DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 094 CS 503 200

AUTHOR Cegala, Donald J.
TITLE An Explication and Partial Test of a Model of Interpersonal Persuasion.
PUB DATE Nov 80
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (66th, New York, NY, November 13-16, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Anxiety; *Communication Research; *Interpersonal Relationship; Models; *Self Esteem; *Speech Communication

ABSTRACT

In applying Ernest Becker's work on self-esteem to Erving Goffman's theory of interpersonal society, this paper suggests that Goffman's views about the politeness structure of face-to-face society might be viewed as largely grounded in a basic motivation for individuals to avoid anxiety due to loss of self-esteem. The paper uses this application as the conceptual basis of a model of interpersonal persuasion that consists of the elements self-esteem, social knowledge, a repertoire of strategies, and an instrumental orientation. The model is explicated and then partially tested by examining correlational data on indicants of the four elements of the model and actual success at persuasion in a laboratory dyadic communication setting. The reported results suggest general support for the model. (Author/FL)

AN EXPLICATION AND PARTIAL TEST OF A MODEL OF INTERPERSONAL PERSUASION

Donald J. Cegala
Department of Communication
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210
614-457-3663 (Home)
614-422-3400 (Office)

Persuasive communication has long been a primary interest of scholars in speech communication. Clearly, the field's academic roots are grounded in ancient rhetorical theory and today scholars with diverse theoretical and methodological preferences continue to engage in research on persuasion. Within this tradition attention has focused primarily on persuasion in mass audience contexts, especially live public speaking settings where a sc rce addresses a large group of individuals.[1] In comparison, the literature on persuasion in interpersonal communication contexts appears to be less extensive and perhaps less clearly prescriptive. The purpose of this paper is to extend initial work on a model of interpersonal persuasion (Cegala, 1979a) by (1) explicating the model more completely, and (2) reporting empirical data in support of its logic.

Basic Terms

In this paper interpersonal communication refers to social interaction where individuals show mutual attentiveness and reciprocally influence one another through their intended and unintended symbolic behavior. This definition may be applied to face to face interaction or to some electronically mediated interactions like those on the telephone, intercom, etc. Of central importance to the perspective on interpersonal communication used here is the dynamic interplay of speaker/listener roles. Interpersonal communication contexts allow for, in fact demand, the dynamic exchange of speaker/listener roles among participants.

For this paper persuasion occurs when desired objectives are obtained by an individual from another through symbolic means (see Burgess, 1972). In short, persuasion is defined as verbal and/or nonverbal behavior that results in instrumental effects in others (Cegala, 1979b). While this definition may be applied from other perspectives, it is the persuader's point of view that is of special interest here. The research focuses on the social actor in interpersonal society and asks: what are some basic communicative competencies that a would-be-persuader needs in order to be effective? The response to this question is grounded in a view of interpersonal society and persuasion that has the self as its fundamental building block. The model of interpersonal persuasion is presented by first considering basic components of the persuasion process and then relating these to a framework of interpersonal society.

The empirical data offered in support of the interpersonal persuasion model are reported in two sections. In the first section general indicants of the persuasion model elements are examined. In the second section, situation specific indicants of the elements are explored for further insights into the model.

The Model of Interpersonal Persuasion

Basic Components of the Persuasion Process

While there are probably countless theoretical formulations about the persuasion process, the general approach seems not to have changed substantively for centuries.

Persuasion is typically viewed as essentially an adaptive process whereby

the would-be-persuader seeks and gathers relevant information about the environment and applies the information in some way to achieve desired goals. Often the terms audience analysis and rhetorical strategy are used in reference to this process. These also serve as the basic components of the currently proposed model of interpersonal persuasion. However, the specific ways in which these components comprise the current model is determined by the interpersonal context to which they are applied. What is especially important for persuasion in interpersonal contexts is some means for the immediate cognitive and overt behavior adaptations to the other with respect to a desired goal. The persuader must immediately assess self in relation to other and situation and use this assessment to select from a variety of alternative behaviors the one(s) that will maximize chances of achieving the desired goal. Additionally, the persuader must enact the selected strategy in a convincing manner so as to oblige the other to behave as desired.

Given the demands of the interpersonal communication context, it seems appropriate to ask: how are the components of audience analysis and rhetorical strategy accomplished by the would-be-persuader? An answer to this question may be found in a framework of interpersonal society.

The Self and Interpersonal Society

The perspective presented here represents an integration of two dominant approaches to the self. The first approach is represented by the work of Erving Goffman and emphasizes the self as ceremonially manipulated. The second approach is often referred to as the evaluative dimension of self and has self esteem as its central concept.

The self as ceremonially manipulated. There are, of course, several ways to view the structure of the interpersonal communication. A popular approach, but one that has received relatively little attention in the speech

communication literature, is the perspective implied throughout several works of Erving Goffman. Because of space limitations it is not possible to provide a detailed examination of all of Goffman's work that may be relevant to this paper. However, an attempt is made to glean from selected works (Goffman, 1959; 1963; 1967; 1974) some central concepts and overall logic of Goffman's view of interpersonal society.

Goffman begins his model with the observation that every person lives in a world of social encounters involving him/her in face to face or mediated contact with other people. Often relying on a general dramaturgical approach, Goffman (1967) indicates that in each of these encounters the individual acts out a line:

> . . . that is, a pattern of verbal and nonverbal acts by which he expresses his view of the situation and through this his evaluation of the participants, especially himself [p. 5].

Immediately apparent in Goffman's observation is the assumed reciprocal, transactional nature of social reality.[2] For example, when introducing the central concept of face Goffman (1967) clearly presents it as a function of social interaction:

> Regardless of whether a person intends to take a line, he will find that he has done so in effect. The other participants will assume that he has more or less willfully taken a stand, so that if he is to deal with their response to him he must take into consideration the impression they have possibly formed of him.
>
> The term face may be defined as the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact [p. 5].

And later Goffman (1967) observes that, ". . . the individual must rely on others to complete the picture of him of which he himself is allowed to paint only certain parts [p. 84]."

Indeed, what is critical to Goffman's model is that social actors are morally bound to one another by considerations for face. The balance of the social order depends upon the individual's regard for self (i.e., face) and his/her considerations for other's self. This is perhaps most clearly illustrated in Goffman's (1967) discussion of the network of tacit rules of social obligations and expectations concerning the demonstration of deference and demeanor.

Acts which introduce inconsistencies in regard to one's face and/or another's face are likely to tear a delicately woven social fabric. Moments of embarrassment, for example, are offered as illustrations of how incongruous acts can disrupt a fragile, symbolically-constituted, social reality. Accordingly, the expressive order is sustained by each actor's assumed responsibility for regulating the flow of events that constitute a social encounter. This responsibility is grounded in a concern for face and is demonstrated by the social actor's face-work; that is:

> . . . the actions taken by a person to make whatever he is doing consistent with face. Face-work serves to counteract "incidents"--that is, events whose effective symbolic implications threaten face [Goffman, 1967, p. 12].

Even from this brief sketch of Goffman's model, it is clear that social order is assumed to be fundamentally based upon individuals' regard for self. Moreover, because an individual's self image is partially dependent upon others' interpretations of his/her behavior, social actors are bound to one another so that one's consideration for self must in some way be related to

his/her demonstrated consideration for others' self. Given this model of face to face society, one might ask: why would one expect such a model to work? In other words, what is presupposed by the model?

At the very center of Goffman's model is the concept of face. While Goffman is clear about how individuals ceremonially manipulate face, he is less explicit about why humans engage in face-work or why it may be so fundamental to interpersonal society. However, Ernest Becker (1962) has provided just this rationale in his book titled, The Birth and Death of Meaning.

The significance of self esteem. Becker eloquently argues the premise that a highly developed ego is what separates humans from other animals. By ego, Becker means the acute sense of I which allows for an absolute separateness of self from the environment. Without an ego an animal exists in timelessness. Only humans, says Becker, can untangle a flow of consciousness and relate self to past, present and future, thus fixing a world of events in a point of self-reference.

Becker takes his reader through a fascinating journey of human evolution to support his claim. After briefly discussing the role of selected fundamental biological factors in human evolution, Becker introduces the concept of ego. He first carefully details a Meadian explanation of the acquisition of a concept of self. He then builds upon this by examining in detail the role of the Oedipal transition in human development. Becker argues that it is in the Oedipal Transition where the child exchanges physiological means of supporting the ego for symbolic means; that is, he/she learns to switch modes of maintaining self esteem:

> Self-esteem becomes the child's feeling of self-warmth that all's right in his action world. Thus, the seemingly trite words "self-esteem" are at the very core of human adaptation. Self-esteem is the warm inner feeling

> of self-righteousness that arms the individual against anxiety. The ego has finally come into its own as an effective control when the organism is no longer at the mercy of a stimulus-response relationship to anxiety. The self-esteem is a natural systematic continuation of the early ego efforts to handle anxiety. It is the durational extension in time of an effective anxiety-buffer. . . . Self-esteem is then an integral part of the self-system. If we had to give one definition of "human nature," it would derive from this crucial need: Man is the only animal who needs a symbolic constitution of his worth [Becker, 1962, pp. 79-70].

Throughout Becker's well written discussion of human evolution and ego development he makes one point very clear: humans pay dearly for having a highly developed sense of I. The symbolic world of ego is a self-conscious world. Everything is labeled in reference to the I and once the child enters this world he/she cannot act like other animals. The human must act according to prescription, as opposed to purely instinctual patterns of response. In other words, to avoid anxiety humans must choose the "right" thing to do--". . . life becomes moral and meaningful. Morality is merely a prescription for choice;-and 'meaning' is born as the choice is carried into action [Becker, 1962, p. 51]." As in Goffman, again it is seen that humans are morally bound to one another through concern for face. However, what Becker emphasizes is the fundamental reason for the bond--a desire to avoid anxiety through loss of self esteem.

Elements of the Interpersonal Persuasion Model

To this point the general structure of the interpersonal persuasion model has been discussed. In this section of the paper the more specific elements

of the model are examined in relation to the central focus of the study, namely the identification of some fundamental communication behaviors that seem necessary for the successful application of the model.

The general structure of the interpersonal persuasion model may be summarized by an observation of Ernest Becker (1962). He states:

> The proper word or phrase, properly delivered, is the highest attainment of human interpersonal power. The easy handling of the verbal context of action gives the only possibility of direct exercise of control over others. . . . By verbally setting the tone for action by the proper ceremonial formula, we permit complementary action by our interlocutor. Not only do we permit it, we compel it, if he is to sustain his face. By properly delivering our lines we fulfill our end of the social bargain, and oblige the other to fulfill his in turn [pp. 103-104].

In addition to reinforcing the general model of society discussed in the previous section of the paper, Becker's observation succinctly captures the essential implications for interpersonal persuasion involving the elements of audience analysis and rhetorical strategy. Yet, there are still important, lingering questions concerning this view of interpersonal persuasion. How is such "interpersonal power" obtained? By what means can the persuader select the "proper ceremonial formula" and properly deliver his/her lines in order to "oblige the other to fulfill his" end of the social bargain? In short, what is necessary for the successful application of this approach to interpersonal persuasion?

There appear to be three elements of this model. First, the competent persuader must possess a fair amount of knowledge about the rules of social

behavior that are pertinent to the context of persuasion. The literature on the "rules perspective" often contains conflicting views on the nature and function of rules (see Cushman, 1977; Berger, 1977). However, for purposes of this paper the intricacies of the rule-law controversy are ignored in favor of an approach that might be called a common sense level of understanding. Rules are viewed as having two general functions: constitutive and regulative (Rosenfield, Schultz-Hayes, & Frentz, 1976). Rules operate constitutively by bringing "the game" into existence. They operate regulatively by providing the means for sanctioning behavior. These general functions of rules appear at the very heart of the interpersonal persuasion model. The competent persuader must first determine what "game" is being played. Given this understanding of the constitutive function of rules, the persuader can assess the regulative functions of the appropriate rules. In other words, he/she can attempt to determine the probable limits of the moral binding that unites self and other in a particular moment in time. From the constitutive and regulative rule assessments, the persuader can choose a behavior strategy that may envoke the "proper ceremonial formula" and permit/compel face-sustaining behavior on the part of his/her interlocutor.

The selection of a strategy implies the second element of the persuasion model, a repertoiré of strategies for adapting to various social contexts. As with other learned skills, the more practice an individual has in enacting persuasive strategies, the more likely it is that such strategies can be effectively implemented in appropriate contexts. Interestingly, this element already presupposes some level of knowledge about rules and general social skill. Without some reasonable capacity for such knowledge it would appear unlikely that an individual could acquire data and integrate them systematically to form a repertoiré of strategies.

While an individual's repertoiré of strategies may be quite diverse, the framework of face to face society suggests that specific strategies share a common bond. This bond is expressed in two fundamental orientations that Goffman (1967) considers necessary for competent facework: a defensive orientation toward saving one's own face, and a protective orientation toward saving the other's face. The delicate balance between these orientations is critical to the application of the persuasion model. The persuader can fulfill his/her end of the social bargain and obligate the other to fulfill his/her end in turn only by maintaining this delicate balance.

A third element of the persuasion model is an implied motivation to engage in covert and overt behavior that is intended to achieve desired objectives. The term instructional orientation is used here in reference to this general tendency. It involves the inclination to use language in order to create situations that are conducive to goal attainment, as well as the disposition to take advantage of serendipitous opportunities for goal development and attainment during an interaction.

Social knowledge, repertoiré of strategies and instrumental orientation are the essential elements of the interpersonal persuasion model. However, self esteem must also be considered an intrical aspect of the model. Because self esteem is so central to the framework of face to face society, it is included as a fourth element. Given this model of interpersonal persuasion, it is appropriate to ask: how are the elements of the model related? The remainder of this paper is an initial attempt to explicate some fundamental relationships among the elements and to provide a partial test of these relationships.

Relationships Among the Elements of the Model

As indicated already, self esteem is central to the foundation upon which the framework of face to face society rests and it serves to explain how the interpersonal persuasion model may be expected to work. Accordingly, self esteem is assumed to be related in complex ways to the entire process of interpersonal communication and persuasion. For example, self esteem appears to be a necessary ingredient for the onset of systematic persuasion and also an end result of it. In other words, some degree of self esteem seems necessary for an individual to have enough self confidence for attempting to exert control over the environment. At the same time, the periodic reinforcement from instances of successful goal achievement in turn serves to bolester self confidence and self esteem. The complexity of this relationship seems in part a function of the role that language plays in self esteem development and the doing of persuasion. Language, or more particularly interactions with others, is the basis for humans' development and maintenance of self esteem. Language is also the medium by which interpersonal persuasion is done. Similar complex relationships involving the role of language may be observed with respect to other elements of the model. Accordingly, at this point in the development of the model no attempt is made to propose causal relationships among the elements.

Given this backdrop of complexity, it is expected that self esteem and social knowledge are positively related. In other words, high self esteem individuals are expected to have acquired a greater amount and/or quality of social knowledge. It has been suggested that social knowledge allows the would-be persuader to understand the reality of the communicative context of which he/she is part. In particular, social knowledge was

examined in relation to an individual's assessment of constitutive and regulative dimensions of rules that govern social behavior in general and in specific contexts. It is suggested that self esteem contributes to an individual's social knowledge by providing a sense of self confidence about his/her interpretations of the social phenomena that comprise the reality of moment to moment social interaction. Given this confidence, the social actor can presumably made critical judgments about the social reality (and test them if necessary), thus acquiring a sense of social knowledge that would appear at least qualitatively different from a low self esteem individual.

Because of this relationship between self esteem and social knowledge, both elements are expected to be positively related to a repertoiré of strategies. First, self esteem again serves as the confidence basis for the acquisition and implementation of strategies developed from a variety of experiences in human interaction. Second, social knowledge would presumably be operating at some level during these experiences, as it is an integrating function for repertoiré of strategies. In other words, as the self esteemed individual interacts he/she learns how to behave appropriately (with reference to social rules) and modifies the range and sophistication[3] of his/her social knowledge. The sophistication of one's social knowledge then serves as the basis for a repertoiré of strategies. The more sophisticated the social knowledge, the more diverse and flexible the repertoiré of strategies.

So far it has been suggested that self esteem, social knowledge and repertoiré of strategies are positively related. The remaining element of the model is also expected to be related positively to these elements.

First, the self confidence that goes hand in hand with self esteem is considered necessary to any orientation that points to goal directedness in the social arena. Second, the emphasis on the element of social knowledge in the interpersonal persuasion model is, of course, with respect to obtaining desired goals in social situations. An instrumental orientation toward the social environment would appear necessary for the acquisition of social knowledge with this emphasis. Third, an instrumental orientation would appear presupposed by the element of repertoiré of strategies, since such a repertoiré would likely develop in response to a desire to obtain personal goals. In addition, the likelihood of such a repertoiré being overtly demonstrated would appear to be a function of some motivation for goal attainment and the self confidence necessary to enact such attempts.

At this point in the development of the interpersonal persuasion model the only relational statement that can be made and tested is that the four elements of the model are significantly positively related to each other and success in persuasion. Yet, the explication of these positive relationships has suggested that self esteem and instrumental orientation may be most basic to the model and may perhaps precede the other elements developmentally. In addition, social knowledge may be expected to precede a repertoiré of strategies. However, the current research is not designed to address issues of this nature.

A significant problem in testing the model of interpersonal persuasion is the breath and complexity of each of its elements. This is an especially difficult problem concerning operational definitions. A weakness of this initial test of the model is that some of the operational definitions employed in the research are rather indirect indicants of the

model's elements (i.e., constructs). The measures used and their relationships to the elements of the model will be discussed in a subsequent section of the paper. The hypotheses tested in this study were:

H1: Indicants of the four elements of the interpersonal persuasion model will correlate significantly ($p \leq .05$) positively.

H2: Individuals who demonstrate significantly ($p \leq .05$) more effective interpersonal behavior will score significantly higher on indicants of the elements of the model.

METHOD

Subjects

The subject pool for this study consisted of 258 undergraduate students in four different communication courses at a large, mid-west university. From this sample 42 subjects were selected for participation in the study.[4] There were 22 males and 20 females in the sample.

Procedures

When subjects arrived at the appointed time they were told that the study in which they were participating was concerned with stranger communication patterns. After verifying that the subjects were in fact strangers, they were told that their task would be to participate in a brief conversation about whatever they wanted. Subjects were told that the purpose of the study was to observe how strangers conversed, what topics they discussed and what kind of information they shared. After reading and signing a consent form, one subject was randomly selected to accompany a research assistant to the lab in order to "help set up the video taping equipment" that would be used to record the conversation.

When the assistant and subject left the room, the experimenter informed the remaining subject that an additional dimension of the study was

to learn how readily a person would share information with a stranger that was of a personal nature. The subject was then asked if he/she would assist in this part of the study by attempting to acquire specified information from the other subject during the course of the conversation they were about to have. All subjects agreed to help. They were told that as a reward for assisting in this part of the study they would receive an additional $1.00 payment if they obtained the required information from the other subject. The subject was then randomly assigned one of four information topics and told specifically what information he/she was to obtain. The experimenter and subject then went to the lab where the other subject was waiting.

The subject who left with the research assistant also received (from him or her) the same set of directions as the person who remained with the experimenter. However, by a previous random assignment procedure the subject received a different information topic than his/her partner. By using this procedure, subjects could be given directions individually and neither subject was certain if the other was given an information topic.

Upon arriving at the lab, subjects were seated in comfortable, lounging chairs that faced each other approximately 3 to 4 feet apart. They were given a miniature microphone to clip to a piece of clothing and cameras were adjusted to accommodate subject size. Once the equipment was set, the subjects were told to begin their conversation and the experimenters left the room.

The conversation was observed through a one-way mirror and television monitors. When approximately five minutes elapsed, the conversation was terminated and the subjects were brought to a separate room to complete a set of paper and pencil questionnaires. After completing the questionnaires,

the subjects were debriefed and all subjects received the additional $1.00 payment. They were requested not to discuss the experimental procedures with anyone and were released. The entire session took approximately one hour and each subject was paid a total of $3.00 for participating.

Section I

Independent Variables

Information topics. One hundred and four students (50 males, 54 females) similar to those who participated in the study were used to determine what personal information topics to assign to subjects. The students were provided with a sketch of the study and asked to list at least five topics that they would not discuss or would not want the other to discuss in the situation. The responses were remarkably similar. Sex and grades were listed by 77 percent of the respondents and far out-distanced any others listed. Because these topics appeared so different from the others, they were not used in the study. The four topics selected for the study were listed by approximately 50% of the sample and were quite comparable in their frequency of appearance. The four information topics and the specific information a subject was to obtain are listed below:

1. Religion
   a. What is S's religion (e.g., Baptist, Catholic)?
   b. How religiously active is S (e.g., church attendance, discussion groups)?
2. Politics
   a. With what political party is S affiliated?
   b. How did S vote in the last presidential election?
3. Income
   a. What is S's present source of income and how much is it?
   b. How much annual income does S's parents have?

4. Drugs

a. Does S use any illegal drugs?

b. What are S's views on drug use?

Self esteem. Coopersmith's (1967) scale was used to measure subjects' level of self esteem. The scale has been shown to have convergent, discriminant and predictive validity as well as high reliability. The average item by total score correlation (on 24 items) obtained in this study was .46. The internal reliability of the scale was .87.

It should be emphasized that Coopersmith's (1967) scale is a measure of general self esteem that is based on experiences across a variety of situations. Accordingly, general self esteem should not be assumed to operate the same as face. The later aspect of self esteem is a more situation-bound view of self, whereas general self esteem is the cumulative result of experiences in a variety of situations. Because of this difference between general self esteem and situation self esteem (i.e., face), Coopersmith's scale is only an indirect indicant of the model element. However, it is assumed that the two types of self esteem are sufficiently related to allow the use of the general scale as an indicant of the model.

Social knowledge. The instrument used to estimate subjects' social knowledge was the interaction involvement scale (Cegala, 1979, in press). While not intended as a measure of social knowledge per se, the involvement concept is related to social knowledge in significant ways. Interaction involvement is the extent to which an individual partakes in a social environment. It is concerned with the extent to which an individual directs his/her consciousness toward self and another during interaction. High involvement entails an accounting of (1) alter's behavior

and (2) how alter is perceiving self. In short, interaction involvement is concerned with the extent to which inner feelings, thoughts and experiences are directed to and acting with the phenomena of a social environment, especially the relationship of self and other communicative behavior.

The interaction involvement scale is composed of 18 items that form two major dimensions of involvement: attentiveness and perceptiveness. Attentiveness is concerned with the extent to which individuals direct their senses to objects of the social environment. For example, the following two items represent the attentiveness dimension:

1. My mind wanders during conversations and I often miss what is going on (-).
2. I listen carefully to others during a conversation (+).

The perceptiveness dimension of involvement is derived from what Goffman (1967) considers, in part, necessary for competent face-work. He observes that the social actor must be aware of the meanings/interpretations that others have placed on his/her acts and what meanings/interpretations one ought to place on others' acts. In another work, Goffman (1974) seems to suggest that this perceptiveness is an understanding of, "what's going on." It involves the integration of meanings of self in relation to other and situation. The following items represent the perceptiveness dimension of the interaction involvement scale:

1. In my conversations I really know what's going on; that is, I have a "handle on the situation" (+).
2. Often in conversations I'm not sure what my role is; that is, I'm not sure how I'm expected to relate to others (-).

Together, the dimensions of attentiveness and perceptiveness comprise the concept of interaction involvement. As for its relationship to

social knowledge, it seems that the connection, though indirect, is found in their common bond with language.

Attentiveness and perceptiveness are assumed to be fundamental to competent language use (i.e., communication). Without these elements, it does not seem possible that one could behave functionally in the social arena. In addition, language is assumed to be the constitution and medium of social knowledge. Accordingly, it is possible that attentiveness and perceptiveness are positively related to social knowledge. Assuming the validity of this statement, a measure of interaction involvement was used as an indicant of social knowledge. The greater the individuals' interaction involvement, the more sophisticated the social knowledge.

Repertoiré of strategies. The instrument used to estimate subjects' repertoiré of strategies was a 50 item, self report measure of assertiveness (Galassi, DeLo, Galassi, & Bastien, 1974). The logic for using a measure of assertiveness as an indicant of a repertoiré of strategies is grounded in Goffman's (1967) writings.

As indicated earlier, a central concept for Goffman's view of face-saving strategies is the dual defensive/protective orientation toward face. The defensive orientation is a basic concern individuals demonstrate toward their own face, while the protective orientation is a concern about others' face. While not precisely the same as Goffman's dual orientation, two general dimensions of assertiveness (i.e., positive and negative) appear to be quite similar (see Wolpe & Lazarus, 1966; Wolpe, 1969; Galassi, et al., 1974). Negative assertiveness refers to a general tendency to defend self when it is justifiable to do so. It includes a willingness to engage in disagreements and express displeasure, annoyance and dissatisfaction with others. Positive assertiveness is a tendency to express admiration, respect, affiliation and affection to others.

Because these dimensions of assertiveness appear similar to Goffman's (1967) defensive and protective orientations, assertiveness was considered a reasonable indicant of a repertoire of strategies. Moreover, the view of assertiveness as socially appropriate, goal-oriented communication behavior (see Wolpe & Lazarus, 1966; Wolpe, 1969; Fensterheim & Barer, 1975) seems especially compatible with a perspective on rhetorical strategies that is grounded in a society structured on a system of politeness.

Instrumental orientation. After participating in the five minute conversation, subjects were asked to complete several paper and pencil questionnaires (among them those already reported). One of the questionnaires was designed to elicit information about subjects' perceptions of their behavior in the specific situation in which they had just participated. One of the behaviors of concern on this questionnaire was the subjects' degree of general and specific control over social situations. The question about the extent of general control was used as an indicant of subjects' instrumental orientation. The item was: "How effectively can you generally control/influence social situations to obtain desired goals?" Under this item was a seven point scale ranging from "not at all effective" to "very effective."

The response to this scale was taken as an indicant of a general instrumental orientation because it was assumed that individuals who effectively control/influence situations to obtain desired goals are reasonably motivated to do so, while the opposite may be assumed true for individuals who are less effective. Of course, there are individuals who are generally motivated to acquire personal goals even though they are not especially effective, but it seemed that these individuals may represent the exception rather than the rule.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable was the degree of success each subject had in acquiring the required information from his/her dyad partner. Three coders were used to make this assessment. Each coder read the transcripts of the dyad interactions and made a judgment about the degree of success each subject demonstrated on a 0 to 8 scale. There was an attempt to assess qualitative as well as quantative dimensions of subjects' persuasive behavior with this scale. A value of 0 was assigned if no attempt was made to discuss or obtain topic relevant information. A value of 1 was assigned if the subject made an attempt to obtain topic relevant information, but failed to do so. Values of 2 or 3 were assigned if a subject obtained one or two pieces of information (respectively) by chance (i.e., the subject did not seem to be the agent of the elicitation, rather the dyad partner volunteered the information unprompted). Values of 4 or 5 were assigned if the subject obtained one or two pieces of information (respectively) by direct means (e.g., a blatent question out of context, a sudden topic shift). A value of 6 was assigned if the subject obtained one piece of information by indirect means, 7 if two pieces of information were obtained (one by direct and the other by indirect means), and a value of 8 was assigned if the subject obtained two pieces of information by indirect means.

The difference between direct and indirect means of obtaining the desired information was meant to reflect Goffman's (1967) views of competent face-work. A direct approach consisted of strategies that seemed inappropriately out of context with what was being discussed. The inappropriateness of the behavior was assumed to result in embarassment or general discomfort on the part of the person being questioned, which

subsequently may accompany loss of face for the person and/or the questioner. In contrast to the direct strategy, the indirect strategy involved introducing a topic of discussion relevant to the desired information and using questions and other types of utterances in context to elicit the desired information. An example of the difference between a direct and indirect strategy may be illustrated as follows:

Direct: While talking about courses the subjects were taking one subject says, "By the way, what is your religion?"

Indirect: While talking about courses the subjects were taking, one subject indicates that he/she is currently taking a course in religion and uses this to begin a general discussion about religion. In the context of this discussion the subject either asks his/her partner what is his/her religion or allows the partner a turn at speaking to further discuss the topic of religion. During this speaking turn, the partner may volunteer the desired information or the subject may continue the discussion by taking another speaking turn, and so on until the desired information is obtained in context.

The reliability of the three judges' evaluations using the 8 point scale was $r = .98$. The judges' evaluations were averaged for each subject and a mean was computed on the average scores. These scores were then divided at the mean ($\bar{X} = 4.5$) forming two groups, successful persuaders ($N = 26$) and unsuccessful persuaders ($N = 16$).

Results

Even though there were comparable frequencies with which the 104 students listed the four information topics, it was not clear if the topics were comparable on other relevant dimensions. Accordingly, before the primary analysis was conducted a one way ANOVA was computed on the average judge scores for the four topics. Ten subjects had been randomly assigned to the religion topic and 10 to the politics topic, while 13 subjects received the income topic and 9 subjects received the topic on drugs. The results were non significant ($F = 1.39$, $df = 3.41$, $p = .26$), suggesting that overall subjects were equally effective regardless of the topic they had been assigned.

The results pertinent to hypothesis 1 are reported in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

The correlations reported in Table 1 support the hypothesis that the indicants of the four elements of the persuasion model would correlate significantly positively. All of the obtained correlations are substantively beyond the $p \leq .05$ alpha criterion and demonstrate meaningful shared variance.

The results pertinent to the second hypothesis are reported in Tables 2 and 3. A multiple discriminant analysis was used to test the hypothesis that successful persuaders would score significantly higher on the indicants of the model elements than would unsuccessful persuaders. The results of univariate ANOVAs are reported in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

These data indicate that successful persuaders scored significantly higher on all measures except assertiveness, providing general support for

hypothesis 2. The results of the multivariate discriminant analysis are reported in Table 3. The discrimination function comprised of the

Insert Table 3 about here

four indicants of the model elements was significant at $p<.01$, accounting for 28.7 percent of the variance in subjects' interpersonal persuasion success. The means (i.e., group centroids) of the successful and unsuccessful persuasion groups were -.485 and .789, respectively. The relative weights of the four indicants were: -.880 (control/influence); -.388 (interaction involvement); -.003 (self esteem); and .298 (assertiveness). These weights suggest that the control/influence variable (instrumental orientation) contributed most to the discriminant function, followed by interaction involvement (social knowledge). Self esteem appeared to be a relatively negligible contributor to the function, while assertiveness (repertoire of strategies) contributed to the discriminant function the least of the four variables. The correlations between the discriminant function and the variables are: -.956 (control/influence); -.660 (interaction involvement); -.540 (self esteem); and -.333 (assertiveness).

Overall, the results of the discriminant analysis support hypothesis 2. A further demonstration of the overall prediction of the discriminant model is reported in Table 4. The obtained discriminant function was used in a classification analysis to determine how well it could predict the actual group membership of the 42 subjects. As indicated in Table 4, 81 percent of the subjects were correctly classified as a member of the successful or unsuccessful persuasion groups by the discriminant function.

Insert Table 4 about here

Discussion

While the overall results suggest support for the hypotheses that the four elements of the persuasion model are (1) positively correlated and (2) positively related to successful persuasion, there is a fair amount of equivocality in the data. The indicants used in this study were only indirectly related to the elements of the persuasion model. Accordingly, it is difficult to assess the actual extent to which the model itself has been tested. However, taking this aspect of the study into account, the results point to trends that may be examined in future research.

It would be useful to learn more about the relative contribution of each element to the model. The correlations reported in Table 1 suggest that the variables studied here interrelate in a relatively balanced way (i.e., the magnitudes of the correlations among the variables are quite comparable). However, the variables did not contribute equally to the discriminant function separating the successful and unsuccessful persuasion groups. Self esteem and assertiveness accounted for relatively little of the discrimination power, while control/influence and interaction involvement accounted for most of the discrimination, respectively. Even these results, however, may be viewed in a potentially positive light.

Earlier it was suggested that self esteem and instrumental orientation may be the most fundamental elements of the persuasion model. The results concerning the importance of the control/influence variable suggest support for half of this hypothesis. Although self esteem was not a significant predictor on the discriminant function, two points might be emphasized about this finding. First, general self esteem[5] may indeed be a fundamental element of the model, but perhaps most important at developmental stages. Once the social actor has acquired a baseline level of self esteem

it may become a less predominant factor unless subsequent interactions do not support and bolster the baseline level. Second, and more directly tied to the data of this study, the obtained correlation between self esteem and control/influence was .538. This was the highest correlation involving the control/influence variable. It may be that self esteem and control/influence share enough variance to have relegated self esteem as a light weight predictor of persuasion once the control/influence variable entered the relationship.

Aside from the unexpected lower weights of self esteem, the remaining variables in the discriminant function did suggest the expected ordering. The instrumental orientation indicant weighted heavily and the social knowledge indicant weighted more significantly than the repertoiré of strategies indicant. However, it must be emphasized that the current study was not designed to address questions of the relative importance of the elements of the model. Rather, it was designed to provide a general assessment of the model elements and their combined ability to account for persuasion success. To this extent, the results of the study are viewed positively and as an indicator that further research on the model is warranted. In this regard, additional analyses were computed on situation-bound data that were available in this study. The logic of this approach is based on the assumption that situation-bound data on the four elements of the model may provide further insight into potential relationships among the model elements.

Section II

Independent Variables

The situation-bound variables used as indicants of the persuasion model elements were assessed by items on a post study questionnaire and

two situation-specific versions of the interaction involvement scale. These variables are discussed separately below.

Self esteem. Self esteem was assessed by two items pertaining to subjects' views of the experimental situation. One item asked subjects to indicate the degree of self confidence they felt during the interaction. The second item asked each subject to assess the degree of self confidence manifested by his/her dyad partner. Both scales were seven point, ranging from "not at all self confident" to "very self confident." The actual number used to represent self esteem in the analysis was computed by subtracting the estimation of the partner's self confidence from the indication of one's own self confidence. Thus, positive values indicated greater self confidence in relation to the partner, while negative scores indicated the opposite.

Social knowledge. Subjects completed two versions of the interaction involvement scale that were designed to be situationally bound. The same items were used as the general scale (Cegala, in press), but they were worded so as to apply to the conversation in which the subject had just participated. Subjects completed a situation-bound version of the involvement scale with reference to their own behavior and with reference to their partner's behavior. Total scale sum scores were then subtracted as was done for the self confidence data.

Instrumental orientation. As for self confidence, there were two items on a post study questionnaire that were designed to assess subjects' perceived degree of control over the experimental situation in terms of obtaining desired goals (i.e., the requested information). One item pertained to the subject's own degree of control, while the other item referred to the subject's perception of his/her dyad partner's degree of

control. Again, the data were subtracted as was done for self confidence and interaction involvement.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable was the same one used in the first study except that here it was interpreted as a specific display of rhetorical strategies. Given the manner in which the persuasion behavior was scored, it seemed that the successful and unsuccessful persuasion groups reflected the type of rhetorical strategy used (i.e., the relative degree of face-saving type strategy in terms of direct vs. indirect methods) and the overall success of the strategies employed (i.e., how much of the desired information was obtained).

Results

The results of the univariate ANOVAs for the three independent variables are reported in Table 5. As indicated, the F-ratios for self confidence and control/influence were highly significant, while interaction involvement was not significant. The multivariate discriminant analysis results are reported in Table 6. As expected, the discriminant function was highly significant. However, it is clear from Table 7 that self confidence and control/influence are the major contributors to the discriminant function. The group means on the discriminant function were -.453 and .736 for the successful and unsuccessful persuaders, respectively. The classification program based on the obtained discriminant function correctly classified 71 percent of the subjects into successful or unsuccessful groups.

Insert Tables 5 & 6 & 7 about here

Discussion

The results on the situation specific data tend to support the hypothesis that self esteem and instrumental orientation are fundamental to the persuasion model. The indicants of these elements were highly significant predictors of the type and success of the rhetorical strategies used by subjects to obtain the desired goal information.

Less supportive of the model are the data pertinent to interaction involvement. The situation specific data relevant to involvement did not contribute significantly to the discrimination between persuasion groups. In fact, there was a trend in the opposite direction from what was found in Study I. The discrepancy in findings relevant to the general and specific interaction involvement data is puzzling. The situation specific data may suggest that the subjects in this study had quite different perceptions of each other's degree of involvement in the interaction. If this is the case, the variability of the difference scores (i.e., self involvement-perception of other's involvement) may not be expected to vary systematically with success or failure at persuasion.

Overall, the findings reported in this paper suggest reasonable support for the model of interpersonal persuasion. Considerably more research is required to determine the precise relationships among the elements of the model and how they in turn relate to persuasion success. One step that can be taken in future research is to develop instruments for assessing the elements of the model in a more direct manner than was done here. Such research would presumably result in less equivocal interpretations regarding the elements of the model. An additional direction for future research is to investigate the model in relation to developing communicators. Such research may provide insight into how humans acquire

competencies necessary for the implementation of the persuasion model and what are the relationships among the elements of the model at early stages of development.

Given the general lack of research on interpersonal persuasion, as opposed to persuasion in other communication contexts, this initial investigation is considered to serve primarily a heuristic function. Hopefully, it will stimulate further interest and research on the model of interpersonal persuasion presented here or suggest alternative approaches to the process of face-to-face influence.

NOTES

[1]Some exceptions in the literature are studies in social power and negotiation (e.g., see Steinfatt & Miller, 1974), small group influence processes (e.g., see Collins & Raven, 1969), and studies in c nter-attitudinal behavior (e.g., see Elms, 1969; Miller, 1973).

[2]The constituted nature of social reality is especially considered in Goffman, 1974.

[3]The term "sophistication" is used here as a general reference to the structure of social knowledge. The specific nature of this structure is not yet articulated, but it may have some resemblance to O'Keefe and Delia's (1979) notions of cognitive complexity. In other words, it is probably a system of constructs that may be described in terms of differentiation, integration, abstractness, comprehensiveness and other dimensions.

[4]Subjects were selected on the basis of their scores on one of the measures to be described later on (i.e., the interaction involvement scale). The top and bottom 20 percent of the distribution were selected and matched in dyads containing one high and one low involvement person. The reason for this procedure was grounded in the initial intent of the study which was to explore further the construct o` interaction involvement. This aspect of the research is currently being analyzed and will be reported elsewhere.

[5]It is important to reemphasize that a general level of self esteem was assessed in this study as opposed to how each subject viewed self esteem (face) during, or as a result of, the interaction in which he/she participated. Accordingly, the role of face-saving and face-loss in the

persuasion model should not be considered the same as general self esteem. Certainly the two are assumed to be related, but what happens in a specific situation (i.e., one's perception of face) is most likely only moderately related to one's overall self view across a variety of situations.

REFERENCES

Alberti, R. E., & Emmons, M. L. Your perfect right. San Louis Obispo: Impact, 1970.

Becker, E. The birth and death of meaning. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1962.

Berger, C. R. The covering law perspective as a theoretical basis for the study of human communication. Communication Quarterly, 1977, 25, 7-18.

Burgess, P. Crisis rhetoric: Coercion vs. force. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1972, 59, 61-73.

Cegala, D. J. A model of interpersonal persuasion. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Antonio, TX, November, 1979a.

Cegala, D. J. Fundamentals of persuasive communication. Unpublished manuscript, 1979b. [Available through the Ohio State University Bookstore.]

Cegala, D. J. The role and assessment of prerequisite behaviors in communication instruction. In Larry L. Barker (Ed.), in press.

Collins, B. E., & Raven, B. H. Group structure: Attraction, coalitions, communication, and power. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology (2nd ed., Vol. 4). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1969.

Coopersmith, S. The antecedants of self-esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1967.

Cushman, D. P. The rules perspective as a theoretical basis for the study of human communication. Communication Quarterly, 1977, 25, 30-45.

Elms, A. C. (Ed.), Role playing, reward, and attitude change. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Publishing Company, 1969.

Fensterheim, H., & Baer, J. Don't say yes when you want to say no. New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1975.

Galassi, J. P., DeLo, J. S., Galassi, M. D., & Bastien, S. The college self-expression scale: A measure of assertiveness. Behavic. Therapy, 1974, 5, 165-171.

Goffman, E. The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor, 1959.

Goffman, E. Behavior in public places. New York: The Free Press, 1963.

Goffman, E. Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behavior. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1967.

Goffman, E. Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Miller, G. R. Counterattitudinal advocacy: A current appraisal. In C. D. Mortensen & K. K. Sereno (Eds.), Advances in communication research. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1973.

O'Keefe, B. J., & Delia, J. G. Construct comprehensiveness and cognitive complexity as predictors of the number and strategic adaptation of arguments and appeals in a persuasive message. Communication Monographs, 1979, 46, 231-240.

Rosenfield, L. W., Hayes, L., & Frentz, T. S. The communicative experience. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976.

Steinfatt, T. M., & Miller, G. R. Communication in game theoretic models of conflict. In G. R. Miller & H. W. Simons (Eds.), Perspectives on communication in social conflict. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.

Wolpe, J. The practice of behavior therapy. New York: Pergamon Press, 1969

Wolpe, J., & Lazarus, A. A. Behavior therapy techniques: A guide to the treatment of neuroses. New York: Pergamon Press, 1966.

Table 1

Pearson Correlations Among the Four Indicants of the Model Elements

	INDICANTS			
Indicants	Interaction Involvement	Assertiveness	Control/Influence	Self Esteem
Interaction Involvement (Social Knowledge)	1.00	.64[a]	.52[a]	.59[a]
Assertiveness (Repertoire of Strategies)		1.00	.43[b]	.56[a]
General Control/ Influence (Instrumental Orientation)			1.00	.54[a]
Self Esteem				1.00

[a] r is significant at $p<.0004$, one-tailed, 40 df.

[b] r is significant at $p<.005$, one-tailed, 40 df.

Table 2

Univariate ANOVA Results for Each of the Model Element Indicants

Indicant	Mean SPG	Mean UPG	Standard Deviation SPG	Standard Deviation USP	F	df	Probability	% of Variance Accounted For
Interaction Involvement (Social Knowledge)	98.65	81.62	19.90	20.82	7.003	1/40	.01	14.54
Assertiveness (Repertoire of Strategies)	131.88	122.44	21.58	23.37	1.782	1/40	.19	4.16
Control/ Influence (Instrumental Orientation)	5.73	4.43	0.92	1.26	14.710	1/40	.0004	26.24
Self Esteem	19.19	16.06	3.97	5.37	4.693	1/40	.04	10.25

Table 3

Summary of the Multivariate Discriminant Analysis on the Persuasion Groups

Eigenvalue	Canonical Correlation	R^2	Wilks' Lamda	Chi Square	df	Probability
.4021	.536	28.7	.7132	12.844	4	.01

Table 4

Results of the Classification Analysis

Group	Correctly Predicted	Incorrectly Predicted
Successful Persuaders	23 (88.5%)	3 (11.5%)
Unsuccessful Persuaders	11 (68.8%)	5 (31.3%)
TOTAL	34 (80.95)	8 (19.05)

Table 5

Univariate ANOVA Results for Each Situation Specific Indicant

Variable	Mean SPG	Mean UPG	Standard Deviation SPG	Standard Deviation UPG	F	df	Probability	% of Variance Accounted For
Self Confidence	.577	-.812	1.837	1.276	7.031	1/40	.011	14.59
Control/Influence	.423	-1.625	1.793	2.217	10.780	1/40	.002	20.73
Interaction involvement	-7.731	-2.562	15.304	12.707	1.279	1/40	.265	3.02

Table 6

Summary of the Discriminant Analysis Using Situation Specific Variables

Eigenvalue	Canonical Correlation	R^2	Wilk's Lamda	Chi Square	df	Probability
.3499	.509	.259	.7407	11.554	3	.009

Table 7

Discriminant Function Coefficients and Correlations With the Variables

Variable	Coefficient on Discriminant Function	Correlation Between Discriminant Function and the Variables
Control Influence	-.8105	-.8777
Self Confidence	-.6105	-.7087
Interaction Involvement	-.4766	.3022