Two Types of Consequences and Their Influence on the Self-Attribution of Attitudes.

William Thomas Shannon
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses

Recommended Citation
https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses/2987

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.
INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is “Missing Page(s)”. If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
SHANNON, William Thomas, 1945-
TWO TYPES OF CONSEQUENCES AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE SELF-ATTRIBUTION OF ATTITUDES.

The Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College,
Ph.D., 1976
Psychology, social

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, the author would like to extend a note of thanks to his parents, who made all this possible. The author has greatly appreciated the support and encouragement which his parents have offered. Without their care and concern, this project would have been impossible.

A note of thanks to David Blouin is also highly appropriate. David's consultation and continuing assistance concerning the statistical analysis was highly appreciated.

And, a special note of appreciation is offered to Brenda Lombardo for the care and consideration she took in preparing the final manuscript.

The author expresses his appreciation to Dr. Siegel, Dr. Coon, Dr. V. Glad and Dr. Lane for their advice and consideration that have enabled the author to successfully complete this project.

Finally, the author would like to acknowledge the efforts of his chairman, Dr. Perry H. Prestholdt. Throughout the course of this project Dr. Prestholdt voluntarily offered considerable time and effort. His advice and criticisms were greatly appreciated and have made this project a valuable learning experience. Dr. Prestholdt has been a friend and instructor throughout many ventures the author has participated in. Any note of thanks would be inadequate for Dr. Prestholdt's many consultations, but just the same, thanks.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TITLE.</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHOD</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VITA</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Analysis of Variance of Question 6: Choice.</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Means for Choice Question.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Summary of Analysis of Variance: Manipulation Check Questions.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Means of Manipulation Check Measure.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 3 x 3 Factor Analysis.</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Analysis of Variance of Attitude Toward Product.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Means of Attitude Toward Product.</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Summary of Analysis of Variance: Task Related Questions.</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Means of Perceived Feeling about Task.</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Means of Perceived Difficulty of Task.</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Means of Perceived Effort.</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Means of Perceived Success.</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Summary of Analysis of Variance: Audience Related Questions.</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Means for Audience Questions.</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Summary of Analysis of Variance: Product Related Questions.</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Analysis of Variance of Question 7: Like or Dislike of Experimenter.</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

Various theorists have postulated that consequences may play an important role in attitude change. Previous studies involving attitude change and consequences have generally used a dissonance generated counter-attitudinal paradigm. However, in the self-attribution interpretations of attitude change, the influence of consequences has not been thoroughly investigated. Therefore, one of the purposes of the present study was to delineate the effect two types of feedback have in a situation amendable to a self-attribution interpretation of attitude change.

Another purpose of the study was to investigate how an individual's perception of various elements in a situation change as differing consequences occur.

Also, an attempt was made to delineate what underlying attitude change processes might be occurring when an individual hears that he has convinced an audience. Based on a role theory interpretation of attitude change, that feedback of other's perception of one's attitude is the primary process which takes place in attitude change, it was proposed that an individual utilizes feedback from an audience in order to infer what his attitudes are.

In order to test these notions, 99 subjects were induced to give speeches about an obscure commercial product. Subjects were given a choice to participate
and were also given a choice about speaking in favor of the product. A 3 x 3 factorial design was conducted involving the independent manipulation of two types of feedback which the speaker received.

After giving the speech, the speaker received feedback as to a) whether the audience was convinced or not convinced that the product was valuable, or received no information regarding the convince factor, and b) whether the audience felt that what the speaker said represented his true attitude, or was not his true attitude, or the speaker received no feedback as to the audience's perception of his true attitude.

The results indicated that feedback that the audience was not convinced about the worth of the product was most influential when subjects were asked their attitudes about the product. These findings were not supportive of the role theory notion that attitude feedback from others is the primary information which determines an individual's attitude.

However, in relation to questions concerning subject's perception of task related behavior it was found that generally, positive feedback and attitudinal feedback were most influential. Speakers indicated the most attitude change when they received positive feedback about the audience's perception of the speaker's attitude.
These results seemed to indicate that negative consequences are more influential when a series of positive behavioral cues are present, and positive consequences are more influential when a series of negative behavioral cues are present. Also, the type of feedback which was utilized by the individual seemed to be related to type of attribution he was asked to make.
INTRODUCTION

The role of attitudes has consistently been an important area of investigation in social psychology. Even though various new areas of emphasis continue to divert the attention of theorists, a substantial amount of time and effort is continuously expended in the attempt to establish and understand the nature of attitudes and attitude change. Through these efforts, it has become well established that there are a multitude of factors which can influence the formation of, or the change of, a person's attitude.

One important aspect of attitude change which has recently received considerable attention is how attitudes are influenced by consequences. When a person states an attitude, or performs a behavior, he is very likely to receive feedback from his environment as to the effect his statements or actions have on other people within the environment. Obviously, there are multifarious factors which act and interact in numerous ways so that there is no easy answer to the question: what effect does the consequences of an individual's behavior have on the modification of his attitudes?

In order to elucidate the effect consequences have on attitude change a research paradigm was developed in
which a common situation was used in order to investigate the effects of consequences. A situation was established where a person made a statement and then found out what other people were saying about his statement.

However, there are several different ways to conceptualize this type of situation. Two of the most important approaches will be reviewed in order to elucidate the important variables emphasized by these theories and to explain why certain approaches were taken in the present study.

Of the numerous ways of conceptualizing the effects of consequences, the theory of cognitive dissonance has been the most fertile in delineating the role of consequences in attitude-discrepant paradigms. The attitude-discrepant paradigm refers to a situation where a person is induced to behave in a manner that is inconsistent or dissonant with his beliefs or attitudes. This situation theoretically leads to a state of dissonance and subsequently to a change in attitude. The induction usually takes place as a result of either promised reward for complying or threatened punishment for non-compliance.

Dissonance is thought to be a negative state of psychological tension aroused by holding two inconsistent cognitions and is reduced by changing cognitions which the individual holds (Festinger, 1957). For example, dissonance aroused by choosing to perform a counter-attitudinal act may be reduced by changing the relevant attitude so that
act and attitude are consistent (Festinger and Carlsmith, 1959).

Investigators have recently proposed that major extensions of dissonance theory should be made based on findings involving counter-attitudinal behavior and consequences. Research involving consequences and attitude change has indicated that a person's perception of the consequences of his action plays a major part in determining if attitude change will take place. Dissonance theorists have attempted to determine what specific factors influence attitude change when an individual is induced to perform a counter-attitudinal behavior which has possible aversive consequences.

Of the numerous studies conducted within the attitude-discrepant paradigm, several pertinent factors seem to play a major part in producing attitude change. First of all, if an individual makes a counter-attitudinal statement, he is likely to experience the most attitude change is he knows that the audience is uncommitted on the issue (Nels, Helmreich, and Aronson, 1969). Another important factor is whether or not counter-attitudinal advocacy results in undesirable consequences when an individual perceives that aversive consequences will take place as a result of his actions. If he perceives that aversive consequences will be the result, then he will change his attitude (Cooper and Worochel, 1970). Aversive consequences have generally been defined as
consequences which block one's own self-interest or serve to bring about a situation that one would rather not have occur (Cooper and Worche1, 1970; Cooper and Goethals, 1974; Hoyt, Henley and Collins, 1972).

Responsibility for one's action has also been shown to be an important factor. Cooper (1971) tested the proposition that an individual will not change his attitude unless he freely decides to become involved in a potentially discrepant situation and that the possible consequences of that decision are known to him prior to his decision. He found that when subjects did not perceive responsibility, they did not experience attitude change, and personal responsibility was shown to be a function of both volition and foreseeability. Similar findings have been reported by Hoyt, Henley and Collins (1972).

Other studies (Cooper and Goethals, 1974; Daniels and Prestholdt, 1975; Sheras, Cooper and Zanna, 1973) have demonstrated that for attitude change to take place, the expectation of negative consequences has to be present. For example, Cooper and Goethals (1974) found that when aversive consequences were eliminated, attitude change did not occur in the group that knew of the possibility that their speech might not be used, but did occur in the group that expected that their behavior would definitely lead to aversive consequences. These results indicate that when an individual cannot foresee the
elimination of an aversive consequence, the individual's commitment to the behavior seems to be sufficient to produce attitude change.

The research conducted within a dissonance framework has illustrated the importance of consequences in influencing attitude change and has demonstrated that three important factors need to be present for attitude change to take place. The first factor is aversive consequences; that is, an individual must feel that the consequences which occur produce a situation which he would rather not have occur. Secondly, choice must be present; that is, an individual must perceive that he has personal responsibility for his actions. Third, foreseeability must be present as an individual must be aware at the time of commitment that his behavior may result in possible aversive consequences.

From a dissonance standpoint, it is evident that consequences play an important role in producing attitude change. It should be noted, however, that the conditions and factors investigated have been limited. All of these studies have used a counter-attitudinal paradigm. It would seem that in real life attitude change can take place in many other situations besides where a person chooses to make a counter-attitudinal statement and aversive consequences occur. Also, the studies involving the manipulation of aversive consequences have only been concerned with whether or not an audience or
confederate is or is not convinced, whether the consequences have high or low desirableness. Also, experimenters have only attempted to evaluate the subject's attitude towards a single experimentally prescribed topic. Given these limiting factors it would seem imperative that researchers consider other approaches besides that of dissonance theory.

Attribution theory is another theoretical conceptualization which can be used to interpret a situation where a speaker's attitudes are influenced by consequences. The attribution approach towards attitude change has become more prominent in recent years and is often considered to be an alternative viewpoint to dissonance theory. Much of the relevant research concerning the attribution of attitudes has been conducted within the framework of self-attribution or self-perception theory.

In contrast to dissonance theory, Bem (1965) and Kelley (1967) have proposed that there is no need to postulate internal states such as dissonance. A person determines his attitude on the basis of his own behavior and the stimulus context in which it occurs, much as an observer would. Bem (1972) and Kelley (1967) have postulated that a person applies the same attribution rules to self as he would to others. With regard to attitude, the self-attribution rule is as follows: "What would my (this man's) attitude be if I am (he is) willing to behave in this fashion in this situation," (Bem, 1972 p. 7).
The most important attributional approach to attitude change has been developed by Bem (1965, 1967, 1972). Bem has developed a behavioristic interpretation of the attitude-discrepant paradigm and has proposed this approach as an alternative to dissonance theory. Bem has proposed an information processing model which explains attitude change by denying any internal motivational interpretations of attitude change. Bem states that we often survey our behavior toward an entity and then infer that our attitudes toward the entity are consistent with our behavior toward it.

Two main postulates have been set forth by Bem (1972) which constitute the heart of self-perception theory. First, individuals come to know their own attitudes, emotions, and other internal states partially by inferring them from observations of their own overt behavior and/or the circumstances in which this behavior occurs. Secondly, to the extent the internal cues are weak, ambiguous, or uninterpretable, the individual is functionally in the same position as an outside observer, an observer who must necessarily rely upon those same external cues to infer the individual's inner states.

What these propositions imply is that attitudes are based on one's observation of his own behavior and from the observation of the controlling variables perceived to be related to his behavior. To repeat a frequently given example, if a person eats brown bread, without
inducements, then he would say to himself, 'I ate the bread and no one told me to. I received no reward, therefore I must like the bread.' However if his mother had forced him to, or he had been given a reward, then he would say, 'I ate the bread because my mother wanted me to eat the bread, or because I got money for my behavior.' Therefore, in the latter case, the individual would see his behavior as being caused by external inducements and would not infer that he ate the bread because he liked it.

Bem (1965, 1967) originally proposed self-perception theory as an alternative to dissonance theory. In demonstrating the viability of self-perception, Bem used a technique which has been referred to as an interpersonal simulation. An interpersonal simulation is when an observer is either given a description of one of the conditions of a dissonance experiment or is actually permitted to observe one of these conditions and then is asked to estimate the subject's attitude. Unfortunately, this approach has demonstrated various empirical and epistemological deficiencies which weaken the validity of using interpersonal simulations.

After numerous studies researchers arrived at the conclusion that self-perception theory would not be proved or disproved using the interpersonal simulation paradigm. It was evident that paradigms had to be developed which would attempt to establish self-perception as a theory without casting it as an alternative
to dissonance theory. In other words, while previous research concerning self-perception has been conducted in an attempt to prove or disprove dissonance theory, little has been done to establish self-perception as an independently viable theory which can explain various aspects of attitude change.

In the self-perception research which has been conducted, it appears that there are several important factors which influence attitude change. Bem (1965, 1966) has demonstrated that environmental variables affect attitudes. In these experiments he demonstrated that a person's behavior and his subsequent attitude could be influenced by environmental cues present in a situation in which behavior occurs.

Other variables have also been established which seem to be pertinent to a self-perception interpretation of attitude change. The first of these is perceived cause. Attitudes formed as a result of behavior seem to be more pronounced when an individual perceives his behavior to be self-caused. Bandler, Maradas, and Bem (1968) demonstrated that subjects rated shocks as being more painful when they could (and did) escape shocks, than in a condition where they were informed that they should not escape. Davidson and Valins (1966) also found that when changes are attributed to one's own self rather than to drugs, behavior changes that occur are most likely to be maintained. Corah and Boffa (1970) conducted an
additional study which illustrated the importance of choice in determining whether or not an individual views his behavior as being self-caused. Essentially this study was a replication of the Bandler, Maradas, and Bem (1968) study with modifications made to determine the effects of choice. They found that in regard to avoiding an aversive stimuli, a procedure which gives the subject the choice of avoiding or not avoiding the stimuli is equivalent to giving him perceived control over the potential threat.

These studies indicate that an important factor in determining attitude change is environmental information about the cause of behavior. If an individual perceives his behavior as being self-caused, then he is likely to use this behavior to infer what his attitudes are. But when he perceives his behavior as being controlled by external forces, then it is unlikely that his behavior will influence his attitudes.

Another factor which has been manipulated has been the attribution of meaning of behavior. In these studies some aspect of the environmental input has been manipulated and the resulting change in attitude then measured. Of the several studies which have been conducted, it has been shown that subjects will use cues in the environment in order to form their attitudes towards a prescribed topic. Salancik (1974) manipulated cognitive sets by varying instructions on a questionnaire and found that
different prepositional phrases provided differing cues as to how an individual would make a judgment. Kiesler, Nisbett and Zanna (1969) used a pro-attitudinal design where subjects argued in favor of already existing positive attitudes. They manipulated reasons for doing an experiment which were conveyed by a confederate who was participating in the same study. When the confederate stated that he wanted to do the experiment because he really believed in the topic, they found more attitude change than when the confederate stated that the experiment was good because it would advance the cause of science. These studies indicate that factors which are in the environment are used as cues by individuals in order to determine what his attitude should be. If he perceives he has choice, and that what he is doing in the experiment is important, something that he believes in, then it is likely that attitude change will take place.

Another factor which has been manipulated has been the intensity of behavior. How intense or effortful an individual perceives his behavior to be is a factor which he takes into consideration when he evaluates his attitude. Zanna (1973) conducted a study where he manipulated the subject's perceived motivation towards a task and initial attitudes towards the experimenter. He found that when perceived motivation was consistent with initial attitudes towards the experimenter, subjects
appeared to explain their performance by inferring that they held attitudes toward the experimenter which were consistent with their performance. When perceived motivation was inconsistent with initial attitudes toward the experimenter, subjects tended to account for their performance by attributing to themselves an attitude toward the task more consistent with their performance. Thus, attitudes towards a task were acquired by one's perspective of how he did on a task and were also influenced by his initial attitudes. This indicates that people use their perception of how they did on a task to infer what their attitude towards the task should be.

Finally, a study which involved a form of consequences was conducted by Taylor (1975). Taylor created a situation where subjects either expected or did not expect to meet an individual who they evaluated. Taylor found that when future consequences were anticipated, subjects engaged in a critical time consuming reevaluation of their attitudes, which resulted in a more critical and broader information search, i.e. a wider perusal of environmental cues. The results indicated that when one's future behavior is influenced by the expression of an attitude, that attitude seems to be weighted more carefully and more information is used in deciding what one believes. This suggests that self-perception must take into account the conditions under which a person infers and subsequently acts on his attitude. It appears that
consequences may play an important role in the self-perception of attitudes.

Kelley (1967) has suggested that consequences may play a major role in an attribution approach to attitude change. He has theorized that if an individual assumes responsibility for negative consequences, then that individual would make an internal attribution of causality. However, if the individual has no choice, and negative consequences occur, then he is likely to make an external attribution for the consequences. However, these conceptualizations about consequences interacting with choice have not been thoroughly investigated within a self-perception framework.

To summarize the two approaches which have been reviewed, the dissonance theory orientation has indicated that several important factors must be present for attitude change to take place. One, the act must be counter-attitudinal, which produces dissonance, which causes a person to change his attitudes in order to reduce the dissonance. Secondly, a perception of choice must be present. Third, aversive consequences must also be the result of one's action if attitude change is to take place. The aversive consequences must be a situation which one would rather not have happen.

Self-perception theorists also emphasize the importance of choice. If a behavior is to influence his attitudes, an individual must feel that he had a choice
to perform the behavior. However, contrary to dissonance theory, self-perception theorists feel that a behavioral act does not need to be counter-attitudinal in order to produce attitude change. Self-perception theorists have also been able to demonstrate that attitude change is influenced by environmental cues present in a situation, and by self-perceptions, such as intensity of behavior.

However, there are many areas of self-perception which have not been investigated. In the majority of studies which have been conducted, the designs have dealt primarily with the manipulation of the perceived cause of behavior (Bandler, Maradas and Bem, 1968; Corah and Boffa, 1970; Davidson and Valins, 1969) or has involved the manipulation of the perceived intensity or meaning of behavior (Kiesler, Nisbett and Zanna, 1969; Salancik, 1974; and Zanna, 1973). But, other than the study by Taylor (1975) there has been a lack of studies designed to determine how consequences of behavior influence the self- attribution of attitudes. Also, most of the procedures have failed to measure anything but the attitude or feeling about the topic or issue about which the subject made a presentation. It is important that measures be taken of more elements other than an individual's attitude towards a single topic. A manipulation of a variable may not only influence the subject's attitude about the topic, but may also produce changes in a subject's perception of other elements which are present
within the situation. For instance, the manipulation of perceived consequences might affect the subject's perception of the cause and intensity of his own behavior and influence his perception of the intensity of his own feelings about the topic. Walster (1966), while looking at attributions which observers make, found that the manipulation of perceived consequences of behavior results in differential attributions of the causes of the behavior. It is likely that consequences in a self-attribution approach may have similar effects that should be investigated.

One of the purposes of the present research was to create a situation amendable to a self-perception interpretation in order to investigate further how an individual's perception of various elements in a situation change as differing consequences occur. Of course, the major purpose of the investigation was to delineate the effect consequences have in influencing attitude change in a self-perception paradigm. Therefore, a situation was created where a speaker gave a talk, which was not counter-attitudinal, about a specific topic and then received feedback from an audience concerning their perception of the talk. Measurements were made to determine the effect of the feedback on the speaker's attitude towards the topic which he advocated and to determine the effect feedback had on the speaker's perception of other elements related to the situation.
In such a situation various factors can influence a speaker's attitude. Basically, previous research involving counter-attitudinal situations (Scott, 1957, 1959, and Nels et al. 1969) have used a procedure which informed the speaker of whether or not the audience was convinced, that is, whether or not the audience's attitudes were influenced by the talk, and then observed what effect this feedback had on the speaker's attitude towards the topic which he advocated. Results have generally indicated that a speaker's attitude changes towards the position he advocates when he hears that he has convinced an audience.

However, an unanswered question is exactly what does this type of feedback convey to the speaker? Why does this type of feedback produce attitude change? One possible explanation is that when a person hears this feedback, he makes certain assumptions about what his own attitude should be, based on this feedback, i.e. the feedback provides information about his own attitude. If this process is taking place then it is very similar to various conceptualizations which role theorists have developed.

Role theory in many ways can be considered to be a forerunner of self-perception theory (Shaver, 1975). Role theorists have emphasized that a person uses others in his environment to establish his attitude. A concept relevant to the present investigation which has been
elucidated and expanded by role theorists is the concept of the "looking glass self". Basically, this concept implies that an individual's self-image develops out of his perceptions of the reactions of others to him. In effect, one's self-image is a mirror of the reactions of other people.

Cooley (1922) was one of the original advocates of the concept and since then various theorists have modified and expanded the concept. The concept presently implies that an individual, in developing or changing his attitudes, uses the external evaluations of other people in order to form his own values and attitudes (Biddle and Thomas, 1966). In contrast to self-perception theorists, role theorists have emphasized that these external evaluations made by others are the primary process an individual uses to develop his attitudes (Turner, 1966). Unfortunately, role theorists have not empirically investigated important factors and processes involved in this "looking glass self" conceptualization. Also, although self-perception theorists have conducted numerous empirical studies, they have not investigated how individuals interpret feedback from others in the environment in order to establish their attitudes. Therefore, while feedback from others has long been emphasized by role theorists as an important component of attitude change, self-perception theorists have not examined the implications of these conceptualizations. It is entirely possible
that self-perception theorists have lost sight of important variables which cause attitude change. An additional purpose of the present research was to examine several types of feedback in order to determine how they influence attitude change.

In a situation where an individual receives feedback about his attitudinal statements, it is important to understand the speaker's interpretation of this feedback. In other words, what type of information is conveyed which causes a speaker to change his attitude? Role theorists state that a person infers his attitude based on information of the audience's perception of his attitude. If this interpretation is correct, then when a speaker finds that what he said convinced an audience, he infers that the audience perceives what he said as being representative of his real attitude. The speaker, in effect, makes an assumption that could be stated as: "I convinced the audience. Since I convinced the audience, they must have perceived me as being sincere and that I believed in what I said. If they perceive this as my attitude, then it must be my attitude."

In order to understand if this inference process occurs, a speaker could be given two different types of feedback. One type of feedback would be that the audience was convinced or not convinced. The speaker would receive information that he had or had not persuaded the audience to accept his point of view. The other type of feedback
would be information of the audience's perception of the speaker's attitude. The speaker would hear feedback which states that the audience perceived his statements to be his true attitude. For example, after giving his talk, a speaker might hear that the audience was convinced and that they perceived what he said as being representative of his true attitude. The present study independently manipulated these two types of feedback in order to see if, in fact, a speaker infers his attitude based on the information which he receives from an audience.

Several principles based on role theory and self-perception theory were used to derive the hypotheses for this study. First of all, according to self-perception theory, individuals will use their behavior toward the attitude object and the cues in the environment to infer their attitudes. Secondly, since role theorists emphasize the importance of other's external evaluation of one's attitude, the most influential type of feedback one receives is information about what others perceive his attitude to be. Third, if an individual receives information that an audience is convinced, he then uses a self-perception process to infer that the audience perceived his behavior to be representative of his attitude.

The first hypothesis is based on role theory's argument that feedback of other's perception of one's attitude is the primary process which takes place in
attitude change. Specifically, it was expected that receiving feedback that the audience perceives the speaker's statements to be his true attitude will result in the speaker demonstrating greater attitude change than when he hears that the audience perceives his statement as not being his real attitude, or when he receives no feedback about other's perception of his attitude.

Secondly, it was expected that when the speaker hears that the audience has been convinced (persuaded), he will demonstrate more attitude change than when the audience is unconvinced, or when the speaker receives no feedback as to whether or not the audience is convinced. This prediction is based on the assumption that knowing that his behavior has convinced an audience causes the speaker to infer that his behavior represents his real attitude.

Third, it was expected that when a speaker receives both forms of information, the speaker will use available cues to infer his attitude. When a speaker receives information that the audience has been convinced and perceives his statements to be his true attitude, then the speaker should have the most attitude change about the topic he advocates. In this situation the speaker receives two types of information which will present him with the greatest number of consistent cues that his behavior represents his true attitude. In contrast, when the speaker hears that the audience is not convinced and do not perceive his statements to be representative
of his true attitude then the speaker should have the least amount of attitude change. This outcome should occur because in this condition the greatest amount of consistent information is present which informs the speaker that it is not his true attitude.

On the other hand, in the conditions where a speaker receives conflicting information it is expected that direct information about a speaker's attitude will be more potent. When the speaker hears that the audience was unconvinced but perceived what he said as being his true attitude, he will demonstrate more attitude change than when he hears that the audience was convinced, but didn't think it was his true attitude. This prediction is based on the role theorists emphasis that feedback of one's attitude from others is the most important information for inferring one's attitudes. Therefore, in this situation the more potent factor should be feedback of perceived attitude.

Fourth, when the speaker receives no feedback about either factor from the audience, it is expected that he will indicate a moderate amount of attitude change. When he does not receive any feedback, the speaker will look at his own behavior for cues. The fact that he chose to participate and chose to advocate a positive position will cause him to change his attitude toward the topic.
Finally, it is expected that when a speaker is informed that the audience was convinced, but receives no feedback about the audience's perception of his attitude, he will demonstrate more attitude change than when he hears that the audience was convinced but did not perceive his statement to be his true attitude. This prediction is based on the assumption that in order for attitude change to take place, a speaker must make an inference about his attitude based on the feedback which he receives. When he hears that he convinced an audience but they did not perceive his statement to be his true attitude, then he cannot infer that he has a positive attitude about the topic and there should be little attitude change.

Similarly, it is expected that there will be no difference when the speaker hears that the audience perceived what he said as being his true attitude but receives no feedback about convincing the audience and when the speaker hears that he convinced the audience but receives no feedback about the audience's perception of his attitude. This will provide additional evidence that when a speaker finds that he convinced an audience, he infers his attitude from this feedback.

If these last two expectations are supported, then this would be supportive of the fact that individuals do make inferences about their attitudes based on feedback about whether or not they convinced an audience.
Secondly, the results will provide additional evidence as to the effect consequences have in a self-perception paradigm. Finally, the study was designed to investigate not only how consequence variables influence the speaker's attitude toward the topic, but also how consequence variables influence the speaker's perception of other aspects of the situation.
METHOD

Design Overview

Subjects were induced to give speeches on a commercial product to which they had little previous exposure. The basic procedure was similar to that used by Daniels and Prestholdt (1975). Subjects were given a choice as to whether or not to participate in the study and were also given a choice as to whether or not they wanted to speak in favor of the proposed topic. A 3 x 3 factorial design was conducted involving the independent manipulation of two types of feedback which the speaker received. After giving the speech, the speaker received feedback as to a) whether the audience was convinced, not convinced, or received no information regarding the convince factor, and b) whether the audience felt that what the speaker said represented his true attitude, or was not his true attitude, or the speaker received no feedback as to the audience's perception of his true attitude.

Subjects

Subjects were recruited from introductory psychology classes. Recruitment was conducted by the experimenter passing sign-up sheets to each class. Subjects were free...
to decide whether or not they wanted to participate. Ninety-nine male and female undergraduate students were recruited. They were randomly assigned to experimental conditions with the constraint that the number of subjects in each condition be equal and conditions be counterbalanced for sex. The subjects received extra credit for participation in the experiment.

**Procedure**

One subject was involved in each experimental session. When the subject arrived at the experimental room, he saw a sign stating "subjects for persuasion-communication study please wait here". This room contained a T.V. monitor, which faced an arrangement of chairs in the room. The monitor was turned on, but there was no picture on the screen. When the experimenter arrived, he greeted the subject and explained the purpose of the experiment.

The experimenter explained that he was interested in finding out what important factors are involved in effective T.V. communications. It was emphasized that there would be relevant use made of the findings - "that with these findings and others, more effective and improved T.V. communications will be developed". The experimenter also informed the subject of past research which had caused substantial improvements in the communication industry. The experimenter further informed the subject that the easiest way to study
different types of communication was to have people talk about various types of products as people are most familiar with this form of communication because of its frequent use on T.V. The subjects were informed that their part in the evaluation would be to make up and deliver a short talk about a product called "Superstrong Strapping Tape" over closed circuit T.V. to an audience in another room. The purpose of this talk would be to inform the audience that this is a valuable and useful product. The experimenter also informed the subjects that at the end of their talk the experimenter would ask the subject several general questions about the product. The experimenter further explained that after giving the talk the subject would listen to the audience's reaction and help the experimenter evaluate how the audience responded to the information which they had received.

Subjects were then given a choice as to whether or not they wanted to participate in the study. They were told that since they were the first to arrive, it would be convenient if they would serve as the speaker. They were informed at this point that if they did not want to participate, they would still receive experimental credit. If they said yes, the experimenter then continued by stating that since members of the audience would arrive shortly, they should go and get ready to make the presentation. The subject was taken to a room set up as a recording studio. The subject was seated at a table
in front of a video camera with a T.V. monitor present on which the subject could view himself while making the speech. The subject was told that there was an intercom set up so that: 1) he could inform the experimenter if he recognized any of the audience over the intercom as it was important that possible biases be minimized, and 2) he would be able to listen to the audience's reaction after the talk was over, in order to help the experimenter evaluate the audience's responses.

The experimenter then left the room, explaining that he would have to greet the audience and that the subject could listen in to make sure that he did not know any of the participants. As he left he turned on the intercom which activated the first part of a tape recording which was the same for all conditions. On the tape the subject heard that members of the audience had arrived or were arriving and then he heard the experimenter arrive. The subject then heard the experimenter inform the audience that he would like to have their reactions to a new product. The experimenter then asked the audience how they felt about new products, for instance types of tape. The audience replied by making non committal answers, that they really had not heard anything about the product and that they would have to wait before making up their minds. The subject was informed, in effect, that the audience was neutral.
After briefing the audience the experimenter returned to the recording area and asked the subject if he recognized any of the audience. If he said yes, the experimenter asked the subject who, and checked the name against the master list and informed the subject that the person was not present and was probably just someone who sounded similar.

The experimenter then told the subject that since he was fully aware of what he had to do, it was still his choice if he wanted to continue. If he said yes, then the experimenter induced the subject to make a positive statement in favor of the product by informing the subject that although he did not have to, the experimenter would appreciate it if he would talk in favor of the product. The experimenter explained that information had already been collected about the audience’s reaction to negative points of view and now the experimenter would like to see how the audience would react to a positive point of view. This was done in order that the subject would feel that he had been given a choice in taking a positive point of view. The subject was informed that it was his choice and his decision and when the subject responded affirmatively, the experimenter gave the subject a list of major points which he could use to make up his talk. The subject was informed that he could make changes and deletions and emphasize whatever he wanted to emphasize. The subject
was told that his talk should be about three minutes long. Subjects were also told that the main idea was to make some sort of testimonial. The testimonial should be in favor of the product and that they should try as hard as they could to inform the audience that this was a good product as the audience would be asked later to commit themselves to a six-month home use trial. The subjects were told that if members of the audience committed themselves to a home use trial, then this would be a further indication of how effective the talk had been.

The subject was given five minutes to make up his talk and when the subject indicated that he was finished, the experimenter turned on the camera, notified the audience that the presentation was to begin and the subject gave his presentation. When he finished, the experimenter then asked the subject to summarize how valuable he felt the product was, and whether or not he would recommend it.

**Manipulations**

After the speech was over the subject was told to remain in the room while the experimenter went to ask the audience some questions. In order to focus the subject's attention on the communication over the intercom the experimenter gave a rating form to the subject in order that he could record the audience's reactions,
and then turned on the intercom and left the room. This activated a tape recorder which presented the feedback from the audience. The experimenter was blind to the condition until the tape was played. The subjects were assigned to conditions in random order. On the tape members of the audience informed the experimenter in the convinced condition either that they were convinced, or they were not convinced. They stated that they felt that what the speaker said was real and they were convinced because the product seemed to be very useful, and that it seemed that they might like to try the product. In the unconvinced condition, they stated that they were not convinced, that they did not believe in what the speaker said, and that they did not think they would like to try it. They also stated that they did not think that the tape was all that good. In the third condition, the audience gave no indication as to whether or not they were convinced. Therefore, in this condition the audience is basically informing the subject of what the audience's attitude is towards the product.

The other variable which was manipulated was the audience's perception of the speaker's attitude. The audience informed the experimenter that they felt that what the speaker said was his true attitude, or they felt it was not his true attitude, or gave no indication of how they felt about the speaker's attitude. The audience stated that the speaker seemed to believe in
what he said, and it seemed that it was his real attitude, that he was sincere, that he must really believe in what he said, and that it must be his real attitude. The audience stated that they felt this to be true because of the effort which the subject made, that he really tried to "put it across". Or, the audience stated that they did not think he was sincere, that he did not seem to believe in what he was talking about, and that he did not have a positive attitude about the product, that what he said did not represent his true attitude, because he really did not seem to try very hard. Or the audience gave no indication as to what they felt the subject's attitude was. Basically, in this condition the speaker hears the audience's perception of his attitude about the product.

In the no feedback/no feedback condition, everything was identical until the experimenter turned on the intercom to go ask the audience the evaluation questions. When the experimenter turned on the intercom, all that was present was a squealing noise. The experimenter hit the intercom and the noise continued. He then turned it off and asked the speaker to wait while he went down and excused the audience. He explained to the speaker that if the speaker can not help in the evaluation, there was no reason to continue. The experimenter then left to excuse the audience. In several minutes the experimenter returned and carried
out the rest of the study. At this point, all conditions were again equivalent.

Thus, there were nine feedback conditions: convinced-no feedback, not convinced-no feedback, true attitude-no feedback, not true attitude-no feedback, convinced-true attitude, convinced-not true attitude, not convinced-true attitude, not convinced-not true attitude, and no feedback-no feedback.

After the audience had finished making comments, the speaker heard the experimenter summarize the audience’s remarks. The speaker then heard the experimenter explain to the audience that the first part of their task was over. For the second part, they were to leave and go to another room where they would be interviewed by another experimenter. The experimenter informed the audience of where they should go. The audience then left and the experimenter returned to the room where the speaker was waiting.

**Dependent Variables**

After the experimenter returned from questioning the audience, the experimenter informed the subject that the study was over and that he could leave. Before the subject went out the door, the experimenter remembered that the subject had to fill out a Psychology Department questionnaire. On this questionnaire were the dependent
measures in the form of 31-point bipolar scaled questions with the scale being labeled at 5-point intervals.

The questions on the questionnaire dealt with a series of topics generally concerning experiments. The subjects were asked to fill out questions pertaining to demographic data along with questions which were designed to elicit information concerning the subject's attitude and perception about intensity of behavior, cause of behavior and feelings about the topic. The pertinent questions were:

6. How much choice do you feel you were given by the experimenter as to whether or not you could participate in the experiment?

7. How do you feel towards the experimenter?

8. How do you feel about the task which you did?

9. How do you feel about the product which you advocated?

10. How useful do you feel the product would be?

11. How valuable as an aid around the home do you feel this product is?

12. Do you think that sometime in the future you will use this product?

13. How hard was the task which you performed?

14. How much effort do you feel you put into the task?

15. If there was an audience involved in the study which you participated in, how did you feel about the audience?

16. If you received information from an audience, how accurate do you think this information was?

17. How well do you think you did on the task?
The subjects were told that the data was confidential and would be viewed only by a psychology experimentation committee which was reviewing various types of research being conducted at the school. At this point the experimenter asked the subject to fill out the questionnaire and seal it in an envelope marked "Psychology Experimentation Committee, Psychology Department". The experimenter then left the room and the subject completed the questionnaire and gave the sealed envelope to the experimenter.
RESULTS

A total of one hundred and twelve individuals arrived at the designated area to participate in the research. Five females and three males refused to participate in the study, one female and two males were dropped from the study because they indicated during the study that they did not believe the deception, and one male and one female were dropped because of equipment failures during the study. Thus, a total of 99 subjects, 11 per cell, participated in the experiment. Each cell had six males and five females.

The individuals who were dropped from the study were evenly distributed throughout the conditions. Since no single cell had a disproportional number discarded, it appears that there were no unintentional bias induced by the non-participation of these subjects.

Manipulation Check Measures

Six questions constituted the manipulation checks. One question, concerning subject's perception of choice, was in the "Psychology Department Questionnaire" which subjects filled out after they had completed the experiment. The other five questions were contained in the "Communication and Evaluation Form" which subjects filled
out under the pretense of helping the experimenter evaluate the audience reaction. All questions were in a 31 point bi-polar scale, except for question three on the communication and evaluation form which had a 16 point scale and question six on the Psychology Department Questionnaire which had a 21 point scale.

**Perception of Choice**

On the "Psychology Department Questionnaire" subjects were asked to indicate how much choice they felt they had about participating in the experiment. A score of 21 indicated "quite a bit" and the other end of the scale was scored as one, which was equivalent to "no choice". The means for the nine cells ranged from 16.64 to 20.68. In terms of scale labels, these means indicate that subjects felt that they had a "good deal" of choice to "quite a bit" of choice. Therefore, all subjects perceived that they had a high amount of choice as to whether or not they could participate in the study. This demonstrates that the choice manipulation was successful as all participants felt they were given an adequate choice.

In order to determine if subjects perception of choice was influenced by the feedback which they received an ANOVA was conducted using data obtained from the choice question. The results indicated that the only significant effect was the attitude factor (B) main effect, $F(2, 90) = 3.804$, $p = .025$ (see Table 1). The means (see Table 2)
Table 1

Analysis of Variance of Question 6 - Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convince Feedback (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.598</td>
<td>1.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Feedback (B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32.205</td>
<td>3.804*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.985</td>
<td>1.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-cell error</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8.466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
Table 2
Means for Choice Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convince Feedback (A)</th>
<th>Attitude Feedback (B)</th>
<th>True Attitude</th>
<th>Not True Attitude</th>
<th>No Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convinced</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>19.86</td>
<td>(19.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Convinced</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>(19.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>20.68</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>18.14</td>
<td>(18.48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(20.06) (18.11) (19.33)

Note. Scale: 21quite a bit to 1none.

a Numbers in parenthesis represent main effect means.
indicated that the true attitude mean (20.06) was greater than the not true attitude mean (18.11). The no feedback mean (19.33) was somewhat closer to the true attitude mean than it was to the not true attitude mean. An orthogonal comparison between true attitude and not true attitude indicated that true attitude feedback was significantly, $F(1, 90) = 7.445, p < .01$, greater than not true attitude feedback. Apparently a subject's perception of the amount of choice he had about participating in the experiment was influenced by feedback about the audience's perception of his attitude. Subjects who heard that the audience perceived their statement to be their real attitude felt they had more choice than subjects who heard that the audience perceived their statement not to be their true attitude.

Perception of attitude and convince feedback

Questions on the Communication and Persuasion Form were designed to determine whether or not individuals were correctly perceiving the feedback. The questions were: 1) how effective did this form of communication seem to be, 2) how favorable or unfavorable do you think the audience's feelings were about the product, 3) to what degree did the audience seem to believe you, 4) how sincere or insincere did the audience perceive your presentation to be, and 5) overall, how positive or negative was the audience's reaction.
Because the no feedback-no feedback condition could not be included in this analysis, a one-way ANOVA of the eight feedback conditions was calculated for each question (see Table 3 for ANOVA, and Table 4 for means). The feedback effects for question one, $F(7, 80) = 23.710$, $p = .0001$, question three, $F(7, 80) = 39.982$, $p = .0001$, and question five, $F(7, 80) = 51.756$, $p = .0001$, were all highly significant. Identical orthogonal comparisons were then conducted on each question which compared the combined positive conditions (i.e. condition 1, true attitude-convincing, condition 3, true attitude-no feedback, and condition 7, convinced-no feedback) with the combined negative conditions (i.e. condition 5, not true attitude-not convinced, condition 6, not convinced-no feedback, and condition 8, not true attitude-no feedback). Highly significant differences between positive and negative feedback were found on question one, $F(1, 80) = 159.932$, $p < .01$, on question three, $F(1, 80) = 275.995$, $p < .01$, and on question five, $F(1, 80) = 6.476$, $p < .01$. This indicates that subjects were able to discern a significant difference between the positive and negative feedback which they received. Subjects who received positive feedback indicated that this form of communication was more effective, that the audience seemed to believe them and that overall, the audience's reaction was positive. On the other hand, subjects who received negative feedback indicated that this form of communication was
Table 3
Summary of Analysis of Variance
Manipulation Check Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (C)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>732.62</td>
<td>23.71****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-cell error</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30.90</td>
<td>23.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**** p < .0001
Table 3
Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (C)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1232.41</td>
<td>78.31***</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-cell error</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>51.76***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**** p < .0001
Table 4
Means of Manipulation Check Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Feedback (C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 True Attitude-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convinced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How effective did this form of communication seem to be? Scale: 31-effective to 1-ineffective.</td>
<td>25.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How favorable or unfavorable do you think the audience's feelings were about the product? Scale: 31-favorable to 1-unfavorable.</td>
<td>26.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what degree did the audience seem to believe you? Scale: 16-a lot to 1-none.</td>
<td>15.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How sincere or insincere did the audience perceive your presentation to be? Scale: 31-sincere to 1-insincere.</td>
<td>27.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Overall, how positive or negative was the audience's reaction? Scale: 31-very positive to 1-very negative.</td>
<td>26.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Feedback (C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Not True Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude-Not Convinced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How effective did this form of communication seem to be? Scale: 31-effective to 1-ineffective.</td>
<td>8.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How favorable or unfavorable do you think the audience's feelings were about the product? Scale: 31-favorable to 1-unfavorable.</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what degree did the audience seem to believe you? Scale: 16-a lot to 1-none.</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How sincere or insincere did the audience perceive your presentation to be? Scale: 31-sincere to 1-insincere.</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Overall, how positive or negative was the audience's reaction? Scale: 31-very positive to 1-very negative.</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ineffective, the audience did not believe them, and that overall, the audience’s reaction was negative.

For question two, "how favorable or unfavorable do you think the audience's feelings were about the product," the ANOVA was also highly significant, $F(7, 80) = 43.015, p = .0001$. A comparison was made between condition 2, not true attitude-convincing (mean = 23.82) and condition 4, true attitude-not convinced (mean = 10.32) as these two conditions were least likely to be significantly different because of conflicting information from attitude feedback. This comparison would delineate whether or not the speaker was able to discern the audience favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the product. The orthogonal comparison indicated a significant difference, $F(1, 80) = 43.26, p < .01$, between the two conditions. Thus, the subject was able to recognize that the audience had a favorable or unfavorable feeling about the product.

For question four, "how sincere or insincere did the audience perceive your presentation to be," the ANOVA was also highly significant, $F(7, 80) = 78.310, p = .0001$. The mean for condition 4, true attitude-not convinced (mean = 26.59) was greater than condition 2, not true attitude-convincing (mean = 7.00). Therefore, a comparison was made between condition 2, not true attitude-convincing and condition 4, true attitude-not convinced as these two cells were least likely to be significantly different because of conflicting information from convince
feedback. This comparison determined if the speaker was able to delineate the feedback concerning the audience's perception of his attitude, i.e., the sincerity or insincerity of his statement. The orthogonal comparison indicated a highly significant difference, $F(1, 80) = 132.891, p<.01$. This indicates that the speaker was able to delineate whether or not the audience perceived his statement as being his real attitude.

Overall, these results demonstrate that subjects felt that they had a choice as to whether or not they could participate, and that subjects were correctly perceiving the essential parts of the feedback. Therefore, later responses to the dependent measures were not a result of possible misinterpretations of the feedback.

**Attitude Change**

**Attitude change toward the product**

The attitude items (questions nine, ten, eleven, and twelve) on the "Psychology Department Questionnaire" were designed to determine the speaker's attitude toward the product. These questions were in a 31-point bi-polar scale.

A multivariate analysis of variance was used to determine if there were any overall significant treatment effects on the subject's attitude toward the product.
A univariate analysis was used to determine the effects of the treatments on specific terms.

For the MANOVA, the Hotelling-Lawley's Trace criteria indicated an overall significant main effect for convince feedback (A), $F(8, 172) = 9.935, p = .0001$, an overall significant main effect for attitude feedback (B), $F(8, 172) = 2.239, p = .027$, and a significant interaction, $F(16, 342) = 1.809, p = .028$. Apparently, the treatments and their combinations had an overall effect on the speaker's attitude toward the product.

Univariate analyses were then calculated to determine the effect of the treatments on each of the separate questions. These analyses indicated very similar results for each question. Therefore, for the sake of clarity, a subject's score on the four questions were combined to produce an overall "attitude toward product". The analysis of each separate question will not be discussed. Instead, the results which will be presented is a 3 x 3 ANOVA on the subjects "attitude toward product". Table 5 indicates the specific name and number of each condition. The following presentation of results will use these names and numbers for identification purposes.

The ANOVA (see Table 6) for "attitude toward product" indicated a significant main effect for convince feedback (A), $F(2, 90) = 38.209, p = .0001$, a significant main effect for attitude feedback (B), $F(2, 90) = 3.529, p = .032$, and a significant interaction, $F(4, 90) = 3.098$, \ldots
Table 5

3 x 3 Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convince Feedback (A)</th>
<th>Attitude Feedback (B)</th>
<th>True Attitude</th>
<th>Not True Attitude</th>
<th>No Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convinced</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Convinced</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Analysis of Variance of Attitude Toward Product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convince Feedback (A)</td>
<td>1054.850</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>527.425</td>
<td>38.209***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Feedback (B)</td>
<td>97.417</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48.708</td>
<td>3.529*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>171.065</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42.766</td>
<td>3.098*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-cell error</td>
<td>1242.304</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13.803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

**** p < .0001
The means (see Table 7) for the main effect of the convince factor (A) indicated that the mean for convince feedback (mean = 27.35) was similar to the mean of no feedback (mean = 24.93) but the mean for not convinced (mean = 19.54) was much lower. The means for the main effect of the attitude factor (B) indicated that the mean for true attitude feedback (mean = 25.32) was greater than not true attitude feedback (mean = 23.46) and the mean for no feedback (mean = 23.04) was very close to not true attitude. The significant interactions allowed examination of specific cell means in order to test the comparisons which would indicate support or non-support of a specific hypothesis. Therefore, the specific interaction was not examined, but paired comparisons indicated by each hypothesis were examined.

In order to test the specific experimental hypotheses, the significant main effects and interaction were supplemented by calculating a Duncan's Multiple Range test on individual paired comparisons.

The first hypothesis was that receiving feedback that the audience perceives the speaker's statements to be his true attitude will result in a more positive attitude than when the audience perceives his statement as not being his real attitude or when he receives no feedback about their perception of his attitude. The significant main effect for attitude feedback supports this hypothesis. It was found that receiving true attitude
Table 7
Means of Attitude Toward Product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convince Feedback (A)</th>
<th>True Attitude</th>
<th>Not True Attitude</th>
<th>No Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convinced</td>
<td>28.27</td>
<td>28.42</td>
<td>25.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Convinced</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>20.10</td>
<td>18.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>27.37</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>25.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(25.32) (23.46) (23.04)

Note. Scale: 31-1; higher rating denotes more favorable attitude toward product

\(^a\) Numbers in parenthesis represent main effect means
feedback resulted in a more positive attitude toward the product than receiving not true attitude feedback. It was also found that receiving true attitude feedback resulted in a more positive attitude than receiving no feedback about the audience's perception of the subject's attitude.

In order to provide a more stringent test of this hypothesis, two comparisons were made. The first comparison was between condition 7, true attitude-no feedback, and condition 8, not true attitude-no feedback, and the second comparison was between condition 7, true attitude-no feedback, and condition 9, no feedback-no feedback. It was found that subjects who received true attitude feedback (mean = 27.37), had a significantly (diff = 5.51, $p < .01$) more positive attitude about the product than those who received not true attitude feedback (mean = 21.86). However, the differences between positive attitude feedback (mean = 27.37) and no feedback-no feedback (mean = 25.55) were not significant. These comparisons then, provide only partial support for the first hypothesis. That is, subjects who received true attitude feedback did have a more positive attitude than subjects who received not true attitude feedback, but they did not differ from subjects who did not receive any feedback.

Thus, although the main effects demonstrates that true attitude feedback resulted in a more positive
attitude than not true attitude feedback, or no feedback, the paired comparisons indicated that true attitude feedback was not more effective than no feedback.

The second hypothesis, that when the speaker hears that the audience is convinced, he will have a more positive attitude than when the audience is unconvinced, or when there is no feedback about the convince factor, was also partially supported. The significant main effect indicated that receiving convince feedback resulted in a more positive attitude than receiving not convinced feedback, but did not result in a more positive attitude than getting no feedback regarding the convince treatment.

To further test this hypothesis, two comparisons were made: one, between condition 3, convinced-no feedback, and condition 6, not convinced-no feedback, and a second between condition 3, convinced-no feedback and condition 9, no feedback-no feedback. The results indicated that subjects in condition 3, convinced-no feedback (mean = 25.36) indicated a significantly (diff = 7.16, p<.01) more positive attitude toward the product than subjects who heard that the audience was not convinced (mean = 18.20). However, the difference between condition 3, convinced-no feedback (mean = 25.36) and condition 9, no feedback-no feedback (mean = 25.55) was not significant. This indicates that subjects who received convince feedback had a significantly more positive attitude than those who received not convinced feedback. However, in
contrast to expectations but consistent with the results of the convince main effects, attitudes of those who received no feedback were not significantly different from those who received positive convince feedback.

The third hypothesis predicted that when a speaker receives information that the audience has been convinced and perceives his statements to be his true attitude, the speaker should have the most positive attitude, and when the speaker hears that the audience is not convinced and do not perceive his statements to be his true attitude, then the speaker should have the least positive attitude. In order to test this hypothesis, a comparison was made between condition 1, true attitude-convinced and condition 3, convinced-no feedback and between condition 1, true attitude-convinced and condition 7, true attitude-no feedback. It was found that condition 1, true attitude-convinced (mean = 28.27) was not significantly greater than either condition 3, convinced-no feedback (mean = 25.36) or condition 7, true attitude-no feedback (mean = 27.37). Also, several comparisons of negative feedback were made to see if combined negative feedback would result in a less positive attitude. A comparison was made between condition 5, not true attitude-not convinced, and condition 6, not convinced-no feedback, and between condition 5, not true attitude-not convinced, and condition 8, not true attitude-no feedback. It was found that condition 5, not true attitude-not convinced
(mean = 20.10) was not significantly less than either condition 6, not convinced-no feedback (mean = 18.20) or condition 8, not true attitude-no feedback (mean = 21.86). Although condition 1, true attitude-convinced had a higher mean than condition 3 or condition 7, the above hypothesis was not supported. This indicates that positive or negative information was not additive, i.e., adding two types of positive feedback or two types of negative feedback did not result in a significantly more positive or negative attitude.

Since it was assumed that attitudinal feedback would be more effective than convince feedback, it was expected that when a speaker receives conflicting information, direct information about a speaker's attitude would be more potent. Specifically, the fourth hypothesis stated that when the speaker hears that the audience was un-convinced but perceived what he said as being his true attitude, he will indicate a more positive attitude than when he hears that the audience was convinced, but did not think it was his true attitude. In order to test this hypothesis, a comparison was made between condition 4, true attitude-not convinced and condition 2, not true attitude-convinced. The results not only failed to support this prediction but in fact, just the opposite was found. The results indicated that condition 2, not true attitude-convinced (mean = 28.42) was significantly greater (diff = 8.10, \( p < .01 \)) than condition 4, true
attitude—not convinced (mean = 20.32). This indicates that convinced feedback was more potent in influencing the speaker's attitude than was attitude feedback.

The fifth hypothesis, that when the speaker received no feedback about either factor from the audience, he would indicate a more positive attitude toward the product than if they had received negative feedback, was supported. In order to test this hypothesis comparisons were made between condition 9, no feedback—no feedback and condition 8, not true attitude—no feedback, between condition 9, no feedback—no feedback and condition 6, not convinced—no feedback, and between condition 9, no feedback—no feedback and condition 5, not true attitude—not convinced. All three comparisons were significant. Condition 9, no feedback—no feedback (mean = 25.55) was found to be significantly greater (diff = 3.69, $p < .05$) than condition 8, not true attitude—no feedback (mean = 21.86), significantly greater (diff = 7.35, $p < .01$) than condition 6, not convinced—no feedback (mean = 18.20) and significantly greater (diff = 5.45, $p < .01$) than condition 5, not true attitude—not convinced (mean = 20.10). This indicated that subjects who received negative feedback about either factor or both factors demonstrated a less positive attitude toward the product than those who received no feedback at all. Thus, feedback that the audience was not convinced and/or did not believe the statements represented the subject's true attitude, resulted in a
less positive attitude toward the product.

The sixth hypothesis was concerned with the relative influence of positive forms of each type of feedback. Specifically, it was predicted that there will be no difference when the speaker hears that an audience perceived what he said as being his attitude and when he convinced the audience. In order to test this hypothesis, a comparison was made between condition 7, true attitude-no feedback, and condition 3, convinced-no feedback. The results supported this hypothesis. The difference between condition 7, true attitude-no feedback (mean = 27.37) and condition 3, convinced-no feedback (mean = 25.36) was not significant. This indicated that the relative influence of the positive form of each type of feedback was approximately the same.

The seventh hypothesis concerned whether negative attitudinal information would negate the effect of feedback that the audience had been convinced. Specifically, it was predicted that when a speaker is informed that the audience was convinced but received no feedback about the audience's perception of his attitude, the speaker would have a more positive attitude than when he hears that the audience was convinced but did not perceive his statement to be his true attitude. In order to test this prediction, a comparison was made between condition 3, convinced-no feedback and condition 2, not true attitude-convinced. It was found that
condition 3, convinced-no feedback (mean = 25.36) was not significantly greater than condition 2, not true attitude-convinced (mean = 28.42). This indicates that the hypothesis was not supported and that negative feedback about the subject's attitude did not significantly affect the subject's attitude when he received information that the audience was convinced.

Overall, the main effects and the comparisons indicated that both types of feedback had a significant effect on the attitude of the subjects toward the product. However, it appears that negative feedback (not convinced or not true attitude) was more influential than positive feedback (convinced or true attitude). This can readily be seen by comparing positive and negative feedback conditions to the no feedback condition. Using condition 9, no feedback-no feedback as a base point, either form of negative feedback resulted in a significantly less positive attitude towards the product than receiving no feedback at all. However, subjects who received either form of positive feedback did not have a significantly more positive attitude about the product than the subjects who received no feedback at all (condition 9).

In addition, not only did negative feedback have a greater effect in influencing attitudes but condition 6, not convinced-no feedback (mean = 18.20) was significantly less (diff = 3.66, p<.05) than condition 8, not true attitude-no feedback (mean = 21.86). This indicates
that not convinced feedback had a greater negative impact on the subject's attitude than did feedback that the audience did not believe the subject was expressing his own attitude.

Further evidence of the greater influence of the convince factor can also be demonstrated by comparing differing levels of one type of feedback while the other type of feedback is constantly positive. The relative effect of the convince treatment can be demonstrated by comparing condition 1, true attitude-convincing (mean = 28.27) with condition 4, true attitude-not convinced (mean = 20.32). This comparison resulted in a significant difference (diff = 7.95, p < .01) between condition 1 and condition 4. When true attitude feedback was constant, convince feedback resulted in a more positive attitude than not convinced feedback. That is, the manipulation of convince feedback significantly affected attitude. However, as previously indicated in hypothesis seven, when positive convince feedback is constant, the manipulation of perceived attitude feedback did not have a significant effect.

Change related to task variables

The four task related questions were all in 31-point bi-polar scales. The questions dealt with subject's feelings about the task: how they felt about the task,
how hard the task was, how much effort was required, and their perception of how well they did on the task.

For the MANOVA of task related questions (8, 13, 14, 17), the Hotelling-Lawley's Trace criteria indicated a significant main effect for convince feedback (A), $F(8, 172) = 2.798, p = .006$, a significant main effect for attitude feedback (B), $F(8, 172) = 4.642, p = .0001$, and a significant interaction, $F(16, 342) = 2.128, p = .007$. These significant findings indicate that the treatment conditions had an effect on the subjects overall feelings about the task. Univariate analyses were calculated in order to determine the effect of the treatments on each of the separate questions.

On question 8, "how do you feel about the task you did", the univariate ANOVA (see Table 8) indicated a significant attitude factor (B) main effect, $F(2, 90) = 4.08, p = .0196$. The means (Table 9) for the attitude main effect indicated that the mean for true attitude feedback (mean = 23.32) was greater than the mean for not true attitude (mean = 18.68) and also greater than the mean of no feedback (mean = 21.94). An orthogonal comparison indicated that true attitude feedback was significantly greater, $F(1, 90) = 7.744, p<.01$, than not true attitude feedback, but not significantly greater than no feedback. This indicates that feedback of attitudes influenced subject's feelings about the task. Also the results indicated that attitude feedback was
Table 8
Summary of Analysis of Variance
Task Related Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convince Feedback(A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>111.563</td>
<td>2.436</td>
<td>47.404</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>9.465</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>266.828</td>
<td>7.568**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Feedback(B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>187.048</td>
<td>4.084*</td>
<td>78.426</td>
<td>1.840</td>
<td>177.244</td>
<td>7.278**</td>
<td>365.836</td>
<td>10.376***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.869</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td>137.797</td>
<td>3.233*</td>
<td>53.919</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>89.071</td>
<td>2.527*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-cell error</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45.795</td>
<td>42.622</td>
<td>24.354</td>
<td>35.258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
Table 9
Means of Perceived Feeling About Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convince Feedback (A)</th>
<th>True Attitude</th>
<th>Not True Attitude</th>
<th>No Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convinced</td>
<td>22.64</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>25.55 (23.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Convinced</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td>20.23 (19.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>25.45</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>20.05 (21.15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(23.32) (18.68) (21.94)

Note. Scale: 31-like very much to 1-dislike very much.

^a Numbers in parenthesis represent main effect means.
more influential than convince feedback as attitude feedback significantly influenced the subjects evaluation of their performance, but convince feedback did not.

The ANOVA (Table 8) of question 13, "how hard was the task which you performed," indicated no significant main effects. However, a significant interaction did occur between the convince factor (A) and attitude factor (B), $F(4, 90) = 3.23, p = .016$. A Duncan's Multiple Range test was used to determine significant differences between conditions. Basically, the significant interaction was due to one cell (see Table 10). The analysis indicated that condition 7, true attitude-no feedback was significantly less than every other condition. This result indicated that in judging the difficulty of the task, when subjects received only true attitude feedback, they rated the task as being easier than did subjects in any other condition.

The ANOVA (Table 8) of question 14, "how much effort do you feel you put into the task," indicated an attitude factor (B) main effect, $F(2, 90) = 7.278, p = .0015$ and an interaction effect which approached significance, $F(4, 90) = 2.214, p = .072$. The means (Table 11) for the attitude main effect indicated that the mean for true attitude feedback (mean = 23.41) was greater than the mean for not true attitude (mean = 18.79) and also greater than the mean for no feedback (mean = 21.41).
Table 10
Means of Perceived Difficulty of Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Feedback (B)</th>
<th>True Attitude</th>
<th>Not True Attitude</th>
<th>No Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convinced</td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>15.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Convinced</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>13.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(14.20) (17.24) (15.30)

Note. Scale: 31-very hard to 1-very easy.

$^a$ Numbers in parenthesis represent main effect means.
Table 11
Means of Perceived Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convince Feedback (A)</th>
<th>True Attitude</th>
<th>Not True Attitude</th>
<th>No Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convinced</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>22.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Convinced</td>
<td>23.59</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>22.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>25.27</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>18.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(23.41) (18.79) (21.41)

Note. Scale: 31-very effortful to 1 very effortless.

\(^a\) Numbers in parenthesis represent main effect means.
Because the interaction approaches significance, it may be important to look at some of the same comparisons that had been conducted on previous data. To determine the effect of attitudinal feedback when not confounded with convince feedback, two comparisons using a Duncan's Multiple Range test were made: first, between condition 7, true attitude-no feedback, and condition 8, not true attitude-no feedback, and second, between condition 7, true attitude-no feedback and condition 9, no feedback-no feedback. The comparisons indicated that condition 7, true attitude-no feedback (mean = 25.27) was significantly greater (diff = 6.41, p < .01) than the not true attitude-no feedback condition (mean = 18.86), and significantly greater (diff = 6.86, p < .01) than the no feedback-no feedback condition (mean = 18.41).

To further determine the effect of attitudinal feedback on the subjects perception of effort, even when the feedback was confounded with conflicting convince feedback, a comparison was made between condition 4, true attitude-not convinced, and condition 2, not true attitude-convinced. The results indicated that condition 4, true attitude-not convinced (mean = 23.59) was significantly greater (diff = 5.09, p < .05) than condition 2, not true attitude-convinced (mean = 18.50).

These comparisons for attitude feedback appear to indicate that subjects who received only true attitude feedback felt they put more effort into the task than
either subjects who received only not true attitude feedback, or subjects who received no feedback about either factor. It also appears that even when conflicting information is present, subjects who receive information that the audience perceives their statements to be their true attitude but are not convinced feel they put more effort into the task than subjects who receive information that the audience is convinced but do not perceive their statement to be their real attitude. Therefore, it appears that attitude feedback affects perception of effort but convince feedback does not. Moreover, not only was attitude feedback more influential than convince feedback, but subjects who received true attitude feedback felt they put more effort into the task than those who received no feedback or negative attitudinal feedback.

The ANOVA (Table 8) on question 17, "how well do you think you did on the task," indicated a significant convince factor (A) main effect, $F(2, 90) = 7.568, p = .0013$, a significant attitude factor (B) main effect, $F(2, 90) = 10.376, p = .0002$, and a significant interaction, $F(4, 90) = 2.527, p = .045$. The means (see Table 12) for the convince main effect indicated that the convince feedback mean (20.24) was greater than the mean for not convinced (mean = 14.67), and the mean for no feedback (mean = 16.48) was closer to the not convinced mean than to the convinced feedback mean. The means for the attitude feedback main effect indicated that the mean for true attitude feedback
Table 12
Means of Perceived Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convince Feedback (A)</th>
<th>True Attitude</th>
<th>Not True Attitude</th>
<th>No Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convinced</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>21.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Convinced</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>23.59</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>12.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(20.77) (14.24) (16.38)

Note. Scale: 31-a very good job to 1-very bad.

\(^a\) Numbers in parenthesis represent main effect means.
(mean = 20.77) was greater than the not true attitude mean (14.24), and the mean for no feedback (mean = 16.38) was closer to the not true attitude mean than to the true attitude mean.

Although the interaction was significant, the cell means generally indicate a similar pattern: positive feedback leads to positive perception of performance. Receiving positive feedback produces the highest means and getting negative feedback produces the lowest means. The interaction appears to be due to the low score in condition 5, not true attitude-not convinced, and in condition 9, no feedback-no feedback.

Based on the significant interaction certain paired comparisons can be examined. An important question again deals with the effect of attitudinal feedback unconfounded by convince feedback. In order to examine this question, a Duncan's Multiple Range test was used to determine the effect of attitudinal feedback. Two comparisons were made: one between condition 7, true attitude-no feedback and condition 8, not true attitude-no feedback, and a second comparison was made between condition 7, true attitude-no feedback and condition 9, no feedback-no feedback. The results indicated that subjects in condition 7, true attitude-no feedback (mean = 23.59) felt they did significantly better (diff = 10.45, p< .01) on the task than subjects in condition 8, not true attitude-no feedback (mean = 13.14), and also felt they did
significantly better (diff = 10.86, p < .01) on the task than subjects in condition 9, no feedback-no feedback (mean = 12.73). These results indicate that subjects who received true attitude feedback felt they had done a better job on the task than subjects who received either no feedback or not true attitude feedback.

Another important question deals with the effect of convince feedback when unconfounded by attitudinal feedback. In order to investigate this question, two comparisons were made: one, a comparison between condition 3, convinced-no feedback and condition 6, not convinced-no feedback, and a second between condition 3, convince-no feedback and condition 9, no feedback-no feedback. The results indicated that subjects in condition 3, convinced-no feedback (mean = 21.41) felt they did significantly better (diff = 6.41, p < .05) on the task than did subjects in condition 6, not convinced-no feedback (mean = 15.00), and significantly better (diff = 8.68, p < .01) than subjects in condition 9, no feedback-no feedback (mean = 12.73).

Therefore, the main effects and individual comparisons of question 17 indicate that subjects who received true attitude feedback felt they had done a better job on the task than subjects who received either no feedback or not true attitude feedback. Similar results were observed in regards to convince feedback. Subjects who received convince feedback felt they had done a better job on the
task than subjects who received either no feedback or not convinced feedback. It appears that positive feedback was more influential than negative feedback. Using the no feedback-no feedback condition as a baseline, positive feedback differed significantly from the baseline but negative feedback did not.

Attitudes towards the audience

Questions 15 and 16 concerned the subject's perception of the alleged audience. The questions were 31 point bipolar scales, where a high score indicated a more positive disposition towards the audience.

For these questions a different MANOVA was calculated since in condition 9 there was no feedback from the audience. Thus, these subjects could not appropriately respond to the two audience questions. Since condition 9 could not be included in the 3 x 3 analysis, factor A and factor B were combined into an overall C factor and a one-way analysis was calculated using 8 conditions.

The MANOVA using the Hotelling-Lawley Trace criteria indicated that there was a significant main effect (C), $F(14, 146) = 2.542, \ p = .003$. This indicates that the treatments had an overall effect on subject's attitude toward the audience.

The ANOVA (see Table 13) calculated on the separate questions indicated that only question 15, "if there was an audience involved in the study which you participated
Table 13
Summary of Analysis of Variance
Audience Related Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS 15</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS 16</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (C)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>117.655</td>
<td>5.812****</td>
<td>27.097</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-cell error</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20.244</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**** p < .0001
in, how did you feel about the audience," was significant, \( F(7, 80) = 5.812, p = .0001 \). An orthogonal comparison of the combined positive conditions (condition 1, true attitude-convincing, condition 3, convinced-no feedback and condition 7, true attitude-no feedback) vs. the combined negative conditions (condition 5, not true attitude-not convincing, condition 6, not convinced-no feedback and condition 8, not true attitude-no feedback) was significant, \( F(1, 80) = 39.420, p < .01 \). This indicates that overall, the positive feedback means (Table 14) were greater than the negative feedback means. This indicates that when subjects received positive feedback they "liked" the audience more than when they received negative feedback.

Finally, a separate ANOVA calculated on question 7, "how do you feel towards the experimenter," produced no significant effects. This indicates that neither attitudinal feedback, or convince feedback significantly influenced the subject's attitude about the experimenter.
Table 14

Means for Audience Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Feedback (C)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>True Attitude-</td>
<td>Not True Attitude-</td>
<td>No Feedback-</td>
<td>True Attitude-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convinced</td>
<td>Convinced</td>
<td>Convinced</td>
<td>Not Convinced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If there was an audience involved in the study you participated in,</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>17.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how do you feel about the audience? Scale: 31-like very much to 1-dislike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very much.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. If you received information from an audience, how accurate do you</td>
<td>25.59</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>24.35</td>
<td>21.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think this information was? Scale: 31-very accurate to 1-very inaccurate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 continued next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Feedback (C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Not True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 No Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 True Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Not True Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Convinced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convinced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If there was an audience involved in the study you participated in,</td>
<td>15.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how do you feel about the audience? Scale: 31-like very much to 1-dislike</td>
<td>14.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very much.</td>
<td>22.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. If you received information from an audience, how accurate do you</td>
<td>22.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think this information was? Scale: 31-very accurate to 1-very inaccurate.</td>
<td>21.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

In the present study volunteers chose to advocate a positive position about a relatively neutral topic. Following the attitudinal statements the volunteer received two types of feedback from an audience concerning his performance. The speaker received feedback as to a) whether the audience was convinced, not convinced, or received no information concerning the convince factor, and b) whether the audience felt that what the speaker said represented his true attitude, or was not his true attitude, or the speaker received no feedback as to the audience’s perception of his true attitude. The experiment investigated the relative effect of these two forms of consequences on the self-attribution of attitudes. The effect of these treatments on the subject’s perception of the task, audience and experimenter was also examined.

In the present study, it was important that subjects accurately perceive the information which they received. If the feedback manipulation was not accurately perceived, the results could possibly be due to the subject's misinterpretation of the feedback. However, it was found that positive and negative forms of feedback had differential effects on subject's perception of audience
feedback. Subjects were also able to delineate between convince and attitudinal feedback. When subjects heard that the audience felt they were sincere, but were not convinced by the subject's talk, the subjects were able to perceive that the audience felt that their talk was sincere. When they heard that they had convinced the audience, but the audience did not think the subject was sincere, then the subjects were still able to determine that the audience held a favorable attitude toward the product. Therefore, the manipulation checks appear to indicate that the results were not influenced by possible misinterpretations of the feedback by the subjects.

The present research was concerned with several major questions. First, results related to these questions will be discussed, along with their implications. Then results which had not been specifically predicted and their implications will be discussed. Finally, an overall summary and interpretation will be presented.

First of all, one of the primary factors which the present study investigated was the effect attitudinal feedback had on a speaker's attitude toward the product. The first hypothesis predicted that when a speaker hears that the audience believes his statement to be his true attitude, he will have a more positive attitude toward the product than when he hears that the audience believes his statement was not his true attitude, or when he receives no feedback about his attitude. The results
partially supported this prediction. True attitude feedback resulted in a more positive attitude than not true attitude feedback, but contrary to expectations, true attitude feedback did not differ from no feedback. Compared to receiving no feedback positive attitudinal feedback did not significantly alter subject's attitude toward the product. Thus, it appears that the role theory conceptualization that another's perception of one's attitude is important information which influences attitudes was only partially supported.

The other feedback factor investigated in this study was whether or not convince feedback influenced the speaker's attitude. Specifically, the second hypothesis stated that when a speaker hears that he convinced an audience, he would adopt a more positive attitude about the product, than when he hears that the audience is not convinced, or when he receives no feedback about the convince factor. The results indicated partial support for this hypothesis. Hearing that the audience was convinced resulted in the speaker adopting a more positive attitude about the product than when he hears that the audience was not convinced. However, contrary to expectations, attitudes of subjects who received convince feedback did not differ from the attitudes of subjects who did not receive any feedback. Although there was a significant difference between convinced and not convinced
feedback, there was no difference between convince feedback and no feedback.

The fact that the first two hypotheses received partial support seems to indicate that both attitudinal feedback and convince feedback influenced attitudes. However, since positive feedback did not significantly differ from no feedback, it appears that negative feedback may have been more influential. As the above hypotheses were not directly concerned with negative forms of feedback, it might be appropriate to examine hypothesis five, which did compare negative feedback to no feedback.

Hypothesis five predicted that when a speaker receives no feedback about either factor, he would indicate a moderate amount of attitude change. When he did not receive any feedback, a speaker will look at his own behavior for cues as his own behavior is the only source of information regarding his attitude. The information that he chose to participate and to advocate a positive position will cause him to attribute a positive attitude about the product. The results supported this hypothesis. It was found that individuals who received no feedback about either factor had a more positive attitude about the product than individuals who received either type of negative feedback, i.e. not convinced feedback, or not true attitude feedback.

The support for hypothesis five indicates that when subjects choose to do the task, and perceived responsibility
for the outcome, the result was a fairly positive attitude

toward the product. However, as the results of hypotheses

one and two indicate, individuals who received no feedback

about either factor had a similar attitude as individuals who

received positive feedback. But, when they received

negative feedback about their behavior, the result was

a less positive attitude about the product. This finding

seems to indicate that negative feedback had a greater

impact than did positive feedback.

The following discussion of hypotheses three, four,
six and seven will attempt to delineate the comparative
effectiveness of the two types of feedback and indicate
the underlying process or processes which may have

occurred.

The third and fourth hypotheses were concerned with
the relative effectiveness of the two types of feedback. The third hypothesis predicted that when both types of
feedback are positive, the speaker would have the most
positive attitude. This hypothesis was not supported.
When both positive forms of feedback occurred, subjects
did not demonstrate a more positive attitude than when
they received only one form of positive feedback and no
feedback about the other factor. When both forms of
negative feedback occurred, subjects did not demonstrate
a more negative attitude than when they received only
one form of negative feedback and no feedback about the
other factor. This indicated that the effect of the
feedback was not additive, that combining two positive sources or two negative sources of feedback did not result in a more positive or negative attitude.

The fourth hypothesis attempted to compare the relative potency of the two types of feedback. Specifically, it was predicted that when a speaker receives conflicting information, direct information about the speaker's attitude would be more influential than information about the audience being convinced. Thus, it was expected that individuals who received true attitude-not convinced feedback would have a more positive attitude than individuals who received not true attitude-convincing feedback. However, contrary to expectations, a reverse relationship was found. Convince feedback was found to be more effective in influencing attitudes than attitudinal feedback. As with the previous results, this finding fails to support the role theory conceptualization that other's perception of one's attitude is the primary information which determines attitudes. It appears that other processes are occurring in which convince feedback may play a primary role. The processes which account for this effect will be discussed later.

Another important question which was investigated was the possible inference process which individuals might be using to determine their attitudes. Previous studies conducted by Scott (1957, 1959) and Nels et al. (1969) have found that convince feedback can influence
attitudes. It was postulated that the results of these previous studies might have been due to the fact that when a speaker finds that he convinced an audience, he infers that the audience perceives what he said as being representative of his real attitude. That is, the speaker makes an assumption that could be stated as "I convinced the audience, therefore they must have perceived me as being sincere and that I believed what I said. If they perceive this as my attitude, then it must be my attitude." Hypotheses six and seven were derived in order to examine if this inference process would occur.

Hypothesis seven predicted that similar attitudes would be demonstrated by subjects who receive either true attitude feedback or convince feedback. This was found to be true. Individuals who received either of these two forms of feedback demonstrated a similar attitude about the product. This indicated that positive forms of feedback, when considered alone, had approximately the same result. Hypothesis six predicted that when a speaker is informed that the audience was convinced, but receives no feedback about the audience's perception of his attitude, he will demonstrate more attitude change than when he hears that the audience was convinced but did not perceive his statement to be his true attitude. This prediction was based on the role theory assumption that in order for attitude change to occur, a speaker must make an inference about his
attitude based on the feedback of other's perception of his attitude. When he hears that he convinced an audience but they did not perceive his statement to be his true attitude, then he cannot infer that he has a positive attitude about the topic and there should be little attitude change. The results did not support the above prediction. Subjects did not have a more positive attitude when they only heard that they had convinced the audience but the audience did not perceive his statement to be his true attitude. Based on these results and the results of hypothesis four, it appears that the postulated inference process was not occurring. It seems that information contained in the convince feedback was more important. Thus, the inference model based on role theorists emphasis of attitudinal feedback was not supported.

The results of hypotheses one through seven have several implications and the following discussion will be concerned with these implications.

First of all, the fact that subjects who received no feedback about either factor had a fairly positive attitude seems to indicate support for Bem's (1972) conceptualization of attitude change. When subjects are asked their attitude, they look for environmental cues in order to infer their attitude. In so doing, they look at the causal factors in the environment and at their own behavior. One important causal factor is
the individual's perception of amount of choice he had to perform the behavior. An individual, in reviewing the forces which cause him to perform a behavior will assume that he would not volunteer for a task he dislikes, and would not speak in favor of a topic he does not like. Therefore, when an individual perceives his verbal behavior to be voluntary, he then concludes that he must have certain positive feelings about the topic which he advocated.

Thus, if a subject did not receive feedback from the audience, the available cues (i.e. perception of choice and overt verbal behavior) inform the subject that he has a positive attitude about the product. However, subjects who received feedback had additional cues upon which to base their perception of attitude. Subjects who received positive feedback did not indicate an appreciably different attitude than those who received no feedback, because, as found in hypothesis five, the effect of cues did not seem to be additive. That is, subjects who received no feedback had cues based on their own behavior from which they inferred a positive attitude about the product. Subjects who received positive feedback had additional cues, but these additional cues were simply consistent with the subject's attribution of his own attitude and was not seen as being important new information. Thus, the additional positive feedback did not result in a more positive attitude.
However, subjects who received negative feedback had a considerable different set of cues to use in order to infer their attitude. Following the speech subjects had information that they had voluntarily made positive statements. This information alone would produce a positive attitude. But then, individuals who received negative feedback received information which was not consistent with cues that they had voluntarily made positive statements. The inconsistent information received from the audience resulted in a self-attribution of a less positive attitude about the product. Therefore, their attitude was less positive than subjects who received positive feedback or no feedback at all. When compared to receiving positive feedback, receiving negative feedback was utilized in the attribution process primarily because it was important new information about their behavior.

These results are supportive of Kelley's (1967) emphasis on negative consequences in an attribution interpretation of attitude change. Kelley believes that an individual assumes responsibility for negative consequences, especially when he perceives having brought them about. In the present study subjects assumed responsibility for their behavior and the consequences, and therefore reacted to the informative impact of the feedback, with negative consequences having the greatest impact.
An additional finding appropriate for discussion is that negative convince feedback was more influential than negative attitudinal feedback. The importance of the convince feedback had not been foreseen. If the postualted inference model based on role theory had been correct, attitudinal feedback should have been more influential. Since the results did not support the role theory conceptualization, it must be concluded that attitudinal feedback is not the primary information which an individual uses to infer his attitude.

A relevant question then, is why was convince feedback more influential than attitudinal feedback? Several explanations are possible for these results, and these explanations will now be discussed.

One answer might be that convince feedback gave the speaker a clear indication that he either failed or succeeded on the assigned task, as defined by the experimenter's instructions. During the study, the experimenter informed the speaker that the idea of the task was to "try to inform, to get it across to the audience that this is a good product." Therefore, if the speaker hears that the audience is or is not convinced, then this feedback gives him a lucid indication that he succeeded or did not succeed on the task. In contrast, hearing what the audience perceives his attitude to be does not directly inform him of how successful he was. Therefore, although both forms of feedback influenced attitudes, the demand
characteristics inherent in the experiment may have produced a heavier "weighting" of the convince factor.

One explanation of the results might be then, that the experimenter's instructions indicated to the subject which factor is most important. Therefore, this factor was used by the subject to infer his own attitude about the product. However, if this process were actually happening then one would expect the convince feedback to be more influential throughout the dependent measures. But, the results indicate that on task related questions and on the choice question, attitudinal feedback was generally more influential. If the heavier "weighting" of the convince factor was experimentally induced, then it seems reasonable to assume that it would also be more influential on all the measures. Since this was not true, it appears that other processes may have caused the convince factor to be more influential.

Another possible explanation for the greater influence of convince feedback might be that the manipulation of convince feedback was more potent than the manipulation of attitudinal feedback. These two forms of feedback can be conceptualized as two separate dimensions, which extend from weak to very strong in potency. It is possible that the attitudinal feedback used in the present study was not as strong on the attitudinal dimension as convince feedback was on the convince dimension. There is some support for this notion as negative convince
feedback resulted in a significantly less positive attitude than when a subject received negative attitudinal feedback. However, there was no difference between the positive forms of each factor. In addition, it would seem logical to conclude that if the manipulation of convince feedback was more potent, then it should be more important over all of the dependent measures. But, as previously discussed, the results indicated that on several task questions and the choice question, attitudinal feedback was more influential. Based on these results, the argument that the manipulations may vary in potency is not very effective.

Another process which might provide an explanation concerns social reinforcement. It is possible that the observed differences between positive and negative feedback and between convince and attitudinal feedback could have resulted from the differentail reinforcement strength of the consequenes. That is, convince feedback had more reinforcing properties than did attitudinal feedback and positive feedback serves as a reinforcer and negative feedback does not.

The fact that convince feedback influenced attitude is consistent with previous research which has found that attitudes can be influenced by reinforcement received from an audience. Scott (1957) found that when subjects heard from an audience that they had won a debate and convinced the audience to accept the advocated position,
the subjects indicated positive attitude change toward the topic which they advocated. Scott felt his results indicated that positive convince feedback acted as a positive reinforcer which reinforced the subject's verbal behavior and the accompanying attitudes. Not convinced feedback served as a negative reinforcer which did not reinforce the verbal behavior and therefore, subjects did not show a change in their attitude. Scott (1959) also found that feedback from judges as to whether or not a speaker won a debate served as an effective reinforcer as winners indicated more attitude change. Winners also indicated more attitude change than controls who did not participate in the task. Finally, Dahlke (1967) was able to demonstrate that when a speaker heard that he had won or lost a debate, this information served as an effective reinforcer. However, Dahlke found that winners did not change their attitudes significantly more than control subjects who prepared and delivered their arguments, but did not receive any feedback. In Dahlke's study, the reinforcement of winning had little effect, whereas losing appeared to cause attitude change.

The present investigation demonstrated results similar to Dahlke's (1967) study. Both studies have indicated a change in attitudes seems to have occurred without positive or negative feedback. In the present study, it was expected that a significant difference should occur between positive feedback and no feedback. The fact
that this difference did not occur seems to indicate that subjects who received no feedback may have changed because of factors involved in making the speech. Attitude change which occurs without reinforcement obviously is not supportive of a reinforcement interpretation. That subjects who received no feedback had approximately the same attitude as subjects who received positive feedback seems to argue against the reinforcement notion that reinforcement has to occur for attitude change to take place.

One would also expect that when an individual receives two consistent forms of feedback, that this would be more reinforcing than just one form, and a more positive or negative attitude should be the result. Specifically, reinforcement theorists predict that the greater the magnitude of reinforcement that is administered, more attitude change should occur. In the present study combined positive or negative feedback did not result in greater change. This additional evidence argues against a reinforcement interpretation of the present results.

While it appears that convince feedback most likely has certain reinforcing properties, it seems that a simple reinforcement explanation of why convince feedback was more influential is inadequate. More involved and complex processes seem to be occurring as attitude change seems to be taking place which reinforcement theory cannot explain.
Another explanation based on a more complex process is that subjects made a discrimination between the feedback based on its relevancy to the type of attribution they were being asked to make. It is possible that convincing feedback was more influential because subjects were being asked to infer an attitude about an external object, i.e., the product. Thus, in looking for cues which they could use to infer their attitude, the behavior of the audience toward the same product could have been an important source of information, at least more important than attitudinal feedback. Subjects in this study seemed to be utilizing the audience's attitude about the object as a more relevant source of information than attitudinal feedback. In effect, attitudinal feedback provided subjects with information about the audience's perception of his attitude and behavior related to his attitude whereas convincing feedback provided information directly about the external object. It seems then, that convincing feedback was more effective because it contained more information about the external object than did attitudinal feedback. Thus, the audience's expressed attitude about the product was the most relevant source of information about the attribution they were asked to make.

These results concerning the subject's attitude toward the product seem to indicate that convincing feedback was more influential than attitudinal feedback and that negative forms of feedback were more influential than
positive forms. However, subjects seemed to respond to the task questions differently than they did to the product questions. The next section will be concerned with these apparent differences as indicated by the task questions.

On task related questions, subjects were asked to state how they felt about the task, how hard the task was, how much effort they put into the task, and how well they did. Responses to the task related questions indicated that when individuals were asked to evaluate aspects of their own behavior, they were, generally, more influenced by positive feedback and were more likely to use feedback of the audience's perception of their attitude as a basis for their evaluation about the task.

Three of the four task questions indicated a significant attitudinal main effect but the convince feedback factor was significant only on question 17, how well did you do. Also, on question thirteen, only individuals who received true attitude feedback but no convince feedback indicated that the task was significantly easier. Question seventeen, "how well did you do on the task", indicated that attitudinal and convince feedback were roughly comparable in their influence. In general then, these findings are in direct opposition to results concerning the subject's attitude toward the product, where negative feedback and convince feedback was more influential.
A possible explanation for the results on the task questions could be that attitudinal feedback was more closely related to the attribution the subject was being asked to make. In other words, the subject received feedback that the audience thinks what he said was his real attitude. In order to support this, the audience also stated that he was sincere, that he put a lot of effort into what he said, and that he really tried to put it across. Therefore, in talking about his perceived attitude, the audience also related information concerning his perceived behavior as related to his attitude. However, convince feedback only contains information about the audiences attitude towards the product. It appears that subjects relied more on attitudinal feedback to answer task questions because it was more informative or more closely related to their behavior than was feedback about whether or not the audience was convinced. Cues relating to perceived attitudes were being used to make attributions about behavior. Thus, subjects seemed to be able to differentiate between types of feedback and utilize information which provided more relevant data about the attribution they were being asked to make.

Results of the question about the subject's perception of choice provides additional support for the explanation of why attitudinal feedback was more influential when subjects were asked about their perceptions of
various elements of the task. Results indicated that subjects who received negative attitudinal feedback perceived that they had less choice than those who received positive attitudinal feedback. However, convince feedback did not significantly effect the subject's perception of choice. This differential perception of choice possibly occurred because, when faced with negative consequences caused by their own behavior, individuals may attempt to partially justify the outcome by decreasing the degree of their own responsibility. Presumably, this occurs because negative consequences may indicate that the individual made a bad decision when he decided to participate in the study. These results are similar to recent findings reported by Sogin and Pallak (1976). They found that individuals are reluctant to assume responsibility for negative consequences. In the present study individuals, when faced with negative information about their perceived attitude, may have attempted to deny responsibility for the outcome by perceiving they had less choice. Again, these results are consistent with the task question results. When individuals are asked about their perception of their behavior, attitudinal feedback seems to be more influential. The possible reason for this is that the attitudinal feedback contains more information about their behavior than does convince feedback. Therefore, subjects
use attitudinal feedback in order to state their perception of their behavior as related to the task.

Another task question result was that generally, positive feedback was more influential than negative feedback, especially positive attitudinal feedback. This was not consistent with the results of the product related questions as the product related questions generally indicated that negative convince feedback was more influential.

One possible explanation of this result may be that following their presentation, individuals had a negative self-perception of how effective they had been. That is, they felt that they had done a poor job of convincing the audience. This notion is supported by low scores on the task performance question obtained for no feedback subjects and by the fact that their evaluation was not different from subjects who received negative feedback. Although the data does not indicate why subjects had such a negative self-perception of their behavior, observations made by the experimenter during the study may help. It was noticed during the study that many of the subjects were apprehensive about appearing on television. During their presentation to the audience, it was not unusual for a subject to make minor errors, such as fumbling for the right word, not being able to say as much as he might want to, not maintaining eye contact with the camera, etc. Although these errors were of a
minor nature, almost everyone felt quite relieved to be finished. Moreover, questions asked by the subjects immediately after their presentation indicated their concern about the minor errors in their presentation. Although after performing the task they may have had a positive attitude about the product, subjects felt they had done poorly on the task. When they received negative feedback, all this did was provide additional information which they were already aware of. Since the feedback was consistent with their self-perception of their behavior, and the cues were not additive, subjects who received additional negative feedback did not indicate a different perception of the task than did subjects who received no feedback. However, when they received positive feedback, this provided important new information which could be utilized in the attribution process. Following the completion of the task, the individuals had information which informed them of how they did. This information alone would produce a negative evaluation. But then, individuals received positive feedback which was inconsistent with their perceived behavior. The inconsistent information received from the audience resulted in a more positive self-attribution of how well they did. When compared to receiving negative feedback, receiving positive feedback was utilized in the attribution process because it was important new information about the individual's behavior.
The present study demonstrates that consequences can and do play a role in self-attribution. Individuals were given a choice to participate in a study where they could expect consequences to occur. Once an individual agreed to participate, he assumed responsibility for the possible consequences. And, as the results indicate, the consequences of his behavior affected his attitude about the product and his perception of the task. Attribution theory suggests that following an attitudinal behavior, an individual typically uses information about this behavior and surrounding cues to infer his attitude. That is, based on his perception of his behavior and the controlling environmental factors, an individual makes certain attributions about his internal state, motivation, attitudes and behavior. Generally, the results of this study are consistent with attribution theory. However, some of the results suggest theoretical modifications in the role of consequences in the self-attribution of attitudes.

These modifications are based on the interaction of type of consequences and initial attributions. When an individual is faced with consequences which provide information about his behavior, whether or not an individual will use this information seems to be based on several considerations. If the feedback is consistent with previous cues, then it is less informative and less likely to have an influence. However, if the feedback
is inconsistent with previous cues, and therefore represents new information, then the feedback will play a major role when an individual states his attitude or perception. For example, if an individual perceives that he has done a poor job, then receiving information that he did a poor job will not affect his perception. However, if consequences inform him that he did a good job, this is important new information which provides him with a new and different set of cues to utilize when he is asked to state how well he believes he did on the task.

Also, the cues which an individual uses are apparently those which provide the most relevant feedback. In other words, there is a certain consistency between the attribution a person makes and the relevant cues which he will use to make an attribution. Individuals seem to be able to delineate the relevant cues which will provide them with the most information about the attribution they are asked to make. For example, an individual upon being asked to infer what his attitude is, will use the information which is most useful to making that attribution. In the present study, when asked to infer an attitude about the product, subjects used information about the audience's attitude toward the product. When the subject was asked about his perception of behavior related to the task, then he used attitudinal feedback, which informed him of the audience's perception of his behavior.
Consistency processes have often been discussed in attitude theories and attribution theory has not been an exception. Kelley (1967) has suggested that individuals infer attitudes consistent with the joint implications of the initial decision and negative consequences following an internal attribution of consequences. The present study indicates the presence of a consistency between type of consequences and the type of internal attribution which individuals are asked to make. The cues in the environment which are used are those which provide the most relevant information. That is, if an individual is asked to evaluate his own behavior, he will use cues which inform him of his behavior. If he is asked about his feelings toward an external object, he will use cues which provide information about the object.

Therefore, it seems that there are two important factors which determine whether or not consequences will influence an individual's self-attribute of his attitude. First of all, the individual's initial perception of cues related to his behavior or attitude is important. These cues are environmental and internal factors which indicate to an individual what his attitude is. For instance, perception of choice, and perceptions of various aspects of behavior would be a series of cues which an individual might use to make a self-attribute of attitude. A series of negative cues seems to imply that positive
consequences will be more influential, and a series of positive cues seems to indicate that negative consequences will be more influential. Feedback which is consistent with existing cues is not as influential as feedback which is inconsistent with existing cues. Also, the type of feedback which will be utilized by the individual seems to be dependent upon the utilitarian value of the information contained in the consequences. If the type of feedback is relevant to the self-attribute the individual is being asked to make, then that type of feedback is likely to be utilized. If the feedback is not relevant to the type of attribution an individual is being asked to make, then this information will not be influential.

If these conceptualizations are correct, then further studies should explore these factors. The importance of relevant feedback could be examined by comparing various forms of relevant feedback with irrelevant feedback. Additionally, the influence of initial cues related to his behavior could be examined in a situation where an individual perceives responsibility for his behavior, then either does poorly, or performs well, and then he receives varying degrees of positive and negative consequences.

Based on the data from the present study that indicates consequences can influence the self-attribute of attitudes, it would seem important to further explore
the apparent interaction between the initial cues relating to an individual's behavior and the effect of various types of consequences.
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Table 15
Summary of Analysis of Variance
Product Related Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convince Feedback (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>532.229</td>
<td>20.907****</td>
<td>425.866</td>
<td>27.678****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Feedback (B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>157.253</td>
<td>6.177**</td>
<td>20.987</td>
<td>1.364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.025</td>
<td>2.240</td>
<td>84.510</td>
<td>5.493***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-cell error</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25.458</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
**** p < .0001

Table 15 continued next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convince Feedback (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>396.434</td>
<td>31.592***</td>
<td>810.234</td>
<td>25.388***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Feedback (B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.366</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>107.341</td>
<td>3.363*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24.396</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>33.053</td>
<td>1.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-cell error</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>12.548</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$
**** $p < .0001$
Table 16
Means for Product Related Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convince Feedback (A)</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Attitude Feedback (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>True Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convinced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Convinced</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Feedback</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Question 9: How do you feel about the product which you advocated? Scale: 31-like very much to 1-dislike very much.

Question 10: How useful do you feel the product would be? Scale: 31-very useful to 1-very useless.

Question 11: How valuable as an aid around the home do you feel this product is? Scale: 31-very valuable to 1-very worthless.

Question 12: Do you think that sometime in the future you will use this product? Scale: 31-very likely to 1-very unlikely.
Table 17
Analysis of Variance of Question 7
Like or Dislike of Experimenter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convince Feedback (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.199</td>
<td>1.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Feedback (B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.638</td>
<td>1.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.225</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-cell error</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>22.418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
OUTLINE FOR TESTIMONIAL

This study is interested in finding out the persuasive effects different forms of communication have. For this aspect of the study, you should talk in favor of the product. The general idea is to convince the audience that this is a good product, so don't be hesitant to state or emphasize whatever you want to say.

PRODUCT: SUPERSTRONG STRAPPING TAPE

Make your talk about 3 minutes long, which is about ½ to 1 page, written. Or, if you wish, just form an outline and make up your talk as you go along. At the end of your talk the experimenter will ask you several short questions.

The following are a few points which you may want to mention. Use these points in your talk, or add your own. So say what you want and emphasize what you want.

Feel free to write on this paper.

Important Points:
- Similar to scotch tape but much stronger.
- Has fiberglass strands throughout, which increases its strength.
- Not much more expensive than regular tape...59¢ for 10 yards.
- Makes old kinds of tape obsolete.
- Has a 150 lb. breaking point, meaning that 150 pounds of pressure has to be applied before it will break.
- Serves several different functions. For instance, it can reinforce, repair and serve as heavy-duty binding for books.
- Can be used to hold bulky objects together, such as hoses or strands of wire.
- Can be used to strengthen cracked windows.
- In many instances, especially in emergencies, it can be used in place of twine or small rope.
- Can repair rubber products.
- Can repair handles on tools.
- Can be used to wrap heavy packages... adds strength to boxes.
- Can be used in place of clamps when glueing objects together.
- Lasts much longer than ordinary tape.
- Is highly resistant to heat and cold.
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