SOCIAL INFLUENCE, SEX DIFFERENCES, AND GROUP SWAY ON JUDGMENTS OF BEAUTY

Lisa Schreindorfer
University Undergraduate Fellow, 1993-1994
Texas A&M University
Department of Psychology

APPROVED:

William G. Graziano
Fellows Advisor

Honors Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS CONTINUED

Abstract

Two converging, multimethod experiments probed the hypothesis that group discussion of physical attractiveness would lead to reevaluation of initial judgments more consistent with group standards. In Study 1 participants evaluated photographs, discussed their opinions with the group, and reevaluated the photos either in private or public. Results showed that participants became more homogeneous as a group, and more negative, in their second ratings. Women initially rated all photos lower than men, became more negative than men at the second rating, and conformed more in the public condition than in the private. Study 2 placed a confederate in the group who communicated positive, negative, or neutral opinions about the photos. As in Study 1, Study 2 found that all participants became more negative at the second rating. Study 2 found that the pattern of social influence was different for men and women. Women were more influenced by negative peers than were men. Results were discussed in terms of different processes underlying social influence in men and women.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank the following people for their assistance on my University Undergraduate Honors Fellows thesis:

Dr. William Graziano, my fellows advisor, who provided much support, encouragement, wisdom, and guidance throughout the course of the year. He made the undertaking and completion of this project not only possible but a pleasure. Without his guidance, I would been lost, and I would not have had the opportunity to learn from him the things he does best. Dr. Graziano, I appreciate the time and effort you have given to me.

Lauri Jensen-Campbell, social psychology graduate student, who provided insightful comments, and helped in preparing the materials, entering data, running data analyses, and interpreting results. This project would truly have been impossible without her help and knowledge of computer data analysis. Lauri, thank you for taking the time out of your impossible schedule.

I am grateful to Annette Gray, Becky Dunn, Bart Mitchell, Chris Crawford, Hao Pham, Max Hartman, Tiffani Fox, and Peach Harvey for helping run the project.

LIST OF TABLES

Social Influence, Sex Differences, and Group Sway

on Judgments of Beauty

Research suggests that individuals differ in the extent to which their social behavior is consistent or variable across situations (Bem & Allen, 1974; Campus 1974; Houts, Cook, & Shadish, 1986). Snyder and Monson (1975) explored the interaction between the personality variable of self-monitoring and situational factors using a group interaction paradigm. The focal issue was conformity in opinions about risk taking. Snyder and Monson found that self-monitoring interacted with situational factors in affecting conformity.

In a series of four studies, Graziano, Jensen-Campbell, Shebilske, and Lundgren (1993) explored situational and personality influences on conformity when rating physical attractiveness. They focused on physical attractiveness because (a) physical attractiveness judgments seem more immediate, automatic, and "given" than do opinions about risk taking; (b) physical attractiveness judgments may operate differently in men and women; and (c) judgments of physical attractiveness may contain elements of

self-presentation. Cunningham (1986) presented
research consistent with several of these speculations,
and suggested that the judgment process in women may be
more complicated, and less direct than the
corresponding process in men, who seem to rely on
objective physical cues.

If these conjectures are valid, then judgments of
attractiveness may not operate the same way as risk
decisions in response to situational pressures for
conformity to group opinions (e.g., Snyder & Monson,
1975). Furthermore, situational and personality factors
may not operate the same way in male and female
judgments of physical attractiveness.

Results from the Graziano et al. study suggested
that female raters were more responsive to social
influence than were male raters. In addition, Graziano
et al. found that when women rated pictures, they were
more influenced by negative evaluations than by
positive evaluations from peers. Relative to women,
male raters were less influenced in their judgments of
physical attractiveness by peers. There was no
evidence that self-monitoring influenced conformity.

The previous studies have limitations. First, these studies use relatively artificial manipulations (e.g., Graziano, et al., 1993) without the use of actual face-to-face interactions. The issue of face-to-face interactions is especially important in studying sex differences in social influence. Wood and Stagner (in press) note that sex differences in social influence appear most frequently during public interaction. In studies when subjects believe that their opinions are confidential, sex differences are minimal. Furthermore, research by Eagly (1987) suggests that women may be more responsive to social influence than men only when women believe that their opinion differs from that of the group and that the group members are attuning to the dissenter's response. These studies imply that sex differences exist in conformity only when opinions are made public. However, these studies have not tested the effects of group discussion on later private judgements.

The present research probes the influence of group interactions, gender differences, and individual personality variables underlying judgments of beauty

and social evaluation. These studies were specifically designed to explore the affect of face-to-face interactions during group discussion and possible subsequent gender differences in conformity to the group. We adapted a paradigm used in previous social influence research by Snyder and Monson (1975).

Study 1

Study 1 probed the hypothesis that there are sex differences in conformity to salient peer groups. First, we predicted that there would be less variability among female subjects after the group discussion in the experimental condition. For male subjects, group discussion would not affect variability. That is, we expect that women will be more influenced (i.e., conform more) by the group. Second, we predicted that group discussion would lead to more negative post-discussion evaluations for women, but not for men. This would extend findings from Graziano et al. (Study 4), showing that effects of group discussion produce effects similar to those found when subjects are given more time to deliberate on their ratings.

Subjects and Design. A total of 216 Texas A&M
University students (112 women, 104 men) participated
in return for partial fulfillment of their introductory
psychology course requirement. Subjects were assigned
to cells in a 2 (sex of research participant) X 2
(public vs. private judgment) X 2 (discuss vs. distract
activity) X 2 (high vs. low self-monitoring subjects)
randomized block factorial design. The dependent
variables were: (a) rating of attractiveness at time
two (R2); and (b) change in rating from time one R1 to
R2.

Stimulus materials. Nine male photographs and
nine female photographs were selected from a larger set
used in previous physical attractiveness research
(i.e., Graziano et al., 1993). Photographs were
reliably rated as "above average" in physical
attractiveness. The photographs were head and shoulder
college yearbook portraits. Photographs were presented
to participants in one of two sequences to control for
a picture order effect. One set was presented in
sequence from photo one to nine; the second set was
presented in sequence from photo nine to one.

Procedure. The participants were scheduled in groups (ranging from 3-8 in number). All groups were homogeneous for sex. The experimenter met with the group once they arrived and told them that the study was about rating physical attractiveness and impression formation. S\he explained that although impression formation is immediate and automatic, given time to reflect on what we have seen or to talk with peers, often impressions change. S\he explained that this distinction is first versus detailed impressions and is the focus of our current research on impression formation. Therefore, they would be asked to make initial, private evaluations of photographed stimulus materials, discuss their impressions with the group while reevaluating the photos as a group, and finally to rerate the photos individually.

S\he then explained that the photos were persons of the other sex and were to be rated on a one to ten scale (one being physically unattractive and ten being very physically attractive). The photographs were passed around one at a time to each participant. After all subjects rated each of the nine pictures, rating

one was collected. Next, half of the groups engaged in a group discussion of the stimulus materials. The other half of the groups engaged in group choice dilemma tasks used in Snyder and Monson (1975) (See Appendix III). The experimenter gave the experimental condition a "group rating sheet" which would be used to record the single group rating or the group range of ratings in addition to positive and negative traits discussed by the group about the individual pictures (see Appendix I). The group was told that this was necessary because aspects of physical attractiveness discussed by groups were also a focal issue in our current research. Following the group interaction timed at approximately fifteen minutes, all participants privately reevaluated the stimulus material they originally rated. Half of the conditions used the same procedure as R1. The other half completed R2 both publically to the group and on paper. Order of the public ratings was randomized for each individual photo to prevent an order effect of the subjects.

The experimenter then told the participants that

personality could influence judgments of physical attractiveness. Consequently, they would be asked to complete some personality inventories. These inventories assessed Self-monitoring (Snyder, 1987), sex roles (PAQ) (Spence & Helmreich, 1978), each of the domains of the five-factor model (Goldberg, 1992), and self-rated expertise in several domains (Graziano et al., 1993)(See Appendices IV-VII).

Once all inventories were completed, the experimenter, using the funnel debriefing format (Aronson & Carlsmith, 1968), probed participants for suspiciousness, debriefed them, and pledged them to secrecy.

Results

Using multivariate procedures, we probed the effects of our independent variables on increased negativity and social conformity after group discussion.

Negativity

To probe increased negativity of ratings from rating time one (R1) to rating time two (R2), we computed average composite scores on ratings of

physical attractiveness for each participant. We could
do this because all photographs were pre-rated to be
physically attractive. We anticipated significant
correlations between R1 and R2, so we first used
multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to analyze
for time effects, using the Pillai test statistic. We
treated R1 and R2 as two potentially correlated
dependent measures. There was a significant
multivariate main effect for time, $\underline{F}$ (1, 211) = 103.54,
$\underline{p}$ <.0001. Ratings across all conditions declined from
R1 to R2. There were no significant multivariate main
effects nor interactions involving self-monitoring.

The multivariate main effect for time was
qualified by several significant multivariate
interactions. First, we found a Time X Sex effect, $\underline{F}$
(1, 203)= 8.32, $\underline{p}$ <.005. Means and standard deviations
are reported on Table 1. This interaction indicated
that while both women and

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

insert Table 1 here

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

men become more negative over time, women not only

reported more negative ratings overall in R1 and R2, but they became more negative than did men at R2. Finally, we found a significant multivariate Time X Discuss X Public/Private interaction, F (1,203) = 5.47, p <.02. This interaction, presented in Table 2, shows that all subjects become more negative over time, but the effect is

----

insert Table 2 here

----

significantly larger when participants discuss their evaluations and then present their final decision in public. When final evaluations are not discussed in the group, or when final evaluations are performed in private, the evaluations are less negative.

Social Conformity

Following the procedure reported in Snyder and Monson (1975), we created deviation/conformity scores for each research participant by subtracting each participant's attraction composite score from his/her group mean attraction score separately for both pre and post-discussion ratings. Social conformity produced by

the group discussion was indicated by a decrease in deviation from the group mean rating over R1 and R2. We again found a main effect for time, F (1,208) = 36.86, p <.001. Ratings across all conditions became more similar from R1 to R2. In addition, we found a significant Public/Private X Time interaction, F (1,208) = 15.25, p <.001, indicating that all subjects become more negative over time, but the conformity effect is amplified in the public condition. Again, we found no main effects or interactions for self-monitoring.

Supplementary Analyses. To probe the possibility that social influence was moderated by participants' personality, we reanalyzed our data after classifying each participant as either high or low on self-rated expertise in evaluating male physical attractiveness, self-rated expertise in evaluating female physical attractiveness, agreeableness (Goldberg, 1992), and sex roles (PAQ). Classification was based on the median split procedure, with participants scoring above the median labeled as "high" on the attribute. In addition, full scale scores on personality variables

were intercorrelated. These intercorrelations are presented in Table 3. None of the personality variables produced significant main effects or interactions (all

----

insert Table 3 here

Fs < 2.00). In particular, this study produced no evidence that persons high in self-rated expertise in evaluating physical attractiveness were less influenced by peers.

Study 2

Study 1 showed that women are more responsive to peer groups than men. Women, while initially rating lower, become more negative (decrease their ratings) more than men at rating two. In addition, study 1 showed that the social influence effect is amplified in the public condition, and still further amplified in the female public condition. These results suggest different dynamics of attraction in men and women and elements of self-presentation. Study 2 was designed to

replicate and extend the findings of Study 1, using the same basic interaction paradigm. As in Study 1, subjects met in groups, made an initial rating, and then following discussion did a second rating, either in private or in public. However, this paradigm involved placing a confederate within each group to influence subjects' deliberation and final physical attractiveness ratings. We wished to probe the idea that face-to-face interactions with a confident confederate may be potent enough to elicit social influence effects in men as well as women. Subjects were randomly assigned to one of three experimental conditions in which a confederate communicated a positive, neutral, or negative reaction to the persons in the photographs. To probe for possible moderation of social influence by personality, we again collected self-rated expertise in evaluating physical attractiveness in both men and women, self-monitoring, and sex roles (PAQ).

Method-Study 2

Subjects and Design. A total of 281 Texas A&M University Introductory students (143 women, 138 men)

participated in return for partial fulfillment of their course requirements. The subjects were assigned to cells of a 2 (Sex of research participant) X 2 (Public vs. private judgment) X 3 (Type of confederate communication: +, -, 0) randomized block factorial design. The dependent variables were: (a) rating of attractiveness at time two; (b) change in rating from time one (R1) to time two (R2); and (c) decrease in deviation from confederate rating from R1 to R2.

Stimulus materials. Stimulus material was the same as that used in study 1.

Procedure. The same procedure was used in this study as that used in study one with the exception of a few important changes. A trained confederate was placed in with the group of subjects posing as a "subject." Group sizes ranged from 4-8 including the confederate. These groups were homogeneous with respect to research participant sex. Groups were randomly assigned to type of confederate communication conditions including positive, neutral and negative. After rating one (R1), all groups discussed the photos. While in the group discussion, the confederate worked

to appear to the other participants as a "real subject," but in fact responded with a uniform, previously established opinion toward all nine pictures. For example, when the confederate was assigned to the negative condition, s/he gave consistently negative responses to all nine photos. During the experiment, the confederate referred to his/her "second informed consent" for the exact ratings for each photograph. The "second informed consent" was an actual informed consent which had been altered to give photograph ratings instead of the numbering of paragraphs on the form. There was a altered form for each of the twelve conditions. This was done to protect the confederate from memory failures. Confederates were instructed to input in amounts similar to the other subjects while making their opinion clear. S/he mentioned between three and five "opinions" which had previously been learned (see Appendix II for listings). These "opinions" were thoughts about the physical attractiveness and specific features of each individual picture (i.e. "his jaw is too big"; "he has beautiful eyes"; "he is average

looking"). After the group discussion, rating two (R2) was taken either publically or privately as in study one. However, in the public condition, the randomization of public announcement was fixed so that the confederate went first each time. The same numbers were kept by subjects for the nine pictures.

Following R2, participants were told that they would be separated into two groups so that they would have more privacy and room while filling out their inventories. Half of the group, including the confederate, was taken from the original room. The confederate asked to be excused to go to the restroom before filling out the inventories. While the confederate "went to the restroom", the other subjects were placed in a separate room. This was done in order to save the confederate from filling out the personality inventories each time. It was assumed that each of the groups of subjects would believe that the confederate went back to the other room to complete his/her inventories. Before bringing the second group back into the original room, the confederate was placed in the original room under the belief that the rest of

the group had been lost in the halls and were on their way. When the groups were back together, they were debriefed using the same funnel format as in study one. Experimenters were careful to make sure that there were no hard feelings between the subjects and confederate.

Results-Study 2

Data were first analyzed using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), followed by separate univariate analyses of individual dependent variables.

Negativity

There were significant multivariate effects for time (i.e., R1 to R2), F (1, 257) = 136.72, p <.0001. Overall, ratings of physical attractiveness became less positive from R1 (M = 6.03) to R2 (M = 5.40). This main effect was qualified by several significant interactions. There was a marginally significant multivariate Time X Self-monitoring interaction, F (1, 257)= 3.66, p <.06. The decline in ratings from R1 to R2 was larger for high self-monitoring participants (-.68) than for low self-monitoring participants (-.56).

There was a significant Time X Public/Private multivariate interaction, F (1, 269) = 3.68, p <.06.

Changes were larger when the second ratings were made in public (M = -.74) than when made in private (M = -.53). There was a significant multivariate Time X Sex X Type of Communication interaction, F (2, 257) = 4.81, p <.01. Means for this interaction are presented in Table 4. Post hoc comparison by SNK test indicated that for both male and female participants, changes in ratings from R1 to R2 were largest in the condition in which the confederate

----

insert Table 4 here

----

was negative, and smallest in the condition in which the confederate was positive. In fact, when participants were exposed to a positive confederate, they actually increased their evaluations (+.22 for women, +.10 for men) but the change was not significant. The largest difference between men and women occurred in the negative conditions. Following exposure to the negative confederate, women changed their ratings more (-1.58) than did men (-1.16). However, overall, the women did not show more change

from R1 to R2 than did men (-1.92 for women, -1.91 for males) summed across all type of confederate communication conditions.

Social Conformity.

We used the same procedure in Study 2 as we used in Study 1. We created deviation/conformity scores for each research participant by subtracting each participant's attraction composite score from his/her group mean attraction score separately for both pre and post-discussion ratings. Social conformity produced by the group discussion was indicated by a decrease in deviation from the group mean rating over R1 and R2.

We again found a multivariate main effect for time, F (1,257) = 68.38, p <.0001. Ratings across all conditions became more similar from R1 to R2. In addition, we found a significant multivariate Sex X Time effect, F (1, 257) = 8.17, p <.005. This interaction indicates that women were initially more heterogeneous than men, but show more change toward similarity following group discussion (women =.38; males =.18). There was also a multivariate Public/Private X Time interaction, F (1,257) = 3.07, p

<.08, suggesting that all subjects become more negative over time, but the conformity effect is amplified in the public condition.

There were two significant three-factor multivariate interactions. There was a Sex X Time X Type of Confederate Communication interaction, F (2, 257) = 4.32, p <.01. There was also a significant Time X Type of Confederate Communication X Public/Private interaction, F (2, 257) = 3.38, p <.04. Tables 5 and 6 reports means, standard deviations, and sample sizes relevant to these interactions. These interactions were subjected to

----

insert Tables 5 & 6 here

----

post-hoc analyses with the Student-Newman-Keuls procedure. The first interaction indicates that female participants are more responsive to a negative confederate than are men, but do not differ from men in responsiveness to neutral or positive peer confederates. The second interaction indicates that participants are more responsive to the negative peer

confederate when they must reevaluate the photos in public.

Supplemental Analyses. As in Study 1, we probed the possibility that social influence was moderated by participants' personality. Consequently, we reanalyzed our data after classifying each participant as either high or low on self-rated expertise in evaluating male physical attractiveness, self-rated expertise in evaluating female attractiveness, and sex roles (PAQ). We did not include an assessment of agreeableness, since Study 1 found no evidence regarding its link to social influence. Classification was based on the median split procedure, with participants scoring above the median labeled as "high" on the attribute. In addition, scores on personality variables were intercorrelated. These intercorrelations are presented in Table 7.

----

insert Table 7 here

Only one dispositional variable produced significant main effects or interactions: It was self-

rated expertise in evaluating physical attractiveness. It is interesting to note that for men, self-rated expertise in rating male physical attractiveness is not significantly correlated with expertise in rating female physical attractiveness (r =.05, ns.) For women, however, self-ratings of expertise of male and female targets are significantly correlated (r =.40, p <.05). Here we report analyses for self-rated expertise in evaluating the other sex.

There were three statistically significant effects involving self-rated expertise. Means, standard deviations and sample sizes relevant to these effects are presented on Table 8. Post-hoc comparisons used the Student-Newman-Keuls procedure. First, there was a significant Time X

----

insert Table 8 here

Expertise interaction, F (1, 257)= 8.10, p <.005. Experts changed less following group discussion (-.50) than did nonexperts (-.90). Second, there was a significant Time X Sex X Expert interaction, F (1, 257)

= 10.35, $\underline{p}$ <.002. Nonexpert women conform more following group discussion (-1.07) than do nonexpert men (-.78). Third, there was a significant Time X Sex X Public/Private X Expertise interaction, $\underline{F}$ (1, 257) = 5.13, $\underline{p}$ < .02. Nonexperts change more in public (-1.10) than in private (-.75), but nonexpert women change more in public (-1.39) than do nonexpert men (-.81).

General Discussion

The present research was motivated by past research on social influence. In particular, Snyder and Monson (1975) explored social influence using the interaction between the personality variable of self-monitoring and situational factors. The situational factors involved making decisions in private or in public. The focal issue was conformity in opinions about risk taking. Snyder and Monson found that self-monitoring interacted with the public/private nature of the decision in affecting conformity. Snyder and Monson interpreted their data in terms of generating and maintaining a social image (i.e., impression management) and social influence.

If the Snyder and Monson conclusions were

generalizable, then we should have been able to find comparable self-monitoring and situational effects using a different focal issue. We selected the focal issue of physical attractiveness because (a) physical attractiveness judgments seem more immediate, automatic, and "given" than do opinions about risk taking; (b) physical attractiveness judgments may operate differently in men and women; and (c) judgments of physical attractiveness may contain elements of self-presentation. Furthermore, in a series of four studies, Graziano, Jensen-Campbell, Shebilske, and Lundgren (1993) found social influences on conformity when rating physical attractiveness.

Our research replicated only part of the Snyder and Monson research. We found social influence effects for the public versus private nature of the decision in both of our studies. In general, participants seem to be more influenced by peers when they must announce their decision in public than when they can make a decision in private. This effect seems to be especially strong when peers advocate a more negative evaluation than the evaluation held by the participant.

Another aspect of the Snyder and Monson research, however, did not generalize to our work. We found little evidence supporting claims that self-monitoring is a moderator of situational effects in social influence. In Study 1, self-monitoring did not interact with any of the other variables. Study 2 did find one marginally significant effect (p <.06) for self-monitoring. There was a Time X Self-monitoring interaction for negativity. The decline in ratings from R1 to R2 was larger for high self-monitors than for low self-monitors, but the magnitude of the effect was small.

We also explored possible correlations linking self-monitoring to expertise in evaluating physical attractiveness. It was possible, for example, that high self-monitoring persons would regard themselves as more expert at judging physical attractiveness, and thus be less influenced on this particular topic. In general, there was no evidence that self-monitoring was systematically related to any of the social or dispositional variables we assessed.

Regardless of the failure to replicate fully

Snyder and Monson, the present research found
potentially important outcomes linking processes of
social influence to judgments of physical
attractiveness. In particular, the present program of
research probed socially-mediated sex differences in
judgments of physical attractiveness. This work stands
in contrast to research emphasizing intrinsic
attributes that cause judgments of physical
attractiveness (e.g., Cunningham, 1986).

Previous research suggested that men and women
might respond differently to peer influence on this
topic. Results from the Graziano et al. study
suggested that female raters were more responsive to
social influence than were male raters. In addition,
Graziano et al. found that when women rated pictures,
they were more influenced by negative evaluations than
by positive evaluations from peers. Relative to women,
male raters were less influenced in their judgments of
physical attractiveness by peers. There was no
evidence that self-monitoring influenced conformity.

The previous studies had limitations. First,
these studies use relatively artificial manipulations

(e.g., Graziano, et al., 1993) without the use of
actual face-to-face interactions. The issue of face-
to-face interactions is especially important in
studying sex differences in social influence. Wood and
Stagner (in press) note that sex differences in social
influence appear most frequently during public
interaction. In studies when subjects believe that
their opinions are confidential, sex differences are
minimal. Furthermore, research by Eagly (1987)
suggests that women may be more responsive to social
influence than men only when women believe that their
opinion differs from that of the group and that the
group members are attuning to the dissenter's response.
These studies imply that sex differences exist in
conformity only when opinions are made public.
However, these studies have not tested the effects of
group discussion on later private judgements.

The present research overcame these problems.
These studies were specifically designed to explore the
affect of face-to-face interactions during group
discussion and possible subsequent gender differences
in conformity to the group.

Study 1 found that judgments of physical attractiveness decline following group interaction. We also found that women are initially more negative about men's physical attractiveness than men were about women's physical attractiveness. Following group interaction, the decline in rating was significantly larger for women than for men.

An interesting question about these patterns involves the precise mechanism inducing the change. We found no evidence that this decline is a result of discourse or discussion. The distraction groups declined in magnitudes similar to the discussion groups. Apparently, the mere presence of other people is sufficient to generate a decline in ratings. Whether this effect is restricted to the topic of physical attractiveness is not clear. Future research should manipulate the group context, using a control group of subjects who complete ratings alone.

Study 2 manipulated the content of discourse more carefully by introducing a confederate to the groups. We found that a negative peer can exert strong influence on the decisions of individuals, especially

when individuals are asked to reevaluate their initial decisions in public. Apparently, there is a self-presentational aspect to public judgments of physical attractiveness: A person looses face by claiming an opposite-sex person is attractive when peers claim that the person is not. The critical may be seen as a person with higher standards, or is more discerning. Future research should examine this process.

Taken together, results from both study 1 and study 2 suggest women are more responsive than men to peer influence in evaluating physical attractiveness in the opposite sex. Women seem to be especially responsive to negative peer evaluation of men. This replicates results found by Graziano et al. However, study 2 suggests that overall change in ratings is not significantly different between men and women; instead, the pattern of influence is different.

These two studies reported here show converging evidence that processes of attraction may differ in men and women. Nonetheless, these studies only begin to explore the social processes that underlie judgments of physical attractiveness. It may be a mistake to treat

beauty as an objective, intrinsic aspect of persons. Beauty may be better regarded as a dependent, effect variable that is a consequence of interpersonal processes.

References

Aronson, E., & Carlsmith, J. M. (1968). Experimentation
in social psychology. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson
(Eds.), Handbook of social psychology, (Vol. II,
2nd ed., pp. 1-79). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bem, D.J., & Allen, A. (1974). On predicting some of
the people some of the time: The search for cross
situational consistencies in behavior.
Psychological Review, 81, 506-520.

Campus, N. (1974). Transituational consistency as a
dimension of personality. Journal of Personality
and Social Psychology, 29, 307-336.

Cunningham, M. R. (1986). Measuring the physical in
physical attractiveness: Quasi-experiments on the
sociobiology of female facial beauty. Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 925-935.

Eagly, A. (1987). Sex differences in social behavior:
A social role interpretation. Hillsdale, NJ:
Erlbaum.

Goldberg, L.R. (1992). The development of markers for
the Big-5 factor structure. Psychological
Assessment, 4, 26-42.

Graziano, W. G., Jensen-Campbell, L. A., Shebilske, L.
A., & Lundgren, S. R. (1993). Social influence,
sex differences, and judgments of beauty: putting
the "interpersonal" back in interpersonal
attraction. <u>Journal of Personality and Social
Psychology</u>, <u>65</u>, 522-531.

Houts, A., Cook, T. D., & Shadish, W. R. (1986) The
person-situation debate: A critical multiplist
perspective. <u>Journal of Personality</u>, <u>54</u>, 52-105.

Snyder, M. (1987). <u>Public appearances/private
realities: The psychology of self-monitoring.</u>
NewYork: Freeman.

Snyder, M., & Monson, T. C. (1975). Persons,
Situations, and the control of Social Behavior.
<u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</u>,
<u>32</u>, 637-644.

Spence, L. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). <u>Masculinity
and femininity: Their psychological dimensions,
correlates, and antecedents</u>. Austin: University
of Texas Press.

Wood, W., & Stagner, B. (in press). Are some people

    T. Brock (Eds.) <u>Psychology of persuasion.</u> New

    York: Freeman.

Table 1

STUDY 1: CHANGE IN MALE AND FEMALE RATINGS OVER TIME

	RATING ONE	RATING TWO
FEMALES	M=5.65 SD=1.10 N=112	M=4.85 SD=1.04 N=112
MALES	M=6.50 SD=0.96 N=104	M=6.00 SD=0.93 N=104

Table 2

STUDY 1: EVALUATIONS OVER TIME FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE
CONDITIONS QUALIFIED BY DISCUSS VERSUS DISTRACT

RATING TIME ONE:

PRIVATE		PUBLIC	
DISCUSS	DISTRACT	DISCUSS	DISTRACT
M=5.88 SD=1.10 N=56	M=6.30 SD=1.11 N=50	M=5.98 SD=0.97 N=54	M=6.13 SD=1.26 N=56

RATING TIME TWO:

PRIVATE		PUBLIC	
DISCUSS	DISTRACT	DISCUSS	DISTRACT
M=5.28 SD=1.01 N=56	M=6.10 SD=1.19 N=50	M=5.25 SD=1.01 N=54	M=1.18 SD=5.12 N=56

TABLE 3

STUDY 1: PERSONALITY VARIABLES CORRELATION MATRIX

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.EXTROVERSION	+.17	+.06	+.03	+.28	-.16	+.30	-.03	+.07	+.33
2.AGREEABLENESS	--	+.44	+.26	+.29	+.20	-.08	+.47	-.12	+.22
3.CONSCIEN-TIOUSNESS	--	--	+.12	+.36	+.27	+.10	+.19	-.24	+.15
4.EMOTIONAL STABILITY	--	--	--	+.13	+.13	+.08	-.06	+.18	-.15
5.OPENNESS TO EXPERIENCE	--	--	--	--	-.05	+.18	+.14	-.03	+.21
6.SELF MONITORING	--	--	--	--	--	-.04	+.03	-.13	+.03
7.MASCULINITY	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.07	+.04	+.11
8.FEMININITY	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.15	+.21
9.EXPERT ON MENS BEAUTY	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-.10
10.EXPERT ON WOMENS BEAUTY	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

TABLE 4

STUDY2: CHANGE IN MALE AND FEMALE RATINGS OVER TIME
AS A RESULT OF TYPE OF CONFEDERATE COMMUNICATION

| | RATING TIME ONE | | | RATING TIME TWO | | |
	-	0	+	-	0	+
FEMALES	M=5.05 SD=1.43 N=45	M=5.39 SD=1.20 N=48	M=6.22 SD=0.99 N=50	M=3.47 SD=0.99 N=45	M=4.83 SD=0.85 N=48	M=6.44 SD=0.81 N=50
MALES	M=6.29 SD=0.91 N=48	M=6.53 SD=0.87 N=46	M=6.74 SD=1.02 N=44	M=5.13 SD=0.82 N=48	M=5.68 SD=0.93 N=46	M=6.84 SD=0.81 N=44

note.
(-) negative confederate communication
(0) neutral confederate communication
(+) positive confederate communication

TABLE 5

STUDY 2: SOCIAL CONFORMITY FROM R1 TO R2 DUE TO GENDER
AND TYPE OF CONFEDERATE COMMUNICATION

	R1 MEAN DIFFERENCE			R2 MEAN DIFFERENCE		
	-	0	+	-	0	+
FEMALES	M=1.14 SD=.79 N=45	M=0.87 SD=.73 N=48	M=0.70 SD=.55 N=50	M=0.57 SD=.41 N=45	M=0.58 SD=.48 N=48	M=0.39 SD=.31 N=50
MALES	M=0.60 SD=.51 N=48	M=0.53 SD=.42 N=46	M=0.54 SD=.46 N=44	M=0.50 SD=.43 N=48	M=0.32 SD=.28 N=46	M=0.29 SD=.27 N=44

note.
(-) negative confederate communication
(0) neutral confederate communication
(+) positive confederate communication

TABLE 6

STUDY 2: SOCIAL CONFORMITY FROM R1 TO R2 DUE TO TYPE OF COMMUNICATION AND PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE RATINGS

	R1 MEAN DIFFERENCE			R2 MEAN DIFFERENCE		
	-	0	+	-	0	+
PRIVATE RATINGS	M=0.77 SD=.65 N=45	M=0.66 SD=.52 N=50	M=0.64 SD=.42 N=47	M=0.56 SD=.44 N=45	M=0.53 SD=.41 N=50	M=0.29 SD=.26 N=47
PUBLIC RATINGS	M=0.95 SD=.77 N=48	M=0.75 SD=.71 N=44	M=0.61 SD=.59 N=47	M=0.51 SD=.40 N=48	M=0.37 SD=.41 N=44	M=0.39 SD=.32 N=47

note.
(-) negative confederate communication
(0) neutral confederate communication
(+) positive confederate communication

TABLE 7

STUDY 2: PERSONALITY VARIABLES CORRELATION MATRIX

	2	3	4	5
1.SELF MONITORING	-.14	+.08	-.14	+.03
2.MASCULINITY	- -	+.05	+.19	-.09
3.FEMININITY	- -	- -	-.01	+.23
4.EXPERT ON MENS BEAUTY	- -	- -	- -	+.07
5.EXPERT ON WOMENS BEAUTY	- -	- -	- -	- -

Table 8

STUDY 2: CHANGE IN RATINGS OVER TIME FOR MALES AND
FEMALES   DUE TO PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE AND LEVEL OF
EXPERTISE

		RATING ONE		RATING TWO	
		PUBLIC	PRIVATE	PUBLIC	PRIVATE
MALES	EXPERT	M=6.44 SD=0.89 N=44	M=6.57 SD=1.03 N=42	M=5.77 SD=1.18 N=44	M=6.08 SD=0.97 N=42
	NON-EXPERT	M=6.03 SD=0.81 N=26	M=7.03 SD=0.78 N=26	M=5.22 SD=1.00 N=26	M=6.29 SD=1.03 N=26
FEMALES	EXPERT	M=5.28 SD=1.35 N=49	M=5.47 SD=1.32 N=54	M=4.80 SD=1.54 N=49	M=5.09 SD=1.49 N=54
	NON-EXPERT	M=6.46 SD=1.19 N=20	M=5.68 SD=0.85 N=20	M=5.07 SD=1.71 N=20	M=4.93 SD=1.31 N=20

APPENDIX I

STUDY1/2 RATING FORMS

Please rate each of the persons in the photos for physical attractiveness. Next to the number for each photo, write your rating, using the following scale.

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10

not at all
physically
attractive

very
physically
attractive

Photograph #   Rating

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

4) _____

5) _____

6) _____

7) _____

8) _____

9) _____

As a group, please discuss and rate each of the eight pictures for physical attractiveness on a one (physically unattractive) to ten (physically attractive) scale. As a group discuss specific features which either add to or detract from the physical attractiveness of the individual. In addition, please write down all details discussed in the group (e.g. good/bad features).

1.____

2.____

3.____

4.____

5.____

6. _____

7. _____

8. _____

9. _____

APPENDIX II

STUDY 2 CONFEDERATE PHOTOGRAPH TRAITS

Male Photograph Traits

	Positive Traits	Negative Traits
9a/1b	Strong Jaw Cute Smile Looks friendly Clean cut Cute eyes	Bad hair Pointy nose Huge jaw Funny (no teeth) smile Beady eyes
8a/2b	Straight teeth Looks "fun" Nice hair Nice nose Intelligent eyes	Sunken eyes Boring looking No upper lip Bushy eyebrows Goofy
7a/3b	Straight teeth Nice Dresser Nice chin line Nice hair Looks friendly	Squinty eyes Too much hair Bushy eyebrows Looks like politician (dishonest) Pointy nose
6a/4b	Boyishly cute Honest eyes Straight Teeth Good hair Looks friendly	Small eyes Lipless Big forehead Eyes Slant down Hair sticks up
5a/5b	Intense eyes Cute smile Cute dimples Good looking Cute nose (straight)	Looks like a player Big forehead Lopsided smile Circles under eyes Funny hair
4a/6b	Good Jaw Nice smile Cute eyes Nice complexion Strong neck	Bart Simpson hair Weird nose Looks arrogant Large uneven ears Looks devious
3a/7b	Broad shoulders Straight teeth Teddy bear look Cute dimples Nice lips	Unibrow Looks like a dumb jock Bad hair Fat neck Big nose

	(+)		(--)
2a/8b	Pretty eyes		Bushy eyebrows
	Straight teeth		Feminine Looking
	Good hair		Hair looks colored
	Dimpled chin		Big ears
	Straight nose		Goofy smile
1a/9b	Looks nice		Big ears
	Cute Smile		Receding hair
	Bright eyes		Bushy Eyebrows
	Straight teeth		Big Adam's apple
	Honest eyes		Big forehead

Neutral traits:

He/she is: OK
Average
Normal looking
Ordinary
Not great but not too bad
Nothing to write home about

**These are basic average concepts. If others fit, use them. Try to talk as much in this condition as you have in other conditions. We have to have a neutral stimulus.

General Negative Comments: (to be used if appropriate)
Conceited
Fake
Dull
Vain looking
Cheesy

General Positive Comments:
Honest looking
Intelligent looking
Wholesome
Easy going

Female Photograph Traits

	Positive Traits	Negative Traits
9a/1b	Cute nose Straight teeth Cute smile Bright eyes Blonde	Bad hair No top lip (bad smile) Unattractive Straight eyebrows (used a ruler) Pointy square nose
8a/2b	Blonde, straight hair Pretty eyes Cute nose Straight teeth Nice cheekbones	Heavy eyes Bony nose Fake looking (hair, smile) Funny facial structure Bad smile
7a/3b	Large smile Looks friendly Nice hair Cute eyes Straight teeth	Big forehead Mouth too big--shows gums Unattractive Big hooked nose Fake smile
6a/4b	Cute face Straight teeth Looks sweet Cute nose Pretty eyes	Weird chin Ugly hair Heavy eyelids No upper lip Long nose compared to small face
5a/5b	Pronounced cheekbones Pretty eyes Straight teeth Pretty hair Good smile	Puffy cheeks Big face Crooked smile Disney nose--too spherical Bushy eyebrows
4a/6b	Nice nose Bright eyes Looks tall Nice smile Straight teeth	Long forehead Too much makeup Ugly hair Fake looking Long nose
3a/7b	Nice smile Good hair Bubbly Cute Pretty smile	Big clumpy nose (pug nose) Square chin Ratty hair Large forehead (trying to cover it) Fat face

	(+)	(−)
2a/8b	Cute overall Good facial shape Deep eyes Cute nose Smile/Teeth good	Pointy chin 80's hair style is ugly Funny jaw Fake smile No cheekbones
1a/9b	Nice eyes Good hair High cheekbones Looks friendly Nice teeth	Crooked smile Huge forehead Ugly hair Wide face Long nose

APPENDIX III

STUDY 2 CHOICE DILEMMA TASKS

CHOICE DILEMMAS PROCEDURE

Instructions: On the following pages, you will find a series of situations that are likely to occur in everyday life. The central person in each situation is faced with a choice between two alternative courses of action, which we might call X and Y. Alternative X is more desirable and attractive than alternative Y, but the probability of attaining or achieving X is less than that of attaining or achieving Y.

For each situation on the following pages, you will be asked to indicate the minimum odds of success you would demand before recommending that the more attractive or desirable alternative, X, be chosen.

Read each situation carefully before giving your judgment. Try to place yourself in the position of the central person in each of the situations. There are twelve situations in all. Please do not omit any of them.

1. Mr. A, an electrical engineer, who is married and has one child, has been working for a large electronics corporation since graduating from college five years ago. he is assured of a lifetime job with a modest, though adequate, salary, and liberal pension benefits upon retirement. On the other hand, it is very unlikely that his salary will increase much before he retires. While attending a convention, Mr. A is offered a job with a small, newly founded company which has a highly uncertain future. The new job would pay more to start and would offer the possibility of a share in the ownership if the company survived the competition of the larger firms.

Imagine that you are advising Mr. A. Listed below are several probabilities or odds of the new company's proving financially sound.

Please check the lowest probability that you would consider acceptable to make it worthwhile for Mr. A to take the new job.

_____Chances are 1 in 10 that the company will be financially sound.
_____Chances are 3 in 10 that the company will be financially sound.
_____Chances are 5 in 10 that the company will be financially sound.
_____Chances are 7 in 10 that the company will be financially sound.
_____Chances are 9 in 10 that the company will be financially sound.
_____Mr. A should not take the new job no matter what the chances.

2. Mr. B, a 45-year-old accountant, has recently been informed by his physician that he has developed a severe heart ailment. The disease would be sufficiently serious to force Mr. B to change many of his strongest life habits--reducing his work load, drastically changing his diet, giving up his favorite leisure-time pursuits. The physician suggests that a delicate medical operation could be attempted which, if successful, would completely relieve his heart condition. But its success could not be assured, and in fact, the operation might prove fatal.

Imagine that you are advising Mr. B. Listed below are several probabilities or odds that the operation will prove successful.
Please check the lowest probability that you would consider acceptable for operation to be performed.

_____Chances are 9 in 10 that the operation will be a success.
_____Chances are 7 in 10 that the operation will be a success.
_____Chances are 5 in 10 that the operation will be a success.
_____Chances are 3 in 10 that the operation will be a success.
_____Chances are 1 in 10 that the operation will be a success.
_____Mr. B should not have the operation.

3. Mr. C., a married man with two children, has a steady job that pays him about $15,000 per year. He can easily afford the necessities of life, but few of the luxuries. Mr. C's father who died recently carried a $10,000 life insurance policy. Mr. C would like to invest this money in stocks. He is well aware of the secure "blue-chip" stocks and bonds that would pay approximately 6% on his investment. On the other hand, Mr. C has heard that the stocks of a relatively unknown Company X might double their present value if a new product currently in production is favorably received by the buying public. However, if the product is unfavorably received, the stocks would decline in value.

Imagine that you are advising Mr. C. Listed below are several probabilities or odds that Company X will double their value.
Please check the lowest probability that you would consider acceptable for Mr. C to invest in Company X stocks.

_____Chances are 1 in 10 the stocks will double their value.
_____Chances are 3 in 10 the stocks will double their value.
_____Chances are 5 in 10 the stocks will double their value.
_____Chances are 7 in 10 the stocks will double their value.
_____Chances are 9 in 10 the stocks will double their value.
_____Mr. C should not invest in Company X.

4. Mr. D is the captain of College X's football team. College X is playing its traditional rival, College Y, in the final game of the season. The game is in its final seconds, and Mr. D's team, College X, is behind in the score. College X has time to run one more play. Mr. D, the captain, must decide whether it would be best to settle for a tie score with a play which would be almost certain to work or, on the other hand, should he try a more complicated and risky play which could bring victory if it succeeded, but defeat if not.

Imagine that you are advising Mr. D. Listed below are several probabilities or odds that the risky play will work.
Please check the lowest probability that you would consider acceptable for the risky play to be attempted.

_____The chances are 9 in 10 that the risky play will work.
_____The chances are 7 in 10 that the risky play will work.
_____The chances are 5 in 10 that the risky play will work.
_____The chances are 3 in 10 that the risky play will work.
_____The chances are 1 in 10 that the risky play will work.
_____Mr. D should not attempt the risky play.

5. Mr. E is president of a light metals corporation in the United States. The corporation is quite prosperous, and has strongly considered the possibilities of business expansion by building and additional plant in a new location. The choice is between building another plant in the U.S., where there would be moderate return on the initial investment, or building a plant in a foreign country. Lower labor costs and easy access to raw materials in that country would mean a much higher return on the initial investment. On the other hand, there is a history of political instability and revolution in the foreign country under consideration. In fact, the leader of a small minority party is committed to nationalizing, that is, taking over, all foreign investments.

Imagine that you are advising Mr. E. Listed below are several probabilities or odds of continued political stability in the foreign country under consideration.
Please check the lowest probability you would consider acceptable for Mr. E's corporation to build a plant in the country.

_____Chances are 1 in 10 the country will remain politically stable.
_____Chances are 3 in 10 the country will remain politically stable.
_____Chances are 5 in 10 the country will remain politically stable.
_____Chances are 7 in 10 the country will remain politically stable.
_____Chances are 9 in 10 the country will remain politically stable.
_____Mr. E's corporation should not build a plant outside of the US.

6. Mr. F is currently a college senior who is very eager to pursue graduate study in chemistry leading to the Doctor of Philosophy degree. He has been accepted by both University X and University Y. University X has a world-wide reputation for excellence in chemistry. While a degree from University X would signify outstanding training in this field, the standards are so very rigorous that only a fraction of the degree candidates actually receive the degree. University Y, on the other hand, has much less of a reputation in chemistry, but almost everyone admitted is awarded the Doctor of Philosophy degree, though the degree has much less prestige that the corresponding degree from University X.

Imagine that you are advising Mr. F. listed below are several probabilities or odds that Mr. F would be awarded a degree at University X, the one with the greater prestige.

Please check the lowest probability that you would consider acceptable to make it worthwhile for Mr. F to enroll in University X rather that University Y.

_____Chances are 9 in 10 that Mr. F would receive his degree.
_____Chances are 7 in 10 that Mr. F would receive his degree.
_____Chances are 5 in 10 that Mr. F would receive his degree.
_____Chances are 3 in 10 that Mr. F would receive his degree.
_____Chances are 1 in 10 that Mr. F would receive his degree.
_____Mr. F should not enroll in University X.

7. Mr. G, a competent chess player, is participating in a national chess tournament. In an early match he draws the top-favored player in the tournament as his opponent. Mr. G has been given a relatively low ranking in view of his performance in previous tournaments. During the course of his play with the top favored man, Mr. G notes the possibility of a deceptive though risky maneuver which might bring him a quick victory. At the same time, if the attempted maneuver should fail, Mr. G would be left in an exposed position and defeat would be almost certain.

Imagine that you are advising Mr. G. Listed below are several probabilities or odds that Mr. G's deceptive play would succeed.

Please check the lowest probability that you would consider acceptable for the risky play in question to be attempted.

_____Chances are 1 in 10 the play would succeed.
_____Chances are 3 in 10 the play would succeed.
_____Chances are 5 in 10 the play would succeed.
_____Chances are 7 in 10 the play would succeed.
_____Chances are 9 in 10 the play would succeed.
_____Mr. G should not attempt the risky play.

8. Mr. H, a college senior, has studied the piano since childhood. He has won amateur prizes and given small recitals, suggesting that Mr. H has considerable musical talent. As graduation approaches, Mr. H has the choice of going to medical school to become a physician, a profession which would bring certain prestige and financial rewards; or entering a conservatory of music for advanced training with a well known pianist. Mr. H realizes that even upon completion of his piano studies, which would take many more years and a lot of money, success as a concert pianist would not be assured.

Imagine that you are advising Mr. H. Listed below are several probabilities or odds that Mr. H would succeed as a concert pianist.
Please check the lowest probability that you would consider acceptable for Mr. H to continue with his musical training.

____Chances are 9 in 10 that Mr. H would succeed as a pianist.
____Chances are 7 in 10 that Mr. H would succeed as a pianist.
____Chances are 5 in 10 that Mr. H would succeed as a pianist.
____Chances are 3 in 10 that Mr. H would succeed as a pianist.
____Chances are 1 in 10 that Mr. H would succeed as a pianist.
____Mr. H should not pursue his musical training.

APPENDIX IV

SELF-MONITORING PERSONALITY INVENTORY

For each question, please circle the answer which you feel best describes your feelings or opinion.

T F 1. I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.
T F 2. My behavior is usually an expression of my true inner feelings, attitudes, and beliefs.
T F 3. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like.
T F 4. I can only argue for ideas which I already believe.
T F 5. I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information.
T F 6. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people.
T F 7. When I am uncertain how to act in a social situation, I look to the behavior of others for cues.
T F 8. I would probably make a good actor.
T F 9. I rarely need the advice of my friends to choose movies, books, or music.
T F 10. I sometimes appear to others to be experiencing deeper emotions than I actually am.
T F 11. I laugh more when I watch a comedy with others than when alone.
T F 12. In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention.
T F 13. In different situations and with different people, I often act like a very different person.
T F 14. I am not particularly good at making other people like me.
T F 15. Even if I am not enjoying myself, I often pretend to be having a good time.
T F 16. I'm not always the person I appear to be.
T F 17. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favor.
T F 18. I have considered being an entertainer.
T F 19. In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else.
T F 20. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting.
T F 21. I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.
T F 22. At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going.
T F 23. I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up quite as well as I should.
T F 24. I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end).
T F 25. I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.

APPENDIX V

SEX ROLES PERSONALITY INVENTORY (PAQ)

PAQ

The items below inquire about what kind of a person you think you are. Each item consists of a pair of characteristics, with the letters A-E in between. For example:

Not at all artistic   A...B...C...D...E   Very artistic

Each pair describes contradictory characteristics--that is, you cannot be both at the same time, such as very artistic and not at all artistic.

The letters form a scale between the two extremes. You are to choose a letter which describes where you fall on the scale. For example, if you think you have no artistic ability, you would choose A, if you think you are pretty good, you might choose D. If you are only medium, you might choose C, and so forth.

1. Not at all aggressive	A...B...C...D...E	Very aggressive
2. Not at all independent	A...B...C...D...E	Very independent
3. Not at all emotional	A...B...C...D...E	Very emotional
4. Very Submissive	A...B...C...D...E	Very dominant
5. Not at all excitable in a MAJOR crisis	A...B...C...D...E	Very excitable in MAJOR crisis
6. Very passive	A...B...C...D...E	Very active
7. Not at all able to devote self completely to others	A...B...C...D...E	Able to devote self completely to others
8. Very rough	A...B...C...D...E	Very gentle
9. Not at all helpful to others	A...B...C...D...E	Very helpful to others
10. Not at all competitive	A...B...C...D...E	Very competitive
11. Very home oriented	A...B...C...D...E	Very worldly
12. Not at all kind	A...B...C...D...E	Very kind
13. Indifferent to others' approval	A...B...C...D...E	Highly needful of approval
14. Feelings not easily hurt	A...B...C...D...E	Feelings easily hurt
15. Not at all aware of others' feelings	A...B...C...D...E	Very aware of others' feelings
16. Can make decisions easily	A...B...C...D...E	Has difficulty making decisions
17. Gives up very easily	A...B...C...D...E	Never gives up easily
18. Never cries easily	A...B...C...D...E	Cries very easily
19. Not at all self-confident	A...B...C...D...E	Very self-confident
20. Feels inferior	A...B...C...D...E	Feels superior
21. Not very understanding of others	A...B...C...D...E	Very understanding of others
22. Very cold in relations with others	A...B...C...D...E	Very warm in relations with others

23. Very little need
    for security

A...B...C...D...E

Very strong need
for security

24. Goes to pieces
    under pressure

A...B...C...D...E

Stands up well
under pressure

APPENDIX VI

SELF-RATED EXPERTISE PERSONALITY INVENTORY

Sex_____
Age_____

Use the following scale to rate yourself on your expertise in the following areas:

not an expert 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 very expert

1) auto mechanics _____

2) calculus _____

3) visual art _____

4) classical music _____

5) computers _____

6) cooking _____

7) clothing style _____

8) manners & etiquette_____

9) sports _____

10) women's physical attractiveness _____

11) men's physical attractiveness _____

12) decorating home or apartment _____

13) relationships (initiating) _____

14) relationships (maintaining) _____

15) dealing with children _____

16) psychology _____

17) landscaping _____

Relative to each other, how would you rate the expertise of college students like yourself on the following issues?

women are more   men are more
expert   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10   expert

1) women's physical attractiveness _____

2) men's physical attractiveness _____

3) decorating home or apartment _____

4) relationships (initiating) _____

5) relationships (maintaining) _____

6) dealing with children _____

7) psychology _____

APPENDIX VII

FIVE-FACTOR MODEL OF PERSONALITY INVENTORY (BIG 5)

HOW ACCURATELY CAN YOU DESCRIBE YOURSELF?

Please use this list of common human traits to describe yourself as accurately as possible. Describe yourself as you see yourself at the present time, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you are generally or typically, as compared with other persons you know of the same sex and of roughly your same age. On your scantron, find the number that corresponds to the trait list, and using the following rating scale, mark the number that best describes you. If you do not know what the word means or how to define it, leave that number blank on the scantron.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. talkative	35. imperturbable	69. inconsiderate
2. bold	36. undemanding	70. quarrelsome
3. assertive	37. placid	71. disorganized
4. spontaneous	38. peaceful	72. undependable
5. active	39. independent	73. unconscientious
6. demonstrative	40. uninhibited	74. impractical
7. energetic	41. intelligent	75. careless
8. enthusiastic	42. perceptive	76. extravagant
9. adventurous	43. curious	77. rash
10. sociable	44. imaginative	78. frivolous
11. warm	45. creative	79. wasteful
12. kind	46. sophisticated	80. unreliable
13. cooperative	47. knowledgeable	81. emotional
14. unselfish	48. intellectual	82. envious
15. polite	49. deep	83. nervous
16. trustful	50. cultured	84. subjective
17. generous	51. silent	85. high-strung
18. flexible	52. timid	86. demanding
19. considerate	53. compliant	87. fretful
20. agreeable	54. inhibited	88. volatile
21. organized	55. passive	89. suggestible
22. dependable	56. reserved	90. fearful
23. conscientious	57. lethargic	91. unintelligent
24. practical	58. apathetic	92. imperceptive
25. thorough	59. unadventurous	93. uninquisitive
26. thrifty	60. unsociable	94. unimaginative
27. cautious	61. cold	95. uncreative
28. serious	62. unkind	96. unsophisticated
29. economical	63. uncooperative	97. ignorant
30. reliable	64. selfish	98. unintellectual
31. unemotional	65. rude	99. shallow
32. unenvious	66. distrustful	100. provincial
33. relaxed	67. stingy	
34. objective	68. stubborn	

STOP! Do not turn the page, or go further in the test. Please wait for further instructions.