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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was to investigate changes in attraction and attitude as a function of the initial attraction and initial attitude similarity of two interacting persons. It was hypothesized that initial attraction and attitude similarity each contribute significantly to the final attraction and final attitude of two persons after interacting. It was further hypothesized that there would be significant combinations of the various levels of initial attraction and attitude which would produce an effect independent of either main effect. It was assumed that change in attraction or attitude would be a function of the proportional counter-influence of the various levels of initial attraction and attitude similarity.

In order to investigate the influence of initial attraction and attitude on attraction and attitude change, several preliminary studies were undertaken to define attraction and attitude by objective measures of behavior. The measure of attraction developed for this study consisted of thirteen positive adjectives, rated as each described another
person; the sum of the ratings represented the attraction score. The measure of attitude consisted of a list of immoral or offensive statements which were rank ordered for degree of offensiveness.

Each subject was arbitrarily assigned a partner and privately rated the list of adjectives to describe him. This rating represented the initial attraction each subject had for his potential dyadic partner. He then privately rank ordered the list of attitude statements. This represented his initial attitude and each subject's ranking was correlated with his potential dyadic partner's ranking and this represented the initial attitude similarity of the two dyadic members. The subjects next met together in the dyad and made a joint ranking of the offensive statements. The subjects then separated and made a private ranking again and re-rated the adjectives privately to describe how they felt about their partner after interacting.

Level of initial attraction was defined by the upper, middle, or lower third of the distribution of initial attraction scores obtained from all subjects. Level of initial attitude similarity was defined by the upper, middle, and lower third of the distribution of attitude similarity scores for all dyadic pairs. Nine treatment groups were formed by
dividing the subjects according to their level of initial attraction and initial attitude similarity, simultaneously.

Attraction change for each treatment group was determined by subtracting the score for the first private rating of descriptive adjectives from the final private rating score. Attitude change was defined by the stability of the subjects' rankings of the offensive statements, that is, the correlation of the first private ranking with the final private ranking. Stability scores were determined for the nine treatment groups. Data were analyzed by means of an analysis of variance. The results indicated that attraction change depended upon the disproportional influence of both initial attraction and initial attitude similarity, but not upon either variable independently. Attitude change depended upon the degree of discrepancy that existed for initial attitude similarity of the two interacting persons, but not upon initial attraction independently or together with initial attitude similarity. From the results it was concluded that the assumption of proportional and reciprocal influence of initial attraction and attitude similarity on attraction and attitude change was untenable.
INTRODUCTION

Within a very loose conceptual framework, the theoretical and empirical efforts devoted to the problem of interpersonal behavior have been directed toward identifying those variables which will adequately predict the consequents of person-to-person relationships.

Interpersonal behavior is generally considered as being that behavior which results from interpersonal relations between two people. Heider (1958) expresses it as, "How one person thinks and feels about another person, how he perceives him and what he does to him, what he expects him to do or think, and how he reacts to the actions of the other." Newcomb (1961) has expressed this diagramatically in his ABX system and has provided the concept of "orientations" which are functionally associated with changes in behavior as a consequence of interpersonal contact. He emphasizes two orientations of primary importance: the initial attraction of the interacting persons, and their attitudes toward some object which exists (psychologically) for both of them.

Within the context of interpersonal behavior, Bass
(1961) conceives of an "orientation" as the manner in which the individual assesses and reacts to, the group situation. The individual is seen by Bass as self-, interaction-, or task-oriented as he relates to the group and the tasks to be accomplished within the group. But the results of an investigation by Campbell (1961) which attempted to demonstrate the influence of self-, interaction-, or task-orientation on behavior change in a dyadic group situation failed to account consistently for the variance which occurred within a group composed to two interacting persons.

The measurements used to determine the influence of self-, interaction-, and task-orientation upon behavior change relied upon an assessment of the attraction and attitude of the dyadic members before and after interacting. However, this study made no attempt to control for the initial attraction and initial attitude similarity of the two interacting members. The inconsistencies which were observed can be assumed to have been at least partially the result of the independent and interdependent effects of these two factors.

Izard (1960), in elaborating on the term "attraction," identifies it as "interpersonal affect—the expression of favorable feeling, self-involving interest, and acceptance or esteem in relation to another person." Bass (1960) uses
the term "esteem" instead of "attraction," and makes an attempt to separate out conviviality, friendliness, and sociability. Newcomb (1961) conceptualizes attraction as an approach-avoidance tendency. Thus, an orientation toward another person that involves psychological approach rather than psychological avoidance, moving toward rather than against or away from the other person, is one of positive attraction.

According to English and English (1958) an "attitude" is "an enduring, learned predisposition to behave in a consistent way toward a given class of objects; a persistent mental and/or neural state of readiness to react to a certain object or class of objects, not as they are, but as they are conceived to be." Newcomb (1961) has differentiated attitude from attraction in that an attitude is "any orientation of a person toward a non-person." When it is necessary to compare the differences between behavior oriented toward persons (attraction) and behavior oriented toward objects (attitude), this distinction is generally accepted.

Change in attraction and change in attitude have been approached from different points of interest. These approaches have usually directed their attention to change in one as a function of the other; that is, attraction change is
a function of the attitudes of the interacting persons, or
attitude change is a function of the attraction each inter­
acting person has for the other, has typically been studied.

Change in attraction as a function of attitude has
been theoretically emphasized by Krech and Crutchfield (1948),
and Rokeach (1960). They maintain that the individual views
the world and those about him in terms of his acquired be­
liefs, expectancies and hypotheses, which is conceptualized
by Rokeach as his "belief-disbelief system." According to
the individual's belief-disbelief system, the attractive
other or social referent is appraised and re-evaluated. The
referent becomes more attractive as his beliefs and attitudes
are seen to be similar to one's own, and less attractive as
his beliefs and attitudes are seen to be different from one's
own. That is to say, "I like you if you like what I like."

Change in attitude as a function of the attractiveness
of the other person in the interpersonal situation has been
experimentally demonstrated by Chapman and Volkman (1939),
Asch (1952), and Sherif (1953). Attitude change is related
to the standard revealed by the reference group or the rele­
vant other. The reference group is considered as a standard
for making judgments of oneself and others, and the source
of an individual's "values." According to Kelley (1952), and
Turner (1956), the individual derives most of his concepts, beliefs, and values from the social community. Turner has stated that the terms "reference group" and "relevant other" refer essentially to the same phenomena. Thus, attitude change resulting from interpersonal relations is attributed to the attraction the individual has for the referent within the interpersonal setting. In other words, "I like what you like if I like you."

Newcomb (1961) has gone one step further than the two previous approaches to attitude and attraction change in his proposal that attitude change is a function of both the initial attraction and the initial attitude similarity of the interacting persons. Newcomb views attraction and attitude of a person as a system of orientations. The individual system (the orientation system of one person) involves person A's attraction toward person B, A's attitude toward an object X, and A's perception of B's attitude toward the object X. Newcomb states that the stronger A's attraction toward B, the greater the strength of the force upon A to maintain minimal discrepancy between his own and B's attitude, as he perceives the latter, toward the same X; and, if positive attraction remains constant, the greater the perceived discrepancy in attitude, the stronger the force to reduce it. Restated,
this means that a person will change his attitudes to conform with those of another as a function of the strength of his attraction, and that this change is also a function of the magnitude of the discrepancy which he perceives in their attitudes. Although it may be implied that attraction change is a function of both the initial attraction and the attitude similarity of the interacting persons, this is not explicitly stated within Newcomb's theory.

In summary, it can be stated that one theoretical position maintains that the greater the difference between A's attitudes and B's, the greater the force upon A to reduce his attraction toward B and maintain his existing attitudes. The other position holds that the stronger A's attraction toward B, the greater the strength of force upon A to reduce the discrepancy which he perceives between his own and B's attitudes.

If these theories were expanded to incorporate the possibility that A's change in attraction or attitude is a function of A's attraction for B; A's attitude toward the object X, and A's perception of B's attitude toward X; then the approaches of Krech and Crutchfield, and Rokeach, and of Kelley and Turner, and Newcomb would both be covered within the same theory.
It may be assumed that there are very probably optimal levels of initial attraction and attitude similarity which produce the changes in attraction and attitude following interaction which have been experimentally demonstrated. There is also the possibility that attraction and attitude combine and produce varying, interactive effects exclusive of any main effect that would be attributable to one or the other variable separately.

It is the purpose of the present study to investigate change in attraction and attitude as a function of both initial attraction and initial attitude similarity. It will be assumed that the change in attraction and attitude will be the result of the equally weighted influence of the initial attraction and attitude similarity of the two persons in interaction. That is, the combined influence of attraction and attitude will be a constant ratio which could be represented mathematically by a straight line. There is no evidence to support a disproportionate effect which would be attributable to any particular level of either variable; therefore, the assumption of linearity would be the most reasonable to consider for the purpose of this study.

It is hypothesized that initial attitude and attraction each contribute significantly to the final attraction and
final attitudes of two persons after interacting. It is further hypothesized that there will be significant combinations of the various levels of initial attraction and attitude which will produce effects independent of either main effect. The predicted changes in attraction and attitude after interacting as a function of initial levels of attraction and attitude similarity are shown in Figure 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Level of Attitude Similarity</th>
<th>Initial Level of Attraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in Attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in Attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>No change in Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Decrease in Attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Change in Attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in Attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Decrease in Attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease in Attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Change in Attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 1**

PREDICTED CHANGES IN ATTRACTION AND ATTITUDE AS A FUNCTION OF INITIAL ATTRACTION AND ATTITUDE SIMILARITY
PILOT RESEARCH

In order to investigate the influence of initial attraction and attitude on attraction and attitude change, several preliminary studies were undertaken to define attraction and attitude by objective measures of behavior.

To measure attraction, an effort was made initially to identify both positively and negatively attractive persons by a simple sociometric questionnaire which was introduced to several separate groups of college students in the classroom. These groups comprised from 8 to 10 members each. After having each person indicate preference for working with one another on some task by ranking all other members in the group (see Appendix A), a list of 10 descriptive adjectives (see Appendix B), was introduced to the subjects. A rating of 1 indicated that the person being rated possessed that quality to a high degree, while a rating of 7 indicated that the person did not possess that quality. However, there was very little relationship between rank order of preference and the mean adjective ratings. Also, the adjective ratings took an excessive amount of time in these 10-person groups.
In a second study, a sociometric choice of three preferred and three rejected members was obtained from each person in a classroom of 35 students in an attempt to identify positive and negative attraction. An adjective rating list was then introduced to obtain descriptions of each of the three preferred and three non-preferred members (see Appendices C and D). Thirteen positive adjectives were used and ratings again were made on a scale from 1 to 7 as to the degree to which the person being rated possessed that quality. The mean rating for preferred individuals was 2.75, and the mean rating for non-preferred choices was 4.62. The difference between these means proved to be very significant using the two-tailed $t$ test ($p < .01$).

One week later the reliability of preference and non-preference within the same group was checked to determine consistency of choice. First and second preference and non-preference persons were again preferred or non-preferred the second time. The third choice person for both preferred and non-preferred did not consistently recur. By reducing the number of required choices to two preferred and two non-preferred, it was felt that attraction could be very reliably demonstrated for direction (chosen or rejected), and for intensity (mean ratings) within the group situation.
Reliabilities of the ratings were .57 and .42 for preferred
and non-preferred persons, respectively. These coefficients
were somewhat lower than desired; however, this was attributed
to the small amount of variance demonstrated by the rater.
That is, all items tended to be rated more or less equally by
the same rater.

The list of items obtained above was that used in the
final study to assess attraction, however the method of em­
ployment was modified and will be described later.

To assess an attitude dimension which would be rele­
vant for every student, but which could vary in affect, a
list of 10 statements (see Appendix E) about various immoral
or offensive activities was drawn from an original pool of
25 statements which had been given to 100 students (Vaughn,
1962). A factor analysis provided information as to specific
and general areas of variance. Those showing specificity
were chosen to compile a list of variable content for the
present research. This list was presented to 40 students
for rating from 1 to 7 (very offensive to very inoffensive).
The average intercorrelation for these ratings showed that
very little difference in attitude was being demonstrated by
the raters. The small range of variance artificially intro­
duced by a rating scale allowed very little real differences
to occur between raters.

A second list (see Appendix F) was devised which eliminated those items which showed high agreement and new items were added. This list contained 10 items and was given to 35 students for ranking from most offensive to least offensive. It was given again a week later to assess the reliability. Although the average reliability coefficient was .93, the average intercorrelation between raters was also very high at .65. It was felt that this average intercorrelation was too high to assume that the list was assessing an attitude which varied significantly in affect between the raters.

By eliminating those items which demonstrated high agreement between raters and adding several new items, a third list composed of thirteen items (see Appendix G) was compiled. This was administered to 45 students and re-administered two days later. The average reliability was .87, and average subject intercorrelation was .25. This list was considered sufficiently reliable to demonstrate a consistent affective attitude, yet allowed for considerable differences to occur between individuals.

In order to determine the utility of these scales, an additional study was undertaken in an effort to identify those persons who were:
Positively attracted with similar attitudes
Positively attracted with dissimilar attitudes
Negatively attracted with similar attitudes
Negatively attracted with dissimilar attitudes

and then to program these persons to meet in dyads where influence of attraction and attitude could be assessed. However, the ratio of persons identified as positively attracted to those identified as negatively attracted occurred on the average of about 8 to 1 in a typical classroom group of 15 to 20 subjects. Of those who were negatively attracted, a smaller proportion had dissimilar attitudes than similar attitudes. From a total of 120 subjects, only six fell into the category of negatively attracted with dissimilar attitudes. A further problem occurred when absences left one of the pre-programmed pair without a partner at the next class session. Because of the disproportionate number of persons falling into the four categories outlined above, and the inefficiencies resulting from pre-programming, this procedure was discontinued.

From these results it was concluded that really disliked or fully rejected persons were rare, and what was being measured by the attraction scale were the two ends of a continuum that exists in a population of more-or-less positively attracted persons. This was fully corroborated by verbal communication with the subjects. Since negative attraction
is rare, a more realistic assessment of attraction influence would be with various levels of the positive segment of that variable. Levels of attraction could be easily obtained from the attraction scale which had been developed to describe positively and negatively attracted persons. Inasmuch as there was a significant difference between the ratings for persons identified as positively attractive and negatively attractive it was felt that three levels would be meaningful: one level would represent relatively high attraction, the next would represent relatively indifferent or indeterminant attraction, and the last level would represent relatively low attraction.

Levels of attraction were identified in the following manner: the range of scores obtained from the rated adjective lists, divided into three equal parts, would yield three levels of positive attraction. If an attraction score fell within the upper third of the range it would be considered High Positive Attraction; if it fell within the middle third of the range it would be considered Medium Positive Attraction; if it fell within the lower third of the range it would be considered Low Positive Attraction. Changes in attraction and attitude could then be associated with the level of initial attraction the person had for his dyadic partner.
This partitioning procedure was also seen to be appropriate for identification of attitude similarity level. A correlation coefficient derived from correlating two private rankings of the offensive statements by two persons prior to interacting would be an index of High, Medium or Low attitude similarity according to its position in the upper, middle or lower third of the range of correlation coefficients obtained for all such pairs. Change in attraction and attitude could then be associated with the level of initial attitude similarity demonstrated by the two persons prior to interacting.

By considering attraction as the dependent variable and manipulating attitude; and conversely, holding attitude constant and manipulating attraction, it was hypothesized that both variables would demonstrate independent and interdependent effects that would be significantly associated with changes in attraction and attitude.
METHOD

Subjects

One hundred-six undergraduate students in two introductory psychology classes at Louisiana State University with no previous experience in what was required of them were used in this study. Ss were chosen during the second week of class work during the summer semester of 1963. Ss were between the ages of 18 and 23 and at approximately the same educational level. There were forty-two females and sixty-four males in the total sample.

Procedure

At the beginning of the experiment, Ss were arbitrarily paired in a random fashion except that the two members of each dyad were always of the same sex. Each pair of Ss was assigned regular classroom chairs which were placed facing each other approximately four feet apart. This spacing allowed each S to work in private before interacting, but in full view of his potential dyadic partner who was seated opposite him.
Each S was then given a booklet which contained the descriptive adjective rating sheet and the list of offensive attitude statements developed in the pilot research (see Appendix H). Each S was told verbally to "make up a 6 place number and to write it on his booklet in the place provided." This identification procedure was necessary to relate the first part of the experiment to the second.

After having placed his identification number on his booklet, S turned the page and was instructed to give the approximate length of time he had known the person sitting opposite him. He was then instructed to privately rate each of the thirteen descriptive adjectives on a scale from 1 to 7, as he felt each adjective best described his partner. When he had completed his ratings he was instructed to turn the page and then to privately rank order the list of thirteen offensive statements. When this was completed he turned his booklet face down, and when all Ss were finished, the booklets were collected by the experimenter. This first part of the experiment was completed in about 10 minutes and about three minutes elapsed before the next part began.

At the beginning of the second part of the experiment, Ss were given another booklet (see Appendix I). S identified himself and his partner by their identification numbers in
the spaces provided on the cover sheet. The second page contained an identical list of offensive statements that each S had been required to rank order privately in the first part of the experiment. Ss were instructed to form dyads with their respective partners and to make a joint ranking which would be a composite effort reflecting the attitudes of both members of the dyad. After completing these composite rankings, Ss were instructed to physically separate and return to their original positions. The next page of their booklet contained an identical list of adjectives presented to them in the first part of the experiment for describing the other person. They were instructed to privately rate them again as they now felt they best described the other person. When this was completed, each S was instructed to turn the page and was again presented the identical list of offensive statements. He was instructed to privately rank them again as he now thought they should be ranked. When this was completed he turned his booklet face down, and, when all Ss had completed the second part of the experiment, the booklets were collected by the experimenter. The second part of the experiment was completed in about 20 minutes.

Measures of Attraction and Attitude

Two measures of attraction were obtained: first,
before interacting with the other person and the second, after interacting. Attitude was assessed three times: first, before interacting; second, the joint product of the interaction; and third, after interacting. The following scores were calculated for attraction and attitude:

1. **Initial attraction**: the sum of the private ratings given each of the thirteen adjectives of the list used to describe the other person before the group meeting. The lower the score, the more attraction was indicated; the higher the score, the less attraction.

2. **Final attraction**: the sum of the private ratings given each adjective after the group meeting.

3. **Attraction change**: from measures 1 and 2 above, a difference score was determined by subtracting the final attraction score from the initial attraction score. This revealed direction and amount of change in attraction after interaction.

4. **Initial attitude similarity of the two members**: each S's initial private ranking of the thirteen offensive statements, symbolized by XX. These coefficients were used in determining the initial levels of attitude similarity.

5. **Stability of attitude**: the correlation between
each S's initial private ranking (X) with his final private ranking (Y), symbolized by XY. These coefficients reflected the amount of change that took place between the S's initial attitude and his final attitude, and were used in the study as a measure of attitude change. Each correlation was transformed to a Fisher's "z" coefficient in order to normalize the data for analysis.

6. **Initial ranking in agreement with the group decision:** each S's initial private ranking (X) correlated with the group ranking (G), symbolized by XG. These coefficients were used to determine the relationship between each S's initial attitude agreement with the group decision and final attraction for the other person. This was accomplished by correlating the XG coefficients with final attraction scores.

7. **Acceptance of the group decision:** each S's final private ranking of the attitude statements (Y), correlated with the group decision (G), symbolized as YG. These coefficients were correlated with change in attraction scores to determine the relationship between acceptance of the group decision and change in attraction.
Design

Initial attraction scores were calculated for each member of the dyad and a frequency distribution determined. Attraction scores ranged from 15 to 91, with a mean of 41.0, and a standard deviation of 14.1. The scores were divided into three groups consisting of 38, 35, and 33 Ss each, representing High, Medium and Low initial attraction levels. The ranges of the groups were 15 to 35, 36 to 46, and 47 to 91, with mean scores of 26.6, 40.6 and 55.7, and standard deviations of 5.8, 2.3, and 12.7, respectively.

Initial attitude similarity of the two members was calculated for all dyads and the score distribution determined. Initial attitude scores ranges from .76 to -.40 with an arithmetic mean of .35 and a standard deviation of .30. The scores were divided into three groups consisting of 38, 34, and 34 Ss each, representing High, Medium and Low initial similarity of attitude. The ranges for the groups were .54 to .76, .26 to .53 and -.40 to .25. Mean attitude similarity for the three groups was .67, .44 and -.08, with standard deviations of .07, .07, and .25, respectively.

A subject was assigned to one of the nine cells shown in Figure 2 depending upon his initial attraction to the other person and the initial attitude similarity of the two
members of each dyad. Mean initial attraction and attitude similarity scores for the nine cells are shown in Figure 2. These nine cells constituted the "treatment groups."

Four subjects were eliminated from the high attraction-high attitude similarity cell on the basis of 40 or more weeks of prior familiarity. The range of length of time known for the remaining Ss was from 2 to 24 weeks with a mean of approximately 3 weeks. No cell contained persons whose average length of time known was longer than approximately 5 weeks.

Two additional subjects were eliminated from the study in order to equalize average initial attraction in the column cells and average initial attitude similarity in the row cells. The total number of subjects eliminated from the original sample of one hundred six was six; thus, the average shown in Figure 2 are based on 100 subjects, with the total number contributing to each treatment group indicated within the particular cell.
### Initial Attraction and Initial Attitude Similarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Attitude Similarity</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean Attraction</th>
<th>Mean Attitude</th>
<th>High 15 to 35</th>
<th>Medium 36 to 46</th>
<th>Low 47 to 91</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.54 to .76</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 12</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>.27 to .53</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-.40 to .26</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 34</td>
<td>N = 33</td>
<td>N = 33</td>
<td>N = 33</td>
<td>N = 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2**

INITIAL ATTRACTION AND INITIAL ATTITUDE SIMILARITY
RESULTS

Attraction Change

Change in attraction was calculated for each subject and means were determined for each treatment group as indicated in Figure 2. Two subjects were eliminated due to improper ratings of adjectives in the final phase of the experiment. A total of 98 change of attraction scores were utilized. The mean results are given in Table I. The variance was analyzed to establish significance of differences in mean values. The source of variance for main effects and interaction, appropriate degrees of freedom, and F's obtained are given in Table II.

It can be seen from Table II that the main effects of initial attraction and attitude similarity on attraction change are not significant at the .05 level, but as independent factors they account for a large portion of the variance. However, change in attraction is a function of both initial attraction for the other person and initial attitude similarity. This is demonstrated in the significance of the interaction effect of initial attraction and initial attitude.
### TABLE I

**MEAN ATTRACTION CHANGE FOR TREATMENT GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Attitude Similarity</th>
<th>Initial Attraction</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>High (15 to 35)</th>
<th>Medium (36 to 46)</th>
<th>Low (47 to 91)</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.54 to .76</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>.27 to .53</td>
<td>-5.27</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-.40 to .26</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .74</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>N = 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N = 98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Significant at the .05 level.

### TABLE II

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF ATTRACTION CHANGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Attraction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>136.05</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Attitude Similarity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>159.97</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction X Attitude</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>155.34</td>
<td>2.89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>53.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

similarity. But the differences in mean attraction change are not as were predicted at the beginning of the study.

By referring to Table I, it will be seen that the Middle Level for initial attraction and the High Level of initial attitude similarity produced the greatest amount of positive attraction change. High Level initial attraction and Middle Level initial attitude similarity produced the greatest amount of negative attraction change. For the Middle Level of initial attraction, positive attraction decreases considerably from High to Middle Level attitude similarity, and becomes slightly negative at the low level. For all levels of attitude similarity, the middle level of initial attraction is associated with the greatest positive increase in attraction. The greatest positive attraction
change for all levels of initial attraction occurred at the high level of initial attitude similarity.

Attraction change at the middle level of initial attitude is also dependent upon the initial level of attraction. For those subjects whose initial level of attraction was high, their change in attraction is definitely negative. But attraction change is positive for the middle level of initial attraction, and is non-changing for the low level of initial attraction.

Because interpersonal contact produces greater attraction (Bass, 1960), the slight over-all positive increase in attraction was expected.

A coefficient of .35 (p < .01) was obtained by correlating each subject's attraction change score with the coefficient obtained for his initial attitude agreement with the group decision (XG). This indicates that the subject whose initial attitude is closely related to the group decision is more likely to increase in attraction, and that the subject whose initial attitude is less related to the group decision is more likely to decrease in attraction.

In summary, it can be stated that attraction change is a function of both level of initial attraction and degree of initial attitude similarity, and that the greatest positive
change takes place when initial attraction for the other person is neither high nor low, but their initial attitudes are highly similar. In addition, the greatest negative change takes place when the person is highly attracted initially but the attitudes of the two persons are neither similar nor dissimilar.

Attitude change

Stability of attitude (XY) was calculated for each subject. These coefficients were transformed into Fisher's "z" coefficients and arithmetic means determined for each treatment group as indicated in Figure 2. Four subjects were eliminated due to improper rankings of the offensive statements in the final phase of the experiment. A total of 96 attitude stability coefficients were utilized. The corresponding correlation coefficients for the mean transformed "z" coefficients are given in Table III. The variance was analyzed to establish significance of differences in mean values using the "z" coefficients as data for the analysis. The source of variance for main effects and interaction, appropriate degrees of freedom, and F's obtained, are given in Table IV.

The results shown in Table IV reveal that change in attitude as a result of personal interaction is a simple
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Attitude Similarity</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>High 15 to 35</th>
<th>Medium 36 to 46</th>
<th>Low 47 to 91</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.54 to .76</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>.27 to .53</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-.40 to .26</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 32</td>
<td>N = 31</td>
<td>N = 33</td>
<td>N = 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Corresponding means for Fisher "z" transformed correlation coefficients.*
### TABLE IV

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ATTITUDE STABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Attraction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Attitude Similarity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0404</td>
<td>3.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction X Attitude</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>.3070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Analysis performed on Fisher "z" coefficients.

**Significant at the .05 level.

function of the initial attitude similarity of the dyadic members. This is demonstrated in the significance of the effect of attitude similarity on stability of attitude after interacting. Initial attraction had no significant effect and the interaction of initial attraction and initial attitude similarity also had no effect. The results shown in Table III reveal that stability of attitude as a measure of change decreases with decreasing levels of initial attitude similarity; that is, the more similar the dyadic members were in initial attitude the more stable were their attitudes, and the more dissimilar, the members' initial attitude the more they would alter their final opinion. The greatest amount of stability was demonstrated in the high level of initial
attitude similarity and was approximately equal to the reliabil-
ity coefficient obtained in the pilot studies.

Stability of attitude (XY) was correlated with initial at-
traction for each subject. The coefficient obtained was 
.03, indicating that initial attraction was not a deciding factor in change of attitude. The degree of relationship that existed between the subject's initial attitude and that of the other person was apparently the significant factor. This is demonstrated in Table III.

In summary, it can be stated that attitude change is a simple function of the initial attitude similarity dis-
played by the two dyadic members.

Inspection of the data revealed that males and females were concerned with different factors related to immorality. This difference probably accounts for the somewhat higher average intercorrelation of .35 for initial attitude simi-
arity obtained in the present study than that obtained in the pilot study where intercorrelated rankings of male and female subjects yielded a coefficient of .23.
DISCUSSION

The present study was designed to investigate change in attraction and attitude as a function of the initial attraction and initial attitude similarity of two interacting persons.

Considering attraction change first, the findings support the hypothesis that attraction change is a function of both the initial attraction and attitude similarity of the dyadic members, but neither variable is statistically effective independent of the other. Although initial attraction and attitude similarity did not attain statistical significance as independent factors, they accounted for a large portion of the variance.

From the results obtained in this study, attraction change does not occur as a simple function of attitude similarity. The theoretical approach taken by Krech and Crutchfield (1948), and Rokeach (1960), overlooks the importance of initial attraction as a contributing factor to attraction change. Initial attraction as an independent factor demonstrates approximately the same amount of influence as attitude
similarity, and as a co-factor attains significance as a major source of variance.

The fact that attraction does change as a function of both the initial attraction and attitude similarity of the interacting persons is not adequately covered by Newcomb (1961) who has emphasized the effects of these variables on attitude change only. The results of this study suggest that the effects of initial attraction and attitude similarity on attraction change should be emphasized as well.

The evidence obtained from the present study supports the idea that attraction change is a special function of the interrelationships that exist between the particular levels of initial attraction and attitude similarity. However, the results were not as were predicted at the beginning of the study. These predictions were based upon the assumption that change in attraction would be related to the equally weighted influence of the particular levels of initial attraction and attitude similarity of the two interacting members. The changes which occurred departed sufficiently from this assumed linear relationship to suggest that particular levels of either variable (attraction or attitude) contributed disproportionally to the change in attraction. However, from the results of this study it is impossible to establish the
statistical function which would adequately represent the disproportional counter influence of the various levels of initial attraction and attitude similarity.

Even though the effects of initial attraction and attitude similarity on attraction change are disproportionate, it is important to note that the effects at the middle levels of both variables are most influenced by the other three levels of the other variable.

The middle level of attraction probably reflects the indifference of the rater. Subjects whose attraction ratings fell into this category can be seen as not having a really positive or negative perception of the other person. When these subjects' attitudes are highly similar, a large positive change in attraction takes place; if their attitudes are not too dissimilar (middle level of attitude similarity), then their attraction is increased, but not as much; if their attitudes are dissimilar, they become less attractive and the change is in the negative direction.

The middle level of attitude similarity contained those subjects who probably saw their attitudes as neither similar nor dissimilar to their partner. When these subjects' attraction was initially high, they reduced their attraction significantly; if their attraction was initially
at the middle level, they increased in attraction; and if they were initially low in attraction, they did not change in their attraction to the other person.

The other initial attraction-attitude similarity treatment groups showed no change or were only slightly more attracted.

There are several ways a person can handle the discordant or dissonant situation produced by discrepant attitudes and attractions within the group. Steiner (1960), has pointed out that the individual can tolerate the situation, or he can reject the other person. Toleration of the situation can be seen in the present study where, even though there was considerable difference in opinion at the low level of initial attitude similarity, Ss remained highly attracted. Rejection of the other person can be seen where persons who were initially highly attracted reduced their attraction significantly when it became apparent that their opinions were not entirely supported by their partner; that is, at the middle level of attitude similarity.

It should also be pointed out that the evidence for attraction change revealed in the present study is not consistent with the views of Davis and Jones (1960) and Jones and Thibaut (1958) who have pointed out that persons must be
allowed to act freely in the interpersonal situation or they will manifest no change in attraction. The procedure used in this study within the interpersonal situation forced the subjects to make a joint ranking of the thirteen offensive statements. The ranking had to reflect the joint opinion of the two persons. This procedure did not allow the persons to act freely but restricted them considerably if their opinions happened to have been very different. However, attraction changed considerably in spite of the restrictions placed upon the subjects within the interpersonal situation.

In interpreting the results obtained for attraction change it should be kept in mind that attraction, as defined in this study, did not include the dimension of familiarity, and the components of status and esteem that are associated with familiarity would only minimally contribute to the composite variable of attraction. Even though the Ss had been together in the same classroom for about two weeks, it is highly probable that their first "interaction" took place in the artificial, experimental dyad and the discussion that was required to arrive at a joint statement of their opinions was their first opportunity to get acquainted. The initial adjective ratings describing the other person proved to be very sensitive to change at this point in the acquaintance
process. However, if there had been greater familiarity among the Ss, it is assumed that it would have taken a much longer period of time to have altered the existing status and esteem of the interacting persons and the method for determining attraction change would have required a much more sensitive tool than rated adjective descriptions used in the present study.

In considering initial attitude similarity as a contributing factor to change in attraction, another aspect of the study which should be considered is that the subjects used in this study may not have perceived their partner as an adequate source for critical evaluation of their own attitudes. Even though their attraction scores would have indicated a very positive perception of the other person, the status and esteem which would be associated with the social referent would not be effectual at the time this study was conducted.

Even though the partner may not have been perceived as a social referent, his opinion as a peer was significantly related to the change that took place in the attitude of the other person.

The findings of this study strongly suggest that attitude change is a simple function of the initial attitude
similarity of the interacting members. Initial attraction, and initial attraction together with initial attitude similarity had no significant effect.

The results do not support the view that attitude change is a function of the initial attraction the individual has for the referent within the interpersonal situation as proposed by Kelley (1952) and Turner (1956). However, as was pointed out in the discussion earlier, the components of status and esteem could not be associated with the referent as an attractive other. Also, Kelley and Turner fail to give proper consideration to the influence of attitude similarity of the peer as referent, which was demonstrated for attitude change in this study.

There was no evidence to support the view taken by Newcomb (1961) that attitude change depends on the initial attraction of the persons in interaction. In fact, the evidence conclusively demonstrated that attitude change was not related to initial attraction and the change that occurred in attitude was solely the result of the magnitude of the discrepancy which existed between the attitudes of the two interacting persons.

At the beginning of the study the assumption was made that change in attraction or attitude would be the function
of the proportional and reciprocal influence of initial attraction and initial attitude similarity. From this assumption the predictions for change in attraction and attitude were made and presented in Figure 1. From the results of this study it must be concluded that the assumption of proportional and reciprocal influence of initial attraction and attitude similarity is untenable. This conclusion is based upon the evidence that attraction change depended upon the disproportional influence of both initial attraction and attitude similarity, but not upon either variable independently. In addition, attitude change depended upon the degree of discrepancy that existed for initial attitude similarity as the independent factor, but not upon initial attraction independently or together with initial attitude similarity.

Turning next to several other aspects of the study, there is the possibility that the three levels of attitude similarity did not psychologically represent the limits of perceptual similarity, non-similarity, and dissimilarity. However it is felt that the ranges used in this study must have closely paralleled subject perception to have obtained the significant differences which occurred in attitude change as a result of initial attitude similarity. A refinement in
the range values established on psychologically meaningful divisions would probably have reduced the error variance which was introduced by arbitrarily establishing the three levels as the upper, middle, and lower thirds of the distribution.

Although incidental to the major hypotheses of this study, the differences between male and female average rankings of the thirteen offensive statements are very interesting from a social-psychological point of view. An attempt should be made to determine the factor elements involved which would account for these differences and thereby lead to a better understanding of the value systems of the two sexes operating within the attitude area of morality.
SUMMARY

The purpose of the present study was to investigate changes in attraction and attitude as a function of the initial attraction and initial attitude similarity of two interacting persons. It was hypothesized that initial attraction and attitude similarity each contribute significantly to the final attraction and final attitude of two persons after interacting. It was further hypothesized that there would be significant combinations of the various levels of initial attraction and attitude which would produce an effect independent of either main effect. It was assumed that change in attraction or attitude would be a function of the proportional counter-influence of the various levels of initial attraction and attitude similarity.

In order to investigate the influence of initial attraction and attitude on attraction and attitude change, several preliminary studies were undertaken to define attraction and attitude by objective measures of behavior. The measure of attraction developed for this study consisted of thirteen positive adjectives, rated as each described another
person; the sum of the ratings represented the attraction score. The measure of attitude consisted of a list of immoral or offensive statements which were rank ordered for degree of offensiveness.

Each subject was arbitrarily assigned a partner and privately rated the list of adjectives to describe him. This rating represented the initial attraction each subject had for his potential dyadic partner. He then privately rank ordered the list of attitude statements. This represented his initial attitude and each subject's ranking was correlated with his potential dyadic partner's ranking and this represented the initial attitude similarity of the two dyadic members. The subjects next met together in the dyad and made a joint ranking of the offensive statements. The subjects then separated and made a private ranking again and re-rated the adjectives privately to describe how they felt about their partner after interacting.

Level of initial attraction was defined by the upper, middle, or lower third of the distribution of initial attraction scores obtained from all subjects. Level of initial attitude similarity was defined by the upper, middle, and lower third of the distribution of attitude similarity scores for all dyadic pairs. Nine treatment groups were formed by
dividing the subjects according to their level of initial attraction and initial attitude similarity simultaneously.

Attraction change for each treatment group was determined by subtracting the score for the first private rating of descriptive adjectives from the final private rating score. Attitude change was defined by the stability of the subjects' rankings of the offensive statements, that is, the correlation of the first private ranking with the final private ranking. Stability scores were determined for the nine treatment groups. Data were analyzed by means of an analysis of variance. The results indicated that attraction change depended upon the disproportional influence of both initial attraction and initial attitude similarity, but not upon either variable independently. Attitude change depended upon the degree of discrepancy that existed for initial attitude similarity of the two interacting persons, but not upon initial attraction independently or together with initial attitude similarity. From the results it was concluded that the assumption of proportional and reciprocal influence of initial attraction and attitude similarity on attraction and attitude change was untenable.
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APPENDIX A

This sheet is for Ranking. Please place a "1" next to that person with whom you would most like to be paired to make a group rating on the list you have just finished discussing. Place a "2" next to that person with whom you would next prefer, and so on until you have ranked as "___" the person with whom you would least prefer to make a group rating.

A____
B____
C____
D____
E____
F____
G____
H____
I____
J____
APPENDIX B

The following is a list of attributes. Please rate each person in this group according to the degree to which you think he possesses the attribute. ("1" is very much, "2" a little, and so on, until "7" does not possess this trait.)

1. Arrogant
2. Modest
3. Distant
4. Humble
5. Dislike others
6. Amiable
7. Dull
8. Intelligent
9. Immature
10. Sophisticated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please be sure that each person is rated on each trait.
APPENDIX C

Please list 3 persons in this class in the order of preference with whom you would most prefer to participate in a class project.

1._________________________________________________
2._________________________________________________
3._________________________________________________

Please rate each of the following traits according to the extent each of the three persons listed above possesses the following:* 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiable</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts easily to new situations</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerates uncertainty</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplined</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm and accepting</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 indicates a high degree, 7 indicates that this person does not possess this trait; 4 would be indicative of something in between 1 and 7.
APPENDIX D

Please list 3 persons in this class in the order of least acceptance with whom you would least prefer to participate in a class project.

1. ____________________  
2. ____________________  
3. ____________________  

Please rate each of the following traits according to the extent each of the three persons listed above possess the following:*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts easily to new situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerates uncertainty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm and accepting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 indicates a high degree, 7 indicates that this person does not possess this trait; 4 would be indicative of something in between 1 and 7.
APPENDIX E

The following is a list of acts or attributes of varying degrees of seriousness. Please rate each in the left margin on a 7-point scale, according to the degree that each one is offensive to you. ("1" is not offensive, "2" is slightly offensive, . . . and so on, until "7" is extremely offensive.)

___1. Lying to cover a wrong-doing.
___2. Seducing a young girl.
___3. Betraying the trust of a friend.
___4. Obtaining an illegal abortion.
___5. Masturbating.
___6. Being cruel to a small helpless animal.
___7. Pretending to be what one is not.
___8. Having intercourse with another man's wife.
___10. Spitting in public.
___11. Deceiving a customer in a business deal.
___13. Killing a human being through negligence.
___14. Having sexual relations with a member of one's own sex.
___15. Being stingy with one's possessions.
APPENDIX F

The following is a list of behaviors of varying degrees of seriousness. Please rank each in the left margin from the most serious to the least serious. Place a 1 next to that which you consider most serious, a 2 next to that which you consider the next most serious, and so on, until you have ranked as 10 that which you consider the least serious.

___ Lying to cover a wrong-doing.
___ Seducing a young girl.
___ Betraying the trust of a friend.
___ Masturbation.
___ Having intercourse with another man's wife.
___ Being habitually unkept and slovenly.
___ Killing a human being.
___ Being excessively aggressive.
___ Being cruel to a small helpless animal.
___ Using the Lord's name in vain.
Appendix G

The following is a list of behaviors of varying degrees of seriousness. Please rank each in the left margin from the most serious to the least serious. Place a 1 next to that which you consider most serious, a 2 next to that which you consider the next most serious, and so on, until you have ranked as 13 that which you consider the least serious.

1. Lying to cover a wrong-doing.
2. Seducing a young girl.
3. Betraying the trust of a friend.
4. Masturbation.
5. Overeating to the point of gluttony.
6. Cheating on an exam.
7. Being stingy with one's possessions.
8. Being cruel to a small helpless animal.
9. Using the Lord's name in vain.
10. Drinking excessively.
12. Pretending to be what one is not.
APPENDIX H

Part I

Number:________________

The enclosed scales are to determine your attitudes and the similarity that exists between your responses and others in this classroom.

Your conscientious and considered responses to the requests made herein will be necessary to provide reliable data for future analyses.

Your responses will be treated with complete anonymity, and therefore we request that you answer with complete honesty.

Please begin.
PART I

Scale 1

How long have you known the person sitting opposite you? (Weeks) __________.

Please rate each of the following traits according to the extent the person sitting opposite you would best be described: (1 indicates a high degree, 7 indicated that this person does not possess this trait; 4 indicates something in between 1 and 7).

Considerate ........................................
Amiable ...........................................
Intelligent ........................................
Adapts easily to new situations ............
Tolerates uncertainty ...........
Disciplined ........................................
Consistent ........................................
Cooperative ....................................
Mature ............................................
Permissive ......................................
Happy ...........................................
Warm and accepting .......................%
Attractive .....................................
Conservative ..................................

56
PART I

Scale 2

The following is a list of behaviors of varying degrees of seriousness. Please rank each in the left margin from the most serious to the least serious. Place a 1 next to that which you consider most serious, a 2 next to that which you consider the next most serious, and so on, until you have ranked as 13 that which you consider the least serious.

___ Lying to cover a wrong-doing.
___ Seducing a young girl.
___ Betraying the trust of a friend.
___ Masturbation.
___ Overeating to the point of gluttony.
___ Cheating on an exam.
___ Being stingy with one's possessions.
___ Being cruel to a small helpless animal.
___ Using the Lord's name in vain.
___ Drinking excessively.
___ Being disrespectful to parents in public.
___ Pretending to be what one is not.
___ Using coarse and vulgar language.
APPENDIX I

Part II

My number is:_________
My partner's number is:_________

The enclosed scales will provide additional information on attitudes. Please follow the instructions carefully.

It is again urged that you conscientiously respond to the requests made herein. These will be treated with complete anonymity.

Do not look through the booklet. Follow the sequence of instructions.

Please begin.
PART II

Scale 1

The following is the same list of acts you were just presented. You and your partner are requested to make a joint ranking. In other words, you are to discuss the list and agree on a ranking that would reflect your combined efforts. Your ranking sheet must be exactly as that of your partner.

Place a 1 next to that which you consider most serious, a 2 next to that which you consider the next most serious, and so on, until you have ranked as 13 that which you consider the least serious.

___ Lying to cover a wrong-doing.
___ Seducing a young girl.
___ Betraying the trust of a friend.
___ Masturbation.
___ Overeating to the point of gluttony.
___ Cheating on an exam.
___ Being stingy with one's possessions.
___ Being cruel to a small helpless animal.
___ Using the Lord's name in vain.
___ Drinking excessively.
___ Being disrespectful to parents in public.
___ Pretending to be what one is not.
___ Using coarse and vulgar language.

Physically separate yourself from your partner so that you can continue in private. Now turn the page.
PART II

Scale 2

Please rate each of the following traits according to the extent you feel the person with whom you just made the joint ranking possesses the following: (Remember: 1 indicates a high degree, 7 indicates that this person does not possess this trait; 4 would be indicative of something in between 1 and 7.)

___ Considerate
___ Amiable
___ Intelligent
___ Adapts easily to new situations
___ Tolerates uncertainty
___ Disciplined
___ Consistent
___ Cooperative
___ Mature
___ Permissive
___ Happy
___ Warm and accepting
___ Attractive
___ Conservative

Turn the Page.
PART II

Scale 3

Please rerank the list of acts as you now feel they should be ranked. 1 is most serious ... 13 is least serious.

___ Lying to cover a wrong-doing
___ Seducing a young girl
___ Betraying the trust of a friend
___ Masturbation
___ Overeating to the point of gluttony
___ Cheating on an exam.
___ Being stingy with one's possessions
___ Using the Lord's name in vain
___ Drinking excessively
___ Being disrespectful to parents in public
___ Pretending to be what one is not
___ Using coarse and vulgar language

Hand in your booklet.
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