actor's dependability became a basis for his negative or positive evaluation. In addition, the interdependence of the Ss in obtaining the goal caused the actor to be rated as more incompetent in the group failure condition because Ss who are interdependent are more concerned with each other's problem solving competence than are Ss whose behavior is independent. Therefore, sensitivity to particular areas of behavior and subsequent evaluations are affected by both inferential set and degree of contingency.

A second Jones and DeCharms study (1958) was designed as the only direct, though exploratory, test of the theory. Naval air cadets were asked to assume one of three roles in evaluating the actions of an

ex-prisoner of the Korean war who had signed propaganda petitions that were highly critical of the United States. The hypothesis was that the assumption of different roles would give rise to different sets, facilitate the use of different cues on which to evaluate the actor, and lead to different evaluations of his actions. Selective sensitivity to information related to different sets was not demonstrated. All subjects, regardless of set, were sensitive to all aspects of the SP's behavior. It is relevant that Ss were not involved in an actual interaction with the SP (they listened to a tape-recorded interview) and were, in a sense, observers. Since they knew they would be asked to evaluate the SP they may have paid attention to all details despite their differing sets. In actual interaction situations, where specific aspects of another's behavior are really relevant to one's role, selective sensitivity may, in fact, occur.

To digress for a moment -- comparing the more complex nature of Jones and DeCharms theoretical and methodological approach to Asch's rather simple paradigm, it is worthwhile to point out a methodological limitation common to both studies (and many others). We cannot even say that the perceiver is an observer since there is no actual person to observe. Such situations are highly artificial in nature because subjects listen to, or see, or hear about an interaction but they do not interact with the SP. Yet actual involvement in an interaction situation should affect the perceiver's need to form an impression, the degree to which he focuses on the behavior, the type of behavior to which he attends, and his final evaluation of the actor. For ex-

ample, it may be extremely difficult for an individual to assume a specific set upon instruction. The type of role or set one assumes in an interaction may be intimately tied to personality differences or to training. Thus, without studying impression formation in an on-going social situation involving actual interaction we cannot be certain that the behavior we observe is, in fact, reflective of the same behavior as it would occur in a realistic social context.

To return to the Jones and DeCharms study, the other findings did not provide specific support for the theory and indicated that knowing the purpose of an interaction, apparently, is not enough to enable prediction of either the subsequent bases for evaluations or the final direction of the evaluation. Factors such as the intentionality of the actor's behavior, his responsibility for the behavior, and mitigating circumstances, seem to be equally or more important in our evaluation of his behavior. It becomes clear when evaluating the other studies which followed Jones and DeCharms (Jones, Hester, Farina and Davis, 1959; Gergen and Jones, 1963) that rather than being directly concerned with comparing the consequences of arousing different sets, later research shifted the focus away from situational context and towards those characteristics of the SP (i.e., mental illness, maladjustment) which would affect perception of intentionality and responsibility and subsequently affect evaluation of that SP.

An outgrowth of this shift in focus was Jones and Davis' correspondence theory (1965). They begin by stating that before a perceiver begins his fundamental task of inferring the causal antecedents of be-

havior he must see an action and its effects, must feel that the actor intended and is aware of these effects (intentionality), and that the actor had the ability to produce these effects (responsibility). Assuming these preconditions are fulfilled, it is the nature of the situational context that causes the perceiver to postulate that underlying personality dispositions account for such behavior, i.e., to infer correspondence of behavior. However, situational context has a very specific and limited meaning in this theory -- the degree of choice or freedom of the actor. The less the actor's behavior is constrained or defined by the setting in which it occurs, the more we tend to see his behavior as indicative of underlying personality dispositions and the more "correspondent" our inferences are. Operationally, degree of correspondence is measured by extremity and certainity of ratings. If a perceiver evaluates an action as indicating underlying personality dispositions he will rate the actor more extremely on these dispositions (more positively or negatively) and he will be confident about his ratings.

In research cited as evidence for the theory (Jones and Davis, 1965) Ss are presented with trait scales and extreme positivity or negativity of rating is taken as evidence of degree of inference. For example, the Jones, Davis, and Gergen study (1961), taken as direct evidence for the theory, demonstrated that SP's whose behavior conformed to clearly specified role requirements were rated moderately on these characteristics while SP's who acted in opposition to these role requirements were rated moderately on these characteristics while SP's who acted in opposition to these role requirements were rated extremely. However,

this operational measure of correspondence is not linked to the original theoretical definition of inferring stable characteristics from behavior. Nowhere in theory or research is a clear cut distinction or relation drawn between the extent of the cognitive process of inferring characteristics and the evaluation of inferred characteristics. There is, in fact, no direct evidence of the extent to which Ss would infer such underlying personality dispositions if they were not already available in the form of trait scales.

Thus, although we have come a long way since Asch's original study by focusing on the myriad of situational factors which can influence the formation of first impressions, emphasis has been placed on the relationship between these situational factors and the evaluative aspects of the impression formed by the perceiver. Little attention has been focused on the relationship between situational context and the structural aspects of the impression formed by a perceiver in that context. As previously mentioned, Jones and Davis (1965) give no direct evidence of free inference by Ss. Furthermore, inferences about underlying dispositions represent only one aspect of the cognitive processes involved in impression formation. Other aspects include the extent to which an impression is organized, the type of organization, the number of characteristics used to describe an actor, the use of superficial as opposed to deeper personality characteristics, etc. Finally, aside from the theoretical statements made by Jones and Thibaut (1958) in regard to the factors affecting the intensity of perceptual searching, virtually no theory or research has focused on the extent to

which an individual will engage in impression forming behavior nor to the ways of measuring this aspect of impression formation.

It seems that the neglect of this aspect of impression formation arises because notably absent from all previous research are studies dealing with the conditions which will motivate differential degrees of impression forming behavior. In these studies impression formation, per se, without concern for extent, is assumed to occur in any situation where P (perceiver) meets another individual (stimulus person or SP) or receives information about another individual, for the first time. Often the question of P's need or desire to engage in impression formation in differential degrees is rendered superfluous by the fact that the experimenter assumes that impression formation is occuring and hence focuses on the evaluative content of the impression. Yet, we have no evidence that P would form the same impression, or any impression, or engage in impression forming behavior to the same extent if he had received the same information outside of the experimental situation. In day-to-day situations the perceiver is not usually instructed to form an impression. In some way, the nature of the situation in which he meets another individual provides some impetus for him to do so. Therefore, if we are to study this phenomenon we should specify those situational conditions which will stimulate or arouse impression forming behavior, per se, and also specify those conditions which will motivate greater or lesser degrees of this behavior. It is with these aspects of impression formation that the present paper is concerned.

## Theoretical Framework

We do not assume that an interaction situation can exist in which impression formation will be completely absent. As Jones and Thibaut (1958) state: "we assume that each participant in an interaction must come to an initial decision (no matter how tentative or erroneous) regarding the nature of the social situation in which he is involved. Out of this decision will evolve a set to attend to, and to utilize in certain ways, the information provided by the other person (p. 154)." Therefore, whenever two or more people meet or receive information about one another some degree of impression forming behavior will occur.

However, a basic assumption in our formulation is that impression formation is cognitive behavior and, like other cognitive behavior, the extent of its occurrence and the nature of the content of the impression are a function of conditions that define the P, the SP, and their relationship to each other. An individual does not engage in impression forming behavior to the same degree in every situation. Some situations require that he think about and know the other individual well, while others require minimal knowledge of the other's characteristics. For example, if P meets the SP for the first time and knows that his relationship with him will be a sustained one, i.e., if the other person is a prospective co-worker for example, he would tend to be more concerned with evaluating or "knowing" this individual than if he was simply introduced to the individual at a social affair and knew that no lasting relationship would occur between them.

According to Proshansky (1962), the individual's need for predictability is the basic determinant underlying impression formation. Other concepts, such as the "need to know" suggested by Katz (1954), assume that the individual has a need to know what is occurring in any situations that are ambiguous or otherwise lack clarity. The need to know, however, is very general and is based on the individual's desire to give structure to his universe, to understand and give meaning to his world. The need for predictability was conceptualized by Proshansky to take account specifically of the nature and extent of cognitive processes underlying the interaction between two individuals who meet for the first time. To the extent that the perceiver in such a situation is unable to or lacks the knowledge to behave appropriately in response to the SP, the need for predictability will be aroused.

In a first meeting interaction context in which the need for predictability is aroused, cognitive activity in the form of impression forming behavior is a direct and immediate consequence. It is a primary method for reducing the perceiver's uncertainty about what to expect from and how to respond to the behavior of the other person. Impression forming behavior, in effect, is functional: to the extent that the perceiver establishes some conception of the attitudes, feelings, and other dispositions of the SP, P feels better able to predict the responses of the latter to his own behavior -- not merely in the immediate situation but in future situations.

Underlying cognitive processes and overt behavior are complexly interrelated in determining the course of interaction in a first meeting

context (or in any interaction sequence). And, there can be no question that the cognitive process which guides, and in turn is guided by, behavior involves far more than the forming of an impression of the other. As Jones and Thibaut (1958) suggest, the perceiver must think about what his own next response should be as well as what the other person is like. The rapid-fire nature of social interaction in which there is a continual cognitive shifting from "self" to "other" is never a very deliberate, systematic, and integrated process. It tends to be fragmentary and intermittent, and as Jones and Thibaut emphasize, it is usually not completed until the perceiver is no longer in the interaction situation when he has more time to think about, organize, and evaluate his information.

We have already assumed that impression forming behavior is the direct consequence of the perceiver's need for predictability. We can expect, therefore, almost by definition that in any first meeting context in which the perceiver has some minimum level of involvement or interest, the need for predictability will always be aroused to some degree and impression formation will occur. The major assumption of the present approach to impression formation in a first meeting situation can now be stated as follows:

> The degree of impression forming behavior in a first meeting context is a direct function of the intensity of the perceiver's need for predictability.

The Degree of Impression Forming Behavior

The intensity of the perceiver's need to predict is a function of the degree and the efficacy of the knowledge he brings to and sub-

sequently derives from his interactions with others. If we consider the degree of information or knowledge he brings to the first-meeting context, it is obvious that he is far from being uninformed, that is, the need for predictability is by no means at its apex. In every instance the perceiver brings considerable knowledge to the situation in the form of expectations based on how people act as a function of their age, sex, occupation, role, ethnic group, and other normatively defined categories. Furthermore, in many instances an individual may acquire specific information about the SP before he interacts with him for the first time. A perceiver who learns or is told that the "other person" he will soon meet is friendly, important, "good," "bad," or "indifferent," is potentially better informed and therefore should experience less need for predictability than the perceiver who does not receive this information.

This view is consistent with the position taken by Jones and Thibaut (1958) when they indicate that in any interaction context the perceiver will act in such a way to reduce the need for information to sustain the interaction process. Ostensibly, the attention to and interpretation of cues as a basis for forming an impression of the other, is the primary cognitive response for reducing the need. To the extent that the perceiver comes to the first meeting context already prepared with information in the form of expectancies, this kind of behavior is less likely to occur.

In terms of the individual's need for predictability, however, expectancies represent only potential knowledge. While it is true that

prior to interaction the perceiver with expectancies or prior knowledge will have less of a need to predict than the perceiver with no such expectancies, this difference may quickly disappear -- if not reverse itself -- if these expectancies are not fulfilled once interaction begins. In an unfulfilled-expectancy situation, that is, where the perceiver's expectancies or prior knowledge lack efficacy or are not confirmed, his need for predictability should be intensified, and consequently, greater impression forming behavior should occur. A similar assumption is to be found in a recent theoretical approach presented by Jones and Davis (1965).

Their primary concern is to establish the conditions under which the perceiver is likely to look for reasons to explain the behavior of the SP. Looking for reasons, in effect, involves attributing personality dispositions to the latter to account for his behavior, e.g., the SP exhibits dominant behavior because he is a dominant person. And this kind of attribution or "correspondence" is likely to occur when the SP's behavior is not defined by the situation or his given role. Since the behavior cannot be explained by the situation then reasons are sought in the intentions or motives of the SP and, therefore, in his basic dispositions. Similarly, in the present approach, it is in the unfulfilled-expectancy situation, that is, when the SP does not behave in the expected way, that the need for predictability is intensified and increased impression forming behavior occurs.

An unfulfilled-expectancy situation, for example, where the

perceiver expects the other person to be friendly and finds that he is not, is analagous to confronting an individual with contradictory or inconsistent verbally presented information about another person. If, as we suggested above, unfulfilled-expectancy will lead to greater impression forming behavior than expectancy fulfillment, then we should expect that the presentation of contradictory traits in comparison to consistent trait information would result in similar effects. Supporting the present interpretation is the finding by Nidorf and Crockett (1964) that individuals presented with ambivalent or contradictory attributes about another person sought significantly more information about that person, before making other interpersonal trait judgments about him, than individuals receiving univalent list of attributes. Leventhal (1962) also found that contradictory or discrepant verbally presented information about another person resulted in the highest degree of impression forming behavior in the perceiver when degree of differentiation, i.e., the number of attributes used to describe the SP, was used as the measure of impression formation.

These findings taken in conjunction with the postulated relationships between expectancy and unfulfilled expectancy, intensity of the need for predictability, and degree of impression forming behavior, lead to the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: The perceiver will exhibit a greater degree of impression forming behavior in a no-expectancy first meeting situation than in a comparable situation in which his expectancy is fulfilled.

Hypothesis 2: The perceiver will exhibit a greater degree of impression forming behavior in an unfulfilled expectancy first meeting situation than in a comparable situation in which his expectancy is fulfilled.

Much earlier in the present discussion we made the assumption that the lowest intensity of arousal of the need for predictability on its consequence -- some corresponding degree of impression forming behavior -- depended on some minimal involvement of the perceiver in the first meeting situation. Such behavior is unlikely to occur if P is not interested in or motivated to make appropriate responses to the SP except in terms of highly stereotyped and superficial responses. Of course, the extent to which P is involved or motivated in this way by the first meeting context depends on its purpose, his reason for being in it. Thus, a casual fifteen minute encounter with an unknown fellow commuter occupying the next seat will not involve the perceiver as much as an encounter for an equal length of time with an SP interviewing him for a job.

The purposes or ends that motivate individuals in a first meeting context reflect the nature of the relationship between them in this context. The employment interview, for example, in which the interviewer has the power to, and will, determine whether the perceiver gets the job, involves a very different role relationship than if all other things are equal except that the SP is simply responsible for gathering information about the perceiver which will be evaluated by still another person. An essential conceptual dimension for distinguishing the two relationships lies in the extent to which P is goal dependent on the SP. In terms of getting the job, P is far more goal dependent on the SP in the first

situation than in the second and, in this respect, the SP's behavior in the first situation is far more relevant to P than in the second.

Most research dealing with the interaction context and its effects on impression formation has focused on the evaluation of the SP as a function of degree of relevance of his behavior for the perceiver. In a study by Jones and DeCharms (1957), for example, it was found that an individual was evaluated more negatively by members of a group when his failure interfered with the attainment of a group goal than when the same failure affected only his own goal attainment. Kleiner (1960) varied the extent to which a group was in need of help in solving difficult problems. Results indicated that when the group was more in need of help an accomplice who facilitated group goal achievement by solving the difficult problems was seen as being more important to the group members. Furthermore, the more the group was in need of help the greater their liking for the SP who provided such help.

Jones and Daugherty (1959) found that evaluation of a particular individual was a function of the relevance of his characteristics to a particular interaction context. Ss were led to believe that they would or would not interact with a specific SP, i.e., minimal and maximal relevance conditions. Clearly, in our own terminology the need for predictability would be greater in the anticipated interaction condition than in the no interaction conditions. Ss received information about one of two SP's: one was characterized as an intellectual, reserved individual with aesthetic interests; the other was presented as an opportunistic and conforming individual who was obviously sociable.

When no interaction was anticipated, i.e., under conditions of minimal relevance, the aesthetic individual was more highly evaluated than the sociable individual. However, when interaction was anticipated, i.e., under conditions of maximal relevance, Ss' evaluations of the sociable individual became more positive than their evaluation of the aesthetic individual. Thus, the sociability of the SP became a critical variable in his evaluation when sociability was relevant because interaction was anticipated. A study by Jones, Hester, Farina, and Davis (1959) also demonstrated the relationship between relevance and the degree to which the SP was evaluated favorably.

Our review of the research literature revealed no investigation of the effects of the relevance of the SP's behavior for the perceiver's need satisfaction on the degree of impression forming behavior in the latter. This particular relationship is the direct concern in the present investigation. It is assumed that the greater the degree to which the perceiver is goal dependent on the SP, to this extent will the perceiver have to act appropriately in order to achieve this goal. Thus, in a high goal dependent situation the behavior of the SP is more relevant to the perceiver than in a low goal situation. Only by a constant monitoring of the SP's behavior can the perceiver know what will constitute appropriate responses on his own part. It follows, therefore, that the greater the degree of goal dependency in a first meeting interaction context, the greater the arousal of the need for predictability in the perceiver in the dependent role. On the basis of this assumption and those made earlier the following hypothesis can be derived:

Hypothesis 3: The perceiver will exhibit a greater degree of impression forming behavior in a first meeting situation in which his goal dependency is high than in a comparable situation in which he has low goal dependency.

Given the previous assumptions and hypotheses on the effects of expectancy and goal dependency on the degree of arousal of the need for predictability, it is possible to specify the conditions under which we expect the most and least impression forming behavior. For the perceiver who has high goal dependency and experiences either no expectancy or unfulfilled expectancy, we would expect the greatest degree of impression forming behavior; and where low goal dependency is the case and expectancies are fulfilled impression forming behavior should be minimal. If high goal dependency interacts with expectancy fulfilled or low goal dependency interacts with no expectancy or unfulfilled expectancy, we would predict moderate degrees of impression forming behavior falling between the predictions made when degrees of goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment are predictively congruent.

## Empirical Dimensions of Impression Forming Behavior

In the present discussion impression forming behavior refers to cognitive processes in which the perceiver attributes characteristics to another on the basis of observed behavior. It is assumed here that degree of differentiation, that is, the number of traits or characteristics attributed to the SP, directly reflects the degree to which impression forming behavior is occurring or has occurred.

Basic to this assumption is the conception, expressed by Zajonc (1960), that "a person has at his disposal a large number of attributes by means of which he can identify and discriminate objects and events in his environment (p. 159)." All of the attributes at the individual's disposal make up his cognitive universe. An organized subset of this universe by means of which the individual can identify or discriminate any specific object or event is known as a cognitive structure. An impression is considered to be one such cognitive structure. Accordingly, like other cognitive structures, it can be described in terms of its degree of differentiation, i.e., the number of attributes it contains -- one of its basic properties (Zajonc, 1961).

Bieri (1961) similarly refers to degree of differentiation as a basic characteristic of cognitive structures. In his approach, complexity-simplicity is considered to be a stable characteristic of the individual's cognitive system (a personality variable) and, more specifically, it is a measure of the degree of differentiation in the cognitive system for perceiving others. "The cognitively complex person (high degree of differentiation) is assumed to have a greater number of personal constructs to construe the behavior of others while the cognitively simple person has available few personal constructs (Bieri, 1961)."

The findings of a number of investigations have indicated that the degree of differentiation of an impression is related to situational as well as personality variables and also to the nature of the perceived stimuli. Crockett (1965) points out that individuals with a high degree of differentiation with respect to the perception of people do not nec-

essarily have complex cognitive systems with respect to other domains. Secondly, a person may show differential complexity in his interpersonal constructs with respect to different categories of people depending upon the extent of his interaction with them. Supnick (1964) reports, for example, that despite individual differences in cognitive complexity, all Ss used more constructs to describe individuals they liked rather than dislike; who were older as opposed to being younger; and who were of the same sex and not of the opposite sex.

Other studies indicate that situational sets may influence the degree of differentiation in impression forming behavior. Zajonc (1960) found that individuals who were set to transmit information used a larger number of attributes to describe a stimulus person than individuals set to receive additional information. Leventhal (1962) also showed that changes will occur in differentiation as a function of the set an individual has. He found that when presented two sets of information, the second set being discrepant with the first, receivers' impressions became more differentiated after presentation of the second set of information while transmitters' impressions became less differentiated.

When the individual is engaged in impression forming behavior it is reasonable to assume that the type of attributes he employs as well as the total number of attributes may reflect the degree to which he is involved in such behavior. Ostensibly, the more attributes he assigns to the SP the more information he has about the latter. However, it is also true that some kinds of attributes may represent more information about the perceived person than other kinds of attributes.

To know, for example, that the SP has a "need to be liked," gives P a greater ability to predict his behavior in a first meeting situation than to know that he has a "nice smile" or that he is "friendly."

The distinction between personality or other kinds of dispositional characteristics and more overt or external characteristics in impression formation was first pointed up by Sarbin (1952). Ss were instructed to "write down the first three words that come into mind" when they were presented with an SP -- in this instance, a student who stood up in class and said nothing. The written words were grouped into two categories. Inferential words -- such as aggressive, logical, warm -- were in one category, while more overtly descriptive words -- such as short girl, student -- were in the other. Sarbin's predictions, that 1) "women would use more inferential terms depicting "underlying" traits more frequently than men in their role expectations of "live Ss"; and 2) that men would use terms that were more continuous with raw data: nouns describing position or adjectives describing external characteristics of the person," were confirmed.

In an exploratory study, Beach and Wertheimer (1961) studied free written descriptions of various SP's in an attempt to answer the following question: what kinds of dimensions are used by different kinds of Ss when describing different kinds of people under different kinds of conditions? Their subjects wrote descriptions of people they knew well, people they didn't know well, and people in different roles. Aspects of the written impression were categorized into four major groupings: Objective Information, i.e., O's appearance; Social Inter-

action, i.e., O's behavior toward S; Behavioral Consistencies, i.e., O's temperment, enduring personal characteristics; and, Performance and Activities, i.e., O's abilities. Among their findings Beach and Wertheimer report that Ss used more objective information in describing people they knew well as compared to people they knew less well. They confirmed Sarbin's findings that men used categories emphasizing physical appearances while females emphasized social interaction and behavioral consistencies. In general these results indicate that the dimensions used in judgments of other people are a function of the S doing the judging, the SP's being judged, the situational context, and the interactions among these variables.

It is assumed in the present approach that the greater the need for predictability, the greater the extent to which more inferential, dispositional, or personality characteristics will occur in the impression relative to less inferential, descriptive or objective attributes. As we have already suggested, the greater P's "need to know" the more likely it is that he will go beyond the perceived behavior or superficial characteristics and look for underlying psychological processes, motives, basic attitudes, etc. If the need is low than we would expect an impression which has a relatively greater number or proportion of physical characteristics, observed behaviors, and other less inferential attributes in comparison to personality dispositions.

The theoretical formulations of Jones and Thibaut (1958) and Jones and Davis (1965) lend support to the view that personality char-

acteristics are more likely to occur in impression formation when the need for predictability is high. In both of the formulations the assumption is made that where the perceiver's information about the other is minimal, e.g., the role of the SP is not defined, or his behavior cannot be explained by social context, P is far more likely to make inferences about the other's motives, intentions, or "true nature." For these theorists impression forming behavior only begins when perceiver uncertainty or lack of knowledge requires that he explain the behavior of the SP in terms of basic personality dispositions -- a view similar to the one taken here.

Given our analysis of the two empirical dimensions of impression forming behavior discussed up to this point, e.g., differentiation and relative number or proportion of personality attributes, we predict in relation to all of our previous hypotheses that a greater need for predictability or greater impression forming behavior will manifest itself in greater differentiation and a greater proportion of personality characteristics. In effect, we are assuming that the two effects in impression forming behavior are correlated to some degree. As the total number of attributes in first impression formation increased under the impetus of a greater need for predictability, then the proportion of personality attributes compared to externalcharacteristics will also increase.

However, it can be argued that if the need for predictability leads to a great reliance on personality dispositions, that is, underlying traits or motives, then differentiation of the impression should

be less since such traits or motives are general and permit a greater degree of predictability. In other words, by simply attributing a few fundamental attributes to the SP the perceiver achieves considerable knowledge of the SP and therefore minimizes his need for predictability. From this point of view, differentiation and the proportion of personality attributes would be negatively related empirical dimensions of impressinn forming behavior or, if not that, then at least unrelated empirical dimensions. The negative relationship, it could be argued further, stems from the fact that when for some reason the perceiver can't reduce the need for predictability by a small number of basic personality attributes, that then he will resort to attributing more and more superficial characteristics as a means of reducing the need.

The difficulty with this argument lies in the fact that while it has some merit it assumes that all perceivers are psychologists. The conception of more general vs. more specific attributes for predicting behavior reflects the thinking of the personality theorist or social psychologist and not the naïve perceiver. By "naïve" we do not mean uninformed or less sophisticated. He is naïve in the sense that whether traits are general or specific, "underlying" or "superficial" simply does not enter into the process of forming an impression for him.

When the need for predictability is low, then the perceiver will observe less and have less of a need to make inferences about what he observes. As it increases, he will both make many more observations and in the process, be more likely to translate perceived overt behavior into enduring personality traits, whenever this is possible. We make the

assumption -- and it is quite reasonable if we view the perceiver as "naïve" rather than as a psychologist -- that what satisfies the need for predictability is the amount of information P has and not its particular nature. Then why does he make inferences in the first place? Because attributing reasons to behavior and events is inherent in the way he perceives, and he will do it to a greater extent, or just do it, when in fact he is faced with a situation in which the meanings of what he observes have not as yet been established or have been inaccurately established. He does not "probe down" for a few "cardinal traits," but rather will inevitably gather information and "converts" it as the need for predictability increases. Although on less certain grounds, it is our view that because the P in a first impression situation is generally not at all certain about any of his "knowledge," save observed physical responses or attributes, and must interact a number of times to achieve such certainty, that the need for predictability is reduced but only by gathering all the relevant information, observed and inferential.

Of course, the problem we have raised cannot be resolved by discussion. It is an empirical question. Given our hypothesis and the position we have taken above, we would predict that an increase in the need for predictability will result in greater differentiation and a greater proportion of personality to descriptive characteristics. Just what the relationship actually is between these two empirical dimensions should be revealed to some degree by the present study.

The Direction of Impression Forming Behavior

Thus far we have considered only the effects of the arousal of the need for predictability on the extent of impression forming behavior. However, we would also expect the arousal of the need for predictability to have other consequences, at least as a function of other conditions. Specifically, we can focus on the evaluative content or substance of the impression formed by the perceiver in a first meeting situation in which the perceiver is striving to obtain a goal, external to the situation, over which the SP has some control. Thus, the ability to predict appropriately and, hence, to make the appropriate responses could result in goal attainment for the perceiver. In such a situation, more or less favorable evaluations of the actor should be related to the extent to which the actor's behavior is predictable. That is, the perceiver's like or dislike for a particular SP should be affected by the former's ability to predict the SP's behavior and to act appropriately in the interaction.[1]

Given that a perceiver has a need for predictability in such a situation, conditions which interfere with or reduce the perceiver's ability to predict appropriate behavior should create negative affect. To the extent that the need to predict is satisfied, and the perceiver feels he is gauging his behavior appropriately, positive affect should result. Support for this notion can be found in a study by Gergen and

---

[1] Any notions here concerning the evaluative effects of unpredictability are based on the assumption that there is attribution of causality, responsibility, and intentionality to the actor for his behavior. Research (Thibaut and Reiken, 1955; Jones et al., 1959; Gergen and Jones, 1963) has indicated that unless the SP is seen as responsible for, and causing his own behavior the perceiver can explain away or overlook the behavior and may inhibit his affective response to the unpredictability.

Jones (1963). They demonstrated that the evaluative judgment of an SP varied with the extent to which his actions were predictable. Perceivers, attempting to predict the SP's actions and rewarded for correct predictions, rated him more positively when he was predictable and less positively when he was unpredictable. It is clear that situations in which there are discrepancies between expectation and occurrence, i.e., unfulfilled expectancy situations, or situations in which there is no prior specific information available, i.e., no-expectancy situations, make the SP's behavior more unpredictable and make the gauging of appropriate behavior a more difficult task than situations in which there is no discrepancy between expectancies and occurrence. Thus, we would expect that the former situations would produce a more negative evaluation of the SP than the latter.

It has been argued, however, that one must be cautious about the usual assumption that <u>any</u> unexpected behavior would produce a negative evaluation of a stimulus. Maddi (1961) cites studies, utilizing animals as Ss (Marx, Henderson, and Roberts, 1955) or human Ss with non-social stimuli (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell, 1953), which indicated that <u>small</u> discrepancies between expectancies and occurrences can cause positive evaluation of non-social stimuli due to the novelty involved. He states that only where there are <u>large</u> discrepancies between expectancies and occurrances would one expect a negative evaluation of the stimulus.

It is our view, however, that in dealing with social stimuli, particularly in an interaction situation in which goal attainment can

depend on accurate prediction, discussing small and large discrepancies has to be a relative matter and may not be the most useful approach to the problem. For example, an interaction situation in which there is no prior specific information about an SP cannot be discussed in terms of size of discrepancy between expectancies and occurrences. In effect, there is no measurable discrepancy since there is no prior information. Yet, in such a situation the SP's behavior is clearly more unpredictable than one in which some form of information is available. In addition, whereas McClelland et al., (1953) found that in non-social situations minimal discrepancy could lead to boredom and negative affect, we believe that in a first meeting social context where goal attainment is involved, the increased ability to predict appropriate behavior should facilitate a more positive evaluation of the SP.

It seems, therefore, that in a first meeting context, an approach more appropriate than considering size of discrepancy would be to speak about the extent to which information conveyed to the perceiver enables him to predict and act and, hence, makes him feel that goal attainment is probable. In this sense, Harvey and Schroeder's concepts of confirmation and refutation are applicable (Harvey, 1963). "Confirmation represents the evaluation of a situation as facilitative of goal attainment.....Refutation is the interpreting of events as portending impediment of goal achievement (p. 106)." The relationship between confirmation and refutation is a linear one such that greater confirmation produces positive affect and greater refutation produces negative affect. Thus, interaction situations in which prediction and, hence,

goal attainment is inhibited, whether due to a discrepancy between expected and occurring behaviors or due to the lack of information, should produce more negative affect than situations in which such a prediction is facilitated.

Therefore, based on the assumption that the gauging or predicting of behavior on the perceiver's part is necessary for the attainment of his goal, and on the postulated relationship between expectancy and unfulfilled expectancy and the inhibition or facilitation of such prediction, our hypotheses are:

Hypothesis 4: The perceiver will evaluate the SP more negatively in a no-expectancy first meeting situation where a goal is involved than in a comparable situation in which his expectancy is fulfilled.

Hypothesis 5: The perceiver will evaluate the SP more negatively in an unfulfilled expectancy first meeting situation in which a goal is involved than in a comparable situation in which his expectancy is fulfilled.

We can extend these hypotheses by predicting the specific effects of variations in expectancy fulfillment on the direction of an impression as a function of the actual nature of the SP's behavior. If the perceiver expects positive, friendly behavior, then negative or unfriendly behavior on the part of the SP will result in unfulfilled expectancy and the inhibition of prediction, while positive behavior will result in fulfillment of expectancy and facilitate prediction. Similarly, if the perceiver expects negative behavior, then positive behavior on the part of the SP will result in unful-

filled expectancy and negative behavior will fulfill his expectancies. Furthermore, in cases of both positive and negative SP behavior, the perceiver who lacks specific or directed prior information will have greater difficulty in predicting than the perceiver who has prior information and finds that the nature of the information is confirmed by the SP's behavior. Thus, in accord with Hypotheses 4 and 5, and in relation to specific situations in which the SP behaves positively or negatively, we predict that:

Hypothesis 4A: In a first meeting situation where a goal is involved, a perceiver will evaluate a positive stimulus person more negatively when he has no specific or directed prior expectancy than in a comparable situation where he expects positive behavior.

Hypothesis 5A: In a first meeting situation where a goal is involved, a perceiver will evaluate a positive stimulus person more negatively when he expects negative behavior than in a comparable situation in which he expects positive behavior.

Hypothesis 4B: In a first meeting situation where a goal is involved, the perceiver will evaluate a negative stimulus person more negatively when he has no specific or directed prior expectancy than in a comparable situation in which he expects such negative behavior.

Hypothesis 5B: In a first meeting situation where a goal is involved, the perceiver will evaluate a negative stimulus person more negatively when he expects positive behavior than in a comparable situation in which he expects such negative behavior.

Earlier in the present paper we cited several studies which demonstrated that evaluation of the SP was a function of the degree to which his behavior was relevant to the perceiver (Jones and DeCharms, 1957; Kleiner, 1960; Jones and Daugherty, 1959; Jones, Hester, Farina and Davis, 1959). For our specific purposes we distinguished two degrees of relevance -- a high goal dependent situation and a low goal dependent situation. To the extent that the perceiver is goal dependent on the SP, to this extent will he have to act appropriately in order to achieve his goal. Thus, prediction of the SP's behavior is far more relevant to the perceiver when he is highly goal dependent on the SP and factors interfering with prediction should create more negative affect when the perceiver is highly goal dependent than when his goal dependence is low.

In an expectancy-fulfilled interaction, although the need for predictability varied directly with degree of goal dependence, there are no factors which prevent the perceiver from predicting appropriate behavior. Regardless of degree of goal dependence, the information he brings to the situation is adequate and his predictions will be confirmed by the SP's behavior. Thus, his evaluation of the SP should not be affected by his degree of goal dependence. However, the nature of the unfulfilled and no expectancy first meeting situations are such that the individual has a more difficult task in predicting and, hence, in acting appropriately. In these situations the evaluation of the SP should be affected by the degree of goal dependence. And, since inaccurate prediction in a high goal dependent situation is more likely

to result in loss of goal than in the low goal dependent situation, evaluation of the SP should be more negative in the former situation. Therefore, concerning the interaction of expectancy and goal dependence in determing the perceiver's evaluation of the SP, our hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 6: In expectancy unfulfilled and no expectancy first meeting situations, the perceiver will evaluate the SP more negatively when his goal dependence is high than in comparable situations in which he has low goal dependency.

In extending this hypothesis to the specific positive and negative stimulus person interactions we predict that:

Hypothesis 6A: In a first meeting situation in which the SP acts in a positive, friendly manner, the perceiver who has no prior expectancies (no expectancy) and the perceiver who expected negative, unfriendly behavior (unfulfilled expectancy) will evaluate the SP more negatively when their goal dependence is high than in comparable situations in which they have low goal dependency.

Hypothesis 6B: In a first meeting situation in which the SP acts in a negative, unfriendly manner, the perceiver who has no prior expectancies (no expectancy) and the perceiver who expected positive, friendly behavior (unfulfilled expectancy) will evaluate the SP more negatively when their goal dependence is high than in comparable situations in which they have low goal dependency.

The above-mentioned effects of variations in expectancy fulfillment have been concerned with the evaluative content of the impression. We can make additional predictions about the way the perceiver feels

about the impression he has formed. To what extent do variations in expectancy fulfillment affect the perceiver's certainty about the impression he has formed? In the expectancy unfulfilled interaction, there is deviation from an expected picture. The perceiver cannot be certain which information, i.e., his prior expectancy or the behavior he perceives, actually reflects the true nature of the SP. In an expectancy fulfilled interaction, the perceiver has prior information which is confirmed by the behavior he encounters. Thus, one would expect the perceiver to be less certain about his evaluation in the former situation than in the latter situation. In a no-expectancy interaction, the perceiver has no prior information on which to base his present perceptions and, hence, has no objective validation of the picture he forms. In comparison to the expectancy fulfilled interactions, then, we would expect the perceiver with no prior expectancy to be less certain about his evaluations. Stated formally, the hypotheses about the effects of variations in expectancy fulfillment on the perceiver's certainty of evaluation are:

Hypothesis 7: The perceiver will be less certain about his evaluations of an SP in a no-expectancy first meeting situation than in an expectancy fulfilled first meeting situation.

Hypothesis 8: The perceiver will be less certain about his evaluations of an SP in an unfulfilled expectancy first meeting situation than in an expectancy fulfilled first meeting situation.

The uncertainty of evaluation created by the lack of prior specific expectancy and by unfulfilled expectancy should be further

intensified as a result of a high degree of goal dependence. Uncertainty may reflect not only the perceiver's inability to corroborate his impression. It may also reflect his unwillingness to commit himself to this uncorroborated picture when a goal is at stake. If, at the point of evaluating the SP, the perceiver does not yet know whether he has obtained his goal, he should be more unwilling to commit himself to the opinion he has formed when that SP plays a large part in making the decision, i.e., when his goal dependence is high, as compared to a situation in which the SP has virtually no decision making power. Thus, we predict that:

Hypothesis 7A: The perceiver will be less certain about his evaluations of an SP in a no expectancy first meeting situation in which his goal dependence is high than in a comparable situation in which he has low goal deppendency.

Hypothesis 8A: The perceiver will be less certain about his evaluations of an SP in an expectancy unfulfilled first meeting situation in which his goal dependence is high than in a comparable situation in which he has low goal dependency.

## Summary

In summary, we have postulated that a perceiver's need for predictability in a first meeting interaction situation should motivate impression forming behavior. We then postulated that situations which create varying intensities of the need to predict should have consequences for the extent of impression forming behavior, for the eval-

uative nature of the formed impression, and for the perceiver's certainty about this evaluation. The present study is designed to test these notions.

# II

## Experimental Methodology

### Overview of the Investigation

The present investigation was designed to study the effects of variations in expectancy fulfillment and goal dependency in a perceiver on the structure and content of his first impressions of a stimulus person with whom he has just interacted. To establish and manipulate the selected variables experimentally, the Ss who were college students were led to believe that there were part-time jobs available for students willing to serve as subjects in various types of investigations. They were also told that in order to be considered for the job they would have to submit to an interview to determine their qualifications and how they could be used best.

In line with the stated hypotheses subject groups varied in: whether or not they thought the interviewer would make the decision about their getting the job (variations in Goal Dependency); whether they were told to expect positive or negative behavior in the interviewer or given no expectations at all, and what actually happened in the light of these expectations when they were interviewed (variations in Expectancy Fulfillment). Although no hypotheses were formulated for subject sex differences, this variation was also included in the study.

After interaction with the SP for approximately twenty minutes, Ss were given to believe that a similar program of part-time jobs was being set up at another college. An experimental confederate presented himself as an instructor from this college who was interested in establishing the same kind of interview procedure. He told Ss that he wanted to get their views about this procedure so that he could decide just how to set up his own selection method. Under this guise he obtained data concerning the efficacy of the experimental manipulations and all of the measures of impression formation including a written impression of the interviewer and Ss' ratings of the SP on various evaluative characteristics.

In the subsequent discussion we shall describe in detail the methodology of the present study. Various aspects of this methodology including the confederate roles, the experimental instructions, and the measuring instruments used, were determined by or modified as a result of the findings of earlier pilot studies. Initial methodological conceptions and devices, in effect, were either retained as is, modified, or dropped on the basis of these preliminary data. The results of our pilot work will be cited whenever possible in the discussion of methodology that follows.

## Subjects

The subjects in the experiment were 60 male and 60 female undergraduate students who believed they were being interviewed for Summer and Fall employment as paid research subjects. Since they were lower

classmen who were recruited from introductory courses in Psychology, Political Science, and Economics, it was assumed that they would be experimentally naïve and would not be suspicious of the procedures employed.

Experimental Design

A 2 x 3 x 2 factorial design was employed in the present investigation. Two levels of goal dependency, high (HGD) and low (LGD), were established by telling half the subjects that the interviewer would decide whether or not they got the job, whereas the other half were told that this decision would be made by someone else. Expectancy was varied by telling the subjects in the Positive Expectancy group that the interviewer would exhibit positive attributes (PE); those in the Negative Expectancy groups were told that she would react in an unfriendly way (NE); and finally, those Ss in the No Expectancy group were not given any prior information about the SP (NOE).

The actual behavior of the SP was also varied. For some subjects she reacted in a positive manner (PSP), whereas for others she was aloof and not friendly (NSP). Thus, from the interaction of subject expectancy conditions (PE, NE, NOE) and variations in the actual behavior of the SP (PSP, NSP), six conditions of expectancy fulfillment for each of the goal dependency conditions resulted. Subjects who expected a positive or negative interviewer and found that she was actually friendly or cold respectively, constituted the two expectancy fulfillment groups, Positive Expectancy Fulfillment (PEF)

and Negative Expectancy Fulfillment (NEF); those subjects whose expectancies were not confirmed in this way (e.g., expecting a friendly interviewer they actually found her to be aloof), made up the Positive Expectancy Unfulfillment group (PEU) and the Negative Expectancy Unfulfillment group (NEU); finally, no expectancy subjects interacted either with a positive interviewer (NOEP) or a negative interviewer (NOEN). One hundred and twenty Ss were employed in the main investigation with 10 Ss randomly assigned to each of the 12 conditions. The experimental conditions are summarized below in Table 1.

Experimental Procedures

Toward the end of the Spring Semester in 1965 "job applications" were distributed during class sessions of Introductory Psychology, Political Science, and Economics. The form indicated that many of the people doing research had decided to set up a Subject Employment Research Pool consisting of students who would serve as paid research subjects for a variety of research projects. The form also indicated very generally what the research would involve, the number of hours the student could work, and his rate of pay, and what he had to do to be considered for the job of research subject, including the fact that he would have to be interviewed. The actual form distributed to the students is shown in Appendix A, p. 179.

Since the job forms asked for the student's name, address, telephone number, and class year, it was a simple matter to first, be sure that only lower classmen participated in the study, and second, to arrange

Table 1. Summary of Experimental Conditions

Low Goal-Dependency (LGD)

| Variables | Conditions | N |
|---|---|---|
| Positive Expectancy X Positive Stimulus Person | Positive Expectancy Fulfillment (PEF) | 10 |
| Positive Expectancy X Negative Stimulus Person | Positive Expectancy Unfulfilled (PEU) | 10 |
| Negative Expectancy X Negative Stimulus Person | Negative Expectancy Fulfillment (NEF) | 10 |
| Negative Expectancy X Positive Stimulus Person | Negative Expectancy Unfulfilled (NEU) | 10 |
| No Expectancy X Positive Stimulus Person | No Expectancy-Positive Stimulus Person (NOEP) | 10 |
| No Expectancy X Negative Stimulus Person | No Expectancy-Negative Stimulus Person (NOEN) | 10 |

High Goal-Dependency (HGD)

| Variables | Conditions | N |
|---|---|---|
| Positive Expectancy X Positive Stimulus Person | Positive Expectancy Fulfillment (PEF) | 10 |
| Positive Expectancy X Negative Stimulus Person | Positive Expectancy Unfulfilled (PEU) | 10 |
| Negative Expectancy X Negative Stimulus Person | Negative Expectancy Fulfillment (NEF) | 10 |
| Negative Expectancy X Positive Stimulus Person | Negative Expectancy Unfulfilled (NEU) | 10 |
| No Expectancy X Positive Stimulus Person | No Expectancy-Positive Stimulus Person (NOEP) | 10 |
| No Expectancy X Negative Stimulus Person | No Expectancy-Negative Stimulus Person (NOEN) | 10 |

for the interview with each student by means of a telephone call making the appointment. By using students who were actually seeking part-time employment, we were assured our subjects would be highly motivated and thereby be very much involved in the interview situation.

As we have already noted, the 120 subjects were randomly assigned to one of the 12 experimental conditions. The randomly determined schedule of conditions was constructed by means of a table or random numbers, such that each of the 12 experimental variations appeared 10 times (5 for male; 5 for female). Thus, appointments were arranged for subjects according to the schedule's indication of the sex of subject and what conditions he was to be exposed to in the investigation. For example, the first scheduled S was to be a male who was to be exposed to a high goal-dependency (HGD) interview, in which he was to expect a negative interviewer (NSP), who, in fact, would act negatively (NEF). Thus, of the list of students who applied for the job, the first male in the list was the first subject exposed to these conditions.

The experimental procedure involved four steps: 1) an initial interview with project supervisor (experimenter); 2) screening interview with the stimulus person (first confederate); 3) second interview with project supervisor; and 4) a final interview with an individual seemingly unconnected with the project (second confederate). These steps are described in detail below.

1. Initial Interview:

The initial interview took place in a room that was arranged to look like an office and was located in the office section of the school

library, away from the Psychology Department. A printed sign on the door read "Subject Employment Research Pool." Subjects, upon arriving for their interview were first seen by the "project supervisor," a role played by the experimenter (E). E was seated at the desk. She acted in a congenial manner, rather informal, but still maintaining a type of student-teacher relationship. When entering all subjects were told the following by E:

> How do you do? My name is Mrs. Wolfe and I am here to tell you something about the Subject Employment Research Pool.
>
> As you know there are many members of the faculty who are engaged in research in many different fields. This research is of various kinds, and ranges from laboratory studies in perception to social survey investigations in which student opinions on political and social issues are measured. None of this research involves experiences for the student which are in anyway harmful or embarrassing. A study might be concerned, for example, with student attitudes toward nuclear war or towards flouridation of water, or it might deal with the development of aptitude tests for chemists, teachers, etc. I am sure you will find all of the research very interesting.
>
> In the past, faculty members doing research have gotten subjects by depending on volunteers or by picking up subjects where and when they could, and most often, by taking over a whole class hour and using class time for research. This presents several problems. It has become increasingly difficult to get students to volunteer as subjects and to get teachers to give up their class time. Teachers become annoyed because someone takes over their class time 6 or 7 times a semester and therefore considerable time is taken away from the course.
>
> In order to eliminate these difficulties and to get subjects who are motivated, it has been decided to establish the Subject Employment Research Pool. What it involves is setting up a pool of students

who would like to serve as subjects in a number of different studies and earn money doing it. We can do this because most research grants provide some money for paying subjects and, if we pool this money from several grants, we can pay subjects for all the research studies they participate in.

Of course, subjects have to have different qualifications for different studies. For example, in one study we may use only science majors.

The researches are diversified enough so that we can use a student in many studies and, since there are many projects, we can guarantee a student several hours of work per week. However, the studies are flexible enough so that we can give students as much or as little work as they desire and the hours are flexible so that almost any free time can be put to use. Of course, a student can refuse to participate in any study. Prior to being used in any study, students will be called and told the nature of the research, the number of hours required, and so on.

Students will be paid $1.50 per hour which is the standard rate for subjects in research work.

If we continue to have the success we have been having, the subject pool will be instituted as a regular procedure at the college and will not only furnish much needed subjects for experiments but will also provide an easy way for students to earn money.

Okay, let me tell you what happens now. Our biggest job at this time is to find out as much as we can about each student who is interested in becoming part of the subject pool. Even though lots of students have applied, we've already found that we can't use a goodly number of them because they don't meet the reauirements of many of the research projects. So, in order to find out whether or not we can use you, and -- if we can -- what projects you will be best suited for, the first thing we would like you to do today is to fill out an application. After that you will go in to see one of our screening interviewers. Then you will be asked to come back to see me again.

At this point one-half of the subjects received the high goal-dependency instructions while the other half received the low goal-dependency instructions.

Subjects in the High Goal-Dependency conditions were then told:

> Let me make one thing absolutely clear. Our set-up here is designed so that our interviewers are responsible for making the decision whether or not to hire you. They are familiar with all of the research projects and know what types of people would best be suited for certain jobs. The hiring decision is completely theirs and will be based on their assessment of your qualifications and on their interview with you. The interview will give you some short tests and discuss your application with you. Remember, there is no limit on the number of students to be hired as long as they meet our qualifications and are accepted by the interviewer.

Subjects in the Low Goal-Dependency conditions were told:

> Let me make one thing absolutely clear. Our set-up here is designed so that our interviewers are not, in any way, responsible for making the decision as to whether or not to hire you. This is to avoid personality problems. We randomly assign subjects to an interviewer. Her job is merely to gather the necessary information from you and to give you some short tests. The hiring decision is made completely on the basis of how well your qualifications meet our needs. The decision is computer-like. We match up your qualifications with the qualifications for different types of studies we have. Remember, there is no limit on the number of students to be hired as long as they meet our qualifications.

It should be pointed out, at this point, that it seemed desirable to stress the computer-like aspect of the decision process and to minimize concern about S's getting the job in order to make this a truly low goal-dependency situation. Even if the subject felt that some other person, besides the interviewer, made the hiring decision on the basis of an evaluation of the subject's qualifications, he could still feel that the interviewer would be in a position to influence that other person. Of course, the subject had to experience some goal dependency for, in fact, it was the interviewer who recorded and assembled the information

about him as a necessary step toward his getting the job.

All subjects were then told:

> Now, please fill out this application blank and then you can go in for your interview.

Each subject was given an application blank to fill out. This took approximately 5 minutes. A copy of the application will be found in Appendix A, p. 180. In general, the application consisted of questions about subjects' physical disabilities; self-ratings on a variety of abilities; hobbies; major field; planned occupation; previous jobs; etc.

After having filled out the application blank, the S sat down at E's desk once again. In order to give the impression that there were many interviewers working for the Subject Pool, E pretended to go through a file of interviewers' names and then proceed to give the S his expectancy instructions.

Subjects in the Positive Expectancy conditions were told:

> By the way, you are very lucky. Your interviewer will be Mrs. Leibman. She's a competent interviewer and, besides that, she's a very nice, warm, friendly person and I'm sure she'll make you feel comfortable. Her interviews are usually very informal and enjoyable. In fact, I'm sure you'll like her.

Subjects in the Negative Expectancy conditions were told:

> Now, let's see. Your interviewer is Mrs. Leibman. (pause) Well, before you go in to see her I thought I'd tell you something about her. Although she's a very competent interviewer, you should know that she is a rather businesslike and curt individual and she may be abrupt and impersonal. So, don't let her offhand remarks bother you.

Subjects in the No Expectancy conditions were simply told:

> Your interviewer will be Mrs. Leibman.

The E then led the subject through a door on the opposite side of the office, into the corridor, and to the next office. A printed sign on the door read: "Subject Employment Research Pool -- Interviews." In order to maintain the guise that there were several interviewers, we placed similar signs on several of the nearby office doors. The door of the interviewer's office was closed so that the E had to knock. When the interviewer replied "Come in," the E opened the door and said: "Mrs. Leibman, this is (student's name)." She then handed the S's application to the interviewer and left the room, closing the door behind her.

During the rather elaborate introductory or initial interview described above, the E would occasionally ask if the S had any questions. When questions were raised they were always answered in accordance with the general tenor of the prepared script. The initial interview instructions used in the main study represented the end result of modifications made after a pilot study in which 15 subjects were interviewed. Actually, very few changes were necessary since the pilot study revealed that Ss had no difficulty understanding the procedure outlined to them and apparently accepted the reality of the "Subject Employment Research Pool." None of the pilot Ss (nor any of the Ss in the main investigation) voiced any suspicions about the experimental procedure. Furthermore, the analysis of the pilot study findings revealed that the Ss had understood and accepted the specific instructions relating to the experimental manipulations of expectancy and goal dependency.

2. Screening Interview

The screening interviewer was the Stimulus Person in the experiment. The role was played by a female graduate student. The same student played both the negative and positive roles according to prepared scripts. For all interviews the interviewer wore a business suit and hat. The screening interview lasted for approximately 15 to 20 minutes.

A pilot study was conducted to aid in the formulation of the standard NSP and PSP interviews. Two interviews were devised by the E. In both interviews an interviewer, the SP, was interviewing a student for a job. In one interview the SP exhibited negative behavior; in the other she exhibited positive behavior. The interviews contained the same questions and differed only in the nature of the remarks made by the SP in response to the student's answers. In some instances the content of the SP's remarks were the same in both interviews and only the verbal tone was altered (a copy of the interviews will be found in Appendix A, pp. 181-184. The experimenter, with the aid of another special confederate playing the role of the student, tape recorded both interviews. A taped interview, of course, eliminates many postural and non-verbal cues which aid in communicating the positive or negative characteristics of an individual. However, we felt that it was necessary to obtain some indication of the effectiveness of the interview, itself, in communicating the desired roles.

The PSP and NSP tape recordings were played to students in two separate undergraduate classes at Brooklyn College (N = 22 and 25,

respectively). Ss were told that the student was being interviewed for a job and that they should focus on the interviewer so that they could answer questions about her after they heard the tape. After the tape was played, Ss were given a sheet of paper and asked to write the impression they had formed of the interviewer. After writing the impressions, Ss were asked to rate the interviewer on 13 characteristics by means of a verbally defined 10 point bipolar scale extending from "extremely unfriendly" through "a little friendly or unfriendly" to "extremely unfriendly." Other traits included "personal-impersonal," "fair-unfair," "sociable-unsociable," and "sensitive-insensitive." We arbitrarily assigned a scale value of 10 to the most negative response and of 1 to the most positive response. These numbers were not visible on the sacle that Ss used. Each characteristic was presented on a separate sheet and the positive and negative poles were alternated so that response sets would be reduced. The mean ratings given for all 13 characteristics were computed for each S and the two group means were compared by means of Fisher's t test. We also computed the mean rating for each characteristic.

Results indicated that the mean ratings given to the PSP were significantly more positive than those given to the NSP ($\bar{X}$s = 4.48 and 7.37, respectively; $t = 7.29$; d.f. = 45; $p < .01$). However, an examination of the means for each of the 13 separate characteristics indicated Ss evaluating the PSP tended to rate her near the scale midpoint or only one point further to the positive side of the pole. On the other hand, Ss rating the NSP gave evaluations which were, in the main,

at least two scale points away from the midpoint toward the negative pole. For example, the NSP received a rating of 8.58 on "thoughtful" whereas the PSP received a rating of 5.075 -- almost exactly at the midpoint. Also, the NSP was given a rating of 7.742 on "efficient" whereas the PSP only received a rating of 5.168 (mean ratings for the remaining characteristics will be found in Appendix A, p. 185). Thus, it appeared that the significant difference in the mean rating was due more to the negativity of the NSP than to the positivity of the PSP. Furthermore, the comments in the written impressions indicated that many of the Ss were dubious about the PSP role. Many students stated that the PSP was too verbose, too positive, and perhaps too saccharine. They felt that by agreeing with all of the student's responses the interviewer seemed insincere.

Accordingly, the PSP interview was revised. Many remarks were shortened or eliminated. The SP's remarks were not all positive. She disagreed with the student and did not support him on all questions. It was felt that these changes would make the PSP more realistic. This interview was taped and played for another group of undergraduate Ss ($N = 35$). The mean rating of this PSP ($\bar{X} = 3.77$) was then compared to the ratings given to the original NSP. The means were significantly different at $p < .01$. We then compared the mean rating for the second PSP with that for the original PSP. This difference was significant at $p = .06$, indicating that we had succeeded in making the role more positive. The examination of means for separate characteristics confirmed this finding. The mean rating for "thoughtful," for example, was 3.583

as compared to the 5.075 rating for the original PSP and the rating for "efficient" dropped from 5.168 to 4.171. Similar differences were found for other characteristics. In addition, the remarks in the written impressions indicated that the second PSP was more believable and viewed more positively by the Ss.

The interviews used in the present experiment, while not completely identical with those in the pilot, made use of many of the same questions and remarks and maintained the same tenor as the pilot interviews. The interview was lengthened because many students said that they could not form an impression of the interviewer from a 5 or 7 minute interview. The questions that were added concerned the student's abilities and interests and these were added on the basis of Ss' remarks, in the original pilot study, that they felt these would be included in an actual job interview.

The interviewer was trained in the two roles during still another pilot study in which she actually interviewed 15 Ss. The only means we had of checking the role behavior of the SP in the actual interview situation were the ratings given to her by these 15 pilot Ss. They evaluated her on 15 characteristics by means of a bipolar graphic scale. The ratings on the scale could range from 5 to 85 (mm.) with the low end of the scale indicating the most positive ratings. The mean ratings given to the PSP and NSP, in this pilot study, were 16.58 and 31.52, respectively. Fisher's t test indicated that these means were significantly different at $p < .05$ ($t = 3.93$; d.f. = 13), demonstrating that the interviewer had been successful in creating the desired roles.

The interviews that were utilized are summarized below (complete copies will be found in Appendix A, pp. 186-190. The screening interviewer was always unaware of the subject's goal or expectancy instructions. For each day's testing she was given a list indicating whether she should be negative or positive toward each subject interviewed on that day.

The general procedure in both the Positive and Negative SP interviews was the same. The S was met by the interviewer, she filled out an index card and manilla folder for him, and explained that he would have to take a series of short tests. The tests included a vergal analogies task, the Picture Completion Subtest of the WAIS, a proverb meaning test, a maze, and a number series completion task. These tests were very simple and the S spent between 5 to 7 minutes working on them. If any subject took an inordinate amount of time on the tests, one or two were eliminated so that the time spent interacting with the interviewer was kept constant. Discussions with subjects in the pilot study indicated that these tests, because of their simplicity, did not create anxiety in the Ss and yet served to make the situation more realistic. After the subject completed the tests, the interviewer proceeded to discuss his answers to selected questions on the application blank. After this discussion the interviewer explained to the subject that he would be notified in a few days whether or not he was hired. The S was then sent back to see the Project Supervisor.

The differences between the Positive and Negative SP interviewer roles were created by the SP's gestures, mannerisms, attitude, her tone in

responding to questions, the types of remarks she made, and the general atmosphere her behavior created. For instance, when playing the PSP role the interviewer greeted the student in a cordial, friendly, manner -- "Hello. Have a seat." She asked permission to call the student by his first name and, while filling out the folder and index card, she engaged in small talk to avoid a long period of silence. As the student entered the NSP interview, on the other hand, he found the interviewer reading a book. She merely said "Sit down" and continued to read for a few seconds. She proceeded to fill out the folder and card, but did not speak to the subject at all. This behavior created a long period of silence, an attitude of disinterest and aloofness. The interviewer made no attempt to call the S by his first name and throughout the interview referred to the S as Miss or Mr.

The major part of the interview was the time spent going over the S's application. It was during this period (approximately 15 minutes) that the SP had the opportunity to convey her attitudes and personality to the S. The SP had set remarks to all responses for different questions on the application blank. In some instances, the remarks made by the negative and positive interviewers were identical -- only the verbal tone and attitude differed; in other instances, only one word in the SP's reply was altered and the whole attitude and idea created was different; finally, some of the remarks of the PSP and NSP were entirely different. The complete list of responses for the PSP and NSP conditions will be found in Appendix A, pp. 186-190. Some examples of these responses are:

Q.2. Does the S wear glasses?
If the S says yes: PSP says: Well, your eyesight might eliminate you from some research.
NSP says: Well, your eyesight will eliminate you from some research.

Q.9 and 10. S's major field and future occupation.
If S knows what he will be majoring in or what occupation he plans to enter:
PSP says: I was always interested in that. Have you taken many courses yet? Do you know what specific area you will be specializing in?
NSP says: I could never be interested in that; or, You're majoring in _____? Humpf! (with a shake of the head and a curl of the lip).

Q.16. S's interest in doing research.
If S says he is not interested in doing research:
PSP says: Well, not all vocations call for research. We like to hire people who are interested in doing research to give them experience but we also hire people who do not intend to do so.
NSP says: We like to hire people who are interested in doing research to give them experience but we also hire people who do not intend to do so.

The atmosphere of the PSP interview was always friendly and leisurely. She smiled a lot and acted in a rather informal manner. Throughout the interview, she attempted to pick up an interest of the student's and chatted about it for a while. Generally, the S was given freedom to respond in any way he chose and the interviewer tried not to

interrupt any of his answers. In reviewing the impressions of Ss in the pilot interviews, we found that these procedures greatly aided in communicating the positive role. Ss specifically mentioned the informal atmosphere, the freedom of behavior, and the SP's general interest in her job and in the student.

The atmosphere of the NSP interview was always formal and unrelaxed. The SP made very little small talk which created periods of silence as she read over the application. SP attempted to keep her voice in a monotone. Facial expressions aided in creating the negative role. The SP curled her lip, shook her head, gave sighs of boredom, and had a generally unpleasant attitude. In reviewing the impressions of Ss in the pilot study we found that these procedures worked well in creating the negative role. Ss found the NSP to be believable although not likeable. Ss specifically mentioned the formality, the monotone voice and SP's lack of interest in her job and in the student.

3. Second Interview with Project Supervisor

After the screening interview, the subject returned to see the project director. All Ss were told:

> Thanks for coming back to see me. I will let you know in a few days about the job.
>
> Now, I would like you to do one more thing. I would appreciate your giving me a few more minutes of your time. Let me explain why. There is a fellow here from the City University. As you may know, the City University (made up of Hunter, City, Queens, and Brooklyn College) now has a doctoral program in several subject areas. They have set up a graduate center uptown and are not preparing to set up their own subject recruiting procedures. In order to do this they have decided to study subject recruiting procedures at several universities to make sure that the one they set up will be good.

> Since we are part of their system, they have decided to include us as part of their study. We have given them temporary quarters and their representative has asked us to ask our students to stop in and see him for a moment on their way out. I suppose he wants to ask you some questions about your own ideas on the subject pool, why you decided to join, how you would feel about traveling uptown and becoming part of their subject pool, etc. We did the same kind of a study, but on a smaller scale, before we set up our own recruiting program.
>
> We've agreed to help him by asking our applicants if they would give him a few minutes of their time. Of course, he has nothing to do with your being hired here.
>
> He's agreed to pay you $1.50 for your time (which will not be anywhere near an hour) and your cooperation, since we told him that this was the rate our applicants would get if this were a school project. So you can help him out and earn some money at the same time.
>
> Would you mind going to see him? I will show you where his office is.

All subjects agreed to see the Final Interviewer. The E then led the S through the hallway toward the final interviewer's office which was located at a considerable distance from the Subject Pool offices. When reaching his office she said:

> I will let you know in a few days about your position here. Goodbye.

4. Final Interview

The Final Interviewer was a male, aged 28 years. He was an instructor at City College and had a great deal of experience in counseling and guidance work. As a result of this experience he was quite at ease in an interview situation and was capable of placing students at ease and of obtaining the necessary information in an in-

formal way. He was trained in his specific role during the third pilot study in which 15 Ss were actually subjected to the main investigation procedures. Discussions with these Ss indicated that they had accepted the fact that he was unconnected with the Subject Employment Research Pool; they all believed his explanation of why he was interviewing students and of the relevance, to this study, of the types of questions he was asking. None of the subjects were suspicious as to the true intent of the final interview.

The Final Interviewer had no knowledge of the conditions to which the Ss were assigned or what had actually happened to them prior to coming to his office.

Upon meeting the S he said:

> Hi. Would you come in please and have a seat? I suppose you have been told my reasons for being here but let me tell you a little bit more. We're very interested in setting up a similar type of research pool within the City University. I, particularly, happen to be with City College but we have a group of people who are working with the Graduate Center to set up this program. We have been allocated a good sum of money for research. Our problem has been that we have not been able to obtain enough students to participate in studies, which is one of my reasons for being here. We also have several other people at different universities that have some system for recruiting students for their research and we're interested in finding out as much as possible about the procedures and materials being used and the people doing the work. We are in the process of developing this program to involve almost 1200 students at the various senior and community colleges of the City University.
>
> I might also mention that anything we might discuss here has nothing whatsoever to do with your being hired at Brooklyn College. I can't get you more or less hours (said jokingly). This material will be reviewed by the Research Staff at the City

> University and will be strictly confidential. I would appreciate your being as honest, candid, and frank as possible. Any courtesy answers such as "everything was great," or general answers like "everything was poor" would be of no help to us.
>
> I will be able to pay you $1.50 for your time which is the rate you would normally be paid for participating as a member of the Subject Pool.
>
> O.K.? Then lets begin.

The interviewer then proceeded with the final interview designed to obtain measures of student's impressions. A copy of this interview will be found in Appendix A, pp. 191-195. The interview contained several measures of impression formation and a good deal of extraneous information so that the S would not become suspicious. With respect to the irrelevant or filler questions Ss were asked:

1. How they heard about the Subject Pool and to evaluate this method of contacting students.
2. To evaluate the entire interview procedure (not the interviewer) and to compare it with other interviews in which they had taken part.
3. To evaluate the interview on a series of 5 characteristics by using a graphic scale.
4. If they had any expectations about the interview and how the actual interview compared to these expectations.
5. How they would improve the interviewing procedures.

All of these questions were used merely to disguise the actual intent of the interview, i.e., that of obtaining measures of impression formation. Ss were made to feel that they were evaluating the total procedure. In several instances explanations about the need for this information were also given to the Ss.

The next series of questions dealt with the Screening Interview. These will be briefly described here since they are considered in detail in the section titled Measurement Techniques (p. 70). Ss were asked:

1. Write an impression of the Screening Interviewer.

2. To rate the Screening Interviewer on a series of 17 characteristics by means of a graphic scale and were also asked to rate the certainty of their judgments.

3. If they had any expectations as to what the Screening Interviewer would be like and how her actual behavior compared with these expectations.

4. To give the Screening Interviewer an overall rating (good to poor on a graphic scale), to rate how well she related to students, and how much she made the student feel at ease.

5. To rate the Screening Interviewer's influence or decision making power with respect to their being hired.

At this point the experiment was <u>partially</u> explained to the Ss. They were told by the Final Interviewer:

> Now, I'd like to tell you a little bit more about my presence here this afternoon. I have actually been conducting a research experiment to see how people form impressions of other people, especially the Screening Interviewer.
>
> As far as the jobs are concerned, there really are jobs and they are exactly what you were told they would be, but they are being administered through the Psychology Department and have nothing to do with anything that occurred between you and me.
>
> Now that you are somewhat enlightened as to my interest I'd like to ask you a few more questions.

Any questions that subjects had, at this point, were answered by the interviewer in accordance with the explanation given above.

We felt that it was necessary to give Ss only this partial explanation at this point in the interview. The nature of the questions were such that, if no explanation were given Ss might become suspicious of the nature of the interview since the questions seemed irrelevant to the Final Interviewer's stated purpose. Yet we felt that Ss had to be told that impression forming was being studied since we wanted them to focus on specific cognitive activities they had engaged in. In addition, if Ss knew that the whole procedure was unreal, they might realize that they had been given specific expectancy instructions and might answer in accordance with their recollection of the instructions rather than according to their actual feelings and perceptions.

Ss were then asked:

1. When they had formed their impression of the Screening Interviewer.

2. Whether the impression remained constant or changed as the interview progressed, and

3. Whether they had been told anything by the Project Supervisor that might have influenced their impression of the Screening Interviewer.

At this point Ss were told the actual nature of the entire experimental situation. They were told that the Subject Employment Research Pool did not exist and that the whole procedure had been part of the research. However, Ss were told that their names would be given to the Psychology Department and if any researcher did need subjects they certainly would be notified. Ss were asked not to reveal the nature of the experiment to anyone else. They were then thanked for their time and cooperation and were paid $1.50 for their participation.

Measurement Techniques

The following discussion will be concerned with the techniques utilized to measure the degree of impression forming behavior and the direction of impression forming behavior. These measurement instruments and techniques were determined by or modified as a result of the findings of earlier pilot studies. The pilot work and the resultant modifications will be cited at relevant points in the discussion.

1. Degree of Impression Forming Behavior:

Written Impressions: During the Final Interview Ss were asked to write their impressions of the Screening Interviewer. The verbal instructions were as follows:

> Since we will be hiring between 12 to 15 people to do the actual screening, administering of advanced tests relating to specific experiments, etc., we would like to know as much as possible about the screening interviewer whom you saw. This will help us to develop the critieria for the people we would like to employ in this position. We decided that since people sometimes feel strange or funny talking about other people, that we would ask you to write your reactions to the screening interviewer rather than ask you to tell us directly.
>
> Please read the brief instructions at the top of this sheet carefully and then write down anything and everything you can about the screening interviewer. You can do this in the room next door. When you finish please seal your paper in the envelope and do not put your name on either the paper or the envelope.

Ss were then given the paper and envelope and escorted into another room.

In our pilot interviews, we had given Ss only one sheet of paper with the follosing instructions written on the impression formation blank:

DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THIS PAPER

Would you please write down the impression you formed of the interviewer. You may write as little or as much as you like or as you feel is necessary to describe her. Take as much time as you need.

We found that Ss were writing very short impressions. We felt this might be due to the fact that Ss were only presented with one sheet of blank paper. In addition, Ss were only describing the interviewer's actions in the interview situation. We felt this might be due to the word "describe" in the instructions and/or to the absence of instructions asking the Ss what they thought of the interviewer as a "person."

With the initial group of 20 Ss in the main experiment we utilized a different method. We had decided that if the method seemed to be effective we would continue using it and include these Ss in the main study. If the method seemed ineffective we would revise the instructions and do another pilot test and not include these Ss in the main experiment. The method was as follows: Ss were given several sheets of paper, attached together, with instructions as follows:

DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THIS PAPER

Would you please tell us in detail the impression you formed of the screening interviewer, as a person.

Take as much time as you need but be sure to tell us everything you can. Use as many of the attached sheets as necessary.

Visual inspection and comparison of the impressions written by the pilot study Ss and those written by the initial 20 Ss indicated that with the new instructions the impressions were considerably longer

and contained more inferential and explanatory information. Therefore, we included these 20 Ss in the main experiment and utilized the revised instructions for the remaining subjects.

In addition to the above instructions, Ss were also instructed to seal their written impression in an envelope. The attached envelope has the following instructions written on it: DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THIS ENVELOPE -- CONFIDENTIAL.

Two measures of extent of impression formation were derived from these written impressions. The first was the number of discrete attributes in the written impression. In order to determine the number of discrete attributes in the written impressions, we developed a set of instructions to define "attributes" (See Appendix A, pp. 196-200). The general instructions for defining and counting attributes read as follows:

> We are interested in any phrase, statement, or idea which indicates or infers something about the interviewer as a person. We are interested in the number of discrete or different attributes that are assigned to the SP. These descriptions should indicate that the interviewer has left an impression with the subject, other than the fact that she carried out her duties (i.e., she handed out papers, used a stopwatch).
>
> Phrases that merely describe the progression of the interview, i.e., she handed me the paper, she gave me a test, she timed me, etc., are not to be counted because they do not indicate that the subject has made any judgment about the interviewer other than in her official role capacities. However, if these capacities are evaluated, i.e., she gave me the tests in a professional manner, they are to be counted.
>
> Descriptions concerning the interviewer's dress or apparel, while not actually being enduring characteristics, do indicate that the subject was cognizant of the interviewer beyond role capacity. There-

> fore, they are to be counted.
>
> When necessary, use contextual cues to determine the meaning of inferences the subject is making and whether or not they shed any new light on what the subject feels about the interviewer.

These general instructions were followed by more elaborate instructions, with specific examples of attributes to be counted and not counted (See Appendix A, pp. 196-200).

The original rules for counting attributes were devised by the experimenter on the basis of reviewing the 15 pilot interviews. In order to detect any difficulties in using the rules and to gain practice in using the coding system, the experimenter and one other judge utilized it to count the attributes in the impressions written by pilot Ss about the tape-recorded PSP and NSP. On the basis of difficulties encountered in these trial sessions, the rules were ammended.

Then, using these revised instructions, two judges, working independently, underlined and then counted the attributes in each impression obtained in the main investigation. In this measure, and all subsequent attribute or content analyses of the written impressions, the impressions were numbered so that judges were unaware of who the subjects were or to what experimental condition they had been assigned.

A measure of inter-rater agreement was obtained prior to any discussion between judges. The judges agreed perfectly for 57.5% of the total number of impression obtained (total N = 120). Disagreement on one attribute occurred for 33.3% of the impressions, that is, in one-third of all impressions the total number of attributes counted by the two raters differed by one. They differed on two attributes for

7.5% of the impressions, and on three attributes for the remaining 1.7% of the impressions. After the percent of agreement had been ascertained the two judges reviewed each impression and came to a mutual agreement on whether or not to count each disputed attribute. Each impression was then given a score indicating the number of discrete attributes it contained.

The second measure obtained from an attribute analysis of the written impressions was the % of Descriptive vs. Superficial Personality Characteristics and/or Inferential Characteristics. The experimenter reviewed the 15 pilot interviews and a set of rules was developed (See Appendix A, pp. 201-203) which classified attributes into three categories: 1) Descriptive; 2) Superficial Personality Characteristics; and 3) Deeper Personality Characteristics and/or Inferences.

In the "Descriptive" category, we placed all phrases, descriptions, or ideas which pertained to overt, physical characteristics of the interviewer (i.e., good dresser, references to age); references to her role behavior during the interview (i.e., didn't answer me; didn't make her directions explicit); and any references to the atmosphere of the interview (i.e., atmosphere tense; interview was informal).

In the "Superficial Personality Characteristics" category, we placed all phrases, descriptions, or ideas which pertained to seemingly more personality oriented characteristics of the interviewer (i.e., she was warm, cold, friendly) but which seemed to be directly tied to her behavior in the interview situation. That is, in contrast to those characteristics placed in Category 3 (i.e., she probably cared about

what people think of her; she goes out with interesting men), those attributes in the present category indicated that the subject was not making inferences from the interview behavior to behavior in other situations (i.e., she was snobby; she was tactless).

In the third category, "Deeper Personality Characteristics and/or Inferences," we placed any phrase, description or ideas which indicated a deeper analysis, by the S, of the interviewer's characteristics. These included references to her behavior in other than interviewing situations (i.e., she goes out with interesting men) and inferences about her motivations (i.e., she seemed interested in her job) or extra-interviewer personality (i.e., she is shy with strangers) or about her basic values of judgments (i.e., she is status conscious). In addition, any characteristic, similar to those in Category 2, but which could not be easily ascertained from the interview situation (i.e., she is backward socially) were also placed in this category.

Although the hypothesis only distinguish between "Descriptive Characteristics" and "Deeper Personality and/or Inferential Characteristics," content analysis of the pilot interviews indicated that a portion of Ss' remarks, although clearly not belonging in a category of descriptive characteristics were also not clearly inferential in the sense of Category 3, described above. These statements described the interviewer's personality in the interview situation rather than her general personality characteristics or her extra-role behavior. Therefore, the second category, "Superficial Personality Characteristics," was developed to handle these remarks.

For practice, and to refine and clarify the rules, the experimenter and one other judge used these rules to categorize the attributes in the impressions of the tape-recorded PSP and NSP. Then, the two judges, working independently, used these revised rules and categorized the underlined attributes in each impression in order to determine whether the attributes Ss used were of a descriptive nature, or were superficial personality characteristics, or whether they involved inferences and/or deeper personality characteristics.

A measure of inter-rater agreement was obtained prior to any discussion between the judges. The judges agreed perfectly on the categorization of attributes in 47.5% of the impressions. Disagreement on one attribute occurred for 32.5% of the impressions. Thus, on 80% of the impressions the raters either completely agreed in classifying all the traits or disagreed on just one of them. They disagreed on two attributes in 16.6% of the impressions, on three attributes for 1.7% of the impressions, and for one impression they disagreed on the categorization of six attributes. After the percent of agreement had been ascertained the judges reviewed the impressions and came to a mutual agreement on the categorization of disputed attributes.

Subsequently, we decided to combine Categories 2 and 3 for analytic purposes. This decision had two bases: 1) only a small number of attributes were classified as belonging to Category 3 (Deeper Personality and/or Inferential Characteristics); and 2) the distinction between Superficial and Deeper Personality Characteristics seemed some-

what tenuous. In many cases the decision to place an attribute in Category 3, rather than Category 2, was based on contextual factors and/or lenthier explanation of a characteristic. Furthermore, the placement of an attribute in Category 2 or 3 was frequently the cause of disagreement among the raters. Thus, the reliability of the categorization was improved by the combination of categories.

Therefore, we had only two categories of characteristics for our analysis: 1) Descriptive Characteristics and 2) Personality Characteristics. The total number of characteristics in each category was divided by the total number of attributes in the impression in order to control for differences in the total number of attributes in a given impression. Ss' scores for each category were, therefore, represented as percentage figures.

Questionnaire Responses: Two additional measures of extent of impression forming behavior were: 1) Time Taken to Form the Impression and 2) the Constant vs. Changing Nature of the Impression. Both of these measures were based on content analysis of answers to the last two questions in the Final Interview. The nature of the experiment had been partially explained to the S as indicated on p. 68.

These two measures of extent of impression forming behavior were included as a means of complementing the findings of the other two measures which are of a more objective nature. Although the "time" and "change" measures are crude, we thought that they could offer some insight into the cognitive processes involved in impression formation.

We assumed that the greater the degree of impression forming behavior, the more time it would take the perceiver to form the impression. This assumption is based on the notion that the individual engaging in more impression forming behavior is making many more observations, is seeking and gathering more information, and is more likely to seek information which is not obvious from observed behavior (i.e., inferential information). Thus, he will need more time to form his impression than someone who is not seeking such detailed and extensive information and whose impression merely mirrors perceived behavior. In this instance we were not concerned with objective time although we could assume that verbal ability, speed of thought and writing are randomly distributed among groups of Ss and, based on this assumption, attempt to actually measure the time which elapsed from the initial perception through the completion of the written impression. However, we were considering subjective time, i.e., perceived time. Ss were asked: "When did you feel you had formed your impression of the interviewer?" Ss responses were placed into one of three categories: impressions formed at the beginning, middle, or end of the interview session. Ss reporting that they had formed their impression when they were asked questions about the interviewer were categorized in the "end" category. Table 1, in Appendix A, pp. 204-211, indicates Ss' verbatim responses to the questions and the subsequent categorization of these responses. All responses were categorized without knowledge of Ss' experimental group membership.

Finally, we assumed that if an individual was engaging in more impression forming behavior his impression should change, as opposed to remaining constant, as the interaction progressed. He should be constantly attending to new cues and information and should be incorporating these into his impression. When there is minimal impression forming behavior and a minimal amount of information is sought and incorporated, the impression should remain constant. Therefore, Ss were asked: "Did your impression remain constant or did it change as the interview progressed?" Ss' responses were categorized as either "change" or "constant."

Thus, we have four measures of the extent of impression forming behavior:

1. number of attributes in written impression
2. percent of personality and/or inferential characteristics in the written impression
3. time taken to form impression
4. constant vs. changing nature of the impression

2. Measures of the Direction of Impression Forming Behavior

In order to determine the evaluative nature of Ss' impressions, Ss were asked to rate the SP on 17 bipolar characteristics by means of graphic scales. Ss gave these ratings after they had written their impressions. Characteristics were chosen to represent areas of interest for the hypotheses, i.e., characteristics dealing with the expectations that Ss had about the interviewer and with general positive and negative qualities relevant to her behavior. Other characteristics

were included to determine whether positivity or negativity of evaluation would extent to areas other than those specifically related to her behavior or to Ss' expectations. Several of the characteristics had been utilized in the pilot study and discussions with subjects indicated that they were relevant to the interviewer's behavior. The characteristics utilized were:

| | |
|---|---|
| stable-changeable | skillful-clumsy |
| unfair-fair | traditional-progressive |
| industrious-lazy | consistent-inconsistent |
| unsociable-sociable | pleasant-unpleasant |
| reliable-undependable | sensitive-insensitive |
| personal-impersonal | honest-dishonest |
| believing-skeptical | emotional-rational |
| untrustworthy-trustworthy | important-unimportant |
| cooperative-uncooperative | |

Each graphic scale was 80mm. long from pole to pole with each pole labeled with the name of a characteristic. Each characteristic was defined for the S at the top of the scale (See Appendix A, p..212) for the definitions of the characteristics). In order to minimize response sets the positive and negative poles were interchanged on each slip. In order to cancel out order effects the slips were presented in random order.

The decision to utilize the mm. graphic scale had two bases: 1) Research by Champney and Marshall (1939), comparing the reliability of cm. and mm. gradations on a graphic scale, had indicated that a graphic scale based on mm. readings gave added refinement of scoring and that this refinement of scoring increased the reliability of ratings. The highest reliability of ratings was found using gradations of 1 mm.; 2) In addition, in our initial pilot study we compared Ss'

use of the graphic scale and of a 10 point verbally defined scale ranging from Very Favorable to Very Unfavorable. Ss seemed to find the graphic scale easier to use and it seemed to be providing greater delineations between ratings. Therefore, in this study we utilized the bipolar graphic scale using gradations of 1 mm.

Ss were given the following instructions:

> Now I'm going to give you a series of slips in order to get at some more specific characteristics of the interviewer. On each slip there will be a question pertaining to a characteristic of the interviewer and a scale on which you can indicate your answer to the question. (Ss were shown a sample slip) You indicate your answer by making alline parallel to the numbers at that point on the scale that would best indicate your feelings about the screening interviewer.
>
> You'll notice that at the top of each slip is a definition of the characteristic. This is done because people often mean different things when they use the same characteristic in describing other people. With a definition you will have a reference point for your judgment.
>
> Look at this example I will show you. The question says: How tactful do you think the interviewer is? By Tactful we mean: How skillful is she in saying and doing the right things when she is dealing with people? The scale runs from tactful to tactless. If you found her to be very tactful you would put a line here (indicates point on scale). If you found her to be very tactless the line would go here (indicates point on scale). And if you think she is somewhere inbetween you would place your line somewhere inbetween the two ends of the scale. Simply mark off that point on the scale that best indicates how you feel each of the characteristics applies to the interviewer.

In addition to rating the interviewer on each characteristic Ss were also asked to indicate the certainty of their judgment. Each slip contained a second, 80mm., scale with one end anchored with the word

"certain" and the other with the word "uncertain." Ss were given the following instructions:

> Now we know that you only saw the interviewer for a short while and that some of the things we are asking are not easily answered. So, just to make sure that you don't feel that you have to make a definite judgment when you don't feel that you can, you can tell us how sure you are that the interviewer fits your description. You'll see, to the right of the characteristic scale, a second scale on which you can indicate the certainty of your judgment.
>
> Now, here is the first slip.

The interviewer then presented the slips, one at a time, removing each slip as it was marked by the S.

Scores for each characteristic were obtained by measuring the distance from the positive pole to the S's mark. Scores could range from 5 to 85mm. with the most favorable rating being 5 mm. In order to avoid ratings of 0, the scores were measured with the most positive pole being equal to 5mm. Thus, the scores ranged from 5-85mm. rather than from 0-80mm. Thus, for each of the 17 characteristics, each subject was given two scores: an evaluative score and a certainty score.

Later on in the interview Ss were asked to make four additional evaluations of the interviewer utilizing the same graphic scale. Ss were asked to rate the interviewer on an overall basis, i.e., good-poor; to rate how much the interviewer relates to students, i.e., good-poor; to rate how much the interviewer made the subject feel at ease, i.e., at ease-ill at ease; and to rate how influential the interviewer was in making the decision to hire the S. This latter rating was used as a measure of the efficacy of the experimental manipulation of high goal-dependency and low goal-dependency situations.

# III

## Results

### A. Efficacy of Experimental Manipulations

Adequate tests of the hypotheses derived for the present investigation depended on the successful manipulation of three variables: subjects' expectancy regarding the behavior of the interviewer; the actual behavior of the interviewer; and, subjects' degree of goal dependency in the interview situation. Various measures were employed to determine the efficacy of these manipulations and, therefore, we turn our attention first to the data derived from these measures.

#### 1. The Effectiveness of Induced Expectancy

The data for the evaluation of the effectiveness of expectancy instructions were obtained in the Final Interview. Each subject was asked: "Before you went into the interview, did you have any idea what the interviewer would be like? I mean, what did you think she would be like?" In any cases where answers were vague or where no answer was given to this, or other, questions dealing with the experimental manipulations, we attempted to utilize information from the written impression and/or answers to the question: "Did Mrs. Wolfe tell you anything that might have influenced your impression?" Answers to these questions and additional information from the written impression will be found on pp. 215-225, Appendix B.

Based on content analysis of the responses to the above questions, subjects were categorized as having a "perceived" positive expectancy (PE), negative expectancy (NE), or no expectancy (NOE). These data, which are shown in Table 2, were analyzed in terms of a Chi-Square test of the relation between the actual expectancy treatment and the subject's report of his expectancies.

Table 2. -- Analysis of perceived vs. instructed expectancy

| | | Perceived Expectancy | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Positive Expectancy (PE) | Negative Expectancy (NE) | No Expectancy (NOE) | |
| Instructed Expectancy | PE | 35 | 0 | 5 | 40 |
| | NE | 0 | 39 | 1 | 40 |
| | NOE | 0 | 0 | 40 | 40 |
| | | 35 | 39 | 46 | 120 |

$\chi^2 = 208.04$
$p < .01$

It is clear, from the analysis in Table 2, that subjects received, and were aware of, their expectancy instructions. It is also clear that 6 subjects were considered to have inaccurately reported their expectancy instructions. Actually, for these six subjects, we did not have adequate information to determine whether the instructions had been received and understood. These Ss simply stated that they had no expectancy. In each of these instances, the final interviewer did not probe further because of his own feelings that the S seemed to be suspicious or might become suspicious if further probing were used.

Such matters were always left to his discretion. These subjects could not really be categorized accurately and had to be placed in a perceived NOE category. However, we could not rule out the possibility that the instructions were understood but were simply not verbalized in the post-experimental interview. And, in light of the fact that all other subjects, according to our measure, did receive and understand these instructions, we assumed that these subjects did likewise and, therefore, for all further statistical analyses data for these six subjects were included in their "instructed" expectancy groups.

2. The Effectiveness of Positive and Negative Stimulus Person Roles

Data for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the role played by the Stimulus Person (SP) were obtained from a content analysis of subjects' responses to the following question asked in the Final Interview: "Well, how would you say she was -- was she like you thought she'd be?" Ss' responses were categorized as either "Perceived Positive SP" or "Perceived Negative SP." Some examples of responses placed in the "Perceived PSP" category were: "she was pleasant and very personable"; "she was a warm person"; and, "she was pleasant, friendly -- someone I could like outside of an interview situation." In the "Perceived NSP" category were placed such responses as: "she was cold"; "she was businesslike, precise, formal"; and, "she was disinterested and unpleasant." A complete listing of Ss' answers will be found in Appendix B, pp. 215-225.

These data, which are shown in Table 3, were analyzed in terms of a Chi-Square test of the relation between the intended behavior of

the SP and how the subject perceived the behavior. The Chi-Square

Table 3. -- Analysis of perceived vs. intended nature of the stimulus person's behavior

| | | Perceived Nature of the SP | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Positive Stimulus Person (PSP) | Negative Stimulus Person (NSP) | |
| Intended Nature of SP (Role Played) | PSP | 58 | 2 | 60 |
| | NSP | 5 | 55 | 60 |
| | | 63 | 57 | 120 |

$\chi^2 = 90.36$
$p < .01$

analysis indicated that the subjects accurately reported the SP's behavior or, alternatively, that behaviors we defined as reflecting positivity-negativity were, in fact, effective in creating and projecting the desired roles.

Based on the original content analysis of responses, seven subjects were considered to have perceived the stimulus person inaccurately. We had utilized a stringent criterion in evaluating Ss' responses. For this specific analysis, subjects had to give a decidedly positive or negative description of the stimulus person in order to have been considered to have perceived her role accurately. The seven cases which were categorized as incorrect were not clear cut responses of extreme positivity or negativity. The ambiguity of these responses may have occurred because prior expectancies could have, and should have according to our hypotheses, made subjects perceive the stimulus person more

or less positively or negatively than she actually was. In addition responses to this particular question may have been affected by subjects' responses to the previous question concerning their expectancies. However, the statements made by these seven subjects, while not as positive or negative as responses which were categorized as "accurate perceptions," did contain elements of the actual stimulus person roles. Thus, their categorization as "inaccurate perceptions" in the above analysis, is not meant to indicate that none of the aspects of the actual SP role were perceived. It merely indicates that these responses were more ambiguous than the other 113 and, for the sake of a stringent test of the efficacy of the experimental manipulations, were categorized as "inaccurate." Furthermore, these seven subjects were randomly distributed over all experimental conditions indicating that their inclusion in further analysis would not contaminate any one particular condition. For these reasons, in subsequent analyses, these subjects were treated with their original SP groups. (See Note in Appendix B, p. 226.)

3. The Efficacy of Induced Goal Dependency

Data for evaluating the efficacy of the goal dependency manipulation are based on subjects' graphic ratings in response to the following question: "How influential do you think the interviewer is in making the decision to hire you?" As a further check, subjects also rated the SP's "importance," defined for the S as: "How big a say do you think she has in things?" Ratings, on both measures, could range from 5 to 85 (mm.) with the lower end of the scale indicating "very

influential" or "very important."

These ratings were analyzed by a 2x3x2x2 analysis of variance. The mean ratings given by Ss in the low goal dependent (LGD) and high goal dependent (HGD) conditions are presented, below, in Table 4 along with the F scores for the Goal Dependency factor. As can be seen from

Table 4. -- Mean ratings of "influence" and "importance" given by Ss in High Goal Dependency and Low Goal Dependency conditions and F scores for the goal dependency factor[1]

| | High Goal Dependent Ss (N=60) | Low Goal Dependent Ss (N=60) | F[2] | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Influential | 21.8 | 53.4 | 82.704 | < .01 |
| Important | 27.4 | 46.2 | 25.520 | < .01 |

[1] The complete analysis of variance for these variables will be found in Appendix B, p. 227.

[2] None of the other factors, in either analysis of variance, were significant.

Table 4, the Goal Dependency factor was highly significant thereby indicating that the subjects accurately perceived the SP's role in the hiring decision. One additional point should be stressed here. Although the ratings within groups did vary, none of the subjects reversed themselves, i.e., checked the end of the scale completely opposite from their given goal dependency instructions. Thus, the experimental manipulation of subjects' goal dependency was highly effective and remained effective despite subjects' experiences with the SP. That is, despite the fact that for some subjects the SP behaved negatively or failed to confirm their expectancies, Ss accurately reported their degree of goal dependency.

The data reviewed up to this point clearly indicate that all of our measures were adequate and confirmed our experimental manipulations. One further point should be added. It is possible that the subjects were aware of the nature of the experiment, i.e., that they could have been suspicious of the entire procedure. If this were true, the effectiveness of the experimental manipulations would be more apparent than real. Subjects could simply be "playing along with the game." However, we have indications that we managed to keep suspicion down to a minimum.

Only one subject openly expressed any suspicion about the experimental procedure. He expressed this suspicion prior to the Final Interview although he did not guess the true nature of the experiment. He was not allowed to complete the experiment. None of the other subjects expressed any suspicion except for some statements in their written impressions questioning whether or not the NSP's behavior was "for real." These statements dealt with the subjects' inability to accept the concept of a negative interviewer rather than a true suspicion as to the experimental nature of the interview situation. All subjects expressed surprise when they were told the actual nature of the experiment and most said that they simply couldn't believe they were "duped."

From all indications it appears that subjects kept their promise not to reveal the actual nature of the experiment. An additional factor, which helped to maintain secrecy, was that subjects had filled out their applications during the Spring semester but were interviewed during the

Summer semester. Therefore, few were still in classes with their original classmates and the probability of communication was greatly reduced.

B. Extent of Impression Forming Behavior

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 in our formulation predict differential effects in the number of attributes and in the percentage of personality characteristics to be found in the written impressions of the subjects as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment and goal dependency. As an initial step in analyzing the extent of impression forming behavior we considered the possibility that subjects in particular experimental conditions might write lengthier impressions than subjects in other experimental conditions. If such differences were found they could confound the analysis of subsequent measures because, for example, there might be a relationship between the total number of words in an impression and the number of attributes in that impression. Therefore, we counted the number of words in each impression and a 2 x 3 x 2 x 2 analysis of variance was performed on the data. The analysis revealed no significant F ratios for any of the factors (Appendix C, p. 230). This indicated that subjects in any one experimental condition did not write significantly longer impressions than subjects in any of the other experimental conditions.

Since there were no differences between the groups in the number of words in the impressions, we proceeded to determine if, as predicted, there were differences in the number of attributes utilized and in the percent of personality characteristics utilized as predicted in Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3.

1. Expectancy Fulfillment

It was hypothesized that subjects in the expectancy unfulfilled (EU) and no expectancy (NOE) conditions would utilize a greater number of attributes in their written impressions than subjects in conditions where expectancies were fulfilled (EF). As will be recalled, an attribute was defined, in general terms, as "any phrase, statement, or idea which indicated or inferred something about the interviewer as a person." This definition included personality characteristics, i.e., she was friendly, had a good sense of humor, etc., as well as descriptive characteristics, i.e., she was pretty, she wore a suit, etc. These data are based on attribute analysis of the written impression as described in Chapter II.

Table 5, below, presents the mean number of attributes used by subjects in the EU, EF, and NOE conditions. It can be said that there is little variation in the means for these three conditions.

Table 5. -- Extent of impression forming behavior as a function of expectancy fulfillment

| | Expectancy Unfulfilled (EU) | No Expectancy (NOE) | Expectancy Fulfilled (EF) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mean number of attributes in impression | 7.52 | 6.92 | 7.42 |
| Mean number of personality attributes in impression | 57.42% | 54.75% | 52.07% |

A 2 x 3 x 2 x 2 analysis of variance was performed with these data. Each of these three conditions are based on the interaction of expectancy (PE, NE, NOE) and the actual behavior of the stimulus person

(PSP, NSP). Thus, the expectancy unfulfilled condition includes the PE NSP and the NE PSP conditions; the expectancy fulfilled condition includes the PE PSP and NE NSP conditions; and the no expectancy condition includes the NOE NSP and NOE PSP conditions. Thus, in the anlysis of variance significant differences due to variations in expectancy fulfillment would be represented by a significant F for the BXC interaction. In this and all subsequent analyses of variance, a .05 level of significance was necessary for the acceptance of each of the hypotheses being tested.

The analysis of variance for the number of attributes in the written impression is presented in Table 6. This analysis revealed no significant differences for the BXC interaction.

Table 6. -- Analysis of variance of number of attributes in written impression

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F[1] | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HGD vs. LGD (A) | 1.40 | 1 | 1.40 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Expectancy (B) | 8.06 | 2 | 4.03 | < 1 | n.s. |
| PSP vs. NSP (C) | 27.07 | 1 | 27.07 | 2.187 | n.s. |
| Sex of Subject (D) | 8.00 | 1 | 8.00 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXB | 4.48 | 2 | 2.24 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXC | 14.02 | 1 | 14.02 | < 1.132 | n.s. |
| AXD | 60.22 | 1 | 60.22 | 4.865 | < .05 |
| BXC (EU,EF,NOE) | 9.81 | 2 | 4.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| BXD | 11.48 | 2 | 5.74 | < 1 | n.s. |
| CXD | 3.02 | 1 | 3.02 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXBXC | 6.25 | 2 | 3.12 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXBXD | 20.25 | 2 | 10.12 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXCXD | 4.99 | 1 | 4.99 | < 1 | n.s. |
| BXCXD | 13.05 | 2 | 6.52 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXBXCXD | 1.89 | 2 | .94 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Error | 1188.80 | 96 | 12.38 | | |
| Total | 1382.79 | 119 | | | |

[1] F's necessary for significance are presented in Appendix B, p. 228.

Our second measure of the extent of impression forming behavior was the degree to which personality and/or inferential characteristics were utilized by the subjects in their written impressions of the stimulus person. Specifically, we predicted that subjects in the EU and NOE situations would utilize a greater proportion of personality characteristics than would subjects in a situation where expectancies were fulfilled.

Table 5, above, presents the mean percent of personality characteristics as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment. Data are based on content analysis of the written impression as described earlier (pp. 74-77). A 2 x 3 x 2 x 2 analysis of variance was used to analyze the data. Again, in the analysis of variance, significant differences between the expectancy fulfillment conditions would be represented by a significant F for the BXC interaction. Table 7, below, presents the analysis of variance.

Table 7. -- Analysis of variance of percent of personality characteristics in written impression

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F[1] | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HGD vs. LGD (A) | .0185 | 1 | .0185 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Expectancy (B) | .0048 | 2 | .0024 | < 1 | n.s. |
| PSP vs. NSP (C) | .0603 | 1 | .0603 | < 1.1085 | n.s. |
| Sex of Subject (D) | .0200 | 1 | .0200 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXB | .1700 | 2 | .0850 | < 1.5625 | n.s. |
| AXC | .0343 | 1 | .0343 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXD | .0947 | 1 | .0947 | 1.7408 | n.s. |
| BXC (EU,EF,NOE) | .1118 | 2 | .0559 | 1.0276 | n.s. |
| BXD | .0923 | 2 | .0462 | < 1 | n.s. |
| CXD | .0437 | 1 | .0437 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXBXC | .0339 | 2 | .0168 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXBXD | .1841 | 2 | .0928 | 1.6912 | n.s. |
| AXCXD | .0004 | 1 | .0004 | < 1 | n.s. |
| BXCXD | .0050 | 2 | .0025 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXBXCXD | .0117 | 2 | .0088 | < 1 | n.s. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Error | 5.2243 | 96 | .0544 |
| Total | 6.1158 | 119 | |

[1] F scores necessary for significance are presented in Appendix B, p. 228.

The analysis of variance revealed no significant differences between the EU, NOE, and EF groups in terms of the percent of personality characteristics utilized in the written impression. Despite the lack of statistical significance, if can be seen from the means in Table 5 that the percent of personality characteristics utilized by the three groups follows the order predicted by our hypotheses. Subjects whose expectancies were not met did use the largest percent of personality characteristics (57.42%) followed by the subjects with no expectancy (54.75%). Subjects with fulfilled expectancies used the smallest percent of personality characteristics in their written impressions (52.07%). Thus, our hypotheses that subjects in the EU and NOE groups would engage in more impression forming behavior than subjects in the EF group is at least confirmed by the directional nature of the data for this measure.

It is worthwhile, at this point, to consider the relationship between the two preceding measures of extent of impression forming behavior, i.e., number of discrete attributes and the percent of personality characteristics utilized by subjects in their written impressions. According to our theory the relationship between these two measures should be positive. The greater the number of attributes as a measure of the degree of impression forming behavior, the greater should

be the proportion of personality and/or inferential traits found among these attributes. The Pearson product-moment correlatinn was utilized to determine the degree and the nature of the relationship between these two measures. The correlation, based on data for all subjects (N=120), was +.807 -- a high, positive correlation which is significantly different from zero at $p < .01$. Thus, as postulated by our theory, these two measures are highly related. The more detailed the description, i.e., the greater the number of attributes, the more likely an increase in the proportion of personality attributes used in the description.

In our theoretical introduction we discussed only two measures of extent of impression forming behavior: 1) the number of attributes in the written impression and, 2) the degree to which personality and/or inferential characteristics are utilized in the written impression. However, as was discussed in the methodology section (pp. 77-79), we utilized two additional measures: time taken to form an impression and the constant vs. changing nature of the impression.

It will be recalled that we assumed that the time taken to form an impression varies directly with the degree of impression forming behavior and, therefore, the more extensive the impression forming behavior the more time it takes to form an impression. We also assumed that if an individual engaged in more impression forming behavior his impression should change, as opposed to remaining constant, as an interaction progresses. Thus, utilizing these two measures and in accord with our previous hypotheses, we would predict that subjects in the unfulfilled expectancy and no expectancy interactions would take more time to form

their impressions than subjects in situations where expectancies are fulfilled and would be more likely to report that their impression changed as the interview progressed than subjects in situations where expectancies are fulfilled. Subjects with fulfilled expectancies are more likely to report that their impressions remained constant.

Data for these hypotheses were based on categorization of subjects' responses to two questions in the Final Interview: "When did you feel you had formed your impression of the interviewer?" and "Did your impression remain constant or did it change as the interview progressed?"

Subjects' subjective reports of the time it took them to form their impression of the stimulus person were classified into three categories: impressions formed at the beginning, middle, or end of the interview session. We determined the frequency of Ss in each of these categories for the EU, NOE, and EF groups and analyzed the relationship between time of impression formation and variations in expectancy fulfillment by means of the Chi-Square statistic (Table 8, below).

Table 8. -- Time taken for Ss to form impression of SP as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment

| | | EU | NOE | EF | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Time Impression Formed | Beginning | 25 | 24 | 29 | 78 |
| | Middle | 9 | 5 | 3 | 17 |
| | End | 6 | 9 | 7 | 22 |
| | | 40 | 39 | 38 | 117[1] |

---

[1] Three subjects did not respond to this question

$\chi^2 = 4.421$
df = 4
p = n.s.

The analysis indicated that subjects in the three conditions did not differ significantly in their subjective report of the time it took them to form their impression of the SP. Thus, our prediction that subjects in EU and NOE conditions would take more time to form their impressions than subjects in EF conditions, was not statistically supported. Inspection of the data in Table 8 does reveal, however, that a slightly larger number of subjects in the EU and NOE groups (15 and 14, respectively) reported that they formed their impressions in the middle or the end of the interview as compared to subjects in the EF group (10 subjects).

Additional analyses, unrelated to specific hypotheses, were conducted to determine whether the time of impression formation was a function of the interaction between the negative or positive stimulus person and a specific expectancy rather than to unfulfilled expectancy in general. We reasoned that perhaps subjects with unfulfilled expectancies (or NOE or EF) might react differently when meeting a positive stimulus person as opposed to a negative stimulus person. Therefore, the data were analyzed separately for EU, NOE and EF as a function of the nature of the behavior of the SP. Table 9, below, indicates the relevant data.

Table 9. -- Time taken for Ss to form impression as a function of the actual behavior of the SP and the expectancy fulfillment condition

| | | PSP* | | | | NSP** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | EU | NOE | EF | | EU | NOE | EF | |
| Time Impression Formed | Beginning | 7 | 11 | 13 | 31 | 18 | 13 | 16 | 47 |
| | Middle | 8 | 4 | 2 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| | End | 5 | 4 | 5 | 14 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 8 |
| | | 20 | 19 | 20 | 59[1] | 20 | 19 | 19 | 58[2] |

---

[1] One S did not respond to this question
[2] Two Ss did not respond to this question
* EU = negative expectancy; EF = positive expectancy
** EU = positive expectancy; EF = negative expectancy

$\chi^2 = 5.839$
df = 4
p = n.s.

$\chi^2$ could not be determined because expected cell frequences were < 2

There were no significant differences between the EU, NOE, and EF groups for either the PSP or NSP conditions. In the positive stimulus person condition, however, we did find some evidence that unfulfilled expectancy had an effect on time taken to form an impression. Almost twice as many subjects report forming their impressions either in the middle or the end of the interview when their expectancies were unfulfilled as compared to subjects whose expectancies were fulfilled. This finding is not true for subjects meeting a negative stimulus person.

The most interesting contrast between the PSP and NSP conditions, as indicated in Table 10, below, is that while 28 of the 59 subjects who interacted with a positive stimulus person reported forming their impres-

sions toward the middle or the end of the interview, only 11 of the subjects meeting a negative stimulus person gave the same report. A Chi-

Table 10. -- Time taken for Ss for form impression as a function of the actual behavior of the SP.

| | | PSP | NSP | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Time Impression Formed | Beginning | 31 | 47 | 78 |
| | Middle | 14 | 3 | 17 |
| | End | 14 | 8 | 22 |
| | | 59 | 58 | 117[1] |

[1] Three Ss did not respond to this question.

$\chi^2 = 12.033$
df = 2
$p < .01$

Square analysis of this data indicated that there were significant differences in time of impression formation as a function of the nature of the behavior of the stimulus person. Subjects who met a PSP tended to form their impression toward the middle or the end of the interview while subjects who met a NSP formed their impressions at the beginning of the interview.

One further analysis was performed on these data to determine whether time of impression formation was related to the nature of the expectancy subjects received (positive, negative, or none). It is possible that subjects receiving any information (positive or negative expectancy) might form their impressions more rapidly than subjects who received no information at all (NOE), or that the specific nature

of the expectancy instruction could affect the time taken for subjects to form their impression. A Chi-Square analysis indicated that there was no significant relationship between the nature of the subjects' expectancy and the time of impression formation ($\chi^2 = 5.925$, df = 4, p = n.s.).

Thus, our hypotheses that subjects experiencing unfulfilled expectancy and subjects experiencing no expectancy, in comparison to expectancy fulfilled subjects, would take more time to form their impressions was not confirmed by the data. However, when meeting a positive stimulus person, those subjects with unfulfilled expectancies showed a tendency to form their impressions later than subjects whose expectancies were fulfilled. And, perhaps of major importance, was the highly significant difference found in time of impression formation as a function of positive or negative stimulus person behavior. Subjects meeting a friendly interviewer formed their impressions later than subjects meeting an unfriendly interviewer.

The final measure of extent of impression formation was based on subjects' reports as to whether their impression changed or remained constant as the interview progressed. We had hypothesized that subjects in EU and NOE conditions would state that their impressions changed as the interview progressed, while EF subjects would state that their impressions remained constant. The number of subjects in each category (constant or change) for the three expectancy fulfillment conditions was analyzed by means of the Chi-Square statistic and the relevant data are presented in Table 11, below.

Table 11. -- Constant vs. changing nature of the impression as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment

| | EU | NOE | EF | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Impression remained constant | 24 | 30 | 37 | 91 |
| Impression changed | 16 | 9 | 2 | 27 |
| | 40 | 39 | 39 | 118[1] |

[1] Two subjects did not respond to this question.

$\chi^2 = 13.610$
$df = 2$
$p < .01$

The resulting Chi-Square was significant at the .01 level of confidence. Somewhat less than one-half of the subjects in the EU group reported that their impression changed as the interview progressed while in the EF group only two subjects reported that their impression changed. Nine subjects in the no expectancy group, as compared to only two in the EF group, reported that their impression changed. Thus, subjects whose expectancies were unfulfilled and, to a lesser extent, subjects with no expectancy engaged in more impression forming behavior than subjects whose expectancies were fulfilled. Since the stimulus person's behavior remained constantly positive or negative throughout the interview, we can see that subjects with unfulfilled expectancies and, to a lesser extent, subjects with no expectancy, reported a change in behavior which did not, in fact, occur. This perception of change, from our view, reflects the active cognitive process of impression formation which was aroused by an intensified need for predictability.

Following the same procedure utilized in the previous analysis of time of impression formation, we analyzed these data separately for the NSP and PSP groups. The first analysis was designed to determine whether change or constancy was a function of the interaction between the nature of the behavior of the stimulus person and the specific expectancy instruction. Tables 12 and 13, below, present the data for the PSP and NSP conditions.

Table 12. -- Constant or changing nature of the impression of the PSP as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment

| | EU[1] | NOE | EF[1] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Impression remained constant | 10 | 15 | 19 | 44 |
| Impression changed | 10 | 4 | 1 | 15 |
| | 20 | 19 | 20 | 59[2] |

$\chi^2 = 10.9729$
df = 2
$p < .01$

[1] EU = negative expectancy; EF = positive expectancy.
[2] One subject did not respond to this question.

Table 13. -- Constant or changing nature of the impression of the NSP as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment

| | EU[1] | NOE | EF[1] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Impression remained constant | 14 | 15 | 18 | 47 |
| Impression changed | 6 | 5 | 1 | 12 |
| | 20 | 20 | 19 | 59[2] |

$\chi^2 = 4.0092$
df = 2
p = n.s.

[1] EU = positive expectancy; EF = negative expectancy.
[2] One subject did not respond to the question.

In the PSP condition there was a significant relationship between variations in expectancy fulfillment and the change or constancy of the impression. A larger number of subjects whose expectancies were unfulfilled reported that their impression changed as the interview progressed. In the NSP condition there appears to be no relationship between expectancy fulfillment and constancy of the impression. Most subjects, meeting a negative stimulus person, reported that their impression remained constant regardless of the expectancy instructions they were given. There was a slight tendency for more subjects in the EU and NOE groups, as compared to the EF group, to report that their impression changed but, as stated above, this difference was not significant.

To evaluate whether the abovementioned results were due specifically to the nature of the SP's behavior, alone, or the expectancy instructions, alone, two further analyses were performed. Table 14 presents the data for constancy or change as a function of the nature of the behavior of the stimulus person and Table 15 presents the same data as a function of the specific expectancy instructions subjects were given.

Table 14. -- Constant or changing nature of the impression as a function of the actual behavior of the SP

| | PSP | NSP | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Impression remained constant | 44 | 47 | 91 |
| Impression changed | 15 | 12 | 27 |
| | 59 | 59 | 118[1] |

[1] Two subjects did not respond to this question.

$\chi^2$ = .4320
df = 1
p = n.s.

Table 15. -- Constant or changing nature of the impression as a function of expectancy given (positive, negative, none)

| | PE | NE | NOE | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Impression remained constant | 33 | 28 | 30 | 91 |
| Impression changed | 7 | 11 | 9 | 27 |
| | 40 | 39 | 39 | 118[1] |

[1] Two subjects did not respond to this question.

$\chi^2$ = 1.288
df = 2
p = n.s.

It is clear from Tables 14 and 15, above, that there was no significant relationship between subjects' reports of the constant or changing nature of their impression and either the nature of the behavior of the stimulus person or the expectancy acting alone.

Thus, the results indicate that change or constancy was significantly related to subjects' fulfillment or unfulfillment of expectancy. A significantly larger number of subjects in the expectancy unfulfilled conditions, as compared to the expectancy fulfilled conditions, reported that their impressions changed as the interview progressed. It will be recalled that a slightly larger, although not statistically significant, number of subjects in the expectancy unfulfilled groups also reported that they had formed their impressions later than subjects in the expectancy fulfilled groups.

In addition, for both measures, i.e., time of impression formation and the constant or changing nature of the impression, we found that the expectancy fulfillment variable had a greater effect when the stimulus person acted in a positive, friendly manner. Subjects whose expectancies were not met when meeting a positive stimulus person (i.e., they expected her to be negative) were significantly more likely to report that their impressions changed than were subjects with no expectancy or expectancy fulfillment. And similarly, although the findings were not statistically significant, we did find evidence that subjects with unfulfilled expectancies meeting a positive stimulus person were also more likely to form their impressions later than were subjects with fulfilled expectancies. However, when the stimulus person acted in a negative, unfriendly manner, there were no differences in time of impression formation or in the constancy or change of impression as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment.

We found that the impotence of the expectancy fulfillment variable in affecting time of impression formation in the negative stimulus person condition was due mainly to the fact that most subjects, regardless of expectancy, formed their impression of the negative stimulus person immediately. Thus, the behavior of the stimulus person appears to be the major factor affecting time of impression formation. The behavior of the stimulus person, alone, was not the major factor affecting constancy or change of the impression. There were no significant differences in constancy of impressions due solely to the negative or positive behavior of the stimulus person. The expectancy-fulfillment

variable, then, is apparently the more important factor in determining the extent to which an impression changes or remains constant while having a lesser effect on time of impression formation. The behavior of the stimulus person, however, is more important in determing time of impression formation and less important in determining whether the impression will change or remain constant.

2. Variations in Goal Dependency

Our third hypothesis dealt with the extent of impression forming behavior as a function of the goal dependency variable. We had predicted that subjects would engage in more impression forming behavior when in a high goal dependent situation (HGD) as compared to a low goal dependent situation (LGD). Table 16, below, presents the relevant data for the first two measures of extent of impression forming behavior, i.e., number of attributes in the written impression and the percent of personality and/or inferential characteristics in the written impression.

Table 16. -- Extent of impression formation as a function of goal dependency

| | HGD (N=60) | LGD (N=60) |
|---|---|---|
| Mean number of attributes in impression | 7.18 | 7.40 |
| Mean percent of personality characteristics in impression | 53.67% | 56.00% |

The data in Table 16 indicates that there are only very small differences between the high goal dependent and low goal dependent subjects in the number of attributes utilized in their written impressions.

An analysis of variance of the data revealed that these differences were not statistically significant (Table 6, p. 92). The mean percent of personality characteristics utilized by subjects in the HGD and LGD conditions is also given in Table 16. Here again, an analysis of variance of this measure (Table 7, p. 93) indicated that the differences in these percentages were not statistically significant.

Thus, subjects in the high goal dependency situation did not, as we had predicted, use more attributes and did not utilize a greater proportion of personality characteristics than subjects in a low goal dependency situation. In fact, although the differences between the groups are very small, the low goal dependency subjects did utilize slightly more attributes and a slightly higher percentage of personality characteristics.

Tables 17 and 18, below, present the data for the two supplementary measures of extent of impression forming behavior, i.e., time of impression formation and constancy or change of impressions. Chi-

Table 17. -- Time taken for Ss to form impression of SP as a function of goal dependency

| | | HGD | LGD | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Time Impression Formed | Beginning | 41 | 37 | 78 |
| | Middle | 8 | 9 | 17 |
| | End | 9 | 13 | 22 |
| | | 58 | 59 | 117[1] |

[1] Three subjects did not respond to this question.

$\chi_2 = .983$
df = 2
p = n.s.

Table 18. -- Constant or changing nature of the impression as a function of goal dependency

| | HGD | LGD | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Impression remained constant | 45 | 46 | 91 |
| Impression changed | 14 | 13 | 27 |
| | 59 | 59 | 118[1] |

[1] Two subjects did not respond to this question.

$\chi^2 = .048$
df = 1
p = n.s.

Square analysis of the data indicate there is no significant relationship between goal dependency and either time of impression or the extent to which the impression changed or remained constant. A slightly larger number of low goal dependent subjects formed their impressions later in the interview.

Thus, our hypothesis, that subjects would engage in more impression forming behavior when in a high goal dependency situation, was not supported by the data in this study.

3. Interaction of Expectancy Fulfillment and Goal Dependency Variations.

Based on the assumptions and hypotheses on the effects of expectancy and goal dependency on the degree of arousal of the need for predictability, we specified the conditions under which we would expect the most and least impression forming behavior. Specifically, we postulated that in the low goal dependency expectancy fulfilled condition we would find the smallest degree of impression forming behavior

while in the high goal dependency unfulfilled and no expectancy conditions we would find the greatest degree of impression forming behavior. We stated that the other situations would produce an intermediate amount of impression forming behavior, although we made no specific predictions about their order on a continum. Tables 19, 20 and 21, below, present the data relevant to this hypothesis for our four measures of extent of impression forming behavior.

Table 19. -- Number of attributes and percent of personality characteristics as a function of the interaction of goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions

| | HGD EU (N=20) | HGD NOE (N=20) | HGD EF (N=20) | LGD EU (N=20) | LGD NOE (N=20) | LGD EF (N=20) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mean number of attributes in impression | 7.8 | 6.6 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 7.6 |
| Mean % of personality attributes in impression | 55.00% | 58.30% | 46.75% | 59.00% | 51.45% | 57.40% |

Table 20. -- Time taken to form impression of SP as a function of the interaction of goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions

| | | HGD EU | HGD NOE | HGD EF | LGD EU | LGD NOE | LGD EF | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Time Impression Formed | Beginning | 14 | 13 | 14 | 11 | 11 | 15 | 78 |
| | Middle or End[1] | 6 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 39 |
| | | 20 | 18 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 117[2] |

[1] These two categories were combined due to small frequences in each separate categgry.

[2] Three subjects did not respond to this question.

$\chi^2 = 4.177$
df = 5
p = n.s.

Table 21. -- Constant or changing nature of the impression as a function of the interaction of goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions

| | HGD EU | HGD NOE | HGD EF | LGD EU | LGD NOE | LGD EF | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Impression remained constant | 14 | 13 | 18 | 10 | 17 | 199 | 91 |
| Impression changed | 6 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 27 |
| | 20 | 19 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 118[1] |

[1] Two subjects did not respond to this question.

The interaction of the goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment factors was significantly related to only one measure of extent of impression forming behavior. Table 21, above, indicates the number of subjects in each condition who reported that their impressions remained constant or changed as the interview progressed. It will be recalled that degree of goal dependency, alone, was not significantly related to subjects' report of the constant or changing nature of their impressions. Variations in expectancy fulfillment were related to this measure such that subjects with unfulfilled expectancies and, to a lesser extent, subjects with no expectancy were significantly more likely to report that their impression changed while Ss with fulfilled expectancies were more likely to report constancy of their impressions. In view of these earlier findings, it is clear that the data in Table 21 simply reflect the effects of variations in expectancy fulfillment. Under both HGD and LGD conditions, Ss with unfulfilled expectancies are most likely to report that their impression changed while subjects with fulfilled expectancies are least likely to make such a report. Thus, on the basis

of all of our measures of extent of impression forming behavior we find no evidence to support the notion that extent of impression forming behavior is a joint function of variations in goal dependency and variations in expectancy fulfillment.

Summary of Findings: Extent of Impression Forming Behavior

In terms of the effects of expectancy fulfillment or unfulfillment on the extent of impression forming behavior, the only finding that provides statistical support for Hypotheses 1 and 2 was that more subjects in the unfulfilled expectancy and no expectancy conditions, as compared to subjects in the expectancy fulfilled condition, reported that their impressions changed as the interview progressed.

Subsequent analyses indicated that the effect of unfulfilled expectancy, on constancy or change, was greater when the stimulus person acted in a positive, as opposed to a negative, manner. Although not supported statistically, we found the same tendency for time of impression formation, i.e., the effect of unfulfilled expectancy was somewhat more pronounced when the stimulus person acted positively. Subjects with unfulfilled expectancies tended to form their impressions of the positive stimulus person later in the interview than subjects with fulfilled expectancies.

In addition, it was only the variation in expectancy fulfillment that significantly affected the constant or changing nature of the impression. The negativity or positivity of the stimulus person, alone, did not affect the constancy of the impression, nor did the negative or positive nature of the expectancy.

On the other hand, an interesting and unpredicted finding was that positivity or negativity of the stimulus person's behavior was a highly significant factor affecting time of impression formation. Regardless of expectancies, subjects meeting a friendly interviewer formed their impressions later than subjects meeting an unfriendly interviewer. Thus, expectancy fulfillment or unfulfillment seems to be the more important factor affecting the constancy of an impression, while the behavior of the stimulus person appears to be the more important factor in determining time of impression formation.

Although not statistically significant, we did find that the use of personality characteristics in the written impression followed the order predicted by Hypotheses 1 and 2. Subjects whose expectancies were not met utilized the largest percent of personality characteristics followed by subjects with no expectancy. Subjects with fulfilled expectancies used the smallest percent of personality characteristics. This finding provides some tentative, directional support for our hypotheses.

No differences were found between expectancy fulfilled, no expectancy, and expectancy unfulfilled subjects in the number of attributes utilized in the impressions.

We did not find any evidence that variations in degree of goal dependency affected the extent of impression forming behavior nor did we find support for the notion that extent of impression forming behavior is a joint function of variations in goal dependency and variations in expectancy fulfillment.

C. Direction of Impression Forming Behavior

Before proceeding to a discussion of results relevant to our hypotheses, some general points should be made about the nature of our measures and our findings. In our hypotheses relating to the evaluative nature of subjects' impressions, we make the general statement that certain conditions should result in more or less "positive" or "negative" evaluations of the SP. To obtain such evaluations we choose to have Ss rate the SP on 19 separate characteristics. The decision to utilize a large number of characteristics, as opposed to a single rating of "positivity-negativity" was based on the idea that a single evaluative rating could not provide adequate information with respect to the total range of the SP's behavior. Using a single rating, for example, would not permit us to determine whether prior expectancy affected only the evaluation of those attributes of the SP which were clearly relevant to her behavior in the interaction situation or whether the positivity or negativity of evaluation extended to characteristics which were not readily apparent during the interaction.

The use of such a large number of characteristics, however, presents a problem in terms of statistical analyses. In testing each hypothesis, the ratings for each of the 19 characteristics and for the mean of the 19 characteristics (general positivity-negativity) were analyzed by separate analyses of variance. Tus, twenty statistical analyses were used in testing each hypothesis. On the basis of chance, alone, we can expect one significant difference among twenty comparisons. Therefore, in order to provide adequate statistical support

for our hypotheses we would have to find more than one significant difference when testing each of our hypotheses.

And yet, despite the use of such a large number of characteristics, we found very few significant differences in the testing of our hypotheses. The lack of significant findings could be taken as evidence against our hypotheses and, in some instances, we clearly cannot find support for them. However, in other instances, we do have clear directional support for our hypotheses. That is, while the predicted differences between groups are not statistically significant, they are consistent. Therefore, in situations where our hypotheses are not supported statistically but where a definite pattern of evaluation does emerge, we will deal with these directional differences.

We will also, in our discussion, have occasion to refer to "more relevant" vs. "less relevant" attributes. As was discussed in the methodology section (pp. 77-79) some of the characteristics were chosen because they were specifically related to the SP's behavior in the interview situation. In the case of prior expectancy situations, "unfulfilled" and "fulfilled" expectancy must refer to those traits mentioned in the instructions and which are directly confirmed or contradicted by the SP's behavior. Examples of such characteristics are "unsociable," "impersonal" and "uncooperative." A second group of characteristics was chosen because we felt that the general positivity or negativity of evaluation might extend to attributes of the SP which were not readily apparent from the interview, for example: "untrustworthy,"

"industrious," "skillful." This latter group of attributes is clearly "less relevant" to the SP's behavior in the interaction and "less relevant" in that they were not a given part of the expectancy instructions.

A correlation matrix, in which Ss' evaluations of the SP for each trait were correlated with their evaluations for all other traits, indicated that we, indeed, have distinct groups of characteristics (Table 5, Appendix C, p. 231). One group -- "unsociable," "impersonal," "skeptical," "uncooperative," "unpleasant," "insensitive," "overall rating of the interview," how the interviewer "relates to students," and the extent to which she made subjects "feel at ease" -- show very high intercorrelations. Most correlations are above .50 and several are .70 or higher. These characteristics can be seen to be clearly "relevant" to the SP's behavior in the interaction and to subjects' expectations regarding her behavior. While highly correlated with each other, these characteristics have rather low correlations with the remaining characteristics and the intercorrelations among the remaining characteristics are low -- a few in the .40 range with most being considerably lower (.08 to .25).

The presence of a distinct group of "relevant" characteristics provides one further means for determining the extent to which the data provides support for our hypotheses. In some instances a directional pattern of differences does not appear for all 19 characteristics. Instead, seven or eight characteristics will show a consistent directional pattern and these characteristics will all belong to the group we have labeled as "relevant." Such a finding can be taken as some evidence

that the predicted effects are occurring selectively, i.e., for only those characteristics directly relevant to the SP's behavior in the interaction and Ss' expectancies concerning this behavior.

Therefore, in discussing the data relating to our hypotheses about the evaluative nature of subjects' impressions, we will discuss significant differences when they appear and when the number of such differences are above a chance level (one in twenty). When significant differences do not appear but where there is clear, consistent directional support for our hypotheses, the directional support will be discussed, and where a large number of directional differences are not found but where directional differences relating to "relevant" characteristics seem to indicate that the predicted effects are occurring selectively, these relevant characteristics will be the focus of our discussion.

1. Expectancy Fulfillment

Hypotheses 4 and 5 dealt with the evaluative nature of the formed impression as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment. Specifically, we hypothesized that regardless of the actual behavior of the stimulus person, subjects in expectancy unfulfilled and no expectancy situations would judge the stimulus person more negatively than subjects in situations where expectancies were fulfilled.

Data utilized in testing these hypotheses are based on Ss' ratings of the SP by use of bipolar graphic scales. Ratings could range from 5 to 85 mm. We arbitrarily selected the lower end of the scale to indicate the more positive rating (5) and the higher end of the

scale to indicate the more negative rating (85). For specific details of the rating scale see pp. 78-79.

The findings relevant to these hypotheses are given, below, in Table 22 which presents the mean ratings given to the stimulus person by subjects in the expectancy unfulfilled, no expectancy, and expectancy fulfilled conditions. Separate means are presented for each of the 19 characteristics. In addition, we computed the mean rating for all 19 characteristics as an indication of the general positivity or negativity of the evaluations. For these hypotheses the data were analyzed by 2 x 3 x 2 x 2 analyses of variance. Ratings for each of the 19 characteristics, and for the mean of the 19 characteristics, were analyzed by separate analyses of variance. Each of the three variations in expectancy fulfillment are based on the interaction between the nature of the expectancy (positive, negative, or no expectancy) and the actual behavior of the stimulus person (positive or negative). The expectancy unfulfilled condition includes the PE NSP and the NE PSP conditions; the expectancy fulfulled condition includes the PE PSP and NE NSP conditions; and the no expectancy condition includes the NOE PSP and NOE NSP conditions. Thus, in the analysis of variance, significant differences between the three conditions would be represented by a significant F for the BXC interaction (EU, EF, and NOE). The F scores and significance levels for the BXC interaction are also presented in Table 22.

The analyses revealed no significant difference between the EU, NOE, and EF groups for any of the characteristics. However, inspection of the data in Table 22 indicates that <u>in no instance did subjects in</u>

the EF groups give the SP the most negative rating. For 16 of the 19 characteristics and for the mean of the 19 characteristics (31.51 for NOE Ss, 27.64 for EF Ss), subjects in the NOE group evaluated the SP more negatively than subjects in the EF group. For example, Ss in the NOE group, as compared to EF Ss, rated the SP as more impersonal, more unpleasant, as relating to students more poorly, as more unsociable and as a poorer interviewer "overall." On only one characteristic -- "rational" did the NOE Ss give a more favorable rating than EF Ss.[1]

Table 22. -- Mean ratings of the SP on evaluative characteristics as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment

| Bipolar Characteristic[1] | EU (N=40) | NOE (N=40) | EF (N=40) | $F^2$ for BXC | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unsociable | 40.28 | 34.70 | 31.98 | 2.446 | n.s. |
| Impersonal | 52.82 | 53.45 | 46.55 | 1.384 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 30.05 | 29.90 | 27.32 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 28.80 | 29.68 | 27.60 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unpleasant | 33.70 | 34.70 | 30.08 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Insensitive | 38.32 | 36.88 | 36.40 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Interviewer Overall-Poor | 28.08 | 30.05 | 24.55 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Relates to Students Poorly | 38.18 | 37.12 | 34.32 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Made You Ill at Ease | 36.35 | 35.45 | 35.58 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 23.78 | 25.95 | 25.18 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 26.72 | 28.25 | 23.50 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 23.75 | 32.25 | 28.08 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Lazy | 24.85 | 29.60 | 22.20 | 2.528 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 18.05 | 22.48 | 17.55 | 1.583 | n.s. |
| Traditional | 32.92 | 31.45 | 27.92 | 2.315 | n.s. |
| Rational | 24.00 | 31.22 | 25.82 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Changeable | 20.38 | 28.80 | 18.32 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 19.00 | 21.12 | 20.07 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 21.75 | 24.58 | 22.05 | 1 | n.s. |
| Mean of All Characteristics | 29.50 | 31.51 | 27.64 | < 1 | n.s. |

[1] Contrary to other characteristics, a higher rating on "rational" is more positive. The opposite characteristic was "emotional" and the attribute was defined as "Do you think the interviewer is ruled more by her heart than by her head?" In view of the definition, the alternative characteristic, and the consistent rating of the PSP as more

[1] Only the negative pole characteristic is listed in table; for positive pole characteristic and for definitions of characteristics see Appendix A, pp. 212 and 213.

[2] F scores necessary for significance are presented in Appendix B, p. 228.

Thus, Hypothesis 4 receives support from these highly consistent directional findings.

When compared to subjects in the expectancy fulfilled conditions, subjects whose expectancies were not met rated the SP more negatively on 15 of the 19 characteristics as well as for the mean of the 19 characteristics. For example, in comparison to EF subjects, EU subjects rated the SP as more unsociable, more impersonal, more skeptical, more unpleasant, as relating to students more poorly, and as a poorer interview on an "overall" basis. In fact, the ratings for all 9 relevant characteristics were more negative in the EU group. Therefore, Hypothesis 5 is also supported by highly consistent, directional findings.

We had made no predictions in relation to whether the EU or NOE conditions would lead to greater negativity of evaluation of the SP. However, we had expected that unfulfilled expectancy would produce the most negative evaluations. Instead, we found that, in general, no expectancy subjects evaluated the SP most negatively. For 12 of the 19 characteristics and for the mean of the 19 characteristics,

"emotional" (Table 23, p. 121) it would seem that the "emotional" end of the scale, which we considered to be the negative end of the scale, was actually interpreted by Ss as a positive characteristics. It is for this reason that in this, and all subsequent analyses, a higher rating on "rational" indicates a more positive evaluation.

subjects in the NOE group evaluated the SP most negatively. In most instances, however, we found that subjects whose expectancies were not met and subjects with no expectancy gave the stimulus person fairly similar evaluations and these evaluations were most disparate from those of expectancy fulfilled subjects. Also, in every instance, subjects with fulfilled expectancies evaluated the stimulus person most positively. Thus, our basic thinking, i.e., that unfulfillment of expectancies and lack of prior expectancy, as compared to fulfillment of expectancy, would lead to a more negative evaluation of the stimulus person was confirmed by these highly consistent, though statistically insignificant, findings.

The lack of significant findings in the above analyses was, in part, a result of the overwhelmingly large contribution of the positive-negative stimulus person variation in the analyses of variance. In testing the hypotheses we defined the unfulfilled expectancy, no expectancy, and expectancy fulfilled conditions without reference to the specific behavior of the stimulus person. That is, unfulfilled expectancy is defined as including both the positive expectancy negative stimulus person condition and the negative expectancy positive stimulus person condition; no expectancy is defined to include both the no expectancy negative stimulus person and the no expectancy positive stimulus person conditions; and, similarly, the expectancy fulfilled condition is defined to include both the positive expectancy positive stimulus person and the negative expectancy negative stimulus person conditions.

As can be seen from Table 23, below, there were very large and significant differences in the ratings subjects gave to the positive and negative stimulus person. Indeed, it was necessary to the experimental

Table 23. -- Mean ratings of SP on evaluative characteristics for PSP and NSP conditions and F scores for this factor

| Bipolar Characteristic | PSP (N=60) | NSP (N=60) | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unsociable | 18.0 | 53.8 | 119.130 | < .01 |
| Impersonal | 33.0 | 68.9 | 108.369 | < .01 |
| Skeptical | 20.9 | 37.4 | 27.719 | < .01 |
| Uncooperative | 17.1 | 40.2 | 63.789 | < .01 |
| Unpleasant | 15.2 | 50.4 | 138.404 | < .01 |
| Insensitive | 25.8 | 48.6 | 44.085 | < .01 |
| Interviewer Overall-Poor | 14.6 | 40.4 | 75.275 | < .01 |
| Relates to Students Poorly | 18.6 | 54.5 | 159.350 | < .01 |
| Made You Ill at Ease | 15.3 | 56.4 | 212.503 | < .01 |
| Untrustworthy | 23.7 | 26.4 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 23.8 | 28.4 | 2.349 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 21.8 | 32.6 | 10.132 | < .01 |
| Lazy | 22.5 | 29.0 | 6.030 | < .02 |
| Clumsy | 19.7 | 19.7 | 1 | n.s. |
| Traditional | 29.0 | 34.5 | 2.999 | n.s. |
| Rational | 30.4 | 23.8 | 4.812 | < .05 |
| Changeable | 23.8 | 21.8 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 20.2 | 20.0 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 24.0 | 21.6 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Mean of All Characteristics | 21.85 | 37.26 | 94.785 | < .01 |

that such large differences occur, i.e., that subjects would clearly perceive the SP as positive or negative. Since the nature of the stimulus person's behavior accounted for so much variance, it undoubtedly could suppress any effect due to the interaction of the expectancy factor (B factor) with a specific SP (PSP or NSP - C factor). Therefore, in subsequent research the general effects of unfulfilled expectancy, no expectancy, and expectancy fulfilled conditions would appear to

require the use of a more neutral stimulus person. In the present design, the directional findings indicated above, are taken as support for our hypotheses. The testing of the separate hypotheses for the PSP and NSP, discussed below, indicate that in addition to the general effects of EU, NOE, and EF conditions, there are significant differences due to the BXC interaction within the NSP and PSP conditions, but that the nature of these interactions, in turn, depend on the actual behavior of the stimulus person.

We have previously mentioned the large amount of variance accounted for by the positive and/or negative nature of the SP. In order to test Hypotheses 4A, 5A, 4B, and 5B, i.e., to evaluate the effects of the interaction between a specific stimulus person and specific expectancies, the data for the PSP and NSP were analyzed separately. The original 2 x 3 x 2 x 2 analyses of variance were split by the C factor (PSP or NSP) into two, a 2 x 3 x 2 analyses. It should be noted that when subjects are interacting with a positive stimulus person, a positive expectancy would result in having expectancies fulfilled (EF) and a negative expectancy would result in having expectancies unfulfilled (EU).

The mean ratings given to the PSP by subjects in the EU, NOE, and EF conditions are presented, below, in Table 24. F scores and significance levels for the B factor (PE, NE, NOE) are also presented.

Table 24. -- Mean ratings of the PSP on evaluative characteristics as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment

| Bipolar Characteristics | EU[1] (N=20) | NOE[1] (N=20) | EF[1] (N=20) | F for B Factor | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unsociable | 24.80 | 16.60 | 12.40 | 5.777 | < .02 |
| Impersonal | 38.40 | 33.80 | 26.70 | 1.609 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 23.90 | 22.70 | 17.00 | 1.307 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 20.40 | 17.50 | 13.30 | 2.617 | n.s. |
| Unpleasant | 18.80 | 16.50 | 10.20 | 3.739 | < .05 |
| Insensitive | 32.60 | 27.20 | 17.20 | 6.096 | < .01 |
| Interviewer Overall-Poor | 12.90 | 16.50 | 12.50 | 1.209 | n.s. |
| Relates to Students Poorly | 23.70 | 19.30 | 12.60 | 5.188 | < .02 |
| Made You Ill at Ease | 16.70 | 16.90 | 12.30 | 1.581 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 25.30 | 24.30 | 20.95 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 27.00 | 23.95 | 20.40 | 1.071 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 21.90 | 25.50 | 18.10 | 1.224 | n.s. |
| Lazy | 22.40 | 22.50 | 22.50 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 18.40 | 20.20 | 20.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Traditional | 30.00 | 33.20 | 23.90 | 1.752 | n.s. |
| Rational | 27.20 | 35.80 | 28.20 | 1.464 | n.s. |
| Changeable | 21.35 | 29.10 | 19.05 | 2.391 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 19.25 | 20.35 | 20.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 23.50 | 16.37 | 23.95 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Mean of All Characteristics | 23.45 | 23.46 | 18.67 | 3.357 | < .05 |

[1] EU = negative expectancy; NOE = no expectancy; EF = positive expectancy.

In Hypotheses 4A and 5A, we predicted that subjects with negative and no expectancy (EU and NOE conditions), interacting with a positive stimulus person, would evaluate the stimulus person positively but not as positively as subjects with a positive expectancy (EF condition). The analyses revealed that there were some significant differences, for specific traits, in subjects' ratings of the positive stimulus person as a function of the expectancy they received.

Subjects whose expectancies were unfulfilled, as compared to subjects with NOE or EF, rated the stimulus person as most unsociable

($p < .02$), most unpleasant ($p < .05$), most insensitive ($p < .01$), and as relating to students most poorly ($p < .02$). In addition, there was a difference between the three groups in the mean of their evaluative ratings. Subjects in the EU and NOE groups rated the PSP more negatively than Ss in the EF group ($p < .05$). It should be noted that for the characteristics mentioned above the pattern of difference was always the same, i.e., subjects with unfulfilled expectancy rated the PSP most negatively, followed by the NOE subjects, while the EF subjects gave the SP the most positive rating.

In general, subjects whose expectancies were fulfilled gave the most positive ratings while subjects with unfulfilled expectancy or no expectancy gave the most negative ratings. Specifically, in addition to the significant differences mentioned above, subjects in the EU group rated the PSP as most impersonal, skeptical, uncooperative, untrustworthy and dishonest. Subjects in the NOE group gave the PSP the most negative "overall" rating; rater her as making the student feel most ill at ease and as most changeable, unfair and traditional.

Therefore, Hypotheses 4A and 5A receive some definitive support on the basis of these data. For four characteristics which were clearly relevant to the SP's behavior and to subjects' prior expectancies, the findings are statistically significant while for other characteristics the hypotheses are supported directionally. Taken together these findings provide fairly strong confirmation of the hypotheses.

Table 25, below, presents the mean ratings given to the negative stimulus person by subjects in the expectancy unfulfilled, expectancy fulfilled, and no expectancy conditions. Data were analyzed by 2x3x2 analyses of variance and the F scores for the B factor (PE, NE, NOE), along with significance levels, are also presented in the table. It will be recalled that when subjects are interacting with a negative stimulus person, a positive expectancy would result in having expectancies unfulfilled (EU) and a negative expectancy would result in having expectancies fulfilled (EF).

Table 25. -- Mean ratings of NSP on evaluative characteristics as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment

| Bipolar Characteristic | EU[1] (N=20) | NOE[1] (N=20) | EF[1] (N=20) | F for B Factor | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unsociable | 56.80 | 52.90 | 51.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Impersonal | 67.20 | 73.00 | 66.40 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 36.30 | 38.10 | 37.40 | 1.026 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 36.90 | 41.90 | 41.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unpleasant | 48.30 | 53.00 | 50.10 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Insensitive | 43.60 | 46.50 | 55.60 | 2.110 | n.s. |
| Interviewer Overall-Poor | 41.50 | 45.20 | 34.40 | 1.298 | n.s. |
| Relates to Students Poorly | 52.40 | 55.00 | 56.10 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Made You Ill at Ease | 56.30 | 54.00 | 58.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 22.25 | 27.60 | 29.40 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 26.45 | 32.55 | 26.60 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 25.60 | 39.00 | 33.10 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Lazy | 28.30 | 36.70 | 21.90 | 3.457 | < .05 |
| Clumsy | 19.90 | 24.80 | 14.50 | 4.206 | < .05 |
| Traditional | 36.80 | 29.70 | 37.00 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Rational | 21.60 | 26.70 | 23.30 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Changeable | 19.40 | 28.50 | 17.60 | 2.630 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 18.75 | 21.90 | 19.25 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 20.00 | 24.60 | 20.15 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Mean of All Characteristics | 35.58 | 39.56 | 36.63 | < 1 | n.s. |

[1] EU = positive expectancy; NOE = no expectancy; EF = negative expectancy.

We had hypothesized that, when interacting with a negative stimulus person, subjects with a positive expectancy (EU) or no expectancy (NOE) would evaluate the stimulus person more negatively than subjects who have a negative expectancy (EF). The analyses of variance indicate that subjects in the EU, NOE, and EF groups differed significantly at $p < .05$ in their rating of the NSP on only one characteristic -- clumsy. On the basis of chance, alone, we would have expected to find this one significant difference among twenty comparisons and, therefore we cannot have confidence in this finding. Ratings of the NSP as "lazy" differed at $p < .05$. For both of these characteristics, subjects with no expectancy rated the stimulus person most negatively while subjects with fulfilled expectancies rated her most positively. Ratings by subjects in the EU condition were intermediate between the other two groups.

On 13 of the 19 characteristics, and for the mean of the evaluative ratings, subjects with no expectancy evaluated the negative stimulus person more negatively than Ss with fulfilled expectancies. For 11 of these characteristics and for the mean evaluative rating NOE Ss gave more negative evaluations than either EU or EF Ss. Subjects in the EU and EF conditions rated the NSP equally on several characteristics (inconsistent, dishonest, traditional). Subjects with unfulfilled expectancies, as compared to subjects with fulfilled expectancies, evaluated the NSP as more changeable, lazier, more unsociable, and as a poorer interviewer on an "overall" basis. Subjects in the EF condition, as compared to the EU subjects, rated the NSP as

more untrustworthy, more unfair, more uncooperative, more insensitive, and as relating to students more poorly.

Thus, we find very little, if any, support for our hypotheses that subjects with unfulfilled expectancies and no expectancies would evaluate the stimulus person more negatively than subjects with fulfilled expectancies. There is some indication that the negative stimulus person was evaluated most negatively by subjects with no expectancy with little difference between the ratings of subjects in fulfilled and unfulfilled expectancy conditions.

It will be recalled that a differential response to the PSP and NSP was revealed earlier in the analyses of the extent of impression forming behavior. Impressions of the NSP were formed early in the interview; impressions of the PSP were formed later. Variations in expectancy fulfillment affected Ss' report of the constancy of their impressions of the PSP while having little, if any, effect on constancy of impressions of the NSP. The evaluative ratings reveal that unfulfilled expectancy and no expectancy conditions function similarly to produce more negative evaluations of the PSP when compared to the expectancy fulfilled conditions. When the SP is negative, however, the EU condition seems to produce the same effects as the $E^F$ condition while the NOE condition seems to produce the most negative evaluation. Clearly, then, the results for the PSP and NSP conditions are different throughout this study. A comprehensive analysis of this differential response to the friendly and unfriendly interviewer will be considered in the discussion section of this paper.

In summary:

1. Our general hypotheses, i.e., that regardless of the actual nature of the SP, subjects with unfulfilled and no expectancy would evaluate the SP more negatively than Ss whose expectancies were met, were supported, but only directionally, by our findings. And,

2. In evaluating the effects of variations in expectancy fulfillment separately for specific stimulus persons (PSP or NSP), it was clear that the support for our general hypotheses was due to the PSP condition and not to the NSP condition. Subjects meeting a positive stimulus person evaluated her more negatively when their expectancies were unfulfilled and when they had no prior expectancy than when their expectancies were met. Thus, our hypotheses concerning the effects of variations in expectancy fulfillment on evaluations of the PSP were supported by our findings. This support was statistically significant for some characteristics and directional for others.

3. Subjects with NOE tended to evaluate the negative stimulus person more negatively than subjects with fulfilled expectancies, although the differences in ratings were not statistically significant. There was little difference in the negativity of ratings given by subjects in expectancy fulfilled and expectancy unfulfilled situations. These data provide little, if any, support for our original hypotheses.

### 2. Evaluative Effects of the Interaction of Goal Dependency and Expectancy Fulfillment Variations

The next hypotheses were concerned with the evaluative nature of subjects' impressions as a function of the interaction between goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions. We

hypothesized that, in general, regardless of the actual nature of the stimulus person, a subject in the unfulfilled and no expectancy conditions would evaluate the SP more negatively when he believed she determined whether or not he could get the job (HGD) as compared to when he believed that this was not a decision she made (LGD).

The mean ratings given to the stimulus person by subjects in the EU, NOE, and EF conditions as a function of their goal dependency are presented in Table 26. Table 6, in Appendix C, indicates the mean ratings given to the SP as a function of the goal dependency factor, alone. As this table reveals there were no significant differences between the ratings given to the SP as a function of goal dependency. Inspection of the means also reveals that there is no consistent trend in these ratings. In some instances subjects in the HGD group gave the stimulus person the more negative rating while in other instances subjects in the LGD group evaluated the stimulus more negatively.

The interaction of goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions, as shown in Table 26 was significant for only one characteristic --

Table 26. -- Mean ratings of SP on evaluative characteristics as a function of the interaction between goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions[1]

| | EU | | NOE | | EF | | F | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bipolar Characteristic | HGD (N=20) | LGD (N=20) | HGD (N=20) | LGD (N=20) | HGD (N=20) | LGD (N=20) | AXBXC | p |
| Unsociable | 41.40 | 39.15 | 29.10 | 40.30 | 30.85 | 33.10 | 1.182 | n.s. |
| Impersonal | 52.05 | 53.60 | 53.70 | 53.20 | 45.90 | 47.20 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 31.30 | 28.20 | 30.10 | 29.70 | 25.95 | 28.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 27.55 | 30.05 | 27.75 | 31.60 | 24.25 | 30.95 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unpleasant | 33.05 | 34.35 | 34.80 | 34.60 | 29.00 | 31.15 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Insensitive | 37.75 | 38.90 | 34.50 | 39.25 | 38.05 | 34.75 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Interviewer Overall-Poor | 25.70 | 30.45 | 30.55 | 31.15 | 26.65 | 22.75 | 1.083 | n.s. |

| Bipolar Characteristic | EU HGD (N=20) | EU LGD (N=20) | NOE HGD (N=20) | NOE LGD (N=20) | EF HGD (N=20) | EF LGD (N=20) | F AXBXC | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Relates to Students Poorly | 36.50 | 39.85 | 36.20 | 38.05 | 32.05 | 36.60 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Made You Ill at Ease | 36.60 | 36.10 | 32.35 | 38.55 | 36.35 | 34.80 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 20.90 | 26.65 | 27.00 | 24.90 | 24.35 | 26.00 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 22.80 | 30.65 | 25.70 | 30.80 | 23.75 | 23.25 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 23.35 | 24.15 | 38.55 | 26.25 | 28.15 | 28.00 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Lazy | 22.85 | 26.85 | 30.40 | 28.80 | 23.45 | 20.95 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 14.70 | 21.40 | 22.80 | 22.15 | 21.70 | 13.40 | 3.873 | < .05 |
| Traditional | 35.45 | 30.40 | 37.15 | 25.75 | 25.95 | 34.90 | 2.664 | n.s. |
| Rational | 23.70 | 24.30 | 32.80 | 29.65 | 29.75 | 21.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Changeable | 18.55 | 22.20 | 26.05 | 31.55 | 17.95 | 18.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 15.85 | 22.15 | 21.10 | 21.15 | 21.95 | 18.20 | 2.138 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 18.05 | 24.45 | 26.40 | 22.75 | 22.55 | 21.55 | 1.220 | n.s. |
| Mean of All Characteristics | 28.22 | 30.81 | 31.38 | 31.60 | 27.89 | 27.41 | < 1 | n.s. |

[1] EU = negative expectancy, positive stimulus person and positive expectancy, negative stimulus person.
NOE = no expectancy, positive stimulus person and no expectancy, negative stimulus person.
EF = positive expectancy, positive stimulus person and negative expectancy, negative stimulus person.

clumsiness. On the basis of chance, alone, we would expect one significant finding out of twenty comparisons, and therefore we cannot have confidence in this finding. The data provide no support for our hypotheses. Contrary to our hypothesis, for one half of the remaining characteristics, as well as for the mean of all characteristics, subjects in the EU condition evaluated the SP less positively when she did not control a goal (EU LGD). On only two characteristics did the HGD subjects rate the SP substantially more negatively and for the remaining characteristics the ratings are almost equal in the LGD and HGD conditions. Thus, variations in goal dependency had no measurable effect on evaluative ratings of the SP. The

reasons for this lack of effectiveness will be examined in the discussion section.

We separately evaluated the effects of the interaction between goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment variations for the positive and negative interviewer, respectively. We had predicted that subjects in expectancy unfulfilled and no expectancy conditions, meeting a positive stimulus person would evaluate her more negatively when she controlled goal achievement for them than when she did not have such control. Table 27, below, presents the mean ratings given to the PSP by subjects in the EU, NOE, and EF conditions as a function of the degree of goal dependency.

Table 7, Appendix C, indicates the mean ratings given to the PSP as a function of the goal dependency factor, alone. There were no significant differences between the mean ratings of the PSP as a function of this factor alone and no consistent directional differences appear either.

Inspection of the data in Table 27 reveals the same single significant finding reported earlier. Subjects whose expectancies

Table 27. -- Mean ratings of PSP on Evaluative Characteristics as a function of the interaction between goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions[1]

| | EU | | NOE | | EF | | F | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bipolar Characteristic | HGD (N=10) | LGD (N=10) | HGD (N=10) | LGD (N=10) | HGD (N=10) | LGD (N=10) | AXB | p |
| Unsociable | 25.70 | 23.70 | 16.20 | 16.90 | 12.10 | 12.00 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Impersonal | 38.20 | 38.70 | 34.30 | 33.20 | 25.70 | 27.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 24.40 | 23.30 | 23.80 | 19.80 | 18.10 | 15.80 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 17.70 | 23.80 | 18.80 | 16.10 | 14.00 | 12.60 | 1.059 | n.s. |
| Unpleasant | 17.40 | 20.90 | 18.30 | 14.60 | 10.60 | 9.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Insensitive | 29.70 | 36.50 | 24.80 | 29.70 | 22.40 | 12.00 | 2.079 | n.s. |

| Bipolar Characteristic | EU HGD (N=10) | EU LGD (N=10) | NOE HGD (N=10) | NOE LGD (N=10) | EF HGD (N=10) | EF LGD (N=10) | F AXB | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Interviewer Overall-Poor | 13.60 | 15.70 | 14.30 | 18.70 | 15.60 | 9.30 | 2.333 | n.s. |
| Relates to Students Poorly | 21.40 | 26.50 | 18.20 | 20.30 | 12.00 | 13.20 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Made You Ill at Ease | 14.90 | 17.90 | 16.90 | 17.10 | 14.90 | 9.60 | 1.093 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 24.80 | 25.80 | 26.20 | 22.40 | 24.00 | 17.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 22.10 | 31.90 | 19.50 | 28.40 | 24.60 | 16.20 | 2.583 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 20.70 | 23.10 | 27.60 | 23.40 | 21.00 | 15.10 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Lazy | 22.10 | 20.70 | 24.90 | 20.10 | 25.20 | 19.80 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 13.80 | 20.40 | 21.40 | 19.00 | 27.60 | 13.70 | 4.276 | < .02 |
| Traditional | 34.90 | 23.30 | 38.60 | 27.80 | 24.00 | 23.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Rational | 32.60 | 30.30 | 36.90 | 34.70 | 33.40 | 26.20 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Changeable | 19.70 | 23.00 | 29.70 | 28.50 | 20.50 | 17.60 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 19.80 | 18.70 | 20.70 | 20.00 | 25.90 | 15.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 20.00 | 27.00 | 25.40 | 23.70 | 27.50 | 20.40 | 1.465 | n.s. |
| Mean of All Character-istics | 22.10 | 24.80 | 24.26 | 22.69 | 21.19 | 16.14 | 1.649 | n.s. |

[1] EU = negative expectancy; NOE = no expectancy; EF = positive expectancy.

were not met evaluated the stimulus person as "clumsier" when they were also in a low goal dependency situation. Subjects with no expectancy or with fulfilled expectancy evaluated the PSP as "clumsier" in the high goal dependent situation. Again, this one significant finding could be the result of chance factors.

Only in the EF condition do we find that a clear picture emerges. Subjects in the expectancy fulfilled high goal dependency condition rated the PSP more negatively (on almost all characteristics) than subjects in the expectancy fulfilled low goal dependency condition. It is in the EF condition that we find the largest differences between the mean ratings given to the PSP by subjects in the HGD and LGD conditions. It is interesting to point out that for the mean of the 19 evaluative characteristics

the EF group had the most positive rating ($\bar{X}$ = 18.67) while there was no difference between the EU and NOE groups ($\bar{X}$'s = 23.45 and 23.46, respectively; Table 24, p. 123). However, when these conditions are further categorized on the basis of goal dependency it becomes clear that the more positive evaluation of the PSP by subjects in the expectancy fulfilled condition is partly a function of the rating by subjects in the low goal dependency condition ($\bar{X}$ for EF HGD = 21.19; $\bar{X}$ for EF LGD = 16.14).

We had made no predictions about the effects of goal dependency on the evaluation of the PSP in expectancy fulfilled conditions. However, we find that it is only in this condition that a consistent picture emerges such that subjects in high goal dependency expectancy fulfilled interactions evaluated the PSP less positively than subjects in low goal dependency expectancy fulfilled interactions.

Mean ratings given to the NSP by subjects in the EU, NOE, and EF conditions as a function of variations in goal dependency are presented in Table 28. Mean ratings of the NSP as a function of goal dependenc, alone, are presented in Table 8, Appendix C.

As will be recalled, ratings of the PSP were not consistently, nor significantly, different as a function of variations in degree of goal dependency. In ratings of the negative stimulus person, a very consistent pattern does emerge. As will be seen in Table 8, the NSP was evaluated more negatively on all, but one, characteristics by subjects in the low goal dependency situation. The one characteristic on which the LGD subjects evaluated the NSP more positively than HGD subjects was "fairness"; this exception is understandable since in a low

goal dependent situation, the NSP's behavior cannot really be evaluated as lacking fairness because she has no role in the hiring decision and cannot be accused of being biased in her evaluation. The ratings given to the negative stimulus person as a function of the interaction between goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions must be examined in light of this consistent trend that low goal dependent subjects evaluated the NSP more negatively than high goal dependent subjects.

Table 28. -- Mean ratings of NSP on evaluative characteristics as a function of the interaction between goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions[1]

| | EU | | NOE | | EF | | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | HGD | LGD | HGD | LGD | HGD | LGD | AXB | |
| Bipolar Characteristic | (N=10) | (N=10) | (N=10) | (N=10) | (N=10) | (N=10) | | |
| Unsociable | 57.10 | 54.60 | 42.00 | 63.70 | 49.60 | 54.20 | 1.549 | n.s. |
| Impersonal | 65.90 | 68.50 | 73.10 | 72.80 | 66.10 | 66.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 38.20 | 34.30 | 36.40 | 39.80 | 33.80 | 41.60 | 1.026 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 37.40 | 36.30 | 36.70 | 47.10 | 34.50 | 49.30 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unpleasant | 48.70 | 47.80 | 51.30 | 54.60 | 47.50 | 52.60 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Insensitive | 45.80 | 41.30 | 44.20 | 48.80 | 53.70 | 57.50 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Interviewer Overall-Poor | 37.80 | 45.20 | 46.80 | 43.60 | 33.70 | 35.60 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Relates to Students Poorly | 51.60 | 53.20 | 54.20 | 55.80 | 52.10 | 60.00 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Made You Ill at Ease | 58.30 | 54.30 | 48.00 | 60.00 | 57.80 | 60.00 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 17.00 | 27.50 | 27.80 | 27.40 | 24.70 | 34.10 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 23.50 | 29.40 | 31.90 | 33.20 | 22.90 | 30.30 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 26.00 | 25.20 | 44.10 | 33.90 | 35.30 | 30.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Lazy | 23.60 | 33.00 | 35.90 | 37.50 | 21.70 | 22.10 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 15.60 | 22.40 | 24.20 | 25.30 | 15.80 | 13.10 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Traditional | 36.00 | 37.50 | 35.70 | 23.70 | 27.90 | 46.10 | 3.369 | < .05 |
| Rational | 24.80 | 18.30 | 28.70 | 24.60 | 29.10 | 17.60 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Changeable | 17.40 | 21.40 | 22.40 | 34.60 | 15.40 | 19.80 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 11.90 | 25.60 | 21.50 | 22.30 | 18.00 | 20.50 | 1.298 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 16.10 | 23.90 | 27.40 | 21.80 | 17.60 | 22.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Mean of All Characteristics | 34.34 | 36.82 | 38.54 | 40.58 | 34.59 | 38.67 | < 1 | n.s. |

[1] EU = positive expectancy; NOE = no expectancy; EF = negative expectancy.

We had hypothesized that when meeting a negative stimulus person, subjects in high goal dependency unfulfilled expectancy and no expectancy conditions would evaluate the stimulus person more negatively than subjects in low goal dependency expectancy unfulfilled and no expectancy conditions.

The analyses of variance revealed no significant differences for this interaction. The consistent pattern found for differences between HGD and LGD groups, mentioned above, is mirrored, to a lesser extent, under each variation of expectancy fulfillment. In the EU, NOE, and EF groups,Ss with LGD tend to rate the SP more negatively -- on 10 of 19 characteristics in the EU group; on 12 of 19 characteristics in the NOE group; and on 15 of 19 characteristics in the EF group; and for all three groups, the mean evaluative rating of the LGD subjects is somewhat more negative than the mean rating of HGD subjects. Thus, Hypothesis 6B is not supported by our findings. We find little evidence of any interaction between the goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions in affecting the evaluation of the NSP.

It is worthwhile to again point out some differences which seem to be due to the nature of the stimulus person's behavior. Firstly, we noted no consistent differences in subjects' evaluation of the positive stimulus person as a function of goal dependency alone, while we did note that the unfriendly stimulus person was consistently rated more negatively by subjects in the low goal dependency conditions. Secondly, in terms of the interaction between goal dependency and expectancy ful-

fillment we found that when confronted with a positive or friendly stimulus person, if expectancies were fulfilled then the positive stimulus person was evaluated more negatively when she did not control subjects' goal satisfaction. In meeting a megative or unfriendly interviewer all subjects, regardless of expectancy fulfillment condition, tended to evaluate her most negatively when she did not control their goal satisfaction.

It seems, therefore, that the nature of the PSP's behavior was such that expectancy fulfillment variations had a major effect on evaluation. The evaluation of the negative stimulus person, however, seems primarily to be a function of her actual behavior and whether or not she controlled subjects' goal satisfaction.

D. Certainty of Evaluation

1. Variations in Expectancy Fulfillment

Hypotheses 7 and 8 dealt with subjects' certainty of judgment as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment. Specifically, we hypothesized that, regardless of the actual behavior of the stimulus person, subjects with unfulfilled or no expectancy would be less certain about their evaluations than subjects with fulfilled expectancy. Data for these hypotheses were based on subjects' ratings, on a graphic scale, as to the certainty or uncertainty of their evaluative judgment for each of 17 characteristics.[1] Ratings could range from 5 to 85 mm. with higher scores indicating greater uncertainty.

---

[1] Subjects were not asked to rate the certainty of the judgments of "Interviewer overall," "Made You Feel at Ease," and "Relates to Students."

Table 29, below, presents the mean certainty ratings for each characteristic given by subjects in the EU, NOE, and EF conditions. Separate means are presented for each of the 17 characteristics. In addition, we computed the mean rating for all 17 characteristics as an indication of the general certainty or uncertainty of the evaluations. Ratings for each of the 17 characteristics, and for the mean of the 17 characteristics, were analyzed by separate analyses of variance. The F scores and significance levels for the BXC interaction (EU, NOE, and EF) are also presented in Table 29.

Table 29. -- Certainty of judgment as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment

| Bipolar Characteristic | EU (N=40) | NOE (N=40) | EF (N=40) | F BXC | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unsociable | 34.30 | 31.30 | 28.30 | 1.468 | n.s. |
| Impersonal | 22.18 | 22.08 | 22.48 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 29.50 | 30.90 | 27.65 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 33.20 | 29.08 | 23.70 | 4.980 | < .02 |
| Unpleasant | 22.52 | 21.40 | 21.45 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Insensitive | 34.58 | 34.62 | 29.78 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 32.82 | 29.22 | 25.42 | 4.129 | < .05 |
| Dishonest | 38.85 | 37.60 | 27.95 | 2.666 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 32.05 | 30.82 | 30.30 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Lazy | 29.38 | 33.28 | 27.18 | 3.961 | < .05 |
| Clumsy | 25.02 | 29.62 | 21.85 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Traditional | 40.72 | 35.85 | 34.15 | 1.127 | n.s. |
| Rational | 31.20 | 38.15 | 26.70 | 2.113 | n.s. |
| Changeable | 28.08 | 32.60 | 25.75 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 33.15 | 31.00 | 28.40 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 32.05 | 37.88 | 26.38 | 3.598 | < .05 |
| Unimportant | 34.47 | 36.00 | 35.65 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Mean Certainty | 31.31 | 31.70 | 27.38 | 3.663 | < .05 |

The analyses of variance indicated that there was a consistent, and, in some instances, significant effect of variations in expectancy fulfillment on the certainty of subjects' judgments. In terms of overall

uncertainty of judgment we find that the mean certainty ratings for the three groups differed at $p < .05$, with the EU and NOE subjects being more uncertain about their evaluations than subjects in the expectancy fulfilled conditions. Certainty ratings for the characteristics "unfair," "unimportant," "impersonal" and "unpleasant" were virtually the same under all conditions. However, if we examine the ratings for the other 13 specific characteristics we find that in all remaining instances subjects in the EU and NOE conditions are more uncertain than subjects in the EF condition. Subjects whose expectancies were not met and subjects with no prior specific expectancy, as compared to subjects whose expectancies were fulfilled, were significantly more uncertain about their evaluations of the SP's "uncooperativeness" ($p < .02$), "laziness" ($p < .05$), "untrustworthiness" ($p < .05$), and "inconsistency" ($p < .05$).

Therefore, insofar as the average certainty rating for all traits, our hypotheses are supported by the findings. Subjects with unfulfilled expectancies and with no expectancy were significantly less certain about their judgments than subjects whose expectancies were fulfilled. This significant finding of general uncertainty is supported by a consistent, and sometimes statistically significant, direction of differences for specific characteristics.

As in the case for the evaluative ratings, we found significant differences in certainty ratings as a function of the nature of the SP the subjects were evaluating (PSP or NSP). Table 30, below, indicates the means of the certainty ratings given by subjects meeting a friendly

or unfriendly interviewer. We have also indicated the F scores and the significance levels for this factor.

For many of the characteristics, the subjects who evaluated a negative stimulus person were less certain about their judgments. On only one characteristic was there a significant reversal of this finding, i.e., subjects meeting a positive stimulus person were less certain about their rating of her as "impersonal" ($p < .01$). If we look at the evaluative ratings for this characteristic (Table 23, p. 121) we note that subjects meeting a positive SP evaluated her much more positively than subjects meeting a negative SP ($\bar{X}$s = 33.00 and 68.90, respectively).

Table 30. -- Certainty ratings as a function of PSP and NSP conditions

| Bipolar Characteristic | PSP (N=60) | NSP (N=60) | F C Factor | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unsociable | 20.90 | 41.30 | 28.516 | < .01 |
| Impersonal | 26.90 | 17.60 | 10.827 | < .01 |
| Skeptical | 25.80 | 32.90 | 4.725 | < .05 |
| Uncooperative | 23.00 | 34.40 | 12.185 | < .01 |
| Unpleasant | 15.20 | 28.40 | 22.484 | < .01 |
| Insensitive | 29.00 | 37.10 | 4.651 | < .05 |
| Untrustworthy | 29.50 | 28.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 33.70 | 35.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 26.80 | 35.60 | 5.434 | < .02 |
| Lazy | 30.10 | 30.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 34.30 | 26.60 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Traditional | 33.00 | 39.50 | 1.435 | n.s. |
| Rational | 34.60 | 29.40 | 2.113 | n.s. |
| Changeable | 30.10 | 27.60 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 30.30 | 31.10 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 32.80 | 31.30 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unimportant | 36.90 | 33.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Mean Certainty | 28.65 | 31.80 | 3.322 | n.s. |

However, in both instances, the SP (whether positive or negative) was evaluated most negatively on this characteristic as compared to other

characteristics. The behavior of the NSP was definitely impersonal in nature. However, although the PSP attempted to appear personally interested in the subjects, the nature of the situation, i.e., an interviewer meeting many people, may have made the subjects unsure as to whether she was personally interested or not. On all other characteristics where a significant difference was found for certainty ratings, those subjects meeting a negative stimulus person were most uncertain about their judgments and their evaluative ratings of the SP were also more negative.[1]

In light of these differences, and even though we had not made specific predictions about certainty of rating as a function of the interaction between specific stimulus persons and specific expectancies, we again split the 2 x 3 x 2 x 2 analysis of variance into two, 2 x 3 x 2 analyses and tested our hypotheses for the PSP and NSP separately. Tables 31 and 32, below, indicate the certainty ratings given by subjects evaluating a PSP and a NSP as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment.

As can be seen from Table 31 we found only one significant difference in subjects' certainty of evaluating a positive stimulus person as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment. Subjects with unfulfilled expectancies were significantly more uncertain about their evaluation of the PSP's "cooperativeness" than subjects whose expectancies were fulfilled. This one significant finding, among so many

---

[1] In Appendix C, p. 235, we have presented the Pearson Product moment correlation coefficients between certainty ratings and evaluative ratings. These coefficients are high and positive with the exception of the correlation for "impersonal" which is only .0561. These correlations indicate that, in general, more negative evaluative ratings were accompanied by ratings of greater uncertainty.

comparisons, could be due to chance factors. However, this finding is also supported directionally for 11 of the remaining 16 characteristics as well as for the mean certainty rating.

When we compare the certainty ratings of the NOE and EF groups we find that while NOE subjects are more uncertain of their evaluation of 8 of the 17 characteristics, on an overall basis they do not appear to be more uncertain than subjects with fulfilled expectancies. When we

Table 31. -- Certainty of evaluation of the PSP as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment[1]

| Bipolar Characteristic | EU (N=20) | NOE (N=20) | EF (N=20) | F B factor | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unsociable | 26.75 | 17.55 | 18.30 | 1.786 | n.s. |
| Impersonal | 27.70 | 25.20 | 27.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 27.55 | 26.70 | 23.15 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 32.70 | 18.60 | 17.60 | 5.000 | < .02 |
| Unpleasant | 19.85 | 13.35 | 12.40 | 2.618 | n.s. |
| Insensitive | 35.95 | 28.80 | 22.20 | 3.129 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 37.20 | 24.90 | 26.10 | 2.136 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 39.35 | 33.85 | 27.95 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 31.45 | 25.10 | 23.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Lazy | 32.35 | 26.15 | 31.85 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 33.30 | 26.90 | 23.05 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Traditional | 37.35 | 28.95 | 32.55 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Rational | 34.00 | 36.30 | 33.50 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Changeable | 29.75 | 33.60 | 26.85 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 33.50 | 27.10 | 31.10 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 34.55 | 32.20 | 31.80 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unimportant | 33.35 | 37.80 | 39.25 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Mean Certainty | 31.54 | 27.46 | 26.41 | < 1 | n.s. |

[1] EU = negative expectancy; NOE = no expectancy; EF = positive expectancy.

had considered the general hypothesis, i.e., certainty of evaluation without regard to the stimulus person's actual behavior, we found that subjects with no expectancy were similar to subjects whose expectancies

were unfulfilled. However, in considering certainty of evaluation of the PSP, we find that subjects with no expectancy and subjects with fulfilled expectancies are both more certain than subjects whose expectancies are unfulfilled. If we now examine the certainty ratings for evaluation of the NSP we can see that there are differences in the effects of variations in expectancy fulfillment on subjects' certainty as a function of the SP actual behavior.

As indicated in Table 32, below, we found two significant differences between the groups in their certainty of evaluation of the unfriendly interviewer. Subjects with no expectancy and subjects with

Table 32. -- Certainty of evaluation of the NSP as a function of variations in expectancy fulfillment[1]

| Bipolar Characteristic | EU (N=20) | NOE (N=20) | EF (N=20) | F B factor | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unsociable | 41.85 | 45.05 | 38.45 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Impersonal | 16.65 | 18.95 | 17.25 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 31.45 | 35.10 | 32.15 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 33.70 | 39.60 | 29.80 | 1.365 | n.s. |
| Unpleasant | 25.20 | 29.45 | 30.50 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Insensitive | 33.20 | 40.45 | 37.35 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 28.45 | 33.60 | 24.75 | 1.024 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 38.35 | 41.35 | 27.95 | 1.081 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 32.65 | 36.55 | 37.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Lazy | 26.40 | 40.40 | 26.00 | 3.136 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 26.75 | 32.35 | 20.65 | 1.906 | n.s. |
| Traditional | 44.10 | 38.75 | 35.75 | 1.128 | n.s. |
| Rational | 28.40 | 40.00 | 19.90 | 4.828 | < .05 |
| Changeable | 26.40 | 31.60 | 24.65 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 32.80 | 34.90 | 25.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 29.25 | 43.60 | 20.95 | 6.738 | < .01 |
| Unimportant | 35.40 | 34.20 | 32.05 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Mean Certainty | 31.09 | 35.95 | 28.35 | 2.609 | n.s. |

[1] EU = positive expectancy; NOE = no expectancy; EF = negative expectancy.

unfulfilled expectancies were significantly less certain about their ratings of the NSP's "consistency" ($p < .01$) and "rationality" ($p < .05$). These significant differences are supported directionally for most of the remaining characteristics as well as for the mean certainty rating. For 13 of the remaining 15 characteristics with NOE were more uncertain than subjects with fulfilled expectancies; Ss with unfulfilled expectancies were more uncertain than EF subjects on 11 of the remaining 15 characteristics. Subjects whose expectancies were unfulfilled were generally more uncertain than subjects with fulfilled expectancies but less uncertain than subjects with no expectancy.

Thus we find that, if we do not take the stimulus person's actual behavior into account, it appears that uncertainty of evaluation is a function of expectancy fulfillment. When expectancies were not met or when there was no expectancy, subjects tended to be more uncertain about the evaluative judgments they made of the SP than when their expectancies were fulfilled. However, once again we find that subjects' certainty of evaluation is a function both of the interviewer's behavior, alone, and of whether their expectancies regarding the positivity or negativity of her behavior are fulfilled or unfulfilled. All subjects, regardless of expectancy, tended to be more uncertain about their evaluation of an unfriendly, as opposed to a friendly, interviewer. On a more general basis, we found that the more negative the subjects' evaluations, the more uncertain they were about these evaluations.

Considering the interaction between the stimulus person's behavior and whether or not subjects' expectancies were fulfilled, we found

directional support for the notion that when the SP was friendly, unfulfilled expectancies led to most uncertainty. We had also predicted that no expectancy conditions would lead to greater uncertainty than fulfilled expectancy, but this was not found. When the stimulus person was friendly, fulfilled expectancy and no expectancy subjects were more certain about their evaluations than subjects with unfulfilled expectancies.

2. Interaction of Goal Dependency and Variations in Expectancy Fulfillment on Certainty of Evaluative Judgments

We had also hypothesized that there would be an effect on certainty of evaluation due to the interaction of goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions. We had predicted that uncertainty of evaluation in expectancy unfulfilled and no expectancy conditions would be greater under high goal dependency as compared to low goal dependency conditions.

Table 33. -- Certainty ratings as a function of the interaction of goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions

| | EU | | NOE | | EF | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bipolar Characteristic | HGD (N=10) | LGD (N=10) | HGD (N=10) | LGD (N=10) | HGD (N=10) | LGD (N=10) | F AXBXC | p |
| Unsociable | 31.15 | 37.45 | 34.55 | 28.05 | 32.00 | 24.75 | 3.212 | < .05 |
| Impersonal | 22.20 | 22.15 | 21.15 | 23.00 | 19.00 | 20.45 | 1.753 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 31.50 | 27.50 | 30.85 | 30.95 | 24.85 | 30.45 | 1.953 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 32.45 | 33.95 | 32.65 | 26.50 | 26.60 | 20.80 | 1.495 | n.s. |
| Unpleasant | 21.00 | 24.05 | 25.00 | 17.80 | 26.55 | 16.35 | 1.891 | n.s. |
| Insensitive | 34.05 | 35.10 | 32.45 | 36.80 | 33.65 | 25.90 | 1.578 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 34.90 | 30.75 | 30.55 | 27.90 | 26.50 | 24.35 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 38.30 | 39.40 | 43.35 | 31.85 | 33.20 | 22.70 | 1.032 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 29.15 | 29.95 | 32.45 | 29.15 | 37.55 | 24.05 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Lazy | 28.10 | 30.65 | 34.70 | 31.85 | 31.45 | 26.40 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 20.00 | 30.05 | 30.50 | 28.75 | 28.65 | 15.05 | 7.225 | < .01 |
| Traditional | 41.90 | 39.55 | 37.55 | 28.25 | 33.50 | 34.80 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Rational | 31.10 | 31.30 | 44.85 | 31.45 | 28.65 | 24.75 | 3.682 | < .05 |
| Changeable | 21.10 | 35.05 | 33.50 | 31.70 | 27.65 | 23.85 | 2.741 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 33.00 | 33.30 | 30.55 | 31.45 | 31.95 | 24.85 | 1.472 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 34.45 | 29.65 | 40.75 | 35.00 | 28.40 | 24.35 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unimportant | 35.85 | 32.90 | 30.95 | 41.05 | 35.90 | 35.40 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Mean Certainty | 30.74 | 31.58 | 33.26 | 30.16 | 29.78 | 24.98 | 2.799 | n.s. |

Table 10, Appendix C, indicates the certainty ratings of subjects as a function of goal dependency, alone. The data indicate that subjects in high goal dependency conditions are, generally speaking, slightly although not significantly more uncertain about their evaluations than subjects in low goal dependency conditions.

Table 33, above, presents the mean certainty ratings for subjects in expectancy unfulfilled, no expectancy, and expectancy fulfilled conditions as a function of the goal dependent nature of the interaction. The analyses of variance revealed one significant and two close to significant differences due to the interaction of these factors. When subjects' expectancies were fulfilled and when they had no expectancy they tended to be more uncertain about their evaluation of an SP who controlled their goal satisfaction than about an SP who did not control their goal satisfaction ("clumsy": $p < .01$; "unsociable": $p < .05$; "rational": $p < .05$). This finding was supported directionally for most other characteristics and for the mean certainty ratings. Thus, the pattern created by the goal dependency factor, alone, i.e., slightly more uncertainty under high goal dependency as compared to low goal dependency, is not substantially altered as a function of expectancy fulfillment or no expectancy. For subjects whose expectancies are unfulfilled there is no consistent effect on certainty ratings as a function of the interaction between goal dependency and unfulfilled expectancy. In some instances LGD subjects are more uncertain about their evaluation; in other instances HGD subjects were more uncertain.

Thus, our hypotheses that uncertainty in the expectancy unfulfilled and no expectancy groups would be greater under high goal dependency, as compared to low goal dependency, conditions was not supported by our findings. When subjects expectancies are not met, this factor alone tends to create uncertainty which is not affected by the goal dependent nature of the situation. When subjects' expectancies are fulfilled or when they have no expectancy, it is only the goal dependency factor which has a slight effect on uncertainty, although this is based on directionality and not on statistically significant differences.

Now, let us examine the interaction of these two factors for the PSP and NSP conditions, separately. Table 11, Appendix C, presents the mean certainty ratings given by subjects meeting a positive stimulus person under high goal dependent and low goal dependent conditions. There were no significant differences between mean certainty ratings of subjects meeting a friendly interviewer as a function of this factor alone and no consistent directional differences appear either.

Table 34, below, presents the mean certainty ratings for subjects meeting a positive stimulus person as a function of the interaction between goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions. This interaction is significant for only one characteristic and, therefore, could be due to chance factors. In general, little is found to support our hypotheses. The most consistent pattern of findings is in the no expectancy condition and indicates that subjects interacting with a friendly interviewer who did not control their goal satis-

faction tended to be more uncertain about their evaluations than subjects who interacted with a friendly interviewer who did control goal satisfaction -- a directional result in opposition to our hypothesis. In the unfulfilled expectancy situation, goal dependency seems to have little effect on uncertainty.

When the stimulus person was friendly, subjects with no prior expectancy were equally certain about their evaluations as subjects whose expectancies were fulfilled (Table 31, p. 141). However, when the factor of goal dependence is introduced we see that, in terms of directional differences, it is the HGD NOE subjects who are similar in certainty to the expectancy fulfilled subjects, while the LGD NOE subjects are as uncertain as subjects whose expectancies are not met.

Table 34. -- Certainty ratings for PSP as a function of the interaction of goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions[1]

| | EU | | NOE | | EF | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bipolar Characteristic | HGD (N=10) | LGD (N=10) | HGD (N=10) | LGD (N=10) | HGD (N=10) | LGD (N=10) | F AXB | p |
| Unsociable | 27.60 | 25.90 | 11.80 | 23.30 | 18.40 | 18.20 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Impersonal | 28.90 | 26.50 | 18.70 | 31.70 | 21.30 | 34.10 | 1.412 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 29.50 | 25.60 | 21.70 | 31.70 | 21.40 | 24.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 31.10 | 34.30 | 17.10 | 20.10 | 20.60 | 14.60 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unpleasant | 15.80 | 23.90 | 14.00 | 12.70 | 14.30 | 10.50 | 1.567 | n.s. |
| Insensitive | 34.10 | 37.80 | 20.20 | 37.40 | 26.50 | 17.90 | 2.754 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 41.80 | 32.60 | 23.80 | 26.00 | 25.50 | 26.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 41.60 | 37.10 | 35.10 | 32.60 | 29.30 | 26.60 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 29.80 | 33.10 | 22.10 | 28.10 | 28.50 | 19.30 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Lazy | 31.40 | 33.30 | 24.40 | 27.90 | 33.00 | 30.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 17.80 | 28.80 | 26.60 | 27.20 | 30.60 | 15.50 | 4.941 | < .05 |
| Traditional | 45.20 | 29.50 | 31.30 | 26.60 | 29.90 | 35.20 | 1.483 | n.s. |
| Rational | 36.00 | 32.00 | 33.80 | 38.80 | 35.00 | 32.00 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Changeable | 22.00 | 37.50 | 31.50 | 35.70 | 29.50 | 24.20 | 1.531 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 34.30 | 32.70 | 22.30 | 31.90 | 37.70 | 24.50 | 1.840 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 35.50 | 33.60 | 33.50 | 30.80 | 32.40 | 31.20 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unimportant | 32.70 | 34.00 | 27.40 | 48.20 | 35.60 | 42.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Mean Certainty | 31.42 | 30.16 | 24.88 | 30.05 | 27.58 | 25.24 | < 1 | n.s. |

[1] EU = negative expectancy; NOE = no expectancy; EF = positive expectancy.

Table 12, Appendix C, presents the mean certainty ratings given by subjects meeting a negative stimulus person under high goal dependency and low goal dependency conditions. Contrary to the PSP condition, here we find a definite, and sometimes significant, effect due to the goal dependent nature of the interaction. Subjects in the high goal dependency conditions were clearly more uncertain about their evaluations of the NSP than were subjects in the low goal dependency conditions. It should be noted that in terms of evaluative ratings, subjects in the low goal dependency situations evaluated the NSP more negatively than subjects in the high goal dependency situations (Appendix C, Table 8).

Table 35. -- Certainty ratings for NSP as a function of the interaction of goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions

| | EU | | NOE | | EF | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bipolar Characteristic | HGD (N=10) | LGD (N=10) | HGD (N=10) | LGD (N=10) | HGD (N=10) | LGD (N=10) | F AXB | p |
| Unsociable | 34.70 | 49.00 | 57.30 | 32.80 | 45.60 | 31.30 | 2.928 | n.s. |
| Impersonal | 15.50 | 17.80 | 23.60 | 14.30 | 16.70 | 17.80 | 1.029 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 33.50 | 29.40 | 40.00 | 30.20 | 28.30 | 36.00 | 1.288 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 33.80 | 33.60 | 48.20 | 30.90 | 32.60 | 27.00 | 1.083 | n.s. |
| Unpleasant | 26.20 | 24.20 | 36.00 | 22.90 | 38.80 | 22.20 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Insensitive | 34.00 | 32.40 | 44.70 | 36.20 | 40.80 | 33.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 28.00 | 28.90 | 37.30 | 29.80 | 27.50 | 22.00 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 35.00 | 41.70 | 51.60 | 31.10 | 37.10 | 18.80 | 2.091 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 38.50 | 26.80 | 42.80 | 30.30 | 46.60 | 28.80 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Lazy | 24.80 | 28.00 | 45.00 | 35.80 | 29.90 | 22.10 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 22.20 | 31.30 | 34.40 | 30.30 | 26.70 | 14.60 | 1.595 | n.s. |
| Traditional | 38.60 | 49.60 | 43.80 | 33.70 | 37.10 | 34.40 | 1.074 | n.s. |
| Rational | 26.20 | 30.60 | 55.90 | 24.10 | 22.30 | 17.50 | 4.198 | < .05 |
| Changeable | 20.20 | 32.60 | 35.50 | 27.70 | 25.80 | 23.50 | 1.869 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 31.70 | 33.90 | 38.80 | 31.00 | 26.20 | 25.20 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 33.40 | 25.70 | 48.00 | 39.20 | 24.40 | 17.50 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unimportant | 39.00 | 31.80 | 34.50 | 33.90 | 36.20 | 27.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Mean Certainty | 30.07 | 33.00 | 41.65 | 30.25 | 31.98 | 24.73 | 2.085 | n.s. |

[1] EU = positive expectancy; NOE = no expectancy; EF = negative expectancy.

The effects of the interaction between the goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions must be examined in light of the above differences between certainty ratings in the high goal dependency and low goal dependency conditions. Table 35, above, presents the mean certainty ratings given by subjects evaluating the negative stimulus person as a function of the interaction between goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions. This interaction was significant for only one characteristic. Subjects in the no expectancy and expectancy fulfilled conditions were more uncertain about their evaluation of the NSP's "rationality" when she controlled a goal than when she did not control a goal. In the EU condition a reversal occurred: subjects were more uncertain under LGD conditions. The finding for the NOE and EF groups is supported directionally on most remaining characteristics (for all 16 of the remaining characteristics in the NOE group; for 14 of 16 characteristics in the EF group). NOE and EF subjects tend to be more uncertain about their evaluation when the negative stimulus person controls their goal satisfaction. In light of the finding that the HGD nature of the situation, alone, produces greater uncertainty, the NOE or EF nature of the situation seems to contribute little to this uncertainty. That is, when the stimulus person is negative, the uncertainty created by the goal dependent nature of the situation, alone, is not further intensified or altered by fulfillment of expectancy or by lack of prior expectancy.

In summary, then, uncertainty of evaluation appears to be a function of: 1) variations in expectancy fulfillment; 2) the behavior

of the stimulus person; and 3) the interaction between goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment conditions. On a general basis, unfulfilled expectancy led to most uncertainty. Lack of prior expectancy led to uncertainty only when the stimulus person was negative. Fulfillment of expectancy led to greatest certainty. Individuals, regardless of expectancies, were less certain about their evaluation of an unfriendly, as compared to a friendly, interviewer. The goal dependency factor, itself, affected only the certainty of evaluating the negative stimulus person. Subjects evaluating a negative, or unfriendly, interviewer were more uncertain when the situation was highly goal dependent in nature. And, finally, the interaction of the goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment variations was such that when the stimulus person was friendly subjects with no expectancy tended to be more uncertain in the low goal dependency situation while there was little indication of an interaction between goal dependency and unfulfillment of expectancy. When the stimulus person was unfriendly, there was little indication of any interaction between goal dependency and expectancy fulfilled or no expectancy conditions.

## Chapter IV

## Discussion

Our major hypotheses for the extent of impression forming behavior were that, in a first meeting context, perceivers whose expectancies were unfulfilled and perceivers with no prior expectancies about a stimulus person would exhibit a greater degree of impression forming behavior than perceivers whose expectancies about the stimulus person were fulfilled. In our formulation, it was also assumed that a greater extent of impression forming behavior would be shown by the utilization of a large number of attributes and by a high percentage of personality characteristics in written impressions about the other.

The hypotheses concerning the extent of impression forming behavior were not supported by the obtained data. We found little, if any, evidence that variations in expectancy fulfillment resulted in varying degrees of differentiation or in the use of different types of characteristics. The only supporting evidence for our hypotheses was the directional but statistically insignificant finding that perceivers with no specific prior expectancies and with unfulfilled expectancies used a slightly larger percentage of personaliyt characteristics as compared to perceivers whose expectancies were fulfilled. Yet, we did find some statistical support for our hypotheses based on

two supplementary measures of impression forming behavior -- "time of impression formation" and the "constancy" of the impression. We found, as predicted, that subjects with unfulfilled expectancies and subjects with no prior expectancies were significantly more likely to report a change in their impressions than subjects with fulfilled expectancies. Furthermore, when the stimulus person was perceived as behaving positively, the predicted relationship between variations in expectancy fulfillment and extent of impression forming behavior as measured by our "time" and "constancy" measures received strong support. When the stimulus person was negative, however, variations in expectancy fulfillment had little effect on the extent of impression forming behavior.

Thus, there are indications that some relationship exists between variations in expectancy fulfillment and the extent of impression forming behavior but that our measures of "differentiation" and "type of attribute" did not reflect this relationship. In addition, we have strong indications that the positive and/or negative nature of the behavior of the stimulus person played a significant role in determining the extent of impression forming behavior. Finally, we found no relationship between degree of goal dependency and the extent of impression forming behavior. We will consider each of these points in the first section of our discussion.

Our finding that the "time" and "constancy" measures were related to variations in expectancy fulfillment while our "differentiation" and "type of attribute" measures were not, necessitates, first,

an examination of the latter measures. There were definite limitations in our measurement of differentiation and type of attribute. Attribute counting and categorization were based on a content analysis of our subjects' impressions by two judges. Reliability among our judges was fairly high. Yet, there are obvious limitations in this method. For instance, we were interested in the number of "discrete" or "different" attributes Ss' utilized. A characteristic was not counted if it seemed to be redundant in meaning with another characteristic. However, since the perceivers did not make such a judgment themselves, it is possible that the high agreement between our judges does not reflect the perceiver's intended meaning, i.e., a given perceiver may have intended two attributes as "different" while our judges may have evaluated them as redundant. Similarly, judges' categorization of attributes as "internal" vs. "external" traits might not reflect Ss' intended meanings. Investigators (e.g., Koltuv, 1962) have reported that while there is some general agreement among perceivers as to the meaning and relationship between characteristics, there are also strong individual differences.

While other procedures undoubtedly can be used to refine the measurement of "differentiation" and "type of attribute," at least two important questions remain concerning the effects of situational variables or motivational states on the extent of impression forming behavior as measured by these variables: are these dimensions related more to the characteristics of the perceiver than to situational factors? and, are these the relevant dimensions for ascertaining the effects of

situational variables on the extent of impression forming behavior?

Past research has demonstrated that these dimensions are related to perceiver variables. Thus, we have evidence that perceivers differ in the degree of differentiation of their impression of people they know: some people are cognitively "simple" while others are cognitively "complex" (Crockett, 1965); cognitively simple persons are more concerned with peoples' performance on surface dimensions while those high in complexity appear to search for information bearing on the inner substance of people (Leventhal and Singer, 1964); males use more descriptive terms while females use more personality oriented characteristics (Sarbin, 1952); females use a greater number of characteristics to describe others than males (Supnick, 1964). Most of this evidence, then, points to "degree of differentiation" and "type of attribute" as characteristics of the basic cognitive structure of the individual. Indeed, our study would tend to provide some indirect support for this notion since, for both measures, we found extreme variability within conditions and we also found an extremely high correlation, both across and within conditions, such that subjects who had more differentiated impressions also used a larger percent of personality characteristics in their impressions. The perceiver's basic cognitive structure, then, may be a major factor affecting the number and type of attributes used in the impression and these dimensions may be insensitive to or unaffected by situational conditions or transitory motivational states. Cognitive complexity is ascertained by having perceivers describe people they <u>know</u>. If situational factors are

relatively impotent in altering the differentiation of the perceiver's impression we should find a relationship between cognitive complexity, as normally measured, and the perceiver's degree of differentiation in an impression of a new individual he has just met or heard about. Leventhal and Singer (1964) found such a relationship. Judges who formed more differentiated impressions of individuals they know (i.e., complex judges) also formed the most differentiated impressions of an individual about whom they had just received information.

It is also possible that situational factors or transitory motivational states may affect these dimensions, but only in relation to the individual's basic cognitive make-up. Since the "complex" perceiver generally forms highly differentiated impressions, we may speculate that the arousal of the need for predictability may not significantly alter the extent of this differentiation. His general approach is a complex one and there may be a limit to the extent to which an impression can be differentiated. The average number of attributes reported is generally between 5 and 7. On the other hand, the arousal of the need for predictability in the "simple" perceiver may motivate him to form a more differentiated impression than he normally would. At least one focus of future research, then, should be the study of the relationship between cognitive complexity and situational or motivational variables in affecting the degree of differentiation and the type of attribute used in the first impression situation.

Are there dimensions for describing the cognitive structure that may be more sensitive to the effects of situational variables and less related to perceiver variables? Zajonc's (1960) concepts of the organization and unity of impressions may be such dimensions. S records all of the characteristics he can think of that are included in his impression of the SP and then places these characteristics into natural groupings. He is then asked to examine, two at a time, constructs which he has placed in the same grouping and to decide whether, if one of the attributes were changed, modified, or untrue of the SP, the other attribute would also change or be untrue of the person. The unity of the impression is then defined as the ratio of the actual number of such dependencies to the number of possible dependencies. The organization of the impression is defined to be the extent to which one construct dominates the others in these dependencies. One significant advantage to these measures is that they are unaffected by the number of attributes an individual uses in his impression. Impressions differing widely in differentiation can be unified or organized to the same extent. Evidence is also available that unity and organization are not correlated with degree of differentiation. Leventhal (1962), who found that "organization" was related to tuning sets while degree of differentiation was not, also found no correlation between differentiation and organization or between differentiation and unity. In addition, while Leventhal and Singer (1964) found that judges differed in degree of differentiation in a first impression situation as a function of their cognitive complexity, they found no relationship

between unity and complexity. It appears, then, that unity and organization, rather than differentiation and type of attribute may be more fruitful dimensions for ascertaining the differential effects of situational factors on the extent of impression forming behavior in the first meeting context. In relation to the need for predictability, we would expect that when the need for predictability is high perceivers would form highly unified and organized impressions while at lower levels or arousal impressions would be less unified and organized.

Our finding of a differential response to the negative and positive stimulus persons, which was revealed by our supplementary measures of time of impression formation and constancy of the impressions, provides a second major point for discussion. At the outset, it should be noted that rapidity of impression formation and stability of the impression were the general rule. Sixty-eight percent of all subjects reported forming an impression early in the interview and eighty-four percent reported that their impression did not change as the interview progressed. This finding confirms many common sense notions about the nature of first impressions -- they are formed rapidly, on the basis of a few cues, and are relatively resistant to change-at least in the beginning. However, despite this finding of overall rapidity and stability of first impression formation, we do have indications that "change" and "extended time of impression formation" were related to the specific situational factors studied here and to stimulus person factors which we had not previously considered.

Time of impression formation was not significantly related to variations in expectancy fulfillment and, hence, this measure provides no support for our general thesis. There was, however, a significant relationship between time of impression formation and the negative or positive nature of the stimulus person's behavior. Subjects who interacted with a friendly interviewer tended to form their impression toward the middle or end of the interview while subjects meeting an unfriendly interviewer formed their impressions at the beginning of the interview. And, when the interviewer was friendly, there was some indication that variations in expectancy fulfillment were related to time of impression formation. When meeting a friendly interviewer, subjects with unfulfilled expectancies showed a strong tendency to form their impressions later than subjects with fulfilled expectancies. A relationship between variations in expectancy fulfillment and time of impression formation was not found in the negative stimulus person condition.

The tendency to form impressions of a negative SP earlier than when meeting a friendly SP, is given further support if we examine the number of attributes and the percent of personality characteristics Ss used in their descriptions. While the analyses of variance for these two measures indicated that the differences were not statistically significant, the data indicates that there is a directional tendency for subjects meeting a NSP to use <u>fewer</u> attributes and a <u>lower percentage</u> of personality characteristics in their impressions. The mean number of attributes for subjects meeting a negative SP was 6.8 and 7.7 for a positive SP, and the mean percent of personality characteristics was

53.0 and 57.0 for the two types of SP, respectively. A median test, relating the number of attributes utilized by Ss to the positive or negative nature of the interviewer revealed that subjects meeting a NSP were more likely to utilize a number of attributes below the median while Ss meeting a PSP were more likely to use a number of attributes above the median ($\chi^2 = 3.593$; df = 1; $< = .061$). Thus, we feel we have some support for the notion that the behavior of the NSP elicited an immediate reaction which, in this instance, was a simple and superficial impression of the interviewer.

One interpretation of the differential response to the negative and positive stimulus persons is that the immediate categorization of the NSP occurred because his behavior was more conspicuous than that of the PSP. That is, negative behavior is figural, clear, and unambiguous because it is threatening and "emergency provoking," whereas positive behavior is more ambiguous and less clear cut because it is safe and reassuring. The information given by negative behavior is immediate and compelling and, hence, the impression is formed immediately. From this point of view one can deal exclusively with stimulus properties and need not be concerned with differential degrees of need arousal as an explanatory concept for the immediate categorization of the unfriendly interviewer as compared to the slower categorization of the positive or friendly interviewer.

In terms of the present study, we have data which would appear to refute such an explanation. If the rapid categorization of the NSP's behavior occurred because her behavior was more figural, more clear cut,

and less ambiguous, then we would expect that there should be more homogeneity among Ss' ratings of the NSP as compared to the PSP; and, Ss interacting with the NSP should have been more certain about their evaluations than Ss interacting with a PSP. In terms of mean certainty scores, there was no significant difference between PSP and NSP conditions ($\bar{X}s$ = 28.65 and 31.80, respectively) indicating that, on an overall basis, neither our negative nor our positive interviewer created more or less ambiguity. And, for the six characteristics where we did find significant differences in certainty ratings as a function of the SP's behavior, those Ss meeting a NSP were more uncertain about their evaluation. Furthermore, an F test comparing the variance of mean ratings for Ss meeting a PSP and a NSP indicated that there was much greater variability among ratings of the NSP ($F = 2.041$, $p < .01$). In terms of the particular situations studied, then, we find no evidence that negative behavior was more figural and less ambiguous than positive behavior.

An interpretation based solely on the conspicuousness of the stimulus person's behavior would seem to valid in numerous situations but mainly in situations where the behavior of the other individual has little consequence for one's own behavior. When we have no reason to respond appropriately, when we can choose between continuing or terminating a relationship, when we are objectively evaluating someone with whom we have no relationship, then it seems reasonable that the nature of stimulus properties, per se, are an important element in determining the differentiation of an impression. However,

when the behavior of an individual has consequence for one's own behavior, when we have no choice but to continue the interaction, and if we are interested in responding appropriately, then it would seem that it is not the behavior, per se, but rather the effect of such behavior on our motivational state which determines the extent of impression forming behavior. The indication of an immediate categorization of the negative stimulus person may indicate that the arousal of the need for predictability and the extent of impression forming behavior are related to the behavior of the SP in addition to the nature of the situation in which such behavior is encountered.

If we evaluate the behavior of the NSP in our interview situation, we can see that it is threatening to the subject. The perceiver may interpret the negativity of the SP's behavior as indicative of his loss of goal. Thus, this threatening aspect of the SP's behavior may arouse a very intense need for predictability. It is possible that the very intense need for predictability created by the negative behavior requires an immediate impression so as to allay anxiety and give the perceiver some notion of how to contend with the behavior and its possible consequences. The primary concern of the perceiver is to act and he has no time for extended thought. Thus, the intense need for predictability results in an immediate categorization of the SP -- a simple, rapid categorization of the SP as negative. The positive or friendly interviewer, on the other hand, poses no threat to the subject. Thus, the need to predict is not aroused to any great extent by the interviewer's behavior and the perceiver can take his time and mull over his impression.

If these speculations about the relationship between stimulus properties and the arousal of the need for predictability are valid, it is clear that our original assumption regarding the relationship between the intensity of the need for predictability and the extent of impression forming behavior has to be altered. It is apparent from the above data that the great intensity of the need for predictability we have hypothesized as being created by the NSP's behavior did not, in terms of our measures, lead to what we have defined as a greater extent of impression forming behavior.

In fact, it produced a low degree of impression forming behavior -- a simple, superficial and immediate picture of the SP. Thus, it would appear that the relation between the need for predictability and the extent of impression forming behavior is not a simple, increasing monotonic relationship. There seem to be conditions which can create so intense a need for predictability that it may actually result in minimal impression forming behavior. We may speculate, then, that the relationship between the need for predictability and the extent of impression forming behavior may be curvilinear. When the need for predictability is either minimal or maximal, the result would be minimal impression forming behavior while at the more intermediate levels of the need for predictability the largest degree of impression forming behavior would take place. Such a relationship is not unusual in dealing with motivational constructs. Hebb (1955) postulated a similar relationship between the arousal level of an emotion and the perceptual responsiveness of an organism. The organism's optimal level of response

and learning occurs when the emotional arousal is at an intermediate level.

Our final measure of extent of impression forming behavior was the subject's perception of the stability of his impression. Although there is a discrepancy between our theoretical definitions of "constancy" and "change" and our operational measurement of these factors, the strongest indications are that Ss' defined change and constancy as reflecting a shift in the evaluative direction of the behavior. This may be the reason for the low number of "change" responses. It appears that Ss reported "change" only when they perceived a shift in behavior from "positive" to "negative" or vice versa. This would appear to be a very stringent test of our hypotheses. If such a large distortion of perception occurred due to our experimental manipulations, we could infer that with a more subtle and sensitive measure of change we might find stronger evidence for our theoretical notions. Based on our present data we have evidence that we were tapping an important aspect of the impression formation process and we also find a consistency between these findings and the earlier findings relating to time of impression formation.

As predicted, the stability of Ss' impressions was significantly related to variations in expectancy fulfillment. Ss with unfulfilled expectancy and Ss with no prior expectancy were significantly more likely to report a change in their impression as compared to Ss whose expectancies were fulfilled. This finding provides strong support for our general thesis that extent of impression forming behavior is related to

variations in expectancy fulfillment. One can argue that this finding is merely a behavioral measurement of our experimental manipulation of expectancy. Were subjects simply reporting a discrepancy between what they were told and what they perceived? We think not -- for several reasons. Unfulfillment of expectancy occurred immediately, yet the question specifically emphasized "as the interview progressed." Ss were not asked to relate their expectancy to their perception. Furthermore, the behavior of the SP remained constant throughout the interview and therefore subjects reported a change in impression which was not accompanied by a concommitant change in the interviewer's behavior. Finally, subjects in the no expectancy group were given no specific prior expectancy in regard to the SP's behavior. Yet, a larger number of these Ss as compared to Ss with fulfilled expectancies reported a change in their impressions. Thus, the perception of change, from our view, reflects the active cognitive process of impression formation which was aroused by an intensified need for predictability in the unfulfilled and no expectancy conditions. We strongly feel that in future research the measurement of "change" and "constancy" of impressions should be pursued as an indicator of the extent of impression forming behavior although it is clear that more specific questions dealing with the amount and type of change should be employed.

Even though we did find a general effect of variations in expectancy fulfillment on the "constancy" of the impressions, this effect draws heavily from those subjects meeting a friendly interviewer. Thus, we again see a differential response under positive and negative

stimulus person conditions. Variations in expectancy fulfillment had a significant effect when the interviewer was friendly but not when she was aloof. Of the 120 Ss in the study, 27 reported a change in impression. Approximately one-third of these were subjects meeting a friendly interviewer when they expected an unfriendly interviewer. Furthermore, this is consistent with the finding that of the 39 Ss who reported forming their impression later in the interview, one-third were also subjects meeting a friendly interviewer when they expected an unfriendly interviewer. Thus, the combination of a friendly stimulus person under conditions where her behavior did not fulfill the subject's expectancies, seems to have created the maximum amount of impression forming behavior. It appears, again, that the non-threatening nature of the PSP condition allows variations in the need for predictability to be raised by variations in expectancy fulfillment while in the NSP condition, the behavior of the stimulus person creates such an intensity of the need for predictability that minimal impression forming behavior occurs and that the additional intensity created by variations in expectancy fulfillment have no further effect.

Our theoretical basis for predicting a relationship between degree of goal dependency and extent of impression forming behavior was based on the assumption that P has to be interested in or motivated to make appropriate responses to the SP in order for P's need for predictability to be aroused. In manipulating the extent of the SP's decision making power, we assumed that when such power was maximal, his behavior would be more relevant to the P and, therefore, the latter's

need to predict SP's behavior and, consequently, the extent of impression forming behavior, would be greater than in a situation where such power was minimal. None of these hypotheses were supported by our findings. While Ss in our study clearly understood their relationship to the SP, the amount of decision making power she had did not affect the degree of impression forming behavior. The reason for this lack of effect would seem to lie in the relationship between the perceiver's initial motivational level and his defined relationship to the SP.

Our subjects were applying for a job and we can assume that they all entered the interview highly motivated to be accepted for this job. We did not manipulate the perceiver's motivational level. It may well be, however, that it is the perceiver's motivational level as well as, if not rather than, the power of the SP that must be taken into account. A highly motivated perceiver should experience high dependency on any individual related to his achieving his goal. If the perceiver is highly motivated to obtain a goal, any person who stands between him and the goal can be considered a "gatekeeper" whose behavior must be closely observed and responded to appropriately. If this is true, then the extent of the arousal of the need to predict and, therefore, the degree of impression forming behavior would be greater or smaller depending on the perceiver's initial motivation for being in the interview situation. Thus, if we investigated a situation in which the SP's power were held constant but P's motivation to obtain a goal was varied, we might find differential degrees of impression forming behavior. It is also possible

that at more moderate levels of initial motivation the degree of power of the SP in satisfying P's needs may determine the level of arousal of the need for predictability.

The theoretical basis for predicting a differential evaluation of the SP due to variations in expectancy fulfillment rested on the notion that like or dislike should be related to the perceiver's ability to predict and act appropriately in the interaction. Conditions interfering with such prediction and action should create negative affect while conditions facilitating prediction and action should not create negative affect. In support of this notion was research by Gergen and Jones (1963) which indicated that the evaluation of an SP was directly related to the extent to which his behavior was predictable. The variations in expectancy fulfillment, in the present experiment, were specifically intended to create inhibition or facilitation of prediction and appropriate behavior and, therefore, to create differential evaluations of the SP. While variations in expectancy fulfillment did create the predicted effects under the PSP conditions, it is clear that variations in expectancy fulfillment had little effect on Ss' evaluations of the NSP. Thus, the differential response in the nature and extent of impression forming behavior for the positive and negative stimulus persons revealed earlier in this discussion, are also apparent in the perceiver's evaluations of the stimulus person's behavior.

Considering the threatening nature of the NSP's behavior, it is conceivable that while prior information may have made his behavior

more predictable, it did not enhance the perceiver's ability to behave appropriately in the interaction. Yet, the possibility of behaving appropriately and, hence, obtaining the goal, may play a decisive role in determining the perceiver's attitudes (Janis and Feshback, 1953).

Thus, the negative and aloof manner of the interviewer may have made the perceiver feel that there was no behavior that would be appropriate, i.e., that would facilitate goal attainment. Prior accurate knowledge about the perceiver's negativity could not make it any easier to behave appropriately while incorrect information, on the other hand, probably could not make appropriate behavior any more difficult than it was in light of the interviewer's behavior and attitude. In the face of a severely negative and threatening interviewer, the impending loss of goal may have seemed so certain that all behavior would seem inappropriate and attitudes about the interviewer were primarily a function of her actual behavior and its probable consequences.

Thus, it appears that in order to determine the effects of the need for predictability on the <u>direction</u> of impression forming behavior in a goal achievement interaction, one must take into account the extent to which the components of the situation interfere with or facilitate not only the perceiver's ability to predict but also his ability to behave appropriately, based on these predictions, in order to obtain the goal. The perceiver must also feel that there is more appropriate behavior which will facilitate goal achievement.

In our study, apparently, the negativity of the SP made attainment of the goal through appropriate behavior an improbability. Under

PSP conditions, however, the interviewer's behavior was not threatening, in and of itself. Her behavior, alone, did not signal a probable loss of goal, and therefore a realistic set of appropriate behaviors could be determined. The only factor which interfered with prediction and with the possibility of acting appropriately was the extent and nature of prior expectancy. Under these circumstances we did find the predicted effects of variations in expectancy fulfillment on the evaluation of the PSP.

Under PSP conditions, the evaluations which were most affected by the unfulfilled expectancy were judgments of those behaviors which were most relevant to what subjects were told to expect from the SP in the interview situation: "sociability," "pleasantness," "sensitivity," and the interviewer's "relationship to students." One might conclude, then, that these findings only reflect a simple bias which subjects brought with them into the interview situation as a result of expectancy instructions. In Kelly's study (1950), for example, when subjects expected the SP to be cold and unfriendly, his positive behavior was perceived as less positive due to subjects' preconceptions. However, in the present study, for the traits noted above and others, it was also found that ratings made by Ss in the no-expectancy conditions were also more negative than those of subjects with fulfilled expectancies. This suggests that while the resulting more negative evaluations when expectancies are not met may in part be due to the established negative expectancy of these Ss, it is also in part the result of an interference with the Ss ability to predict and act appropriately

in both the unfulfilled and no expectancy situations.

The predicted relationship between variations in goal dependency and expectancy fulfillment in affecting the evaluations of the stimulus person were not found. But, again, clear differences were found in the effects of goal dependency on the evaluations of the friendly and unfriendly interviewer. We postulated earlier in this discussion (p. 168) that since there was no possibility of behaving appropriately in the interaction, the evaluation of the negative interviewer was primarily a function of her actual behavior and its probable consequences. The probable consequences of the NSP's behavior are directly related to her decision making power and we have clear indications that the evaluations of the NSP were strongly affected by the extent of such power.

Degree of goal dependency, alone, had no effect on evaluation of the PSP, whereas the NSP was consistently rated more positively when she had the greatest amount of decision making power. These findings would seem best explained by Pepitone's concept of facilitative distortion (1950). Pepitone stated that facilitative distortion, i.e., a perceptual organization which is beneficial or facilitative with respect to the subject's goal achievement, was a function of the level of motivation and the degree to which the stimulus offers restraint against reaching the goal. Thus, when level of motivation is not varied, as in our study, facilitative distortion will be a direct function of the degree of stimulus restraint.

When the interviewer behaves negatively, of course, there is a high degree of stimulus restraint against P reaching the goal. However, even under these conditions, whether or not the interviewer has decision making power is significant to the perceiver -- the more power she has, the more indicative her behavior is of loss of goal. Thus, when the interviewer's power is great, one would expect greater facilitative distortion to occur and this is exactly what we found. The negative interviewer was evaluated more positively when she had most control over the goal, that is, when goal dependency was high. If evaluated in terms of facilitative distortion, our data also answers a question posited by Pepitone in his study. The absolute level of stimulus restraint in Pepitone's study was not inordinately severe. His Ss met three SP's at a time and even in the most restraining conditions, there was one stimulus person who was warm and friendly. Pepitone suggests that more severely restraining conditions might produce a "hypochondriasis effect" in which the distortion might assume a negative direction. Our high goal dependency-negative stimulus person condition was much more severe than Pepitone's severest condition and yet we still find facilitative distortion.

Evaluation of a stimulus person, in a goal achievement situation appears to be a complex function of a variety of factors all of which are closely related to the nature of the stimulus person's actual behavior. When such behavior provides minimal restraint against goal achievement, i.e., when there is a realistic possibility of obtaining the goal by behaving appropriately, interference with or

facilitation of the perceiver's ability to predict will affect the evaluations of the stimulus person. Under such a condition of minimal stimulus restraint, the extent of the SP's decision making power creates little or no distortion in evaluation. When the stimulus person's behavior provides severe restraint against goal achievement, i.e., when there is no realistic possibility of behaving appropriately in order to obtain the goal, interference with or facilitation of the perceiver's ability to predict will not affect evaluation of the SP. Under such conditions of severe stimulus restraint, distortions in perception in a direction facilitating goal achievement are related to the extent of the SP's decision making power.

Our final set of hypotheses dealt with the perceiver's feelings of certainty in relation to the evaluations he made about the stimulus person. In evaluating the findings related to these hypotheses, it appears that the certainty ratings were utilized differently by subjects in the various experimental conditions. As predicted, greater uncertainty occurred when there was an obvious contradiction between the stimulus person's behavior and the perceiver's expectation, than when the stimulus person's behavior confirmed such expectations. The uncertainty of perceivers with unfulfilled expectancies appears to reflect only the actual deviation between expectancy and occurrence, since it was unaffected by either the nature of the SP's actual behavior (positive-negative) or by the extent of her decision making power. Thus, it seems that the perceiver is unwilling to trust his own evaluation when contradictory information has been offered from a reputable source.

Our prediction that subjects with no prior expectancy would be more uncertain than subjects with fulfilled expectancies was not supported when the stimulus person was friendly. Both groups of subjects expressed the same degree of certainty in their ratings. Certainty was expected from our expectancy fulfilled subjects because they were told that the interviewer was friendly and their interaction substantiated this expectancy. What factors, then, could create certainty for subjects with no prior information about the personal characteristics of the interviewer? According to our data, such certainty stems from her role in the decision making process. Subjects with no prior expectancy are more certain about their evaluation of the friendly interviewer when she has a large degree of decision making power. These subjects, having no prior information about the friendliness of the interviewer are in a position where they must decide whether such friendliness is sincere or merely a facade. In a situation where the interviewer has power over the subject she has nothing to gain from being friendly. Thus, there is no apparent ulterior motive for her ingratiating behavior. Hence, the perceiver is apt to believe that she is not presenting a facade but that her behavior represents her true nature (Jones, 1964). Furthermore, when the stimulus person is powerful it is to the perceiver's advantage, psychologically, to believe her behavior since such positive behavior is indicative of goal attainment.

When the stimulus person was negative, or unfriendly, subjects with no prior expectancy were, as predicted, more uncertain about their evaluation than subjects with fulfilled expectancies. However, certainty

for both of these groups was most strongly related to the stimulus person's decision making power. That is, while having prior information about a negative interviewer creates more certainty about evaluation than the lack of such information, uncertainty is created in both instances when the interviewer has extensive decision making power. The most tenable explanation for these findings is that, to a large extent, certainty ratings in these conditions represent a further attempt to characterize a better state of affairs than actually exists. Our subjects did not distort the SP's role in the decision making process because they did not have the "opportunity," as Pepitone's Ss did. Our subject's were given clear and specific information about the SP's power and there was no one else present to whom such power could be assigned. These subjects did, however, distort their evaluatinns of her negativity; they rated her less negatively when she had a great deal of decision making power. One further means of distorting facilitatively is to be more uncertain of one's evaluation, i.e., reduce her negativity even further by being uncertain about it. If one is uncertain, then goal attainment is still a possibility.

The data of the present study, in relation to certainty of evaluation, as well as to the evaluation itself, and especially in relation to the extent of impression forming behavior, leave many unanswered questions about the cognitive process of impression formation. It is felt that one of the values of the present research inheres in the attempt to study the <u>extent</u> of impression forming

behavior and to relate the extent of such behavior to the needs of the individual in the interaction situation. In this sense, our study must be viewed as exploratory in nature since virtually no research in this area has been attempted previously. While we have provided some support for our theoretical notions concerning the arousal of the need for predictability and its relation to the extent of impression forming behavior, we view this study as only an initial step in testing and refining these notions. One obvious need in future research is an attempt to ascertain the relevant dimensions of the extent of impression forming behavior and to develop methods of measuring these dimensions. There is also, clearly, a need to determine the relative contributions of perceiver variables, situational variables and stimulus person variables in affecting the arousal of the need for predictability. While we made no provision in our theory concerning stimulus person variables, for example, it is perhaps the most significant finding of this study that stimulus person variables appear to be a crucial determinant of the initial arousal of the need for predictability and of the subsequent effectiveness of other variables in further arousing the need. Because the arousal of the need for predictability seems related to the nature of the stimulus person's behavior, future investigations of the role of situational variables in arousing the need should perhaps be confined to the use of more neutral stimulus persons. The arousal of the need for predictability, then, might be manipulated by factors unrelated to the stimulus person's actual behavior. We might hypothesize, for example, that the arousal of the need for predict-

ability and the extent of impression forming behavior would be greater if the perceiver had to decide on the desirability of the SP as a future co-worker than if there were no such decision required following the interaction. The proposed curvilinear relationship between the degree of the need for predictability and the extent of impression forming behavior also remains to be investigated and might, also, be most fruitfully approached by varying the intensity of the need for predictability without reference to the actual behavior of the SP.

It is felt that the significant value in the present research was our attempt to study the structural and evaluative aspects of impression formation process based on an actual social interaction. The implication has been that the data gathered in this study are related to the actual process of impression formation as it occurs in day-to-day interactions. Naturally, no direct translation may be made. We did utilize, for example, written impressions which are clearly not analogous to the normal manner one would use to describe another individual. Yet, it is possible to assume that the students regarded this as a realistic situation in which they were applying for jobs and in which the impressions they formed had meaning for them. We succeeded in establishing a situation which included a reciprocal rather than a unilateral relationship; our subjects were participants, not observers. Thus, it seems possible that the needs and fears of individuals would function in a similar manner in an extra-experimental interaction. It is our belief that if we wish to understand behavior in response to social stimuli, it is crucial to investigate the cog-

nitive processes in situations which, as closely as possible, approximate the actual life situations in which they would normally occur.

# APPENDIX A

## Method and Procedures

Subject Employment Research Pool

APPLICATION FOR INTERVIEW

Many of the people carrying out research have decided to set up a pool of research subjects, that is, to hire many students to serve as paid research subjects for a variety of research projects. It is to be known as the SUBJECT EMPLOYMENT RESEARCH POOL.

None of the projects will involve experiences for the student which will be harmful or embarrassing in any way. Most of the studies will deal with the development of aptitude tests, attitude surveys on social issues, performance on tasks, etc.

Hours are very vlexible and you can put in as much or as little time as you like. Of course, you are free to refuse to participate in any experiment.

The jobs pay $1.50 per hour and would first become available for the summer and/or next fall.

If you are interested in getting one of these jobs, would you please fill out the following form. You will be notified shortly about an interview. Interviews will take place starting June 12 and will continue throughout the Summer Session.

---

Name_____Address_____

Telephone Number_____Class & Curriculum Number_____

Sex_____

HOURS THAT YOU ARE AVAILABLE FOR AN INTERVIEW

(Check appropriate box (or boxes if you are available at several different times)

| | Monday | Tuesday | Wednesday | Thursday | Friday |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9am | | | | | |
| 10am | | | | | |
| 11am | | | | | |
| 12pm | | | | | |
| 1pm | | | | | |
| 2pm | | | | | |
| 3pm | | | | | |
| 4pm | | | | | |

If you cannot be interviewed at these times, please indicate below the other hours you have available.

Brooklyn College
Subject Employment Research Pool

APPLICATION

Name_____ Address_____
Street City
Telephone_____ Birthdate _____ Birthplace_____
mo./ day/ yr.

Term in school_____ Hours available for research_____

---

1. Do you have any physical defects? Yes___ No___
IF YES, what are they?_____
_____

2. Do you wear glasses? Yes___ No___
IF YES, what is your eyesight without glasses?_____

3. Do you have any hearing difficulties? Yes___ No___
IF YES, what are they? _____

4. Would you say you were in good physical condition? Yes___ No___
IF NO, explain:_____

---

5. Rate yourself on the following abilities:

| | Poor | Fair | Good | Excellent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Mathematics | | | | |
| b. Reading Comprehension | | | | |
| c. Vocabulary | | | | |
| d. Manual Dexterity | | | | |
| e. Spatial Relations | | | | |
| f. Mechanical Ability | | | | |
| g. Artistic Ability | | | | |

6. Is there a foreign language spoken in your home? Yes___ No___
IF YES, which language(s)?_____

7. Rate yourself on your ability to speak, write and read the following languages:

| | Speak | | | | Write | | | | Read | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Fair | Good | Exc. | Not at all | Fair | Good | Exc. | Not at all | Fair | Good | Exc. | Not at all |
| French | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| German | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Italian | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spanish | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | | | | | | |

8. List your hobbies, special interests, etc. _____
_____

---

9. What are you majoring in(or do you think you will major in)?_____

10. What occupation are you planning to enter:
1st. choice:_____
2nd. choice:_____



(over)

Interview Scripts for Pilot Study Tape Recordings

| Original PSP | Revised PSP | NSP |
|---|---|---|
| Interviewer(I): Won't you come in please? How do you do? I'm Mrs. Wolfe. Thank you for coming in to see us. This is important work and the more people we see the better the chance it will work out. Now, lets see if we can get the information we need. Please sit down. You can put your books and coat over there. | Won't you come in please? I'm Mrs. Wolfe. Now, let's see if we can get the information we need. Please sit down. You can put your books and coat over there. | Come in! Sit down. You'll have to answer these questions. |
| Now, what is your name? | Same. | Same. |
| Student(S): Ronald Barazani. | Same. | Same. |
| I: | | Spell that. |
| S: | | B-a-r-a-z-a-n-i. |
| I: And your address? | Same. | Address? |
| S: 1562 Ocean Avenue. | Same. | Same. |
| I: And your telephone number? | Same. | Same. |
| S: 253-7260 | Same. | Same. |
| I: How old are you? | Same. | Age? |
| S: 19. | Same. | Same. |
| I: What term are you in? | Same. | Same. |
| S: I'm a lower junior. | Same. | Same. |
| I: What are you majoring in? | Same. | Same. |
| S: Sociology. | Same. | Same. |
| I: I was always interested in that. I guess if I had to do it over again I might study that. | I was always interested in that. Have you taken many courses yet? | I could never be interested in that. It's the last thing I'd study if I had the chance to do it over again. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S: | | Not really. Most of my first 2 years in school I took required courses. I just started taking elective courses. | |
| I: | What hours are you available for work? | Mmmmm. I see. Now, what hours are you available for work? | What hours are you available for work? |
| S: | Monday, Wednesday and Friday afternoons from 1-4 p.m. | Same. | Same. |
| I: | Good -- we usually have research going on at that time. Now, what are your feelings about research in general. Do you feel it must make a contribution to everyday life? | Okay. Now, lets see...What are your feelings about research in general? Do you feel it must make a contribution to everyday life? | Are those the only hours you have? Well, I hope something fits in. Now, what are your feelings about research in general. Do you feel it must make a contribution to everyday life? |
| S: | Well - ah -- no. Not necessarily. I think some research should be just for the sake of scholarly investigation and not directly begun with an eye toward application to some problem area in everyday life. You know, you can never tell when something you do will end up contributing to these problems even if it wasn't the researcher's original intent. | Same. | Same. |
| I: | That's very interesting. I really agree with you. It may seem like some research makes no contribution immediately but in the long run it will. Practicality and applicability shouldn't be the factor that influences research -- you can really stiffle some good ideas that way. | That's interesting. Personally I feel it should contribute but I can see your point of view. | I don't agree at all. Why spend all that money and energy if you can't be sure it will have some use. The trouble today is that the government spends our money supporting research that is going no where and doesn't do anything for anybody. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Well, do you feel that you would eventually like to do research? | Same. | Same. |
| S: | No -- I would prefer to do social work rather than research in Sociology. | Same. | Same. |
| I: | Well, I can understand. Not everyone should do or wants to do research. Practical work in any field is important. | Well, I can understand. However, we like to hire people who are interested in doing research. But we also hire people who do not intend to do so. | Well, not <u>everyone</u> can do research. We like to hire people who are interested in doing research but we also hire people who do not intend to do so. |
| | Now, what area would you be most interested in being a subject for? Psychology, Political Science, or Sociology? | Same. | Same. |
| S: | Political Science -- I think. | Same. | Same. |
| I: | Oh yes, we have had lots of people doing research in Political Science and we have quite a few projects in that area. For some reason a lot of students are interested in that. | We have some interesting research in that area. | Oh. Well, we don't have many people who are interested in research in Political Science and we don't have too many projects in that area. For some reason a lot of students aren't interested in that. |
| I: | Well, why do you want to be a research subject? | Same. | Same. |
| S: | Well, first of all, I can use the extra money and secondly, I thought it would be interesting work and fun to do. Besides that, the work would be on campus and wouldn't entail travelling time. | Same. | Same. |

Interview Scripts for Pilot Study Tape Recordings (continued)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| I: | Yes. That's a good answer. It does pay well and the money comes in handy. I know -- I depended on money like that when I went through college. | I see. Well, those are good reasons. | Oh. Are those your only reasons? Money shouldn't be the motivating factor. |
| | Have you ever worked before? | Same. | Same. |
| S: | Yes. | Same. | Same. |
| I: | What types of jobs have you had? | Same. | Same. |
| S: | I've been a camp counselor and a waiter and I've done some messenger work. | Same. | Same. |
| I: | Uh-huh. Good. | Uh-huh. Good. | Those jobs don't sound too interesting. |
| S: | | | Well, they were all right. |
| I: | Well, that all for now. Its been nice talking with you. You'll hear about the job in a few days. | I think that is about all for now. We'll be able to let you know in a few days whether we can use you. Goodbye. Nice meeting you. | Hmmm. Well. That's all. You'll hear from us in a few days. |

Pilot Study of Tape-Recorded PSP and NSP

Ratings on Individual Characteristics

and Mean Rating for All Characteristics[1]

| Characteristics | Original PSP (N = 22) | Revised PSP (N = 35) | NSP (N = 25) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Friendly | 3.245 | 2.486 | 7.457 |
| Patient | 4.118 | 3.457 | 8.174 |
| Personal | 4.950 | 4.943 | 6.302 |
| Fair | 3.869 | 3.200 | 7.659 |
| Thoughtful | 5.075 | 3.853 | 8.580 |
| Sociable | 3.910 | 3.400 | 6.865 |
| Sensitive | 6.198 | 5.886 | 8.059 |
| Calm | 3.619 | 3.171 | 4.586 |
| Efficient | 5.168 | 4.171 | 7.742 |
| Responsible | 4.522 | 3.828 | 7.032 |
| Sincere | 5.158 | 4.257 | 6.227 |
| Cooperative | 3.869 | 3.371 | 7.259 |
| Pleasant | 3.744 | 3.057 | 8.714 |
| Mean of All Characteristics | 4.48 | 3.77 | 7.37 |

[1] Ratings could run from 1 to 10 with a rating of 1 being the most positive and a rating of 10 being the most negative.

Script for PSP Interview in Main Investigation

S enters.

I: Hello. Have a seat. (Interviewer smiles, looks at application, repeats student's name, and asks:)

May I call you (student's first name)?

Interviewer fills out an index card and a manilla folder for the subject. While doing so she engages in small talk to prevent a long silence.

All right, let me tell you why you're here. I'm going to give you a series of short forms and tests to fill out. Each one measures something different and I'll tell you what each one is about when I give it to you. There is a very liberal time limit so there is no reason to feel rushed. I'll be using a stop watch, not to time you, but to ascertain the overall time limit. All of the tests will be written except the last one, which I'll give you myself. O.K.? Please sit down over there and I'll bring you the tests.

S is seated at a separate table and the tests are presented one at a time. SP smiles but makes no additional comments except for test instructions. She gives reassuring nods, smiles, etc.

After the subject has completed the tests (which are short and very easy), he is asked to sit down at the interviewer's desk and the interviewer says:

Now, let look at your application blank.

The interviewer has set answers to all responses for different questions on the application blank. These were as follows:

Q.2. Does the S wear glasses?
If S answers yes, SP says: Well, your eyesight might eliminate you from some research.

Q.5. S's ratings on abilities:
SP chooses two areas in which the S has rated himself as "good" or "excellent" and says:
Oh, your excellent (good) in _____. We can use people who are excellent (good) in that. And you're also good in _____. good.

Q. 9 and 10. S's major field and future occupation.
If S knows what he will be majoring in or what occupation he plans to enter, SP says:
I was always interested in that. Have you taken many courses yet? Do you know what specific area you will be specializing in?
If S says he does not know what he will be majoring in or what occupation he will enter, SP says:
Well, you have time to decide that.

Script for PSP Interview in Main Investigatinn (continued)

Q.16. S's interest in doing research.
If S says he is interested in doing reseearch SP says:
We like to hire people who are interested in doing research so that we can give them some experience.

If S says he is not interested in doing research, SP says:
Well, not all vocations call for research. We like to hire people who are interested in doing research but we also hire people who do not intend to do so.

SP then asks: Do you think research should make a practical contribution? (Question not on application form).
After SP replies, SP says: "That's interesting" and looks as though he is agreeing with subject.

Q.17. Experiments S would like to participate in.
Regardless of area S chooses, SP says:
We have some very interesting research in those areas.

Q.18. Previous jobs.
SP says: These jobs you've had sound interesting.

Q.19. Experiments S has participated in previously.
If S has participated before, SP asks:
What type of research was it?

Q.20. Reasons S would like to be a research subject.
Regardless of S's reason, SP says:
That's a good reason.

Then SP ends the interview by saying:

Well, that is about it for now. We'll be able to let you know in a few dayd whether we can use you. Mrs. Wolfe would like to see you again. Goodbye. Nice meeting you.

Script for NSP Interview in Main Investigation

S enters. Interviewer is reading and without looking up says:

> Sit down.

SP continues to read for a few minutes while S sits. She then closes book and sighs. She fills out the index card and manilla folder and does not speak to the S at all. This makes for a long period of silence. SP makes no attempt to call S by first name and throughout the interview refers to the S as Miss or Mrs. Interviewer then says:

> I'm going to give you a series of short forms and tests to fill out. Each one measures something different and I'll tell you what each one is about when I give it to you. There is a very liberal time limit so there is no reason to feel rushed. I'll be using a stop watch not to time you but to ascertain the overall time limit. All of the tests will be written except the last one which I'll give you myself. Sit down over there and I'll bring you the tests.

S is seated at a separate table and the tests are presented one at a time. SP makes no comments during the tests. During the tests she busies herself with work so that the subject has to attract her attention to tell her when they are finished.

After the subject has completed the tests he is asked to sit down at the interviewer's desk and the interviewer says:

> Now let's look at your application form. (This is said in a skeptical type of manner.)

After reading S's name, SP says:

> How do you pronounce that?

Then SP calls S Mr. or Miss several times throughout the interview.

After reading a few items, SP says:

> You should try to write more clearly. Your handwriting is hard to read.

The interviewer proceeds with set responses to the different questions on the application blank. These were as follows:

> Q.2. Does the S wear glasses?
> If S says yes, SP says: Well, your eyesight will eliminate you from some research.

Script for NSP Interview in Main Investigation (continued)

Q.5. S's ratings on abilities:
SP chooses two areas in which the S has rated himself fair or poor and says:
Hmmm. You're poor in _____. We can use people who are good in that. Oh, and fair in _____. Hmmm.

Q.9 and 10. S's major field and future occupation.
If S knows what he will be majoring in or what occupation he plans to enter, SP gives varied responses, all giving the idea of disapproval. SP might say:
I could never be interested in that. Or
You're majoring in _____? Humpf! (with a shake of the head and a curl of the lip, definitely indicating dislike)

If S does not know what he will be majoring in or what occupation he plans to enter, SP says:
You really ought to make up your mind.

Q.16. S's interest in doing research.
Regardless of whether S says yes or no, SP replies:
You do (do not) want to do research? Why? (Question is asked abruptly)

If S says he is interested in doing research, SP says:
Well, I hope it's more creative than some of the stuff done today (SP sneers at answer).

If S says he is not interested in doing research, SP says:
We like to hire people who are planning to do research to give them experience but we also hire people who do not intend to do so.

SP then asks: Do you think research should make a practical contribution? (Question not on application form)
Regardless of answer, SP looks as though she disagrees and,

If answer is short, SP says: Don't you have anything else to say?
If answer is long, SP cuts off S and says: Allright.

Q.17. Experiments S would like to participate in.
If S chooses one area only, SP says:
Well, most of our research is in the other two areas (she looks disgusted at the whole system).

If S chooses two or all three areas, SP says:
Well, isn't there one you like better than the other(s)?

Script for NSP Interview in Main Investigation (continued)

Q.18. Previous jobs
If S says he never worked before, SP says:
You never worked? (Said with disbelief and disapproval).
Hmmm.

If S has worked, SP says:
Are these the only jobs you've had?

Q. 19. Experiments S has participated in previously.
SP points to question on application form, reads it, makes no comment.

Q.20. Reasons S would like to be a research subject.
SP looks cynical about answer.

If S says money is the reason, SP says:
Well, certainly money shouldn't be the only motivating factor.
(This is said even if S had reasons other than money listed)

Then SP ends the interview by saying:

Well, thats it. We'll let you know in a few days whether or not we can use you. Mrs. Wolfe wants to see you again.

If S makes some farewell remarks, SP answers with a curt: Goodbye.

FINAL (POST-EXPERIMENTAL) INTERVIEW

Now the first thing I'd like to talk to you about is the way you first heard about the Subject Employment Research Pool.

1. How did you hear about it?

2. Do you think that handing out applications in classes is a good idea?

   Why or why not?

My reason for asking this is because we would like to establish a uniform procedure for the recruiting of students OR At the present time CCNY doesn't permit the distribution of material in classes, unless they pertain to that class or department so we'd like to have the student's evaluation of the procedure.

Now this is an important part of what we are doing. We'd like to know how you felt about the screening interview. Overall,

3. What was your impression of it?

4. (ASKED ONLY IF S HAS HAD PRIOR INTERVIEWS)
   How did it compare to other interviews you've had?

Now I'll tell you what I'd like you to do. You have some pretty good ideas about how you felt about the screening interview. Now I'd like to get down to some specific questions.

5. I'm going to give you some slips of paper. On each slip there will be a question pertaining to a description of the interview and a scale on which you can indicate your answer to the question. You indicate your answer by making a line parallel to the anchors at that point on the scale which would best indicate your feelings about the screening interview. Look at this example I will show you. (Show Sample Slip). The question says: How noisy was the interview? The scale runs from noisy to quiet. If you found the interview to be noisy you would put a line here. If you found it to be quiet the line would go here. And if you thought it was somewhere inbetween you would place your line somewhere on the line between the two ends of the scale (ILLUSTRATE WITH SAMPLE SLIP). Now here is the first slip. (PRESENT SLIPS ONE AT A TIME AND COLLECT FINISHED ONES.)

| | |
|---|---|
| Relaxed - Tense | Warm - Cold |
| Formal - Informal | Worthless - Worthwhile |
| Interesting - Dull | |

I'd like to tell you a little more about our purpose in asking you some of these questions. We decided at the beginning of our investigation that we would not review the materials being used, the procedures being employed or meet with the interviewers or observe them until after we had spoken to a number of the students, such as yourself, who were being interviewed. Our reasons being that we could be much more objective in recording your reactions without projecting our biases into what you may

tell me. So we really don't know what the actual interview is like. That's why we're particularly interested in the next few questions.

6. For instance, before you went into the interview, what did you think it would be like? I mean did you have any idea of what was going to happen.

If yes, what?

7. If yes, what happened. Did it go the way you thought it would?

If no, what was different about it?

8. Let me ask you this now, If you could do anything, how would you improve the interview procedure?

Well, now we come to another important part of our study. Now that you have given us answers about the interview, I'd like you to do the same thing, only this time about the screening interviewer.

Since we will be hiring between 12 to 15 people to do the actual screening, administering of advanced tests related to specific experiments, etc., we would like to know as much as possible about the screening interviewer that you saw. This will help us to develop the criteria for the people we would want to employ in this position. We decided that since people sometimes feel strange or funny talking about other people, that we would ask you to write your reactions to the screening interviewer rather than ask you verbally.

If you would, read the brief instructions at the top of this sheet carefully and then write down anything and everything you can about the interviewer. You can do this in the room next door. When you finish please seal your paper in the envelope and do not put your name on either the paper or the envelope.

S is given paper and envelope and taken to next room. When S has finished, continue with:

Now, I'm going to give you another series of slips, this time in order to get at some more specific characteristics of the interviewer. On each slip there will be a question pertaining to a characteristic of the interviewer, and a scale on which you can indicate your answer to the question (show S the Sample Slip). You indicate your answer by making a line parallel to the anchors at that point on the scale that would best indicate your feelings about the screening interviewer.

You'll notice that at the top of each slip is a definition of the characteristic. This is done because people often mean different things when they use the same characteristic to describe people. With a definition you will have a reference point for your judgment.

Look at this example I will show you. The question says: How tactful do you think the interviewer is? By Tactful we mean: How skillful is she in saying and doing the right things when she is dealing with people? The scale runs from tactful to tactless. If you found the interviewer to be very tactful you would put a line here (indicates point on scale). If you found her to be very tactless the line would go here (indicates point on scale). And if you think that she is somewhere inbetween you would place your line somewhere inbetween the two ends of the scale. Simply mark off that point on the scale that best indicates how you feel each of the characteristics applies to the interviewer.

Now we know that you only saw the interviewer for a short while and that some of the things we are asking about are not easily answered. So, just to make sure that you don't feel that you have to make a definite judgment when you don't feel that you can, you can tell us how sure you are that the interviewer fits your description. You'll see, to the right of the characteristic scale, a second scale on which you can indicate the certainty of your judgment.

Okay, here is the first slip. (Present slips one at a time -- remove the slip once it has been checked.)

Stable - Changeable
Unfair - Fair
Important - Unimportant
Industrious - Lazy
Unsociable - Sociable
Reliable - Undependable
Personal - Impersonal
Believing - Skeptical
Untrustworthy - Trustworthy
Cooperative - Uncooperative
Skillful-Clumsy
Traditional - Progressive
Consistent - Inconsistent
Pleasant - Unpleasant
Sensitive - Insensitive
Honest - Dishonest
Emotional - Rational

Now I told you before that we have not done our own study of the interview or of the interviewer. So we are especially interested in hearing what you have to say about these things.

10. Before you went into the interview, did you have any idea what the interviewer would be like? I mean, what did you think she would be like?

11. Well, how would you say she was -- was she like you thought she'd be?

If no, how was she different?

Now -- just a few more questions.

I'd like to know what you would rate the interviewer overall. Look at this slip.

12. Overall, how would you rate the screening interviewer? (Give S graphic scale ranging from Good to Poor.)

13. How would you rate the interview, overall? (Give S graphic scale ranging from Good to Poor.)

14. Look at this next slip. How well do you think the interviewer relates to students? (Give S graphic scale ranging from Well to Poorly.)

15. Now, answer this one. How much did the interviewer make you feel at ease? (Give S graphic scale ranging from At Ease to Ill at Ease.)

16. Look at this slip. How influential do you think the interviewer is in making the decision to hire you? (Give S graphic scale ranging from Influential to Uninfluential.)

17. How influential do you think the interviewer should be? (Give S graphic scale ranging from Influential to Uninfluential.)

18. One final question. If you are hired, will you take the job?

If no, why?

Now, I'd like to tell you a little bit more about my presence here this afternoon. I have actually been conducting a research experiment to see how people form impressions of other people, especially the screening interviewer.
As far as the jobs are concerned, there really are jobs and they are exactly what you were told they would be, but they are being administered through the Psychology Department and have nothing to do with anything that occurred between you and me.

Now that you are somewhat enlightened as to my interest, I'd like to ask you a few more questions.

19. When did you feel you had formed your impression of the interviewer? (Probe and try to pinpoint time in the interview when impression was formed.)

20. Did your impression remain constant or did it change as the interview progressed?

21. If it changed: How did it change? (Good to bad, bad to good, etc.)

22. If it changed: What behavior on the part of the interviewer contributed to the change?

23. Did Mrs. Wolfe tell you anything that might have influenced your impression?

Now I would like to tell you what really occurred here this afternoon. There really is no such thing as the Subject Employment Research Pool. This has actually been a research experiment conducted by one of the members of the Psychology Department to see how you form impressions of the interviewer. As far as jobs are concerned, although there is

no formal set up for giving jobs to students, there are researchers who need subjects and who will pay them for their participation. The name of each student serving as a subject in this research will be given to the Psychology Department and if subjects are needed you will certainly be called.

These are the only questions I have to ask you. If there is anything regarding the procedures here I would be glad to try to explain it to you.

We are paying you the $1.50 for your time and cooperation this afternoon.

The only other thing I'd like to ask you is: Since this is a research experiment it is necessary that when students come in for their interview they will be as honest and spontaneous as you have been. So may I have your word that you will not say anything to anyone else. It is particularly important in your case since we will be interviewing other students within your class. If anyone asks you about it, you might say that "it was interesting," "you got the job," "you hope to be called soon," or "it was like any other interview." Don't be overly suspicious or too secretive. If you are pressed for more information you might say, "there were some simple tests, but nothing to worry about." Do not mention anything about the interviewer, myself, or that you were given any money.

Thank you very much for coming in. Can I have your word that you will not say any more than I have indicated?

RULES FOR COUNTING ATTRIBUTES OR DESCRIPTIVE PHRASES AND IDEAS

General Instructions

We are interested in any phrase, statement, or ideas which indicate or infer something about the interviewer as a person. We are interested in the number of discrete or different attributes that are assigned to the SP. These descriptions should indicate that the interviewer has left some impression with the subject, other than the fact that she carried out her duties (i.e., she handed out papers, used stopwatch).

Phrases that merely describe the progression of the interview (i.e., she handed me the paper, she gave me a test, she timed me, etc.) are not to be counted because they do not indicate that the subject has made any judgment about the interviewer other than in her superficial role capacities. However, if these capacities are evaluated, i.e., she gave me the tests in a professional manner, they are to be counted.

However, descriptions concerning the interviewer's dress or apparel, while not actually being enduring characteristics, do indicate that the subject was cognizant of the interviewer beyond her role capacity. Therefore, although they are of a superficial nature, they should be counted.

When necessary, use contextual clues to determine the meaning or inferences the subject is making and whether or not they shed any new light on what the subject feels about the interviewer.

These and other rules are listed below.

UNDERLINE each phrase, idea, or adjective that you are counting.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

I. STATEMENTS THAT ARE COUNTED:

a. any phrase, statement, adjective, idea that indicates something about the interviewer as a person.

i.e. she was warm she stands on ceremony she is like a good friend

b. either/or statements - counts as two attributes

i.e. she was either shy or detached = 2.

c. statements using yet or but as conjunctions -- counts as two attributes.

e.g. she was firm yet friendly.
she was quiet but in a nasty sort of way.

d. Repeated attributes or ideas -- are counted ONLY ONCE.

1. We are looking for distinct and different attributes or descriptions. If attributes are repeated later on, either as a reiteration or as a summary statement, they are not counted the second time. Repititions refer, generally, to exact repitions of word or unrefutable synonym. If any question arises as to whether a word is an exact synonym or is slightly different then count it as another word.

i.e. She seemed friendly and smiled often. The tests were given to me and we spoke for a while. I appreciated her friendly attitude. --- "Friendly" counted only once.

i.e. She was nervous. Her moving about indicated that she was nervous. -- "Nervous" counted only once.

2. Further explanation of behavior already mentioned which merely serves to clarify a previous statement is NOT COUNTED.

i.e., The interviewer seemed to look down on me. This condescending attitude was conveyed to me when she made some negative remarks about my answers. The repititive idea of a condescending attitude is not counted. This conveys exactly the same idea as the initial description. ("Negative remarks" are not counted because they are part of role behavior.)

e. Descriptions of clothes and actions -- ARE COUNTED.
(EXCEPTION -- actions are not counted if they are merely )
(descriptions of role behavior -- See part II -- a. )

i.e. she wore a red scarf she kept on rejecting me
she gave explicit instructions she didn't encourage me
she scowled she looked bored

f. 1. An adjective that refers to MORE THAN ONE descriptive characteristic at the same time is counted only once.

i.e. the manner of her dress and the way she wore her hair was pleasing. = 1.

2. Two adjectives refering to the same attribute or action are counted only once.

i.e. Her voice was calm and soothing. = 1

g. Action and its evaluation are separate

i.e. she kept smiling nervously = 2

h. Statements about interviewer acting -- ARE COUNTED.

i.e. This might be an act she was putting on.
I think she's hiding her true personality.

i. Inferences -- are counted.

i.e. I think I could confide in her.
I think she would be easy to talk to.
She is probably not very sociable.

j. Statements indicating that interviewer was opposite to what subject expected -- ARE COUNTED. However, they are counted only if no further explanation is given.

i.e. I expected her to be unfriendly but she was not.
She was very friendly and warm.

Here the first statement would be counted in accordance with the rule. However, the second "friendly" is not counted because it merely makes explicit what is implied in the first statement.

Statements that the interviewer was oppositive to some one (i.e. she was just the opposite of Mrs. Wolfe) are counted only if no further explanation is given. However if explanation is given: i.e., She was just the opposite of Mrs. Wolfe. She was warm, friendly etc., then the characteristics are counted but not the statement preceeding it.

k. An evaluative statement about a characteristic is counted only as one.

i.e. her niceness was pleasant. = 1

l. Statements indicating
1) Absence of characteristics or
2) References to behavior that might have been shown

ARE COUNTED because they infer that the opposite qualities were present.

i.e. had she been nicer the interview would have been better.
I think a more pleasant interviewer would have had more rapport.
She was not informal She was not abrupt

BUT: once they have been counted, their opposites or a statement of the presence of the opposite characteristics are not counted (based on repetitive rule).

i.e. she was not informal. She was very formal. There is only one idea here and it is counted only once.

m. If the subject says that the interviewer is doing something to him, or has made him feel a certain way -- this is counted (See Exception -- Part II - e.) If a self referent (i.e. she made me feel relaxed) is followed by a description of the interviewer's behavior or attribute which created the feeling, the whole idea is counted as 1 characteristic. i.e. she made me feel relaxed because she smiled. -- the self referent and the behavior ARE NOT counted separately. However, if the self referent is made with out subsequent explanation it is counted as a characteristic by itself.

i.e. She made me feel relaxed I felt calm in her presence

n. Reference to the interview or interview situation which must necessarily involve some action on the part of the interviewer IS COUNTED because it infers some characteristic of the interviewer. However, if the description about the interview is general, i.e., it was more worthwhile than I expected, it is not counted because it does not mean that the interviewer was worthwhile.

i.e. the interview was conducted in a businesslike manner
the interview was enjoyable and relaxing
the atmosphere was tense

o. References to her effectiveness as an interviewer are counted.

i.e. she was an excellent choice as an interviewer.

p. References to the fact that her behavior changed as the interview progressed are counted. They infer that the interviewer is capable of changing. i.e., she started out being friendly but she changed and by the end she was really nasty.

q. See Exception - part II - c.

II. Statements that are NOT COUNTED

a. General descriptions of her role behavior are NOT counted.

i.e. she handed me the paper
she went over my application
she read the question
we spoke about biology

EXCEPTION: when an evaluation is made of her role behavior it is counted. i.e. her instructions were explicit.-- she was very inept.

b. Evaluative statements concerning positivity or negativity of impression are not counted.

i.e. I liked her My attitude towards her was positive
I had a favorable impression

c. General attributes like PERSON, WOMAN, LADY, FEMALE are not counted.

EXCEPTION: specifics like YOUNG, MARRIED -- ARE counted.

d. COMPARISON phrases are NOT counted

i.e. she was nice and pretty as opposed to nasty and ugly -- count only nice and pretty

e. Comments about subjects feelings in the situation which make no reference to interviewer -- NOT COUNTED.

i.e. I felt nervous
I didn't make a good impression
I entered the situation relaxed

EXCEPTION -- if they, in any way, refer to or imply behavior on the part of the interviewer which produced the feeling, then they are counted --
i.e. because of her I felt relaxed.

## RULES FOR CATEGORIZING ATTRIBUTES

We are classifying the attributes (outlines in each impression) into 3 categories:

1. Physical or Descriptive Aspects and/or Interviewer Aspects or Role Behavior and/or References to Interview or Atmosphere of Interview

2. Superficial Personality Characteristics (Both Interview-Oriented and Non-Interview Oriented)

3. Deeper Personality Characteristics and/or Inferences

Below is an explanation of each category and examples of characteristics which would fall into each category.

1. Physical of Descriptive Aspects and/or Interviewer Aspects or Role Behavior and/or References to Interview or Atmosphere of Interview

In this category we are placing any phrases, descriptions or ideas which pertain to overt, physical characteristics of the interviewer, references to her role behavior during the interview (what she said, her methods, procedures) and any references to the atmosphere of the interview (formal, relaxed, tense, etc.).

Examples of each are:

a. Physical and/or Descriptive Aspects

wasn't ugly
good dresser
nice looking
wore a ring
married
should have laughed
voice was clear
references to age

b. Interviewer Aspects or Role Behavior

didn't answer me
very encouraging when she said "...."
didn't make her direction explicit
hardly talked
formal in her methods
gave the impression she was interested in me
procedure efficient
seemed to be accepting me
good choice for an interviewer

c. References to Interview of Atmosphere

atmosphere tense
she made me feel relaxed
interview was informal
atmosphere made me feel relaxed

2. Superficial Personality Characteristics (Interview Oriented and Non-Interview Oriented)

In this category we are placing any phrases, descriptions or ideas which pertain to seemingly more personality oriented characteristics of the interviewer (warm, cold, friendly) but which do not make inferences of the type outlined in category 3. Any characteristics in this category (2) can be related to the interview (she was cold) or can be non-interview oriented (she seems like a cold person). Both would fit into this category.

Examples are

| | |
|---|---|
| nervous | easy to talk to |
| self-confident | aloof attitude |
| intelligent | not easy to get along with |
| nice | efficient |
| formal | businesslike |
| tactless | snobby |
| | could have been nicer |

3. Deeper Personality Characteristics and/or Inferences

In this category we are placing any phrases or ideas which indicate a deeper analysis (by the subject) of the interviewer's characteristics. References to behaviors in other than interview situations, of inferences about her motivation or extra-interviewer personality or about her basic values and judgments would belong in this category. In addition, any characteristic which is similar to those in category 2 but which could not be easily ascertained from the interview situation, should be placed in this category.

e.g. she seemed like a sensitive person
shy person
backward socially

Examples are

she seemed like an understanding person
she has no sense of humor
she is shy with strangers
she is just the opposite of what she seemed to be
treats all people alike
goes out with interesting men

would make a great teacher
she tries to hide her true personality
seems uninterested in her job
probably cares about what other people think of her
probably committed to her work
has very strong opinions

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

You have been given a recording sheet which has room for the total # of characteristics in the impression (written next to each impression) and for the breakdown of this total into the three separate categories.

First, record the total # of characteristics in the proper column.

Then, above each characteristic (boxed in) in the impression, you are to write a 1, 2, or 3 indicating the category it belongs to.

Then, add up the # for each category, write it on the recording sheet and make sure that the sum of the characteristics from the three categories is equal to the total # of attributes in the impression.

Table 1

Time Taken for Ss to Form Impression of Stimulus Person
and
Constant vs. Changing Nature of the Impression

| S# and Assigned Condition | Ss Response to Question: When did you feel you had formed your impression of the interviewer? | Categorization of Ss Responses (B = Beginning M = Middle E = End) | Ss response to question: Did your impression remain constant or did it change as interview progressed? (C = Constant Ch = Changed) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. NoE NSP | really made impression at end; interviewer made remark about money | E | Ch |
| 2. NE NSP | no responses | no responses | |
| 3. PE PSP | when he walked into the room; friendly. Mrs. Wolfe said she'd be nice and she was | B | C |
| 4. NE NSP | with the first words out of her mouth; 10 seconds; businesslike; never smiled | B | C |
| 5. NE NSP | when Mrs. Wolfe told me what to expect | B | C |
| 6. NoE PSP | when he first came in but really formed when interviewer started going over interview her speaking was warm; friendly | M | Ch |
| 7. NE PSP | still does not really have one; | E | Ch |
| 8. NoE NSP | as soon as I went into the office | B | C |
| 9. NE NSP | almost before I met the interviewer; as soon as I walked in the door | B | C |
| 10. NE PSP | now that you are asking me these questions | E | C |

Table 1 (continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Ss Response to Question When was Impression Formed | Categorization of Ss responses | Constant vs. Changing Nature of Impression |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11. NE PSP | tried to relate to her what I had been told; but formed impression when going over application and she laughed at my jokes | M | Ch |
| 12. NoE PSP | as soon as I walked in | B | C |
| 13. NoE PSP | almost immediately | B | C |
| 14. NoE NSP | first two minutes | B | C |
| 15. NoE NSP | almost immediately | B | C |
| 16. PE NSP | when she first talked to me at the beginning | B | C |
| 17. NoE PSP | when she started going over my application | M | C |
| 18. PE NSP | about the middle of the interview | B | Ch |
| 19. PE NSP | during her explanations of the tests | B | C |
| 20. NE PSP | when she gave him the tests to fill out | B | C |
| 21. PE PSP | not until the end | E | C |
| 22. NoE PSP | not until you started asking me these questions | E | C |
| 23. NE NSP | when I walked in the door | B | C |
| 24. NoE PSP | no response | | no response |
| 25. PE NSP | as soon as I walked into the office | B | C |
| 26. NE PSP | in the middle of the interview expected her to be curt but she wasn't after a while | M | Ch |
| 27. PE NSP | soon after she started to speak | B | C |

Table 1 (continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Ss Response to Question When was Impression Formed | Categorization of Ss responses | Constant vs. Changing Nature of Impression |
|---|---|---|---|
| 28. NE NSP | knew what to expect; first few minutes | B | C |
| 29. PE NSP | as soon as I sat down | B | C |
| 30. NE NSP | fairly soon; waited until after I saw her | B | C |
| 31. NE PSP | when you started asking me questions about her | E | Ch |
| 32. NoE NSP | as soon as I walked into room | B | C |
| 33. NE PSP | after we spoke for a few minutes; when interviewer started going over application | M | C |
| 34. NoE NSP | when she started talking to me | B | C |
| 35. NE NSP | pretty much near the end of the interview | E | C |
| 36. PE PSP | within the first few minutes | B | C |
| 37. NoE NSP | fairly quick; within first 10 seconds | B | Ch |
| 38. NE PSP | after talking for a while and hearing her responses | M | C |
| 39. NoE NSP | no response | | C |
| 40. NoE PSP | when I walked in; she was friendly | B | C |
| 41. NE NSP | minute I walked in | B | C |
| 42. PE PSP | at the beginning | B | C |
| 43. PE NSP | within the first 5 minutes | B | C |
| 44. NE PSP | when I first walked in; by the first words she spoke | B | C |
| 45. NoE PSP | when I first walked in and saw her | B | C |

Table 1 (continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Ss Response to Question When was Impression Formed | Categorization of Ss responses | Constant vs. Changing Nature of Impression |
|---|---|---|---|
| 46. PE PSP | didn't really form one until you asked; but made some preliminary decisions as interview progressed | E | C |
| 47. NoE NSP | almost immediately | B | C |
| 48. NoE NSP | tries not to form first impressions; after the interview when you asked | E | C |
| 49. PE NSP | as soon as I entered the room; she gave no recognition or smile | B | Ch |
| 50. NE NSP | as soon as she looked over the forms in the beginning | B | C |
| 51. NE PSP | at the last test I took -- the one with the pictures | M | Ch |
| 52. NE NSP | after a little while when she started speaking | B | C |
| 53. PE PSP | about the middle of the interview | M | Ch |
| 54. NoE PSP | as soon as I saw her | B | C |
| 55. PE PSP | toward the beginning | B | C |
| 56. PE PSP | after the interview; when I came to see you | E | C |
| 57. NoE PSP | didn't think about it until I left the interview; when you asked | E | Ch |
| 58. PE PSP | when she opened her mouth; when I first walked in | B | C |
| 59. PE PSP | when talking with her; after written tests but before pictures | M | C |
| 60. NoE NSP | somewhere between taking the tests and talking to her | M | Ch |

Table 1 (continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Ss Response to Question When was Impression Formed | Categorization of Ss responses | Constant vs. Changing Nature of Impression |
|---|---|---|---|
| 61. NE PSP | not until you asked about it | E | Ch |
| 62. NE PSP | right after I walked in | B | C |
| 63. NE PSP | when I walked into the room -- good appearance; at ease | B | C |
| 64. NoE NSP | right after she gave instructions for tests | B | C |
| 65. NoE PSP | after he finished the tests | M | C |
| 66. NE NSP | gradually developed throughout interview | M | C |
| 67. NoE NSP | as soon as I sat down | B | C |
| 68. NE NSP | even before I walked in; based on what I had been told | B | C |
| 69. NoE PSP | 3 seconds after I walked in | B | Ch |
| 70. PE PSP | when I first walked in | B | C |
| 71. NE PSP | slightly preformed before meeting interviewer but formed as interview progressed-near middle | M | Ch |
| 72. PE PSP | after a few minutes | B | C |
| 73. PE NSP | toward the very end of the interview | E | Ch |
| 74. NoE NSP | formed an impression based on looks when I first entered | B | C |
| 75. NoE PSP | a little while after it began | B | C |
| 76. PE NSP | as soon as I walked in | B | C |
| 77. NE NSP | almost immediately I started forming an impression and I completed it right after that | B | C |
| 78. PE NSP | when she spoke to me a few minutes before I took tests | B | C |

Table 1 (continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Ss Response to Question When was Impression Formed | Categorization of Ss responses | Constant vs. Changing Nature of Impression |
|---|---|---|---|
| 79. NE NSP | toward the end; at first no impression; didn't really think about it until you asked | E | Ch |
| 80. NoE PSP | when you asked | E | C |
| 81. NE NSP | he has a preconceived notion; as soon as I saw her; as soon as I walked into room | B | C |
| 82. NE PSP | during the first part of the interview | B | C |
| 83. PE NSP | when she first looked at me and didn't smile | B | Ch |
| 84. PE NSP | almost as soon as I walked in | B | Ch |
| 85. NoE PSP | about five minutes after the interview began--starting with the tests | B | Ch |
| 86. NE PSP | preconditioned; as soon as I sat down she seemed nice | B | C |
| 87. NE PSP | when I left the room; when the interview was all finished | E | C |
| 88. PE NSP | after a few minutes at the beginning | B | C |
| 89. PE PSP | not until you spoke to me | E | C |
| 90. NoE NSP | very soon after I walked in; when she told me to sit down | B | Ch |
| 91. NoE NSP | thought about it as soon as I walked in | B | C |
| 92. NE PSP | when I realized that what I expected was untrue--when I saw she was younger immediately | B | Ch |
| 93. NoE NSP | when you asked me the first question | E | C |
| 94. NE NSP | as soon as she asked me to sit down | B | C |

Table 1 (continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Ss Response to Question When was Impression Formed | Categorization of Ss responses | Constant vs. Changing Nature of Impression |
|---|---|---|---|
| 95. NoE NSP | as soon as I entered | B | C |
| 96. PE PSP | when she listened to me at the end of the interview | E | C |
| 97. NE NSP | when I came into the room; she said nothing | B | C |
| 98. NE NSP | at the beginning; after a few minutes | B | C |
| 99. PE PSP | shortly after I came in: after I spoke to her for a few minutes | B | C |
| 100. NE PSP | a few minutes after I was in there | B | C |
| 101. NoE PSP | when you asked me about it | E | C |
| 102. PE NSP | when I started taking the tests | B | C |
| 103. NoE NSP | when you asked me about it | E | C |
| 104. NE PSP | when I started to babble to her and she didn't look at me like I was nuts; before I saw the picture cards | M | Ch |
| 105. NE PSP | sometimes towards the middle | M | Ch |
| 106. PE PSP | after the first 5 minutes | B | C |
| 107. NoE PSP | as soon as I sat down; she smiled | B | C |
| 108. PE NSP | before she said anything--when she looked at the forms | B | C |
| 109. NoE NSP | after I finished the interview | E | Ch |
| 110. NoE PSP | a minute after I spoke with her | B | C |
| 111. PE NSP | within first few minutes | B | C |
| 112. NE NSP | 10 seconds after I met her | B | C |
| 113. PE PSP | toward beginning of interview | B | C |

Table 1 (continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Ss Response to Question When was Impression Formed | Categorization of Ss responses | Constant vs. Changing Nature of Impression |
|---|---|---|---|
| 114. PE NSP | ignored me when I walked in; that started it | B | Ch |
| 115. PE NSP | at beginning; surprised that she was so sullen | B | C |
| 116. PE PSP | as soon as I walked in | B | C |
| 117. PE PSP | toward beginning | B | C |
| 118. PE NSP | as soon as I started to take the tests | B | C |
| 119. NoE PSP | first 30 seconds | B | C |
| 120. NoE PSP | about the middle of the interview | M | C |

Characteristics Utilized For Evaluative Ratings on Bipolar Graphic Scales and Their Definitions

| Characteristics | | Definition * |
|---|---|---|
| Stable | - Changeable | Do you think that her behavior is predictable and that you could count on it? |
| Unfair | - Fair | How biases would she be in making a judgment? |
| Important | - Unimportant | How big a say do you think she has in things? |
| Industrious | - Lazy | Do you think she works hard at everything she does? |
| Unsociable | - Sociable | Do you think she enjoys mingling with people or would she rather be alone? |
| Reliable | - Undependable | Do you think you could depend on her? |
| Personal | - Impersonal | How much do you think you count as a person with her rather than as just another student who is applying for a job? |
| Believing | - Skeptical | Do you think she accepts what you say as true or is she inclined to doubt your answers? |
| Untrustworthy | - Trustworthy | Do you think you'd have to worry about her keeping a confidence? |
| Cooperative | - Uncooperative | Do you think she works well with others and tries to help them? |
| Skillful | - Clumsy | Do you think that when she does things she is adept and does things well? |
| Traditional | - Progressive | Do you think she sticks to old methods or would she be willing to try something new? |
| Consistent | - Inconsistent | Do you think her behavior would usually be the same or does she appear to be fickle in her moods? |
| Pleasant | - Unpleasant | Do you think she's congenial and enjoyable company? |

* In all instances definitions refer to word on left and were preceeded by the phrase: By (CHARACTERISTIC) we mean:

Characteristics Utilized for Evaluative Ratings on Bipolar Graphic Scales and Their Definitions (continued)

| Characteristics | | Definition |
|---|---|---|
| Sensitive | - Insensitive | Do you think she is aware of other people's feelings? |
| Honest | - Dishonest | Do you think she is frank and open as opposed to being secretive? |
| Emotional | - Rational | Do you think she is ruled more by her heart than by her head? |

# APPENDIX B

## Efficacy of Experimental Manipulations

Post-Experiment Interview -- Check on Experimental Manipulations

| S# and Assigned Condition | Perception of Expectancy Based on questions: "Before you went into the interview, did you have any idea what the interview would be like? I mean, what did you think she would be like?" and/or "Did Mrs. Wolfe tell you anything that might have influenced your impression?" | Perception of Stimulus Person Based on the question: "Well, how would you say she was --was she like you thought she'd be?" | Perception of Stimulus Person or Expectancy Based on Written Impression--(To provide additional information where answers to other questions are vague or when other questions were not answered.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. NoE NSP | no idea--own expectation-expected someone more pleasant | negative attitude; expected someone more pleasant | I found that fact that she was so cold disconnecting |
| 2. NE NSP | older, ugly woman, thought she was going to be tough -- | she was like he thought | the interviewer seemed very cold |
| 3. PE PSP | surprised at youth; Mrs. Wolfe said she'd be nice | she was; he was relaxed | she was pretty, friendly, and had a nice smile |
| 4. NE NSP | Mrs. Wolfe said she'd be businesslike | she was formal, young, attractive | the interview was conducted in a businesslike manner and the atmosphere was a little tense |
| 5. NE NSP | thought she would be brief (abrupt) | she was abrupt | if her job is to make the applicant feel at ease...then I believe there is room for improvement |
| 6. NoE PSP | no--didn't expect her to be so young | fairly nice; was warm and friendly | |
| 7. NE PSP | Mrs. Wolfe told me she'd be blunt | didn't find her blunt; she was pleasant | |
| 8. NoE NSP | no | colder than expected | cold person--her attitude was very formal |

Check on Experimental Manipulations
(continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Perception of Expectancy | Perception of Stimulus Person | Perception of Stimulus Person or Expectancy (written impression) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9. NE NSP | yes--abrupt--went the way Mrs. Wolfe told her--would have been upset had she not been forewarned | went the way Mrs. Wolfe told her--still did not think it would be as cold and unsociable | |
| 10. NE PSP | expected an abrupt person | very pleasant | smile projected warmth and friendliness |
| 11. NE PSP | thought she'd be firm; an older lady | she wasn't that; formal but pleasant; she was more personable; had Mrs. Wolfe not told me anything I would have had a better impression | |
| 12. NoE PSP | no idea--didn't think she'd be so young | comfortable--formally dressed but informal interview | pleasant and easy to talk to |
| 13. NoE PSP | didn't think she'd be attractive | felt at ease | very pleasant and warm--sociable |
| 14. NoE NSP | thought it would be a graduate student not a woman. All Mrs. Wolfe told me was that the interviewer decides who is hired | | cold type; interviewed me in a mechanical way |
| 15. NoE NSP | no idea--thought she'd be friendlier | made him feel uncomfortable; businesslike | very cold, unfriendly type |
| 16. PE NSP | none at all | business-like; efficient | |
| 17. NoE PSP | none | pleasant | |
| 18. PE NSP | expected to like her | | intelligent; attractive; seemed interested; appeared slightly detached; did not demonstrate the least amount of emotion... |

Check on Experimental Manipulations
(continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Perception of Expectancy | Perception of Stimulus Person | Perception of Stimulus Person or Expectancy (written impression) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 19. PE NSP | told that interviewer was nice-- | did not find her that way; colder than expected; disconcerned | |
| 20. NE PSP | thought she'd be businesslike | never had that impression; wasn't cold | |
| 21. PE PSP | told she'd be nice --relaxed | more traditiona; friendly young, charming | |
| 22. NoE PSP | no idea | pleasant | seemed quite nice |
| 23. NE NSP | told she was businesslike | yes-- | too professional than necessary for her job; made me feel sort of inadequate |
| 24. NoE PSP | no idea | | she was tactful |
| 25. PE NSP | Mrs. Wolfe put me at ease; | no--she was youthful | indifferent in giving instructions and performing necessary duties. I feel that a friendlier attitude would be more beneficial |
| 26. NE PSP | told interviewer had a tendency to be curt and businesslike | found her pleasant | didn't discern any curtness...or any other unpleasantness |
| 27. PE NSP | no | | she was cold, unsmiling; only abilities were testing and criticizing. |
| 28. NE NSP | Mrs. Wolfe said interviewer would be curt-knew what to expect | yes | quite stiff; not easy to get along with; she could have been more congenial |
| 29. PE NSP | thought she might be young; told she would like her | hadn't thought about it | did not smile; businesslike; did not exude warmth toward me as a person |
| 30. NE NSP | told she would be curt | business-like but pleasant--not curt | pleasant-almost unemotional; businesslike but not abrupt, curt or demanding |

Check on Experimental Manipulations
(continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Perception of Expectancy | Perception of Stimulus Person | Perception of Stimulus Person or Expectancy (written impression) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 31. NE PSP | assumed she would be very business-like | initially she seemed businesslike; then she was informal and friendly | quite friendly; encouraging |
| 32. NoE NSP | no--just told "an interview"--assumed it would be impersonal and objective | she was as I thought | completely impersonal; quite officious; approach formalized |
| 33. NE PSP | told she was harsh, businesslike, abrupt | she was much different; pretty, young woman | warm person; pleasant personality |
| 34. NoE NSP | none | busy--didn't seem to pay attention--can't tell by looks | cold, impersonal, seemed to be disciplining me |
| 35. NE NSP | told she was businesslike | he expected this and that was his reaction | interviewer had a highly esoteric outlook on her field of work and seemed to denigrate the field in which the subject has his main interest |
| 36. PE PSP | no--just told they were randomly chosen | congenial, pleasant | |
| 37. NoE NSP | no--just told she was unimportant | | interview conducted in impersonal manner |
| 38. NE PSP | told interviewer was businesslike | changed after initial meeting | cold efficiency did not materialize; good sense of humor; relaxed, informal interview |
| 39. NoE NSP | no-- | was as if I were talking to a wall | |
| 40. NoE PSP | no--only about her part in hiring | friendly | warm--trying to put me at ease |
| 41. NE NSP | told she was businesslike--expected worse | see her as cold, impersonal aloof | |

Check on Experimental Manipulations
(continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Perception of Expectancy | Perception of Stimulus Person | Percetpion of Stimulus Person or Expectancy (written impression) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 42. PE PSP | told she'd be nice | she was nice | put me at ease right away |
| 43. PE NSP | told she was nice and she (S) was lucky | seemed just the opposite of what she was | she was not cordial; rather aloof; didn't smile |
| 44. NE PSP | told she'd be curt and businesslike | more friendly than he thought--she was nice but business-like | friendly, personable individual; she was businesslike in that she got the job done |
| 45. NoE PSP | no | very nice | |
| 46. PE PSP | told she'd be friendly | yes--she was as he was told | warm person |
| 47. NoE NSP | no | cold, efficient, no sociability; almost like a machine | |
| 48. NoE NSP | no | | warm person working at objective job |
| 49. PE NSP | expected a personal atmosphere--told she'd be friendly | it was very formal; didn't find her so; felt ill at ease | |
| 50. NE NSP | no--(note: in impression used word "abrupt") | unfriendly | very abrupt in her manner; unfriendly attitude |
| 51. NE PSP | told she was abrupt | but she was nice, warm and interested in what she was doing | |
| 52. NE NSP | told she'd be businesslike | saw her that way | "sticking to job," not at all warm |
| 53. PE PSP | told she was nice | younger--hat formal--got friendlier near end | atmosphere seemed quite unrelaxed--did not expect formality I was met with |
| 54. NoE PSP | no expectancy | very, very nice-pleasant personable | |

Check on Experimental Manipulations
(continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Perception of Expectancy | Perception of Stimulus Person | Perception of Stimulus Person or Expectancy (written impression) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 55. PE PSP | expected her to be more critical like other interviewers -critical always watching (note-said his impression was supported by her actions) | nice, very pleasant | |
| 56. PE PSP | told she'd be friendly, at ease | was as he was told | friendly, made me feel at ease |
| 57. NoE PSP | all he was told was that she was unimportant | | warm, friendly, smiled often |
| 58. PE PSP | told she was friendly | yes, young-congenial | |
| 59. PE PSP | told she'd be friendly and informal | it was pleasant, personable; no strained atmosphere | |
| 60. NoE NSP | none | interviewer upset by what she had written; interviewer could be friendlier | very impersonal; interview conducted in a cool manner |
| 61. NE PSP | warning tended to influence him--said she was cold and businesslike | didn't find that especially true; after a while she seemed more friendly | amiable but not overly so; courteous |
| 62. NE PSP | said she was abrupt | she was not that way | friendly; nice personality |
| 63. PE PSP | said she was a warm, friendly person | she was a warm person | friendly |
| 64. NoE NSP | no | academic | cold, down to business no fooling around businesswoman |
| 65. NoE PSP | no idea | | warm, extremely likable |

Check on Experimental Manipulations
(continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Perception of Expectancy | Perception of Stimulus Person | Perception of Stimulus Person or Expectancy (written impression) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 66. NE NSP | forewarned she might be cold | seemed like any interviewer would be--cold; didn't smile | acted calm and businesslike--not cold-like any stranger |
| 67. NoE NSP | no | very cold; condescending attitude | cold, formal, unfriendly |
| 68. NE NSP | told she was businesslike | she agreed with what she had been told | abrupt, businesslike |
| 69. NoE PSP | no | distant-formal | rather cold and formal as reflected by her hat. Quite willing to help me as far as she was allowed which wasn't terribly far. Think she is a person with whom one can deal easily and without anxiety. |
| 70. PE PSP | no-- | didn't expect what he found | very warm person, interview pleasant |
| 71. NE PSP | yes--she might be abrupt | didn't think she was abrupt but efficient | told she was a businesslike person-was pleasant but not too warm-- I did find the interview altogether pleasant and painless |
| 72. PE PSP | told she'd be very friendly | friendly, warm | |
| 73. PE NSP | just told she's a nice person | | quick, efficient, patient; felt at ease in the beginning--then tense; in general she seemed to be a pleasant person |
| 74. NoE NSP | no idea | she looked like a working person | pleasant but not too friendly; efficient systematic |
| 75. NoE PSP | no idea | as pleasant as anyone | very pleasant person in whose presence I felt altogether comfortable. |

Check on Experimental Manipulations
(continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Perception of Expectancy | Perception of Stimulus Person | Perception of Stimulus Person or Expectancy (written impression) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 76. PE NSP | told she was nice, pleasant friendly | appearance was indicative of her personality; was cold, businesslike | |
| 77. NE NSP | thought she would be businesslike-- | tried to make conversation but unsuccessfully | she was pure business; voice authoritative |
| 78. PE NSP | thought she would be interested in what he had to say and pleasant; told she was very nice and pleasant | she was disinterested and unpleasant; wasn't nice | |
| 79. NE NSP | no | did her job; made me feel uncomfortable; antisocial | |
| 80. NoE PSP | no | interviewer nice throughout interview; at ease | |
| 81. NE NSP | told she'd be businesslike | businesslike; precise, formal | |
| 82. NE PSP | told she was cold | didn't find her that pleasant, friendly way at all | |
| 83. PE NSP | told she was very nice | she was as she had to be--not a warm person; cold | |
| 84. PE NSP | told she was friendly | she was as she had to be--what she was told was not too wrong | not overly friendly; |
| 85. NoE PSP | no; just thought she'd be older | informa; helpful; at ease | |
| 86. NE PSP | told she was curt and businesslike | she was very pleasant | |
| 87. NE PSP | told she was businesslike | she was not particularly so | not as formal as I thought it would be; she was businesslike but also very friendly |

Check on Experimental Manipulations
(continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Perception of Expectancy | Perception of Stimulus Person | Perception of Stimulus Person or Expectancy (written impression) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 88. PE NSP | expected older person; told she'd be nice | expected her to be more informal | formal; seemed impersonal; stern. |
| 89. PE PSP | told she was very harmless | very nice woman; almost friendly | |
| 90. NoE NSP | no | | seemed bored with job; air of indifference around her; sort of "cold attractiveness" |
| 91. NoE NSP | no | cold, mechanical interview | cold person |
| 92. NE PSP | warned that she was businesslike; formal-assumed she would be older | was the opposite; younger; friendly; dressed well, helpful; not very aloof | |
| 93. NoE NSP | no--just thought she'd be female | she was not warm | did not feel completely relaxed in her presence |
| 94. NE NSP | told she'd be stern | frank; businesslike | |
| 95. NoE NSP | no | less sociable and friendly | cold; showed no emotion; acted like a machine |
| 96. PE PSP | told she was very nice | pleasant, friendly, someone he could like outside the interview | |
| 97. NE NSP | businesslike | she was cold | warned that she was not a warm person |
| 98. NE NSP | told that she was abrupt | | fairly formal in her approach; not boring or antagonistic; charming |
| 99. PE PSP | told she would be nice; put him at ease | very warm, attractive young lady; felt as if he had known her for a long time | |
| 100. NE PSP | told she was businesslike | surprised that she wasn't | friendly; interested in her work; smiled quite a bit |

Check on Experimental Manipulations
(continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Perception of Expectancy | Perception of Stimulus Person | Perception of Stimulus Person or Expectancy (written impression) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 101. NoE PSP | no; just told there was an interviewer | | friendly person; interested; smile seemed to be her natural manner |
| 102. PE NSP | told she would enjoy it; interviewer very nice | just the opposite; quite surprised | |
| 103. NoE NSP | no | very cold; acted like a robot | |
| 104. NE PSP | told she was abrupt; went in on the defensive | she was very nice | |
| 105. NE PSP | told she was cold and businesslike | seemed very pleasant; knew her job | pleasant; cheerful |
| 106. PE PSP | she was intelligent efficient person | yes-- | friendly; informal |
| 107. NoE PSP | no | nice; charming | |
| 108. PE NSP | told she was very nice | more detached | complete air of detachment; not made to feel relaxed |
| 109. NoE NSP | just told interviewer's name | "had to do the job" | she was perhaps too cold toward the subject |
| 110. NoE PSP | not told anything-- but figured she'd be friendly; all interviewers would be friendly | YES | pleasant; seemed to be quite a nice person |
| 111. PE NSP | told she was a nice person | fairly pleasant and efficient--expected both | |
| 112. NE NSP | businesslike | pretty cold; didn't talk much like machine | |
| 113. PE PSP | told she was very nice | very warm, interested, friendly | |

Check on Experimental Manipulations
(continued)

| S# and Assigned Condition | Perception of Expectancy | Perception of Stimulus Person | Perception of Stimulus Person or Expectancy (written impression) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 114. PE NSP | told she would be nice; thought it would be older person | seemed to be talking down to him; could have been friendlier | |
| 115. PE NSP | thought she would be more friendly; told she was pleasant | impersonal; just doing her job | |
| 116. PE PSP | she was a charming person | very charming | |
| 117. PE PSP | generally a pleasant person chosen as an interviewer (Note--hinted at expectance) | very nice; no pressure; relaxed | |
| 118. PE NSP | expected her to be like she was; totally interested in what she was doing; told she was friendly | not overly friendly or unfriendly | manner businesslike; at times quite discouraging; greatest shortcoming was inability to communicate in even a partially informal or casual manner |
| 119. NoE PSP | expected her to be older; told nothing | did just what an interviewer should do | pretty, well dressed; cheerful |
| 120. NoE PSP | no--thought she might be older and impersonal; told nothing | she was interested | warm, friendly |

Note on Perception of Stimulus Person's Behavior

The responses of the two Ss who interacted with a PSP but whose responses were categorized as reflecting an NSP interaction were:

#53 -- "I was told she was nice -- she was younger than I expected -- her hat was formal -- she got friendlier towards the end of the interview."

#69 -- "formal as reflected by her hat -- quite willing to help me as far as she could go -- which wasn't terribly far. I think she is a person with whom one can deal easily and without anxiety."

The responses of the five subjects who interacted with an NSP but were categorized as perceiving her to be positive were:

#48 -- "fairly warm person working at an objective job"

#73 -- "I didn't like or dislike her particularly. She was quick, efficient, and patient. I first felt at ease but then became tense. In general, a pleasant person."

#74 -- "She seemed to be a pleasant woman but not too friendly -- efficient and systematic."

#98 -- "formal in her approach but not boring or antagonistic"

#111 -- "it is difficult to form an impression in so short a time. She was fairly pleasant and efficient."

As was mentioned in the Results section, all of these statements are, admittedly, not as positive or negative as responses which were categorized as "accurate" perceptions. However, they do contain elements of the actual stimulus person roles, i.e., the NSP did seem more efficient than the PSP; the NSP was not meant to be antagonistic but was meant to be formal, etc. Therefore, aspects of the actual roles were perceived.

Table 2 Analysis of Variance of Ratings of SP's Influence

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F[1] | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A (Goal Dependence) | 35232 | 1 | 35232.0 | 82.704 | < .01 |
| B (Expectancy - PE, NE or NoE) | 233 | 2 | 116.5 | < 1 | n.s. |
| C (Nature of SP - PSP or NSP) | 1518 | 1 | 1518.0 | 3.563 | n.s. |
| D (Sex of S - M or F) | 6 | 1 | 6.0 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXB | 86 | 2 | 43.0 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXC | 22 | 1 | 22.0 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXD | 561 | 1 | 561.0 | 1.317 | n.s. |
| BXC | 236 | 2 | 118.0 | < 1 | n.s. |
| BXD | 222 | 2 | 111.0 | < 1 | n.s. |
| CXD | 729 | 1 | 729.0 | 1.711 | n.s. |
| AXBXC | 335 | 2 | 167.5 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXBXD | 696 | 2 | 348.0 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXCXD | 738 | 1 | 738.0 | 1.731 | n.s. |
| BXCXD | 228 | 2 | 114.0 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXBXCXD | 45 | 2 | 22.5 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Error | 40896 | 96 | 426.0 | | |
| Total | 81783 | 119 | | | |

Table 3 Analysis of Variance of Ratings of SP's Importance

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F[1] | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A (Goal Dependence) | 10623 | 1 | 10623.0 | 27.520 | < .01 |
| B | 874 | 2 | 237.0 | < 1 | n.s. |
| C | 813 | 1 | 813.0 | 2.106 | n.s. |
| D | 202 | 1 | 202.0 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXB | 209 | 2 | 104.5 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXC | 331 | 1 | 331.0 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXD | 185 | 1 | 185.0 | < 1 | n.s. |
| BXC | 913 | 2 | 456.5 | 1.183 | n.s. |
| BXD | 768 | 2 | 384.0 | < 1 | n.s. |
| CXD | 1260 | 1 | 1260.0 | 3.264 | n.s. |
| AXBXC | 2388 | 2 | 1194.0 | 3.093 | n.s. |
| AXBXD | 983 | 2 | 491.5 | 1.273 | n.s. |
| AXCXD | 66 | 1 | 66.0 | < 1 | n.s. |
| BXCXD | 104 | 2 | 52.0 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXBXCXD | 84 | 2 | 42.0 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Error | 37057 | 96 | 386.010 | | |
| Total | 56529 | 119 | | | |

[1] F's necessary for significance for this, and all other analyses of variance, will be found in Appendix B, p. 228.

F Scores Necessary for Significance at p = .05, .02 and .01[a] for df = 1 and 48, 2 and 48, 1 and 96, and 2 and 96[b]

| df | p = | .05 | .02 | .01 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1/48 | | 4.0430 | 5.3548 | 7.1956 |
| 2/48 | | 3.1911 | 3.9882 | 5.0780 |
| 1/80 ) 1/96 | | 3.9607 | 5.2191 | 6.9641 |
| 1/120 ) | | 3.9201 | 5.1524 | 6.8510 |
| 2/80 ) | | 3.111 | 3.8650 | 4.8820 |
| 2/120 ) 2/96 | | 3.0718 | 3.8046 | 4.7865 |

---

[a] Table values taken from: Owne, D.R. Handbook of Statistical Tables. Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1962, p. 84.

[b] F's necessary for significance with df = 1/96 and 2/96 could not be found in available sources. Therefore F's for 1/80 and 1/20 and 2/80 and 2/120 are presented. F's necessary for significance with df = 1/96 and 2/96 would be somewhere between the tabled values.

# APPENDIX C

## Extent and Direction of Impression Forming Behavior

Table 4. -- Analysis of Variance for Number of Words in Written Impression

| Source of Variation | SS | df | MS | F[1] | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HGD vs. LGD (A) | 12710.209 | 1 | 12710.209 | 4.054 | n.s. |
| Expectancy (B) | 14657.267 | 2 | 7328.632 | 2.338 | n.s. |
| PSP vs. NSP (C) | 4236.409 | 1 | 4236.409 | 1.511 | n.s. |
| Sex of Subject (D) | 705.675 | 1 | 705.675 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXB | 4962.067 | 2 | 2481.033 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXC | 2385.207 | 1 | 2385.207 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXD | 9100.208 | 1 | 9100.208 | 2.903 | n.s. |
| BXC | 1057.066 | 2 | 528.533 | < 1 | n.s. |
| BXD | 2620.800 | 2 | 1310.400 | < 1 | n.s. |
| CXD | 130.208 | 1 | 130.208 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXBXC | 7597.068 | 2 | 3798.534 | 2.212 | n.s. |
| AXBXD | 2763.767 | 2 | 1381.383 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXCXD | 8383.410 | 1 | 8383.410 | 2.658 | n.s. |
| BXCXD | 446.467 | 2 | 221.234 | < 1 | n.s. |
| AXBXCXD | 1912.569 | 2 | 956.284 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Error | 300958.400 | 96 | 3134.983 | | |
| Total | 374626.792 | 119 | | | |

[1] F's necessary for significance are presented in Appendix B, p. 228.

Table 5. -- Intercorrelation Matrix For Evaluative Ratings

| | Unsociable | Impersonal | Skeptical | Uncooperative | Unpleasant | Insensitive | Inverviewer Overall-Poor | Relates to Students Poorly | Made You Ill at Ease | Untrustworthy | Dishonest | Unfair | Lazy | Clumsy | Traditional | Rational | Changeable | Undependable | Inconsistent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unsociable | | .62 | .51 | .68 | .76 | .57 | .67 | .76 | .73 | .14 | .23 | .31 | .17 | .11 | .34 | -.08 | .19 | .11 | -.01 |
| Impersonal | | | .49 | .61 | .68 | .53 | .58 | .73 | .61 | .20 | .26 | .38 | .11 | .11 | .34 | -.08 | .08 | .11 | .11 |
| Skeptical | | | | .52 | .53 | .48 | .53 | .54 | .51 | .38 | .25 | .25 | .19 | .13 | .36 | .01 | .14 | .17 | .13 |
| Uncooperative | | | | | .76 | .62 | .67 | .76 | .70 | .37 | .36 | .43 | .41 | .19 | .32 | .00 | .24 | .17 | .21 |
| Unpleasant | | | | | | .68 | .69 | .86 | .76 | .24 | .29 | .41 | .22 | .10 | .24 | -.17 | .08 | .07 | -.02 |
| Insensitive | | | | | | | .46 | .71 | .62 | .30 | .34 | .33 | .17 | .02 | .24 | -.12 | .08 | .11 | .04 |
| Interviewer Overall-Poor | | | | | | | | .74 | .68 | .38 | .42 | .48 | .33 | .40 | .29 | .09 | .26 | .28 | .19 |
| Relates to Students Poorly | | | | | | | | | .77 | .20 | .32 | .48 | .24 | .12 | .27 | .11 | .11 | .10 | .08 |
| Made You Ill at Ease | | | | | | | | | | .25 | .26 | .32 | .19 | .11 | .29 | .11 | .13 | .14 | .05 |
| Untrustworthy | | | | | | | | | | | .49 | .25 | .28 | .36 | .28 | .23 | .29 | .45 | .40 |
| Dishonest | | | | | | | | | | | | .42 | .36 | .36 | .15 | .22 | .30 | .51 | .38 |
| Unfair | | | | | | | | | | | | | .26 | .27 | .16 | .25 | .34 | .24 | .19 |
| Lazy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | .34 | .08 | .20 | .35 | .44 | .34 |
| Clumsy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | .14 | .45 | .24 | .44 | .41 |
| Traditional | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | .09 | .21 | .19 | .18 |
| Rational | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | .40 | .34 | .19 |
| Changeable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | .42 | .48 |
| Undependable | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | .54 |
| Inconsistent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table 6. -- Evaluative Ratings of SP as a Function of Goal Dependency

| Bipolar Characteristic | HGD (N=60) | LGD (N=60) | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unsociable | 34.00 | 37.50 | 1.116 | n.s. |
| Impersonal | 50.30 | 51.30 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 29.00 | 29.10 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 26.30 | 30.90 | 2.478 | n.s. |
| Unpleasant | 32.00 | 33.40 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Insensitive | 36.50 | 37.60 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Interviewer Overall-Poor | 26.90 | 27.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Relates to Students Poorly | 34.70 | 38.20 | 1.527 | n.s. |
| Made You Ill at Ease | 34.90 | 36.50 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 24.30 | 25.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 28.10 | 24.10 | 1.779 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 29.00 | 25.30 | 1.224 | n.s. |
| Lazy | 25.80 | 25.50 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 20.10 | 19.00 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Traditional | 33.10 | 30.40 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Rational | 29.00 | 25.30 | 1.549 | n.s. |
| Changeable | 21.10 | 24.20 | 1.144 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 21.10 | 24.20 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 22.40 | 23.30 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Mean of All Characteristics | 29.15 | 29.96 | < 1 | n.s. |

Table 7. -- Evaluative Ratings of PSP as a Function of Goal Dependency

| Bipolar Characteristic | HGD (N=30) | LGD (N=30) | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unsociable | 18.20 | 17.53 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Impersonal | 32.73 | 33.20 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 22.10 | 19.56 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 16.70 | 17.50 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unpleasant | 15.43 | 15.07 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Insensitive | 25.63 | 26.07 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Interviewer Overall-Poor | 14.50 | 14.57 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Relates to Students Poorly | 17.20 | 20.00 | 1.276 | n.s. |
| Made You Ill at Ease | 15.50 | 14.87 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 25.00 | 21.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 22.07 | 25.50 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 23.10 | 20.53 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Lazy | 24.07 | 20.20 | 2.243 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 20.93 | 17.70 | 1.604 | n.s. |
| Traditional | 32.50 | 24.93 | 3.425 | n.s. |
| Rational | 30.04 | 30.04 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Changeable | 23.30 | 23.03 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 22.12 | 18.20 | 1.496 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 24.30 | 23.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Mean of All Characteristics | 22.50 | 21.22 | < 1 | n.s. |

Table 8. -- Evaluative Ratings of the NSP as a Function of Goal Dependency

| Bipolar Characteristic | HGD (N=30) | LGD (N=30) | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unsociable | 50.20 | 57.50 | 1.890 | n.s. |
| Impersonal | 68.40 | 69.30 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 36.10 | 38.60 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 36.20 | 44.20 | 2.430 | n.s. |
| Unpleasant | 49.20 | 51.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Insensitive | 47.90 | 49.20 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Interviewer Overall-Poor | 39.40 | 41.30 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Relates to Students Poorly | 52.60 | 56.30 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Made You Ill at Ease | 54.70 | 58.10 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 23.20 | 29.70 | 2.101 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 26.10 | 30.60 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 35.10 | 30.00 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Lazy | 27.10 | 30.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 18.50 | 20.30 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Traditional | 33.20 | 35.80 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Rational[1] | 27.50 | 20.10 | 3.126 | n.s. |
| Changeable | 18.40 | 25.30 | 2.724 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 17.10 | 20.00 | 2.547 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 20.40 | 22.80 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Mean of All Characteristics | 35.82 | 38.69 | 1.182 | n.s. |

[1] It will be recalled that a higher rating on "rational," contrary to other characteristics, is taken to indicate a more positive evaluation.

Table 9. -- Correlations between Evaluative Ratings and Certainty Ratings

| Bipolar Characteristics | r (N=120) |
|---|---|
| Unsociable | .5190 |
| Impersonal | .0561 |
| Skeptical | .3491 |
| Uncooperative | .6886 |
| Unpleasant | .5884 |
| Insensitive | .5403 |
| Untrustworthy | .7056 |
| Dishonest | .5878 |
| Unfair | .5470 |
| Lazy | .5240 |
| Clumsy | .7369 |
| Traditional | .4311 |
| Rational | .5775 |
| Changeable | .5872 |
| Undependable | .6606 |
| Inconsistent | .6280 |
| Unimportant | .3283 |

Table 10. -- Certainty Ratings as a Function of Goal Dependency

| Bipolar Characteristic | HGD (N=60) | LGD (N=60) | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unsociable | 32.57 | 30.08 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Impersonal | 20.78 | 21.87 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 29.07 | 29.63 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 30.57 | 27.08 | 1.367 | n.s. |
| Unpleasant | 24.18 | 19.40 | 2.959 | n.s. |
| Insensitive | 33.38 | 32.60 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 30.65 | 27.67 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 38.28 | 31.32 | 2.768 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 33.05 | 27.72 | 3.436 | < .05 |
| Lazy | 31.42 | 29.63 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 26.38 | 24.65 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Traditional | 37.65 | 34.20 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Rational | 34.87 | 29.17 | 2.597 | n.s. |
| Changeable | 27.42 | 30.20 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 31.83 | 29.87 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 34.53 | 29.67 | 1.667 | n.s. |
| Unimportant | 34.23 | 36.45 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Mean Certainty | 31.26 | 28.90 | 1.999 | n.s. |

Table 11. -- Certainty Ratings of Ss Evaluating the PSP as a Function of Goal Dependency

| Bipolar Characteristic | HGD (N=30) | LGD (N=30) | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unsociable | 19.27 | 22.47 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Impersonal | 22.97 | 30.77 | 3.304 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 24.20 | 27.40 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 22.93 | 23.00 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unpleasant | 14.70 | 15.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Insensitive | 30.27 | 31.03 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 30.37 | 28.43 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 35.33 | 32.10 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 26.80 | 26.83 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Lazy | 29.60 | 30.63 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 25.00 | 23.83 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Traditional | 35.47 | 30.43 | 1.022 | n.s. |
| Rational | 34.93 | 34.27 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Changeable | 27.67 | 32.47 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 31.43 | 29.70 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 33.80 | 31.87 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Unimportant | 31.90 | 41.70 | 2.583 | n.s. |
| Mean Certainty | 27.96 | 28.48 | < 1 | n.s. |

Table 12. -- Certainty Ratings of Ss Evaluating the NSP as a Function of Goal Dependency

| Bipolar Characteristic | HGD (N=30) | LGD (N=30) | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Unsociable | 45.87 | 37.70 | 2.167 | n.s. |
| Impersonal | 18.60 | 16.63 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Skeptical | 33.93 | 31.87 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Uncooperative | 38.20 | 30.50 | 2.521 | n.s. |
| Unpleasant | 33.67 | 23.10 | 4.956 | < .05 |
| Insensitive | 39.83 | 34.17 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Untrustworthy | 30.93 | 26.90 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Dishonest | 41.23 | 30.53 | 3.223 | n.s. |
| Unfair | 42.63 | 28.63 | 6.002 | < .05 |
| Lazy | 33.23 | 28.63 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Clumsy | 27.77 | 25.40 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Traditional | 39.83 | 39.23 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Rational | 34.80 | 24.07 | 4.098 | < .05 |
| Changeable | 27.17 | 27.93 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Undependable | 32.23 | 30.03 | < 1 | n.s. |
| Inconsistent | 35.27 | 27.27 | 2.463 | n.s. |
| Unimportant | 36.57 | 31.20 | 1.062 | n.s. |
| Mean Certainty | 34.56 | 29.03 | 4.057 | < .05 |

REFERENCES


Asch, S.E. Forming impressions of personality. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1946, 41, 258.

Beach, L. and Wertheimer, M. A free response approach to the study of person cognition. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1961, 62, 367.

Berkowitz, L. Anti-semitism and the displacement of aggression. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1959, 59, 182.

Berkowitz, L. Some aspects of observed aggression. J. Pers. Soc. Psych., 1965, 2, 359.

Berkowitz, L. and Holmes, D.S. A further investigation of hostility generalization to disliked subjects. J. Pers., 1960, 28, 427.

Berkowitz, L., Corwin, R. and Heironimus, M. Film violence and subsequent aggressive tendencies. Pub. Opin. Quart., 1963, 27, 217.

Berkowitz, L. and Rawlings, E. Effects of film violence on inhibitions against subsequent aggression. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1963, 66, 405.

Bieri, J. Complexity-simplicity as a personality variable in cognitive and preferential behavior. In: D.W. Fiske and S.R. Maddi (Eds). Functions of Varied Experience. Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1961.

Bruner, J.S. and Taiguri, R. The perception of people. In: G. Lindzey (Ed.). Handbook of Social Psychology, V. II. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Campbell, V.N. Assumed similarity, perceived sociometric balance and social influence. Unpublished doctoral thesis, U. of Colorado, 1960. Cited in: Bieri, J. Complexity-simplicity as a personality variable in cognitive and preferential behavior. In: D.W. Fiske and S.R. Maddi (Eds.). Functions of Varied Experience. Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1961.

Champney, H. and Marshall, H. Optimal refinement of the rating scale. J. Appl. Psych., 1939, 23, 323.

Cohen, A.R. Cognitive tuning as a factor affecting impression formation. J. Pers., 1961, 29, 235.

Crockett, W.H. Cognitive complexity and impression formation. In: B.A. Maher (Ed.). Progress in Experimental Personality Research, V. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Feshback, S. and Singer, R. Effects of fear arousal and suppression of fear upon social perception. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1957, 55, 283.

Gergen, J. and Jones, E.E. Mental illness, predictability, and affective consequences as stimulus factors in person perception. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1963, 67, 95.

Gollin, E. Forming impressions of personality. J. Pers., 1954, 23, 65.

Haire, M. and Grunes, W.F. Perceptual defenses: processes protecting an organized perception of another personality. Hum. Rel., 1950, 3, 403.

Harvey, O.J. Motivation and Social Interaction: Cognitive Determinants. New York: Ronald Press, 1963.

Hastorf, A.H., Richardson, S.A. and Dornbusch, S.M. The problem of relevance in the study of person perception. In: R. Taguiri, and L. Petrullo (Eds.). Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior. California: Stanford Univ. Press, 1958.

Hays, W.L. An approach to the study of trait implication and trait similarity. In: R. Taguiri and L. Petrullo, (Eds.). Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior. California: Stanford Univ. Press, 1958.

Hebb, D.O. Drives and the C.N.S. (conceptual nervous system). Psych. Rev., 1955, 62, 243.

Iverson, M.A. Personality impressions of punitive stimulus persons of differential status. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1964, 68, 617.

Janis, J.L. and Feshback, S. Effects of fear arousing communications. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1953, 48, 78.

Jones, E.E. Authoritarianism as a determinant of first-impression formation. J. Pers., 1954, 23, 107.

Jones, E.E. Ingratiation: A Social Psychological Analysis. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1964.

Jones, E.E. and Daugherty, B.N. Political orientation and the perceptual effects of an anticipated reaction. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1959, 59, 340.

Jones, E.E. and David, K.E. From acts to dispositions: The attribution process in person perception. In: L. Berkowitz (Ed.). Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, V. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Jones, E.E., David, K.E., and Gergen, K.J. Role playing variations and their informational value for person perception. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1961, 63, 302.

Jones, E.E. and DeCharms, R. Changes in social perception as a function of the personal relevance of behavior. Sociometry, 1957, 20, 75.

Jones, E.E. and DeCharms, R. The organizing function of interaction roles in person perception. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1958, 57, 155.

Jones, E.E., Hester, S.L., Farina, A. and Davis, K.E. Reactions to unfavorable personal evaluations as a function of the evaluator's perceived adjustment. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1959, 59, 363.

Jones, E.E. and Thibaut, J.W. Interaction goals as a basis of inference in interpersonal perception. In: R. Tagiuri and L. Petrullo (Eds.). Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior. California: Stanford Univ. Press, 1958.

Kastenbaum, A. An experimental study of the formation of impressions of personality. Unpublished Master's thesis, New School for Social Research, 1951.

Katz, D. Motivational basis of attitude change. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1954, 49, 115.

Kelly, H. The warm-cold variable in first impressions of persons. J. Pers., 1950, 18, 431.

Kelly, G.A. The psychology of personal constructs. New York: Norton Press, 1955.

Kleiner, R.J. The effects of threat reduction upon interpersonal attractiveness. J. Pers., 1960, 28, 145.

Koltuv, B.B. Some characteristics of intrajudge trait intercorrelations. Psych. Monogr., 1962, 26, Whole #882.

Leventhal, H. The effects of set and discrepancy on impression change. J. Pers., 1962, 30, 1.

Leventhal, H. and Singer, D.L. Cognitive complexity, impression formation and impression change. J. Pers., 1964, 32, 210.

Luchins, A. Forming impressions of personality: a critique. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1948, 43, 318.

Maddi, S.R. Unexpectedness, affective tone, and behavior. In: D.W. Fiske and S.R. Maddi (Eds.). Functions of Varied Experience. Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1961.

Marx, M.H., Henderson, R.L., and Roberts, C.L. Positive reinforcement of the bar pressing response by a light stimulus following dark operant pretests with no after effect. J. Comp. Physio. Psych., 1955, 48, 73.

Mayo, C.W. and Crockett, W.H. Cognitive complexity and primacy-recency effects in impression formation. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1964, 68, 335.

McClelland, D.C., Atkinson, J.W., Clarke, R.A. and Lowell, E.L. The Achievement Motive. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1953.

Mensh, I.N. and Wishness, J. Asch on forming impressions of personality: further evidence. J. Pers., 1947, 16, 188.

Murray, H.A. The effects of fear upon estimates of maliciousness of other personalities. J. Soc. Psych., 1933, 4, 310.

Nidorf, L.J. Individual differences in impression formation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Clark Univ., Worcester, Mass., 1961. Cited in: Crockett, W.H. Cognitive complexity and impression formation. In: B.A. Maher (Ed.). Progress in Experimental Personality Research, V. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Nidorf, L.J. and Crockett, W.H. Some factors affecting the amount of information sought about others. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1964, 69, 98.

Pepitone, A. Motivational factors in social perception. Hum. Rel., 1950, 3, 57.

Pepitone, A. and Wallace, W. Experimental studies on the dynamics of hostility. Cited in: Pepitone, A. Attributions of causality, social attitudes and cognitive matching processes. In: R. Taiguri and L. Petrullo (Eds.). Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior. California: Stanford Univ. Press, 1958.

Proshansky, H. The degree of impression forming behavior. Unpublished manuscript, 1962.

Radke-Yarrow, M. and Campbell, J.D. Person perception in children. Merrill-Palmer Quart., 1963, 9, 57.

Sarbin, T.R. Contributions to role taking theory: role expectancies as qualities, 1952. Cited in: Sarbin, T.R., Role Theory. In: G. Lindzey (Ed.). Handbook of Social Psychology, V. 1. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Secord, P.F. and Methard, J.E. Personalities in faces: IV. A descriptive analysis of the perception of women's faces and the identification of some physiognomic determinants. J. Psych., 1955, 39, 269.

Shapiro, D. and Taguiri, R. Sex differences in inferring personality traits. J. Psych., 1959, 47, 127.

Shrauger, S. and Altrocchi, J. The personality of the perceiver as a factor in person perception. Psych. Bull., 1964, 62, 289.

Singer, R. and Feshback, S. Effects of anxiety arousal in psychotics and normals upon the perception of anxiety in others. J. Pers., 1962, 30, 574.

Supnick, L.E. Differences in univalence and extremity of impressions of others as a function of personal and situational variables. Unpublished Master's thesis, Clark Univ., Worchester, Mass., 1964. Cited in: Crockett, W.H. Cognitive complexity and impression formation. In: B.A. Maher (Ed.). Progress in Experimental Personality Research, V. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Supnick, J. Unpublished Senior Honors Thesis, Clark Univ., Worchester, Mass., 1964. Cited in: Crockett, W.H. Cognitive complexity and impression formation. In: B.A. Maher (Ed.). Progress in Experimental Personality Research, V. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.

Thibaut, J.W. and Reiken, H.W. Some determinants and consequences of the perception of social causality. J. Pers., 1955, 24, 113.

Zajonc, R.B. The process of cognitive tuning in communication. J. Abn. Soc. Psych., 1960, 61, 159.