

5-1993

## **The Effects of Motivational Intent and Accuracy in Same Sex Groups**

Brandi Annette Braud

Motivational Intent

THE Effects of Motivational Intent and Accurcy  
in Same Sex Groups

Brandi Braud  
Louisiana State University

May 1993

Running Head: MOTIVATIONAL INTENT

**Abstract**

Studies have documented sex differences between men and women and the problems that result from these differences since the 1950's. However, little has been documented about the problems and complexities of working in same sex groups. Approximately 96 males and 96 females from introductory psychology courses at Louisiana State University participated in this study. Male and female confederates interacted with members of the same sex on a bean estimation task. The effects of accuracy and behavioral styles were investigated. The results indicate that self-orientated motivational style leads to enhanced influence in same sex groups, as does accuracy. These findings suggest that the adoption of a behavioral style such as this may be successful strategy for the attainment of influence.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	1
Introduction .....	4
Theories of Influence .....	5
Ridgeway .....	5
Heirarchy .....	7
Attention-based .....	9
Hollander .....	10
Expectation States .....	11
Social Influence .....	12
Hypotheses .....	19
Method .....	21
Participants .....	21
Procedure .....	21
Results .....	24
References .....	37
Appendix A .....	39
Appendix B .....	45
Appendix C .....	47
Appendix D .....	51
Appendix E .....	53

Tables

Table 1	
<u>Mean Rankings of Confederates in each Condition</u> .....	26
Table 2	
<u>Mean Composite Perceived Influence, Liking, Perceived</u> <u>Style, Perceived Competence, Attention, and Personality</u> <u>Ratings of Confederate</u> .....	28
Table 3	
<u>Intercorrelations Among Dependent Variables</u> .....	29
Table 4	
<u>Correlations of Dependent variables with Actual</u> <u>Influence</u> .....	32
Table 5	
<u>Correlations Between Composites and Actual Influence</u> ...	33

### **The Effects of Motivational Intent and Accuracy in Same Sex Groups**

In group interactions initial judgments of status are based on visible characteristics, such as gender or race. Once such judgments are made those with higher status have more opportunities to attain influence within the group, than those with lower status. Several theories dealing with the problems of attaining influence as low status individuals have been proposed. Each theory attempts to explain how individuals interacting within a group can employ certain strategies to attain influence. Most of the theories suggest using a behavioral style, such as self-orientation, to gain influence. Adopting this particular behavioral style involves presenting oneself as being motivated to help him/herself and promote his/her ideas.

A common thread that runs throughout most of the theories of influence is that men in mixed sex groups are at a considerable advantage when trying to attain influence. Studies clearly document that men are seen as having higher status due to their gender (Carli, 1991; Megargee, 1969; Miller, Taylor, & Buck, 1991; Meeker & Weitzel-O'Neill, 1977). When in a group interaction the high status attributed to men gives them more contribution opportunities than women. This enhances their influence within mixed sex groups. The more opportunities

one has to contribute the more chances one is given to gain influence. Thus, men in mixed sex groups do not generally have to concern themselves with exhibiting any particular behavioral style.

On the other hand, women are seen as having lower status. In group interactions they can either willingly accept their lower status positions, or develop ways in which to gain influence regardless of perceived status.

This study attempts to examine the effects of a self-oriented behavioral style of interaction and accuracy on the attainment of influence in same sex groups. The study combines portions of several theories in an attempt to integrate different mechanisms into a single system. It is hoped this will result in greater influence for the individuals who employ this strategy.

### Theories of Influence

#### Ridgeway's Model

Ridgeway's theory of influence deals with motivational intent and attained influence. According to Ridgeway (1981; 1982; 1987) females in an all male group are perceived to be low in status and, therefore, cannot legitimately try to gain status. They must, instead, demonstrate that they are motivated to help the group, and not themselves. Thus, group-oriented females will attain more influence when interacting within a group of men than will females who adopt no style or a self-oriented

behavioral style. Other researchers as well have found that women must be more concerned with establishing a wish to help the group than men (Meeker & Weitzel-O'Neill, 1977; Carli, 1991).

Ridgeway, however, argues that self-oriented females as opposed to group-oriented females or females who exhibit no behavioral style will gain influence in an all female group because these persons are status equals, but equals low in status. Females are typically less likely to be aggressive and speak up in a group. They defer more to those in leadership positions and do not seek to gain influence for themselves as much as males. They, therefore, are more likely to accept self-orientation from another female because no one else in the group is willing to challenge that person.

Unlike the female in the female group, the male in the male group will gain more influence if he demonstrates a group-oriented style of interaction than if he displays self-orientation, according to Ridgeway's study. However, Ridgeway presents no explanation for these results.

Ridgeway approached the problem of influence attainment by proposing ways in which individuals could gain influence despite their initial status. In general, she states that those who initially have low status must be more concerned with proving that they are motivated to help the group and have no wish to promote their own ideas than those initially granted



high status. Although she insists that status equals need not bother with motivational intent, the results of her study suggest that the adoption of a behavioral style which is the opposite of the typical style for individuals of that particular status will enhance influence. A second model of influence attainment, the hierarchy model, differs from Ridgeway's theory in that it proposes methods to gain influence in which individuals exhibit characteristics of high status individuals and thus gain higher status.

### **Hierarchy Model**

Unlike Ridgeway's theory, the hierarchy model emphasizes high status characteristics, or those characteristics which are common in high status individuals, and suggests that individuals attempting to gain influence should exhibit such characteristics in order to gain the same contribution opportunities as high status individuals, and thus the same opportunities to attain influence. Some studies argue that in social interactions a hierarchy is formed in dealing with status inconsistencies (Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch, 1972: Zelditch, Lauderdale, & Stublarec, 1980) . This model proposes that those with two high characteristics (a male who is self-oriented) will be more influential than those with inconsistent characteristics (a male who is group-oriented or a female who is self-oriented). In addition, it is proposed that those with inconsistent characteristics will be more

influential than those with two low characteristics (a female who is group-oriented). According to this model, then, the self-oriented female should ultimately be more influential than the group oriented female because she is combining two inconsistent characteristics, while the group-oriented female is combining two low characteristics.

Regarding the influence of males, the same relationship applies. Self-orientation is seen as a characteristic of high status individuals and group-orientation is seen as characteristic of low status individuals. Therefore, self-oriented males would be seen as possessing two high characteristics. The group-oriented male, on the other hand, would be seen as possessing inconsistent characteristics. Thus, according to the Hierarchy model the self-oriented male should attain more influence than the group-oriented male.

In summary, this model suggests that self-oriented individuals will be more influential than group oriented individuals of the same sex. The predictions for those exhibiting either behavioral style differ for males and females. Because males initially have high status they will attain more influence than females exhibiting the same behavioral style.

Like the hierarchy model the attention-based model, the third model of influence attainment, proposes that self-oriented individuals will attain influence, however, unlike the hierarchy model, the attention-based model does not propose any significant

differences in the amount of influence attained by group versus self-oriented individuals.

### **The Attention Based Model**

As opposed to the hierarchy model discussed above, the attention based model suggests that both group-orientation and self-orientation may lead to enhanced influence (Shackelford, Wood, & Worchel, 1991) . However, this theory deals with females in mixed sex groups only. This model proposes that the attention brought to the individual is due in part to the fact that a self-oriented behavioral style serves as a cue to the validity of the answer. In situations where knowledge of one's competence is not readily available outside cues such as a self-oriented behavioral style draw attention to the individual and his/her contributions and can override other status expectations. This model predicts that attention is the essential element for influence and suggests that the same results should occur for self-oriented members in same sex groups as occurs for those in mixed sex groups. According to this model, group-orientation is also proposed to lead to influence for females in mixed sex groups. This is due to the fact that these individuals conform to status expectations and therefore are perceived as highly competent and logical. Thus, their contributions are noticed and legitimized.

In summary, this model proposes that it is through attention that one gains influence. By employing a behavioral style one

can draw attention to oneself and one's contributions.

In contrast to this attention based theory is yet another theory of influence, Hollander's theory of idiosyncrasy credits. This theory suggests that group orientation or conforming to group norms will result in the most influence.

### **Hollander's Theory of Idiosyncrasy Credits**

This is one of the earliest theories of minority influence. This model, like Ridgeway's, stresses the importance of group-orientation when trying to attain influence. However, Hollander (1958) expressed the view that group-orientation is important for all group members, because it makes the member more valuable to the group. He accounts for the discrepancy in contributions between different group members by pointing to the different norms and expectations that exist for leaders vs other group members. Hollander predicts that the group-oriented members should be more influential in mixed and same sex groups. The group-oriented member is more likely to conform to group norms and, therefore, amass idiosyncrasy credits. These credits later give the member a legitimate right to deviate from these norms and influence the group. However, a self-oriented member is more likely to deviate early and lose idiosyncrasy credits and, ultimately, status.

In summary, this theory states that all group-oriented members will be more influential than self-oriented members. Hollander's theory was expanded upon years later by Berger,

Cohen, & Zelditch.

### **Expectation States Theory**

The expectation states theory is yet another theory proposed to explain how we might attain influence in group interactions. This theory states that individuals enter a group unequal in status based on visible characteristics such as gender (Berger et al, 1972; Wahrman & Pugh, 1972; Wahrman & Pugh, 1974). Subsequent interaction is affected by these initial judgments of status. Higher status individuals are given more contribution opportunities since they are expected to contribute more, and they are more likely to take these opportunities. They are perceived as being more competent, thus, their contributions are viewed with greater seriousness than the contributions of other group members. In situations such as these, high status individuals gain more influence, while low status individuals lose influence as they receive fewer chances to contribute. This theory predicts that males in a mixed sex group will be more influential than females, unless other characteristics outweigh gender. This theory, however, makes no predictions regarding what might occur in same sex groups. Based on the above findings, the expectation states theory attempts to explain why the idiosyncrasy credit theory is true for females and not for males. They predict that because of the initial high status of males there may be a different set of norms to which males are expected to conform. The theory, also, predicts that the

male may be tolerated more readily if he does indeed deviate from the norms. Thus, because different norms may exist, the male may be in fact conforming to the group's expectations even if he is exhibiting what would normally be termed self-oriented behavior.

Expectation states theory is very similar to Ridgeway's theory in that it states that the amount of influence attained will be based on the way in which other group member expect the individual to behave. Unlike the Expectation States theory, the social influence model bases its assumptions on the belief that any group member may attain influence regardless of behavioral style depending on how he/she presents his/her views. This model contrasts with most of the other theories in that it does not emphasize the use of a behavioral style to attain influence.

#### **The Social Influence Model**

The social influence model is an attempt to integrate majority and minority influence into a single system (Moscovici, 1980; Tanford & Penrod, 1984). Majority influence is attainment of influence by someone in the majority/someone of high status, while minority influence is attainment of influence by someone in the minority/someone of low status. This model proposes that the same forces that govern majority influence govern minority influence. Minorities do not have to conform to group expectancies, nor be well-liked, as is often implied by other

theories of influence. Instead this model suggests that influence is a function of consistency, group size, and the strength of the influence source. Thus if a minority consistently presents his/her view in a confident and well-thought out manner, if he/she does not give in easily to the opinions of others and if the group size is small the minority has a moderate chance for success. In other words, this model predicts that motivational intent is not important in determining influence.

The above theories all provide plausible strategies for attaining influence, from devising ways in which minorities/low status individuals can use behavioral styles to gain influence to integrating the attainment of influence by minorities and majorities into a single strategic system. However, most of the theories ignore important aspects and problems apparent in the attempt to gain influence by any member of the group.

This study first examines the predicted effects of these strategies in same sex groups to see if the strategies would work here as well, or if they are unique in their success to mixed sex groups. The study also explores the differences, if any, between male groups and female groups. Lastly, the study compares a particular behavioral style to a no style control in order to assess the effectiveness of the behavioral style. If no control is provided then is the discovery that one behavioral style works better than another really important.

It could be that exhibiting no style results in more influence. Until this aspect of attaining influence is examined more closely it will be difficult to make any clear statements regarding the effects of specific behavioral styles.

In most studies, little is said concerning interaction among members of the same sex. In general men are more dominating and aggressive than females and tend more to focus on self improvement when interacting with others. In addition, they are more competitive, confident, likely to attribute success to their own talents and abilities, and demand more rewards for their achievements.

Women, on the other hand, initially have lower status and are less confident and competitive than males. While males tend to attribute success to internal factors, women are more likely to attribute success to external factors and, thus, demand fewer rewards for their achievements.

When looking at these characteristics some researchers have hypothesized that they can pose problems for males and females in interacting with members of their own sex (Meeker & Weitzel-O'Neal, 1977). The more dominating and aggressive nature of males in addition to their competitiveness hampers their ability to come to group decisions, while females' typical reluctance to compete and their lack of confidence and assertiveness may also make decision making hard for an all female group. These phenomenon, if true, could present



particular problems for members of same sex groups when trying to attain influence. In addition, in situations such as these it may become difficult to come to group decisions.

One particular strategy that has been shown to enhance influence in group interactions is the adoption of a self-oriented behavioral style (Berger et al. 1972; Zelditch et al. 1980; Ridgeway, 1987; Shackelford et al. 1991). The self-oriented behavioral style establishes the individual as motivated to help him/herself and may draw attention to the individual and his/her ideas. In fact, recent research provides evidence that displaying self-orientation can lead to influence (Berger et al. 1972; Zelditch et al. 1980; Shackelford et al. 1991). These studies argue that self-orientation brings attention to the individual which may lead to perceived competence of the individual and adoption of their ideas.

The present research deals with the question of males and females in a same sex groups. Little research has been done on this topic. Ridgeway (1982) documented that a self-oriented female was more influential in an all female group, and a group-oriented male was more influential in an all male group, but little explanation was given for these results.

By first examining the existing theories of influence and applying them to the problems of interaction among members of same sex groups, this research addresses the effects of self-orientation on the attainment of influence in same sex

groups. Self-orientation was chosen because it appears to be characteristic of and accepted from high status individuals. Since these individuals typically gain influence more so than low status individuals, it was thought that individuals exhibiting this behavioral style would have an advantage over those exhibiting no style. The effects of accuracy on influence attainment and the success of the behavioral style were also examined because some studies have shown that accuracy or perceived competence can override other status characteristics (Carli, 1991; Shackelford et al. 1991). The research questions examined here are: Is the adoption of a behavioral style such as self-orientation necessary, or effective for status equals? Will the self-oriented individual, regardless of gender attain more influence in same sex groups than the individual exhibiting no style? Will accuracy hinder, help or have no effect on the use of self-orientation to gain influence. Through the exploration of these questions this study attempts to begin integrating different aspects of the above theories into a coherent picture of enhancing influence in group interactions.

### Overview of the Design

This experiment was designed to focus on the potential problems facing men and women in same sex groups, and the effects of a self-oriented behavioral style within these groups. In same sex groups there are no immediate, visible cues that suggest high or low status. Since self-orientation is seen by most researchers as characteristic of high status individuals, this experiment examines whether or not self orientation implies high status in the same way visible characteristics such as gender do. The experiment, also, examines the impact of accuracy on the attainment of influence. It looks at whether or not accuracy is necessary when exhibiting a self-oriented behavior style.

The experiment involves same sex groups composed of three naive subjects and a confederate. Each confederate exhibited either a self-orientated behavioral style or no style and was either accurate seven out of the fifteen trials or none of the fifteen trials. The self-oriented statements used by the confederate to convey self-orientation were pretested by a group of fifty Texas A&M students in an earlier study. They were rated on six-point scales from very self-oriented (1) to very group-oriented (7). The self-oriented statements chosen were all ranked either 1 or 2 on this scale. Examples of self-oriented statements include: "My answers are always right so let's just use mine and finish," and "I think it's important that you

cooperate with me. I know what I'm doing." (Shackelford et al, 1991). (See Appendix A for complete listing of self-oriented statements). The effects of self-oriented motivation were measured through the amount of influence the confederate ultimately attained. In addition, post-experimental questionnaires also measured perceived competence, liking for the confederate, amount of resentment and other process measures.

### Hypotheses

Two main effects are hypothesized.

#### Hypothesis 1:

a) Previous research (Berger, Cohen, & Zelditch, 1972; Zelditch, Lauderdale, & Stublarec, 1980; Ridgeway, 1987; Shackelford, Wood, & Worchel, 1991) indicates that self-orientation is an effective way to gain influence when interacting within a mixed group and Ridgeway's (1987) results indicated that status equals may have to resort to the use of a behavioral style to attain influence. Based on these results it is expected that the self-oriented confederate will gain more influence than the confederate exhibiting no style, regardless of accuracy.

b) It is also expected that the self-oriented confederate will draw attention to him/herself through the self-oriented behavioral style, and will be less well-liked than the no style confederate. These predictions are based on findings of previous research (Carli; 1991; Shackelford et al. 1991)

#### Hypothesis 2:

a) In addition, it is expected that the accurate confederates will attain more influence than the inaccurate confederates. This is expected is because those individuals who are more competent at the task logically should be more influential than those who are not. Previous research indicates

that competence may override the effects of status characteristics (Carli, 1991; Shackelford et al. 1991.)

b) It is also predicted that the accurate confederate will be perceived as more competent, and more influential than the inaccurate confederate.

## Method

### Participants

Approximately ninety-six males and ninety-six females were recruited from Introductory psychology courses at Louisiana State University. Four person groups participated, each with a confederate and three naive members of the same sex. Two female and two male confederates of average physical attractiveness were trained to exhibit the appropriate behavioral style in each condition.

### Procedure

#### Independent variables

There were three independent variables in this study confederate sex (male or female), motivational intent (self-orientation or no style), and accuracy (accurate 7 out of 15 trials or 0 out of 15 trials) which define a 2x2x2 factorial design.

#### Dependent variables

The primary dependent variable in this study is confederate influence. This influence was determined by the total number of times the confederate's opinion was adopted by the group. Other dependent variables include perceived influence, perceived competence, perceived liking, perceived motivational style, personality and attention to the confederate.

The experimental task (a bean estimation task) used in this study was adopted from Shackelford, Wood, and Worchel (1991)

in which it was established as a non-gender specific task. Thus, much of this procedure attempted to replicate the technique of the earlier study.

Upon entering the laboratory the subjects were asked to give written consent (See Appendix B). The subjects were then seated around a table in chairs numbered 1 to 4 with the confederate always sitting in the last seat. A description of the task was then given to the subjects. Subjects were told that individual estimations of the number of beans must be given aloud, and they should avoid exceeding the actual number of beans in the jar. Once each subject had given his/her estimate the group had to choose one of the four individual answers within 2 minutes or forfeit the chance to win that trial. A reward of an extra half credit was given if the group selected the most accurate individual answer as the group answer.

In order to assess the impact of accuracy the confederate replied more accurately than the other members on seven of the fifteen trials or on none of the fifteen trials. Groups chose to voice their estimations in order of seating. Thus, by situating the confederate in the last seat he/she was able to accurately tailor his/her responses.

Once interaction had commenced the confederate engaged in either a self-oriented behavioral style or no style. Self-orientation was established through statements indicating the individuals desire for preserving his/her own interests.



These statements were given during nine out of fifteen of the trials (Trials 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, & 15). The confederate, also, exhibited self-orientation by nonconforming to the group rules of answering in order of chair number and using the answer favored by the majority as the group choice. In doing so, the confederate spoke out of turn or put down another group members' answers on nine out of fifteen trials. The confederate was able to do so because he/she was seated in the last chair and heard all the other answers before having to give his/her own answer.

The experimenter kept note throughout the group interaction of when the confederate was self-oriented and when he/she was accurate. This procedure allowed the experimenter to check the confederate's behavior to be sure he/she was displaying the correct style and giving the correct answers.

At the end of the study students were given a post-experimental questionnaire (See Appendix C). Following completion of the post-experimental questionnaires the participants were debriefed and dismissed. (For debriefing form see Appendix D).

## Results

The hypotheses were investigated according to a 2 (male or female) x 2 (self orientation or no style) x 2 (accuracy) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). Univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAS) were used to examine individual questions with significant multivariate effects.

Preliminary analyses for confederate and experimenter effects yielded no significant results, thus were dropped from further analyses.

### Manipulation Checks

An analysis of variance was conducted to ensure that those confederates who exhibited a self-oriented behavior style were indeed perceived as self-oriented. The main effect for behavioral style was significant,  $F(1,72) = 44.92, p < .01$ . The self-oriented confederate was perceived as more self-oriented ( $M = 4.68$ ) than the confederate exhibiting no style ( $M = 6.48$ ). The confederates were rated on 7 point scales with 1 being very self-oriented and 7 being very group oriented.

An analysis of variance was also performed to ensure that the confederates who were more accurate were perceived as more competent than those who were inaccurate. The main effect for accuracy was also significant,  $F(1,72) = 33.89, p < .01$ . The confederate who was accurate seven out of fifteen trials was perceived as more competent ( $M = 5.55$ ) than the confederate who was accurate none of the fifteen trials ( $M = 4.51$ ).

### Main Effects

The overall MANOVA yielded a significant main effect for behavioral style, Wilks = .41,  $F(8,59)$ ,  $p < .01$  and for accuracy, Wilks = .60,  $F(8,59)$ ,  $p < .01$ . The next sections will examine the ANOVA results on these independent variables for each dependent variable.

### Confederate Influence:

Table 1 shows the mean influence of the confederates in each of the conditions. It was predicted that there would be a main effect for both behavioral style and accuracy. The analysis of variance indicated that when the confederate exhibited a self-oriented behavior style he/she gained more influence ( $M = 6.89$ ) than when he/she exhibited no behavior style ( $M = 5.05$ ),  $F(1,72) = 18.30$ ,  $p < .01$ . In addition, the results indicate a significant main effect for accuracy,  $F(1,72) = 36.33$ ,  $p < .01$ , specifically, the more accurate confederate attained more influence ( $M = 7.16$ ) than the inaccurate confederate regardless of behavior style ( $M = 4.61$ ). There was no significant interaction between behavior style and accuracy for confederate influence.

### Perceptions of the Confederate

Post-experimental questionnaires were used to tap group members perceptions of the confederate. Each group member was asked to rate the other members in the group on several characteristics using either a seven-point scale or an

Table 1

Mean Rankings of Confederates in each Condition

<u>Condition</u>	<u>Mean Influence</u>	<u>Condition</u>	<u>Mean Influence</u>
MAS	8.80	FAS	8.08
MIS	5.72	FIS	4.67
MAN	7.60	FAN	6.23
MIN	3.25	FIN	4.07

NOTE. Higher numbers indicate more influence.

MAS-Male accurate self-oriented confederate.

MIS-Male inaccurate self-oriented confederate.

MAN-Male accurate no style confederate.

MIN-Male inaccurate no style confederate.

FAS-Female accurate self-oriented confederate.

FIS-Female inaccurate self-oriented confederate.

FAN-Female accurate no style confederate.

FIN-Female inaccurate no style confederate.

eleven-point scale. Composites were formed by grouping those items that logically fit together. The composites include: 1) perceived influence, 2) liking, 3) perceived style, 4) perceived competence, 5) attention, and 6) personality (Table 2 gives the mean rankings of the confederates on these variables). Internal consistency reliabilities were computed and all meet acceptable standards (See Appendix E for Alphas and for variables used in each composite). Measures of attention were based solely on one question no inter-consistency reliability was computed. The scores on these variables were used in subsequent univariate analyses of variance.

Correlations among dependent variables are presented in Table 3. The correlations indicate how certain items relate to one another, and provide one rationale for the composite groupings. Correlations ranged from  $-.74$  to  $.88$ .

#### Perceived Influence:

It was hypothesized that there would be a main effect for accuracy when examining the perceived influence of the confederate. The analysis of variance showed just that,  $F(1,72) = 22.29$ ,  $p < .01$ . The more accurate confederate was thought to have gained more influence ( $M = 5.35$ ) than the inaccurate confederate ( $M = 4.28$ ). There was no main effect for style and no interaction.

#### Liking:

It was predicted that liking for the confederate would

Table 2

Mean Composite Perceived Influence, Liking, Perceived Style, Perceived Competence, Attention, and Personality Ratings of the Confederate

<u>Condition</u>	<u>PINF</u>	<u>LIK</u>	<u>PSTYLE</u>	<u>Mean</u> <u>PCOMP</u>	<u>ATTN</u>	<u>PERS</u>
MAS	5.10	3.79	4.30	5.47	5.03	5.20
MIS	4.78	3.92	4.55	4.67	4.80	4.80
MAN	5.37	2.01	6.95	5.21	5.67	4.55
MIN	4.69	2.90	6.02	4.80	4.75	3.92
FAS	5.61	3.74	4.98	5.75	5.46	5.45
FIS	3.71	3.97	4.98	4.16	3.88	4.43
FAN	5.19	2.35	6.76	5.55	5.26	4.22
FIN	4.46	2.86	6.13	4.65	4.63	3.72

Note. Higher numbers indicate a confederate was perceived as more influential, less well-liked, perceived as more group oriented, perceived as more competent, gained more attention, and perceived as more active, dominant, aggressive, and independent.

MAS=Male accurate self-oriented confederate.  
 MIS=Male inaccurate self-oriented confederate.  
 MAN=Male accurate no style confederate.  
 MIN=Male inaccurate no style confederate.  
 FAS=Female accurate self-oriented confederate.  
 FIS=Female inaccurate self-oriented confederate.  
 FAN=Female accurate no style confederate.  
 FIN=Female inaccurate no style confederate.

Table 3

Intercorrelations Among Dependent Variables

Dependent Variable	1	N2	3	4	5	6	7	N8	9	10	13A	13B	13C	13D	13E	13F	13G	13H	N13I	13J	13L	14	N15	16
1	1.0	-.64	.89	.60	.57	-.07	.78	-.40	.79	.81	.29	.41	.43	.47	.58	.65	.74	.67	-.66	-.30	.54	.40	.04	.32
N2		1.0	-.62	-.45	-.56	.28	-.50	.33	-.56	-.62	-.47	-.09	-.14	-.17	-.32	-.44	-.51	-.52	.29	.41	.16	-.20	-.36	-.23
3			1.0	.62	.60	-.01	.73	-.33	.82	.71	.19	.51	.53	.53	.67	.69	.74	.57	-.70	-.23	-.17	.62	.41	.00
4				1.0	.73	-.12	.51	-.33	.61	.54	.31	.32	.25	.37	.58	.47	.55	.41	-.49	-.32	-.21	.37	.21	.05
5					1.0	.20	.50	-.36	.62	.45	.40	.15	.16	.29	.47	.35	.57	.42	-.39	-.37	-.36	.28	.16	.16
6						1.0	-.01	.04	-.10	-.20	-.50	.26	.17	.19	.08	-.06	-.08	-.20	.06	.40	.63	.11	-.07	-.49
7							1.0	-.45	.70	.78	-.18	.22	.27	.33	.39	.42	.59	.55	-.44	-.24	-.18	.38	.36	.00
N8								1.0	-.46	.40	-.23	-.02	.02	-.04	-.11	.11	.35	-.39	.10	.19	.31	.02	-.26	.10
9									1.0	.74	-.27	.41	.40	.46	.63	.62	.70	.58	.62	-.26	.26	.48	.43	.11
10										1.0	.37	.22	.28	.33	.45	.48	.60	.73	-.48	-.40	-.36	.37	.42	.15
13A											1.0	-.33	-.31	-.23	-.03	.09	.16	.31	.07	-.57	-.75	-.14	.03	.60
13B												1.0	.75	.77	.69	.53	.39	.11	-.70	-.22	.42	.68	.28	.37
13C													1.0	.72	.66	.58	.46	.22	-.71	.15	.28	.67	.24	.30
13D														1.0	.76	.50	.47	.22	-.70	.17	.31	.69	.27	.35
13E															1.0	.62	.57	.30	-.81	.03	.09	.71	.24	.15
13F																1.0	.59	.45	-.69	-.14	-.06	.61	.32	.05
13G																	1.0	.57	-.56	-.22	-.17	.49	.29	.06
13H																		1.0	-.42	-.46	-.46	.28	.35	.25
N13I																			1.0	1.0	-.07	-.78	-.33	.16
13J																				1.0	1.0	-.00	-.05	-.48
13K																					1.0	.17	-.06	-.67
13L																						.19	-.23	.19
14																						1.0	-.04	.01
N15																							1.0	-.58
16																								1.0

Note.  $r \geq .20$   $\alpha = p \leq .05$ 

- 1=Contributed to group's success  
 N2=Disappointment if confederate's gone  
 3=Confederate's influence  
 4=Confederate's group motivation  
 5=Confederate's self motivation  
 6=Resentment toward confederate  
 7=Confederate's task competence  
 N8=Group's influence on confederate's contribution  
 9=Attention to confederate's contributions  
 10=Competence of confederate's contributions  
 13A=Self vs group oriented  
 13B=Not aggressive vs aggressive  
 13C=Easily influenced vs not easily influenced  
 13D=Very submissive vs very dominant  
 13E=Very passive vs very active  
 13F=Difficulty with decisions vs no difficulty  
 13G=Not influential vs very influential  
 13H=Illogical vs logical  
 13I=Not self confident vs very self confident  
 13J=Not friendly vs not friendly  
 13K=Not rude vs very rude  
 13L=Not independent vs very independent  
 14=High ability at task  
 N15=Self orientation of confederate  
 16=group orientation of confederate

be related to behavioral style, but not to accuracy. There was a main effect for behavior style,  $F(1,72) = 41.86$ ,  $p < .01$ . Confederates exhibiting a self-oriented behavior style were less well liked ( $M = 3.85$ ) than those who exhibited no style ( $M = 2.53$ ), regardless of whether or not he/she was accurate or inaccurate. Confederates were rated on 7 point scales with 1 indicating a well-liked confederate and 7 indicating a highly disliked confederate.. There was no interaction.

#### Attention:

It was hypothesized that there would be a main effect for behavioral style when examining the amount of attention given the confederate. However, this was not found. Instead there was a main effect for accuracy,  $F(1,72) = 16.12$ ,  $p < .01$ , indicating that the more accurate confederates were perceived to have obtained more attention from the other members ( $M = 5.37$ ) than the inaccurate confederates ( $M = 4.42$ ). There was no interaction.

#### Personality:

There was a main effect for style when examining the perceived personality of the confederate,  $F(1,72) = 15.63$ ,  $p < .01$ . The self-oriented confederate was perceived as more aggressive, dominant, active, and independent ( $M = 6.88$ ) than the confederate exhibiting no style ( $M = 4.05$ ), regardless of whether or not he/she was accurate or inaccurate. There was



no interaction.

### **Correlations with Actual Influence**

Table 4 shows the correlations of the individual dependent variables with actual influence, and Table 5 shows the correlations of the composites with actual influence. Although not predicted all composites, except liking and perceived style were significantly and positively correlated with actual influence.

Table 4

Correlations of Dependent Variables with Actual Influence

<u>Dependent Variables</u>	<u>Influence</u>
1	.41***
N2	-.18
3	.43***
4	.26
5	.17
6	.10
7	.36***
N8	-.17
9	.39***
10	.40***
13A	-.11
13B	.43***
13C	.47***
13D	.47***
13E	.49***
13F	.40***
13G	.30***
13H	.24**
N13I	-.49***
13J	.00
13K	.17
13L	.46***
14	.31***
N15	-.36***
16	-.03

NOTE. \*\*\* $p < .01$

\*\* $p < .05$

N=variable values reverse sined.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1=Contributed to group's success                    | 13C=Easily influenced vs not easily influenced |
| N2=Disappointment if confederate gone               | 13D=Very submissive vs very dominant           |
| 3=Confederate's influence                           | 13E=Very passive vs very active                |
| 4=Confederate's group motivation                    | 13F=Difficulty with decisions vs no difficulty |
| 5=Confederate's self motivation                     | 13G=Not influential vs very influential        |
| 6=resentment toward confederate                     | 13H=Illogical vs Logical                       |
| 7=Confederate's task competence                     | N13I=Not self confident vs very self confident |
| N8=Group's influence on confederate's contributions | 13J=Friendly vs not friendly                   |
| 9=Attention to confederate's contributions          | 13K=Not rude vs very rude                      |
| 10=Competence of confederate's contributions        | 13L=Not independent vs very independent        |
| 13A=Self vs group oriented                          | 14=High ability at task                        |
| 13B=Not aggressive vs aggressive                    | N15=Self orientation of confederate            |
|   | 16=group orientation of confederate            |

Table 5

Correlations Between Composites and Actual Influence

<u>Composites</u>	<u>Influence</u>
Perceived Influence	.41***
Liking	.03
Perceived Competence	.45***
Perceived Style	-.12
Attention	.40***
Personality	.52***

NOTE.      \*\*\* $p < .01$

### Discussion and Conclusion

The hypotheses regarding the effects of behavioral style and accuracy were supported for the most part in this study. Both self-orientation and accuracy affected the amount of actual influence the confederate attained. The self-oriented confederates attained more influence than the confederates exhibiting no style, regardless of accuracy. This finding that self-oriented confederates gained influence was consistent with results of earlier studies (Berger et al. 1982; Zelditch et al. 1980; Shackelford et al. 1991) It was inconsistent, however, with Ridgeway's earlier assumption that status equals need not bother with motivational intent.

It was also found that the more accurate confederates were more influential than those that were inaccurate. This finding lends support to the success of accuracy/competence at the task as method for attaining influence as well.

The findings indicate that there was no significant difference in the actual influence attained by males in same sex groups and in the actual influence attained by females in same sex groups. Thus, the gender of the confederate has no bearing on the amount of influence gained when in same sex groups. The fact that men as well as women gained more influence when exhibiting self-orientation is contradictory to the earlier assumption by some researchers that only low status individuals must concern themselves with motivational intent (Carli, 1991;

Ridgeway, 1981). These findings indicate that in certain situations, such as same sex groups, any individual may attain more influence if he/she exhibits a certain behavioral style.

The findings also indicate that behavioral style affected liking for the confederate, perceived motivational style of the confederate, and the perceived personality of the confederate. The self-oriented confederate was less well-liked, perceived as more self-oriented, and perceived as more aggressive, active, dominate, and independent than the confederate exhibiting no style. This is contrary to Carli's assumption that liking and a positive perception of the confederate are necessary in order to attain influence.

It was also discovered that composites for perceived influence, perceived competence, and attention were affected by accuracy but not behavioral style. While it is logical that the more accurate confederate would be perceived as more competent at the task, the other results could be due to the fact that group members are not willing to admit to themselves that the self-oriented confederate can influence them or that he/she will listen to the self-oriented confederate.

Alternative explanations for these findings are plausible and should be addressed. The results may be a function of the high number of acts initiated by the confederate during group interaction. Reynolds (1984) suggests that a good indicator of actual influence is the volume of contributions

displayed by any one member of the group. It could be that the self-oriented confederate gained a substantial amount of influence because he/she engaged in high levels of talking in order to exhibit the experimental manipulation of self-orientation.

Despite the fact that questions concerning motivational intent and the attainment of influence remain, the findings reported here have important practical implications. This study provides individuals with a potential strategy they may use to attain influence in same sex groups. It demonstrates the impact of this strategy on the attainment of influence regardless of status, and regardless of the competence of the individual. Individuals need not rely on the group to provide opportunities to contribute. Individuals may create their own opportunities through the use of a self-oriented behavioral style.

### References

- Berger, Joseph, Cohen, Bernard P., Zelditch, Morris. Status characteristics and social interaction. American Sociological Review, 1972, Vol. 37, 241-255.
- Carli, Linda L. Gender, status, and influence. Advances in Group Processes, 1991, Vol. 8, 89-113.
- Hollander, E. P. Conformity, status, and idiosyncrasy credits. Psychological Review, 1958, Vol. 65, 2, 117-127.
- Kimberly, James C. Status inconsistency. Human Relations, 1972, 171-179.
- Meeker, B.F., Weitzel-O'Neil, P.A. Sex roles and interpersonal behavior in task-oriented groups. American Sociological Review, 1977, Vol. 42, 91-105.
- Megargee, Edwin I. Influence of sex roles on the manifestation of leadership. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, Vol. 53, 5, 377-382.
- Miller, Dale t., Taylor, Brian, and Buck, Michelle L. Gender gaps: Who needs to be explained? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1991, Vol. 61, 1, 5-12.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L. Noncomformity, competence, and influence in groups: A test of two theories. American Sociological Review, 1981, Vol. 46, 333-347.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L. Status in groups: The importance of motivation. American Sociological Review, 1982, Vol. 47, 76-88.

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. Nonverbal behavior, dominance, and the basis of status in task groups. American Sociological Review, 1987, Vol. 52, 683-694.

Shackelford, Susan L. Effects of competence, nonconformity, and motivation on the attainment of influence. Unpublished Manuscript, Texas A&M University, 1987.

Shackelford, Susan, Wood, Wendy, Worchel, Stephen. Strategies to enhance women's influence in mixed-sex groups: Task skill and behavioral style. Manuscript submitted for publication, Texas A&M University, 1991.

Wahrman, R., Pugh, M. D. Neutralizing sexism in mixed-sex groups: Do women have to be better than men? American Journal of Sociology, 1983, Vol. 88, 746-762.

Zelditch, Morris, Lauderdale, Patrick, Stublarec, Stephen. How are inconsistencies between status and ability resolved? Social Forces, 1980, Vol. 58, 4, 1025-1043.



APPENDIX A

Pretest of Group/Self statements

Pretest of Group/Self Statements

Assume you are interacting in a small group and your group must come up with an answer on a task within a three minute frame. Please rate the following statements made by group members on the extent to which you think they are group-oriented in nature. Intentions are group-oriented if they reflect a cooperative attitude toward group members, an interest in group activities, and a desire to help the group further its aims. Intentions are self-oriented if they reflect an indifference to the group or simple self interest. Please rate the following statements.

1. "I've never really spoken up in groups before but I am now because I think its really important for our group to succeed at this task."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self			neither self			group
oriented			or group oriented			oriented

2. "I really need the money so let's get together on this and win."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self			neither self			group
oriented			or group oriented			oriented

3. "I think it's important that you cooperate with me. I know

what I'm doing."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self		neither self			group	
oriented		or group oriented			oriented	

4. "This research is important so let's all confer so we can come up with a group answer."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self		neither self			group	
oriented		or group oriented			oriented	

5. "Let's hurry up and decide on this because I've got other things I need to do today."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self		neither self			group	
oriented		or group oriented			oriented	

6. "This is so boring. Just pick a number and decide because it really doesn't matter anyway."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self		neither self			group	
oriented		or group oriented			oriented	

7. "If we all cooperate it will give better data to the researcher."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self		neither self or group			group	

8. "Think about it. For the good of the group it would be better if we all agreed."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self			neither self			group
oriented			or group oriented			oriented

9. "We only have ten minutes left. I only get one lab credit for this so let's hurry and decide."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self			neither self			group
oriented			or group oriented			oriented

10. "I'm sorry I'm causing a problem since I don't agree with the rest of you but I just can't sit here and pretend to. I have to say what I feel is the right answer."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self			neither self			group
oriented			or group oriented			oriented

11. "I've been in this kind of experiment before and I have always been right so just trust my judgement."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self			neither self			group
oriented			or group oriented			oriented

12. "I know we disagree but since we have to come up with a group answer why don't we compromise?"

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self			neither self			group
oriented			or group oriented			oriented

13. "I think the best thing for the group would be to go with my answer this time and see if we don't win more money."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self			neither self			group
oriented			or group oriented			oriented

14. "There is no way that is right. I'm going to go with my original answer."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self			neither self			group
oriented			or group oriented			oriented

15. "You are wrong. Why don't we just do it my way?"

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self			neither self			group
oriented			or group oriented			oriented

16. "I am usually shy but I'm speaking up for the good of the group because I feel I have a knack of this."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self			neither self	or group		group

17. "If we as a group use my answer, which I feel is correct, we can all finish faster."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self			neither self			group
oriented			or group oriented			oriented

18. "My answers are always right so let's just use mine and finish."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self			neither self			group
oriented			or group oriented			oriented

19. "Let's hurry on this because my car is parked illegally outside plus my answering machine is broken and I'm expecting a important phone call."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self			neither self			group
oriented			or group oriented			oriented

20. "I'm usually intimidated by people, but I'm so confident that my answer is correct that I will speak up."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
self			neither self			group
oriented			or group oriented			oriented

**APPENDIX B**

**Consent Form**

**Consent Form**

This is one of many ongoing psychological research projects at Louisiana State University. This research is concerned with interactions among same and mixed sex groups. Your responsibility is to participate in a group task (i.e. estimate the number of beans in a jar) and fill out a questionnaire at the end of the study. You will not be subjected to any physical, social, or psychological injuries. You can withdraw anytime during the experiment without penalty. Your anonymity is assured (your name and/or social security number will not appear in any verbal, visual, or audio reports.) It is understood that your experience should remain confidential; that is, you will not tell anyone what the purpose of the experiment is, nor what you did while participating. If you have any questions during the experiment the experimenter will assist you. Your signature below certifies that you understand the nature of the experiment and the consent to experiment.

---

Signature

---

Date



APPENDIX C

Post-Experimental Questionnaire

## Questionnaire

Please rate person number one in your group by circling the point on the scale that corresponds to your answer. Answer as honestly as you can.

1. How much do you feel \_\_\_\_\_ contributed to the group's success?  
very little    1       2       3       4       5       6       7 very much
2. How disappointed would you be if \_\_\_\_\_ were no longer a member of this group?  
not at all    1       2       3       4       5       6       7 very much
3. In your opinion, how much influence do you think \_\_\_\_\_ had in the group's decisions?  
very little    1       2       3       4       5       6       7 very much
4. How motivated, in your opinion, was \_\_\_\_\_ for the group to succeed at the task?  
not at all    1       2       3       4       5       6       7 very much
5. In your opinion, how concerned was \_\_\_\_\_ that you succeed at the task?  
not at all    1       2       3       4       5       6       7 very much
6. In your opinion, how much resentment do you think others in the group feel toward \_\_\_\_\_?  
very little    1       2       3       4       5       6       7 very much
7. How competent do you feel \_\_\_\_\_ was at the task?  
not at all    1       2       3       4       5       6       7 very much
8. In your opinion, how much influence did the group have on \_\_\_\_\_ decisions?  
very little influence    1       2       3       4       5       6       7 very much influence
9. How much attention do you think others in the group paid to \_\_\_\_\_ contributions?  
very little attention    1       2       3       4       5       6       7 very much attention
10. How competent do you feel \_\_\_\_\_ contributions were?  
not at all competent    1       2       3       4       5       6       7 very competent
11. If you were to describe \_\_\_\_\_ to another person, what would you say? Use the space provided to describe them. Don't list physical characteristics.

12. Looking back, how do you think \_\_\_\_\_ acted in this study? Describe their behavior in a few sentences.

13. Rate \_\_\_\_\_ on the following attributes.

self-oriented	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 group-oriented
not at all aggressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 very aggressive
very easily influenced	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 not at all easily influenced
very submissive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 very dominate
very passive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 very active
has difficulty making decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 can make decisions easily
not at all influential	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 very influential
very illogical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 very logical
not at all self-confident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 very self-confident
very friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 not at all friendly
not at all rude	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 very rude
not at all independent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 very independent

What do you think is the reason for \_\_\_\_\_'s behavior in your group? That is, why did this person act as he or she did?

Circle one number below each reason to indicate how important each reason is for this person's behavior:

1. Was the person's behavior due to his or her high ability at the task? Did the person act this way because he or she knew the right answers?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Definitely <u>not</u> due to knowing the right answers		Probably <u>not</u> due to knowing the answers		Uncertain whether due to knowing the answers		Probably due to knowing the answers		Definitely due to knowing the right answers		

2. Was the person's behavior due to his or her selfish attitude? Did the person act this way because he or she wanted to perform well personally but did not care about how well the group as a whole performed?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Definitely <u>not</u> due to a concern for what happens to self		Probably <u>not</u> due to a concern for what happens to self		Uncertain whether due to a concern for what happens to self			Probably due to a concern for what happens to self		Definitely due to a concern for what happens to self	

3. Was the person's behavior due to his or her concern for others in the group? Did the person act this way because he or she wanted the group to perform well and for everyone to get along with each other?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Definitely not due to a concern for what happens to the group		Probably not due to a concern for what happens to the group		Uncertain whether due to a concern for what happens to the group			Probably due to a concern for what happens to the group		Definitely due to a concern for what happens to the group	

**APPENDIX D**

**Debriefing Form**

### Debrief

The impact of gender and motivational intent on influence and status in small task groups is still uncertain. Past research has shown that males will gain influence in mixed sex groups regardless of influence, while females must show the group that they are competent and/or group-oriented. The purpose of this study was to study the impact of motivational intent on same sex groups. We examined this phenomenon by placing a male or female confederate in either a mixed or same sex group. Each confederate displayed either group or self-orientation over a series of trials. If the results are as expected it will be shown that in same sex groups men will gain more influence if group-oriented, while women will gain more influence if self-oriented.

If you have any further questions please feel free to contact Susan Shackelford at Louisiana State University, 388-4119.

Thank you for participating, and remember, please do not discuss this study with friends or acquaintances.

**Appendix E**  
**Composites and Alphas**

**Composites and Alphas**

Perceived Influence                      Alpha=.92

1=Contributed to group's success

3=Confederate's influence

13G=Not influential vs very influential

Liking                      Alpha=.78

N2=Disappointment if confederate is gone

6=Resentment toward confederate

13J=Friendly vs not friendly

13K=Not rude vs very rude

Perceived Motivational Style                      Alpha=.77

4=Confederate's group motivation

13A=Self vs group oriented

N15=Self orientation of confederate

16=Group orientation of confederate

Perceived Competence                      Alpha=.82

7=Confederate's task competence

10=Competence of confederate's contributions

13F=Difficulty with decisions vs no difficulty

13H=Illogical vs logical

14=High ability at task

Attention

9=Attention to confederate's contributions



Personality

13B=Not aggressive vs aggressive

13D=Very submissive vs very dominant

13E=Very passive vs very active

13L=Not independent vs very independent