ED 453 567                                                    CS 510 582

AUTHOR          Hanson, Erika J.; Pollard, Gloria D.; Williams, Christina M.
TITLE           Persuasion Tactics Used by College Age Females on College
                Age Males.
PUB DATE        1999-12-08
NOTE            30p.
PUB TYPE        Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE      MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS     *College Students; Communication Research; *Dating (Social);
                Higher Education; *Interpersonal Communication; *Nonverbal
                Communication; *Persuasive Discourse; Verbal Communication
IDENTIFIERS     *Communication Behavior

ABSTRACT
                This paper researched persuasive tactics used by college age
females on college age males. Previous evidence indicates that nonverbal
persuasion is more effective than verbal persuasion. The topics explored in
previous research on persuasion consisted of physical attractiveness,
indirect knowledge of influence, tactics used by children and college age
students, tactics used by women in different cultures, stereotypical tactics,
and gender influence on persuasion. To date, there has been an absence of
research on dating and single college age females and their use of nonverbal,
verbal, liking and authoritative persuasion techniques on college age males,
leading to the topics researched in this study. It was concluded that the
nonverbal and liking persuasion techniques were the most effective. This
study also found that females in relationships do not always get their way
more often than females who are not in relationships. (Contains 52
references. Appendixes contain three versions of survey instruments.)
(Author/RS)

Running Head: PERSUASION

Persuasion tactics used by college age

females on college age males.

By: Erika J. Hanson, Gloria D. Pollard, and Christina M. Williams

c/o Dr. Daniel C. Davis, Ph.D.

Marist College

Communication Studies Department

290 North Road, LT 213

Poughkeepsie, NY 12601-1387

(914) 575-3000, ext. 2878

Persuasive tactics used by college age females on college age males

Abstract

This paper researched persuasive tactics used by college age females on college

age males. Previous evidence indicates that nonverbal persuasion is more effective than

verbal persuasion. The topics explored in previous research on persuasion consisted of

physical attractiveness, indirect knowledge of influence, tactics used by children and

college age students, tactics used by women in different cultures, stereotypical tactics, and

gender influence on persuasion. To date, there has been an absence of research on dating

and single college age females and their use of nonverbal, verbal, liking and authoritative

persuasion techniques on college age males, leading to the topics researched in this study.

It was concluded that the nonverbal and liking persuasion techniques were the most

effective. This study also found that females in relationships do not always get their way

more often than females who are not in relationships.

Introduction

"Persuasion involves a conscious effort at influencing the thoughts or actions of a receiver" (Bettinghaus & Cody, 1994, p.5). Researchers have studied persuasion for many years and have found that nonverbal communication plays an effective role in persuasion. Such studies focused on physical attractiveness, persuasion within a relationship, personalities, and manipulation without knowledge of influence. Verbal communication also plays an effective role in persuasion; however, nonverbal communication can affect one subconsciously, which has been proven to be more influential. Researchers have long examined the many aspects of persuasion, focusing on specific age and sex groups. This study will compensate where previous research was weak or non-existent by focusing on college age females and their persuasion tactics when influencing college age males.

Literature Review

Manipulation Without Direct Knowledge of Influence

"Influence refers to a power that affects a person or a course of events, usually indirectly or intangibly" (Ross, 1985, p. 2). A very effective form of persuasion is influence without the direct knowledge of the participant. Bornstein's (1989) study done on exposure to stimuli without the direct knowledge of influence compared simple stimuli to complex stimuli. Six out of the nine studies, all comparing a person's attitude variance after being exposed to simple versus complex stimuli, found that the more complex and interesting the stimuli, the more positively effective it was. Therefore, when unfamiliar stimuli in a commercial is presented while a person is watching a favorite

television program, the unfamiliar stimuli is correlated with the positive effect of the television program making this unfamiliar stimuli also positive. "Repeated exposure to stimulus causes increased liking of that stimulus" (Zajonc, 1968, as cited in Gordon & Holyoak, 1983, p.492).

In another attempt to find the effects of exposure without the participants' realization, Wilson (1979) had participants listen to a distracter message in one ear while a hidden message was being sent to the other ear. As a result, the participants learned the information that was subliminally sent to them. Borstein, Leone and Galley (1987) found that people learn information even though they do not consciously know that they are learning. Therefore, both studies show that information sent to people, without their direct knowledge of the message transmission, is effective.

<div align="center">Different Age Groups</div>

The following studies looked at persuasion tactics within different age groups. Kline and Clinton (1998) found that the various age groups use alternate persuasion tactics. Cowan, Drinkard and MacGavin (1984) asked 6th, 9th, and 12th graders to describe how they would persuade their mother, father, and a friend into doing something they wanted to do, but the other person did not. Females tended to use more types of persuasion tactics when influencing their parents than the males. Also, both females and males tend to use stronger strategies when trying to persuade a friend than when trying to persuade a parent, which contradicts Woodward and Denton's (1988) findings that "Increased age usually makes persuasion more difficult" (p.143). Harrington (1997) found that the most common strategy used by college age persuaders was making a simple offer. Aguinis, Nesler, Hosoda, and Tedeschi (1994) found that college age males

and females "would be most likely to use rational appeals, somewhat less likely to use ingratiation, even less likely to use assertiveness, and least likely to use exchange" (p.431).

Falbo and Peplau (1980) studied 127 lesbians, 151 gay men, 90 heterosexual women, and 66 heterosexual men who were undergraduate college students, and asked them about their backgrounds, attitudes, and sexual/romantic relationships. This study showed that both homosexual men and heterosexual women tend to use manipulation and supplication (crying, pleading, etc.). Heterosexual men tend to feel that they influence their partners with strength and power, whereas heterosexual women tend to feel their influence strategies are based on weaker and subordinate tactics. Buss (1992) found that females use manipulation tactics such as silent treatment, charm, reason and debasement to get their way with their significant others. However, when persuading their friends, mothers and fathers, they use coercion. Dunn and Cowan (1993) surveyed American and Japanese undergraduate female students, finding that Japanese women used strong strategies more than American women did. Most American women used more stereotypical female strategies such as manipulation, sexuality and positive behavior as opposed to the controlled emotion and persistence strategies that were more widely used by Japanese women.

<div align="center">Relationships</div>

Many studies were done on persuasion tactics used within intimate relationships such as Buss, Gomes, Higgins and Lauterbach (1987), who examined 67 college undergraduates who are in relationships. The result was that the less similar and less well matched the couple, the more frequently they used the silent treatment, debasement, and

reason tactics. The well-matched couples used these same tactics, but less frequently. Cataldi and Reardon (1996) also studied the persuasion tactics used in relationships. They discovered that males use tactics in which they can take advantage of the stereotypical power that they hold over women. The women tend to use tactics that make up for their lack of power.

Howard, Blumstein, and Schwartz's (1986) study indicates that heterosexual women and homosexual men tend to use manipulation and supplication, like Falbo and Peplau (1980) had found, as dominant strategies in persuading their partners whether in a relationship or not. The reasoning behind such similar strategies is concluded to be that heterosexual women and homosexual men both have male partners who are characterized as being the more powerful individual in a sexual relationship. This is also prevalent in a homosexual male/male relationship because past studies have found that one male always takes on a more dominant role and the other one a more feminine role.

Johnson and Eagly (1989) looked to see if there is a coincidence between the persuasibility of people in relationships and how the relationships were formed. The results showed all relationship formations had similar outcomes. Participants who were highly involved in the relationship were less persuaded than participants who had low involvement in their relationships. This corresponds with LittleJohn and Jabusch's (1987) theory that "relational identification is an important source of power, which is why the person least committed to a relationship may have more power than the person who most wants the relationship to endure" (p.123).

## Sex Groups

A person's sex and its power to influence seem to be a widely studied area. Men and women differ in how influential and easily persuaded they are. Men are generally more influential and women are more easily influenced (Eagly, 1983). In contrast, Pascal (1998, as quoted in Auletto, 1998) states, "women's power is a little more manipulative than men's. But women are trained to be manipulative. Men are more fragile" (p.76). Carli (1999) looks at the power that males and females have and the influence differences in their levels of influence. It proves that males have more expert and legitimate power while females are evaluated more favorably and are more liked. It also found that females use more assertive and indirect persuasion tactics as opposed to males who use more interpersonal warmth and agreeableness to persuade. In compliance with this, Johnson (1976) proves that males use strong aggressive type tactics and display a powerful influence, whereas females use weak indirect type tactics based upon personal reward and sexuality.

According to Stiff (1994) and Woodward and Denton (1988), women are ordinarily more susceptible to be persuaded than men. Instone, Major and Bunker (1983) found that when females were placed in an authoritative role they made fewer persuasion attempts and used less strategies then males. One last area of persuasion tactics looked at how women used their sexuality to persuade men who were reluctant to have sex with them. Clements-Schrieber, Rempel, and Desmarais (1998) found that women not only believe that they have the sexual power to get a man to do what they want, but also they are willing to use as many different tactics as possible to get a reluctant partner into bed.

Nonverbal behavior and a person's sex have a legitimate effect on a person's ability to be persuaded. Carli (1995), tested to see how a female or a male using nonverbal behavior styles would influence the participants. The participants were influenced more when the liking nonverbal styles were used compared to the authoritative styles. Males tend to see that the liking nonverbal tactics are more important for female speakers. Burgoon, Birk, and Pfau's (1990) study found that vocal pitch and body movements are a key role in persuading a college audience. Hawkins, Latkin and Mandel (1999) also found that nonverbal persuasion is more effective than verbal.

<div align="center">Personality</div>

Personality is an aspect of nonverbal behavior that is indirectly involved in persuasion. Most persuasion theories verify that different personalities are a part of the persuasion process (Bostrom, 1983). Weitz (1974, as cited in Henley, 1977) found that females change their behavior based on a male's personality. For example, if a male is more dominant, the female would use more nonverbal tactics such as facial focus to make up for her lack of power. Hovland's (1959) study involving high school juniors proves that personality and level of self- esteem influence a person's susceptibility of being persuaded. For example, people who are easy going are more easily persuaded and people who are aggressive are better persuaders. This coincides with Bickman (1974), who found that a person dressed as an authoritative figure such as a guard received the most compliance from people.

According to Cialdini (1993), there is a social rule in which it is an "obligation to make a concession to someone who has made a concession to us" (p.37). His reasoning behind this rule is that in society it is in the best interest of people who have the same

goals to work together in order to reach them. In compliance with Cialdini (1993),

Burger and Petty (1981) also found that in order to do this people will have to

compromise; compromising is part of making concessions.

Cialdini and Ascani (1976) used the concession technique, which they referred to

as the rejection-then-retreat technique, to try to persuade participants to give blood. The

results were that the participants agreed to give blood more often when they thought the

requester was making a concession. This is an example of persuasion without the

knowledge of being persuaded. Participants do not realize that the requester is not

interested in the first favor. Schwarzwald, Raz and Zribel (1979) and Brownstien and

Katzev (1985) both looked at the "door-in-the-face technique," finding that this was an

effective persuasion tactic.

<div align="center">Physical Attractiveness</div>

There has been a plethora of research done focusing on the power of physical

attractiveness when a person is trying to persuade. Larrance and Zuckerman (1981) found

that physical attractiveness does enhance social and persuasability skills. Chaiken (1987)

studied how physical attractiveness influences persuasion by having both physically

attractive and unattractive males and females give a persuasive speech in order to

convince the target audience to sign a petition. This resulted in the physically attractive

male and female communicators receiving more signatures on the petition than the

unattractive communicators, proving that physical attractiveness plays a significant role

in nonverbal persuasion. Reingen and Kernan (1993) found that the more physically

attractive salespeople were treated more cordially, and that physical attractiveness makes

a difference when persuading a member of the opposite sex.

Also looking at physical attractiveness, Eagly, Ashmore, Longo, and Makhijani (1991) looked at the common phrase "what is beautiful is good" (p. 109). This study showed that the physical attractiveness stereotype was not as strong as the implications that can be drawn from the phrase "what is beautiful is good." This phrase implies that whatever is attractive is positive. Benson, Karabenic, and Lerner (1976) focused on the influence that physical attractiveness has when a person needs help by leaving filled out applications each with a different picture of the applicant and a stamped and addressed envelope at a phone booth in a large airport. The results were that more of the applications with a picture of an attractive person were mailed out than applications with a picture of an unattractive person. The conclusion was that attractive people are more likely to receive help than unattractive people.

Shavitt, Swan, Lowrey and Waenke (1994) and Kenrick and Gutierres (1980) looked at how physical attractiveness in the media influences the judgment of physical attractiveness in society. Kenrick and Gutierre's study proved that the physical attractiveness of females in the media has a subconscious influence on adolescent males in their judgment of a typical female. Gonzales, Davis, Loney, LuKens and Junghans (1983) looked at how attracted a participant was to a stranger who had an attitude similar to his/hers, as opposed to a stranger who had a dissimilar attitude. Results showed that participants were more attracted to strangers who had similar attitudes, which mirrors Stiff's (1994) statement "Though indirect, the influence of attitude similarity on perceived trustworthiness can enhance the persuasiveness of message sources" (p. 103). Barnes and Rosenthal (1985) tested whether or not apparel had anything to do with

persuasion on participants. Results proved that physically attractive, well dressed people were seen as more successful than unattractive and poorly dressed people.

Waldron and Applegate (1998) took 80 undergraduate students from introductory communication courses and examined their persuasive speaking techniques to see what influenced people more. The results showed that the effect of physical attractiveness in persuading a person needed further study and also that the entire study itself needed more research in order to come to a definite conclusion.

<div align="center">Verbal</div>

Persuasion tactics through the use of verbal communication has been a very researched topic. Maynard (1996) found begging to be an ineffective tactic of persuasion. Howard's (1990) study found that participants were more likely to give a donation if they were first asked how they were, they responded, and then the requester acknowledged their response. Woodward and Denton (1988) also found that "audiences seek messages of agreement rather than disagreement. Thus, audiences generally begin with a favorable predisposition toward the speakers message" (p.143). The requesters received more donations using this technique then when they did not respond to the participant. So many participants, after being coerced into saying how they felt, gave a donation in order to live up to their word. "Asking people to predict whether they will perform a socially desirable action appears to increase their probability of performing the action" (Greenwald, Carnot, Beach, & Young, 1987, p. 315). This verbal persuasion technique influenced the participant with the participant's knowledge (Howard, 1990). Another example of this is Murphy's (1998) study that found that after reading a textbook students tend to conform their opinions to the authors.

<div align="center">12</div>

## Summary

Previous research conducted on persuasion examined the areas of physical attractiveness on persuasion, influence without knowledge of persuasion, persuasion tactics used by children, women in different cultures, and the influence that a person's sex has on persuasion. Physical attractiveness and other nonverbal tactics have been found to be the most effective tactics in persuasion. Influence without the knowledge of persuasion was also found to be very effective. Unlike these studies, the present study focuses on college age females' persuasive tactics used on college age males to get them to do something out of the ordinary.

## Hypotheses

$H_1$: Through the use of nonverbal tactics of persuasion, the college age female will be more effective in persuading the college age male than through the use of verbal persuasion tactics.

$H_2$: College age females within relationships will have an easier time persuading their opposite sex partners than college age females who are not in a relationship.

$H_3$: College age females will be more effective in persuading by using the liking persuasive method as opposed to the authoritative method.

## Methodology

This study was conducted at a small liberal arts college in the Mid-Hudson valley in the northeastern United States. Data was collected by using surveys (see Appendix A), focus groups (see Appendix B), and logs (see Appendix C) using convenient sampling.

Surveys were distributed on November 11,1999. Focus groups were conducted on November 20,1999. Logs were distributed on November 14,1999 and collected on November 21,1999. The date and time of the year are irrelevant to the results of this research paper.

The average age of the participants who filled out the survey was 18.77 years of age. Of the 221 participants, 9 (4%) were 17, 80 (36%) were 18, 92 (42%) were 19, 26 (12%) were 20, 9 (4%) were 21, 2 (.9%) were 22, and 3 (1%) were missing. One hundred and twenty-two of the participants were female (55%) leaving 96 (43%) male and 3 (1%) that did not specify their sexual identification. The majority of the participants (69%) were Caucasian, 9% were Hispanics, 9% were African-American, .5% selected the "other" options, .9% were Asians, and 8% were missing. The participants were conveniently selected from the four undergraduate classes. Of the participants studied 105 (48%) were sophomore, 85 (39%) were freshmen, 13 (6%) were juniors, 8 (4%) were seniors, and 10 (5%) were not applicable.

The focus groups conducted consisted of five males and five females. The participants were conveniently selected from the four undergraduate classes. The logs collected data from conveniently selected single and dating college age students from the undergraduate classes. Of the 200 logs distributed, 21 were completed from the freshmen and sophomore classes. All the participants who filled out surveys and logs and participated in focus groups were aware that they were taking part in this research.

## Analysis

This research was conducted using SPSS (windows for PC 8.0) on a 350 MHz IBM Activa PC Computer using a Pentium II processor.

## Quantitative Results

The results were obtained from the surveys in order to prove or disprove the hypotheses using the ANOVA test. In order to verify $H_1$, the significance between the variables of sex and physical attractiveness, sex and intelligence, and sex and a person's reputation was examined. $H_2$ examined the participant's relationship status with how often the participants get their own way, how easily they are persuaded, and their level of persistence. The variables looked at for $H_3$ were participant's sex and how aggressiveness affects how much the participant is persuaded.

The results for $H_1$ that show how a person views physical attractiveness, from a scale of always to not at all, were found to be significantly different in terms of a persons sex, $F_{1,216} = 7.76$, p= .006, $eta^2 = .035$. Males were found to be more persuaded by physical attractiveness, M= 2.69, SD= 1.50 (N=96), than females, M= 3.24, SD= 1.40 (N=122). The extent to which intelligence affects how easily a participant is persuaded, using a scale from always to not at all, was found to have no significance in terms of a participants sex, $F_{1,215} = .213$, p= .645, $eta^2 = .001$. Being male M= 2.77, SD= 1.53 (N= 95) or female M= 2.68, SD= 1.27 (N= 122), does not have any significance when it comes to being persuaded by a person's intelligence. How much a participant is persuaded by a person's reputation, from a scale of always to not at all, was found to be statistically insignificant, $F_{1,214} = 1.18$, p= .278, $eta^2 = .005$. There was no correlation

15

between males M= 3.49, SD= 1.75 (N= 94) and females M= 3.75, SD= 1.69 (N=122) when it comes to being influenced by a person's reputation.

For $H_2$ it was found that how often participants got their own way, in a scale from never to always, was significantly different in terms of a person's relational status, $F_{2, 210}$= 3.62, p= .028, eta$^2$= .033. Males and females who were married M= 4.25, SD= .050 (N= 4), and those who were dating, M= 3.63, SD= .831 (N=89), were found to get their own way more than males and females not in a relationship, M= 3.40, SD= .842 (N=120). How easily a person is persuaded, on a scale from always to never, was found to be insignificant in terms of a participant's relational status, $F_{2,211}$= .994, p= .372, eta$^2$= .009. So, whether a person is married M=3.75, SD= .957 (N= 4), dating M= 3.17, SD= 3.908 (N= 89), or single M= 3.12, SD= .862, (N= 121), there is no significance with how easily a participant is persuaded. The participant's level of persistence, on a scale from never give in to always give in, was found to have no significance in terms of a participant's relational status, $F_{2,212}$= .952, p= .388, eta$^2$= .009. Being married M= 1.75, SD= .500 (N= 4), dating M= 2.35, SD= .867 (N= 89) or single M= 2.39, SD= .975 (N=122) is not a factor in a participant's level of persistence.

The results for $H_3$ found that the extent to which a participant is persuaded by aggressiveness, using a scale of always to not at all, has no significance in terms of a person's sex, $F_{1,216}$= .397, p= .530, eta$^2$= .002. Therefore, being either male M= 3.42, SD= 1.67 (N=96) or female M=3.56, SD= 1.61 (N=122) has no impact on how persuaded a participant is by aggressiveness.

Qualitative Results

The first focus group that was conducted was made up of five male participants. All five participants said that the characteristic of a female that influences them the most is physical attractiveness. Other characteristics that also influence them are a female's personality and her intelligence. The five participants also agreed that they do not always give in more easily when they are in a relationship because they feel more comfortable saying "no" to their girlfriends than to their friends. It was also unanimous that the participants would rather give in to a friendly person than a bossy person.

In the all female focus group, all five participants agreed that crying is a very effective persuasion tactic. Participant # 3 said that she often gets easily upset in order to get her own way. Participant # 5 said that she uses the silent treatment to get what she wants. All of the participants agreed that they do not have to be as persistent with their boyfriends as with their friends. They also all agreed that they are more persuaded by a friendly person than a bossy person.

Of the 200 logs distributed, 21 were completed and looked at. Each of the participants wrote about at least one of the following techniques: nonverbal, verbal, liking, and authoritative persuasion techniques. From the 38 situations that were contained in the 21 logs, 20 (53%) had examples of nonverbal tactics and 18 (47%) had examples of verbal tactics. Out of the 21 logs that were completed, 14 (88%) had examples of the liking technique and 2 (12%) had examples of the authoritative technique.

## Discussion

The results found from the surveys, focus groups, and logs both supported and questioned the three hypotheses. For $H_1$ the results show that males are more persuaded by physical attractiveness (a non-verbal trait) than females. Males are more influenced by females who are physically attractive than females who are not physically attractive. This shows that males are strongly influenced by this non-verbal tactic. Results from the surveys also show that there is no significant relationship between a participant's intelligence and sex and a participant's reputation and sex. Since these two verbal characteristics were found to be unrelated to a participant's sex, males are not more influenced by these characteristics than females. This supports $H_1$ that it is more effective for females to use non-verbal tactics than verbal tactics when persuading males.

Evidence supporting $H_1$ was also found in the focus groups. In the all-male focus group, there was a consensus with all the participants that males are persuaded a lot by physical attractiveness. In the all-female focus group, it was unanimous with all the participants that the most effective persuasion tactic was crying, which is a nonverbal tactic. Participant # 4 said that girls are also good at "whining when they do not get their own way."

Further evidence supporting $H_1$ was also found in the logs. One female participant wrote that she cried over the phone to her boyfriend in order to get him to pick her up, and he agreed. This is another example of the effectiveness of the non-verbal persuasion tactics. Another female participant wrote about the time that she was collecting money for a fund-raiser. Whenever she was asking for donations from males, she made a sad face and they agreed to donate. A male participant wrote that a female

persuaded him to dance with her by giving him "puppy dog" eyes. In both of these cases, facial expressions, which are a non-verbal tactic, were used. This supporting evidence concludes that non-verbal persuasion tactics are more effective than verbal persuasion tactics.

Results from the surveys looked at for $H_2$ show that participants who are in a relationship get their way more often than participants who are not in a relationship. This supports $H_2$, which stated that females within a relationship have an easier time persuading their partners of the opposite sex than females who are not in a relationship. The results also found that a participant's persuasiveness and level of persistence are not significantly related to their relational status.

Evidence from the focus groups shows a contradiction. In the all-male focus group, all five participants agreed that since they feel more comfortable saying "no" to their girlfriends, they are more easily persuaded by a friend. Participant # 4 said that he went on the zipper ride at an amusement park with a female friend even though roller coasters make him sick. Since the female was not his girlfriend, he felt bad saying "no," so he went even though he did not want to. However, in the all-female focus group there was a consensus that females do not have to be as persistent with their boyfriends as they are with their friends. Support for this can be found in the logs. One female wrote that she simply asked and her boyfriend agreed to drive an hour and a half out of the way to pick her up.

There is a discrepancy between the results of the surveys and the results from the focus groups and logs. The surveys, the female focus group, and the logs supported $H_2$ while the male focus group contradicted $H_2$. From this evidence, $H_2$ is not completely

supported. It is unclear whether or not people in a relationship get their own way more often than people who are not in a relationship.

Looking at results for H₃ evidence was found in both the focus groups and logs, showing that the liking persuasive technique is more effective than the authoritative technique. In both the male and female focus groups, the majority of the participants agreed that they are more likely to be persuaded by a friendly person. In the all-female focus group, participant # 5 said that she was more persuaded by a friendly person because she "does not like to be told what to do." In the logs, the majority of the participants wrote about the use of the liking technique. One example was by a female who wrote that she got her male friend to call her by "using sweet talk and pleases." This evidence shows that participants are more easily persuaded by the liking technique as opposed to the authoritative technique.

Consistent with previous findings, this study found that physical attractiveness is a large factor in the persuasion process. Also, this study found that females use indirect persuasion tactics such as crying and the silent treatment in order to get their way in a relationship. The results from this study can be used by a female to determine the best persuasive tactics in order to get what she wants from a college age male. Males can utilize these findings in order to learn what persuasive tactics females use on them.

Caveats

Some of the limitations on this study were that the research was done at a small liberal arts school in the northeastern United States. The participants involved in the research were of only the four undergraduate classes, mainly sophomores, and a large

majority was Caucasian. The methods used were only non-manipulative; surveys, focus groups and logs. Also, the third focus group involving both males and females was not as effective as the separate groups because the same questions were asked. Therefore, many of the participants failed to respond because they had already done so. The results of the logs might be more substantial if more had been completed. Another limitation was that all four members of the research team are female, possibly creating a bias in how the research was conducted and interpreted.

## Implications for Further Research

This study focused on college age females' persuasion tactics. For future research, it might be interesting to examine the college age males' persuasion tactics on the college age female. Also, this study found that people in a relationship use more verbal tactics then those who are single. Future research could be done in order to discover why people in a relationship use more verbal tactics and to find out if they have a better success rate then those in a relationship who use nonverbal tactics. This study focused on qualitative research to find the liking method more influential then the authoritative method. Future research may focus on quantitative methods. Another possibility for future research is to use a manipulative experiment.

References

Aguinis, H., Nesler, M. S., Hosoda, M., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1994). The use of influence tactics in persuasion. The Journal of Social Psychology, 134, 429-434.

Auletto, K. (1998, April 20). Annals of communication in the company of women. The New Yorker. p. 76.

Barnes, M. L., & Rosenthal, R. (1985). Interpersonal effects of experimenter attractiveness, attire, and gender. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 435-446.

Benson, P. L., Karabenic, S. A., & Lerner, R. M. (1976). The effects of pretty pleases: The effects of physical attractiveness on race, sex, and receiving help. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 12, 409-415.

Bettinghaus, E. P. & Cody, M. J. (1994). Persuasive Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bickman, L. (1974). The social power of a uniform. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 4, 47-61.

Bornstein, R. F. (1989). Exposure and effects: Overview and meta-analysis of research. Psychological Bulletin, 106, 265-289.

Bornstein, R. F., Leone, D. R., & Galley, D. S. (1987). The Generalizability of subliminal mere exposure effects: Influence stimuli perceived without awareness on social behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 1070-1079.

Bostrom, R. N. (1983). Persuasion. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Brownstein, R. J. II., & Katzev, R. D. (1985). The relative effectiveness of three compliance techniques in eliciting donations to a cultural organizations. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 15, 564-574.

Burger, J. M., & Petty, R. E. (1981). The low-ball compliance technique: Task or person committment? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 492-500.

Burgoon, J. K., Birk, T., & Pfau, M. (1990). Nonverbal behavior, persuasion, and credibility. Human Communication Research, 17, 140-169.

Buss, D. M. (1992). Manipulation in close relationships: Five personality factors in interactional context. Journal of Personality, 60, 477-498.

Buss, D. M., Gomes, M., Higgins, S. & Lauterbach, K. (1987). Tactics of manipulation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 1219-1229.

Cataldi, A., & Reardon, R. (1996). Gender, interpersonal orientation, and manipulation tactic use in close relationships. Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 35, 205-219.

Carli, L. L. (1995). Nonverbal behavior, gender, and influence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 1030-1041.

Carli, L. L. (1999). Gender, interpersonal power, and social influences. Journal of Social Issues, 55, 81-98.

Chaiken, S. (1987). Communicator physical attractiveness and persuasion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1387-1397.

Cialdini, R. B., & Ascani, K. (1976). Test of concession procedure for inducing verbal behavioral and further compliance with a request to give blood. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 295-300.

Cialdini, R. B., (1993). Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion. New York: Qwill.

Clements-Schrieber, M. E., Rempel, J. K., & Desmarais, S. (1998). Women's sexual pressure tactics and adherence to relate attitudes: A step toward prediction. The Journal of Sex Research, 35, 197-205.

Cowan, G., Drinkard, J., & MacGavin, L. (1984). The effects of target, age, and gender on use of power strategies. Journal of Personality, 47, 1391-1398.

Dunn, K. F., & Cowan, G. (1993). Social influence strategies among Japanese and American college women. Psychological of Women Quarterly, 17, 39-52.

Eagly, A. H. (1983). Gender and social influence: a social psychological analysis. American Psychologist, 38, 971-981.

Eagly, A. H., Ashmore, R. A., Longo, L. C., Makhijani, M. C. (1991). What is beautiful is good...: A meta-analytic review of research on the physical attractiveness stereotype. Psychological Bulletin, 110, 109-128.

Falbo, T., & Peplau, L. A. (1980). Power strategies in intimate relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 618-628.

Gonzales, M. H., Davis, J. M., Loney, G. L., LuKens, C. K., & Junghans, C. M. (1983). Interactional approach to interpersonal attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Pyschology, 44, 1192-1197.

Gordon, P.C., & Holyoak, K. J. (1983). Implicit learning and generalization of the "mere exposure" effect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 492-500.

Greenwald, A. G., Carnot, C. G., Beach, R., & Young, B. (1987). Increasing voting behavior by asking people if they expect to vote. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 315-318.

Harrington, N. G. (1997). Strategies used by college students to persuade peers to drink. The Southern Communication Journal, 62, 229-242.

Hawkins, W. E., Latkin, C., & Mandel, A. (1999). Do actions speak louder than words? Perceived peer influences on needle sharing and cleaning in a sample of injection drug users. AIDS Education and Prevention, 11, 122-131.

Henley, N. M. (1977). Body Politics: Power, Sex and Nonverbal Communication. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hovland, C. I. (1959). Personality and Persuability. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Howard, D. J. (1990). The influence of verbal responses to common greetings on compliance behavior: The foot-in-the-mouth effect. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 20, 1185-1196.

Howard, J. A., Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1986). Sex power and influence tactics in intimate relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 102-109.

Instone, D., Major, B., & Bunker, B. (1983). Gender, self confidence, and social influence strategies: An organizational simulation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 322-333.

Johnson, B. T., & Eagly, A. H. (1989). Effects of involvement on persuasion: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 106, 290-314.

Johnson, P. (1976). Women and power: Toward a theory of effectiveness. Journal of Social Issues, 32, 99-109.

Kenrick, D. T., & Gutierres, S. E. (1980). Contrast effects in judgments of attractiveness: When beauty becomes a problem. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 131-140.

Kline, S. L., & Clinton, B. L. (1998). Developments in children's persuasive message practices. Communication Education, 47, 120-136.

Larrance, D. T., & Zuckerman, M. (1981). Facial attractiveness and vocal likeability as determinants of nonverbal skills. Journal of Personality, 49, 349-361.

LittleJohn, S. W., & Jabusch, D. M. (1987). Persuasive Transactions. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Maynard, M. L. (1996). Effectiveness of "begging" as a persuasive tactic for improving response rate on a client/agency mail survey. Psychological Reports, 78, 204-206.

Murphy, P. K. (1998). Toward a multifaceted model of persuasion: Exploring textual and learner interactions. Dissertation Abstracts International, 59, 1906.

Reingen, P. H., & Kernan, J. B. (1993). Social perception and interpersonal influence: Some consequences of the physical attractiveness stereotype in a personal selling setting. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 2, 25-38.

Ross, R. S. (1985). Understanding Persuasion: Foundations and Practice. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Schwarzwald, J., Raz, M., & Zribel, M. (1979). The applicability of the door-in-the-face technique when established behavioral customs exist. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 9, 576-586.

Shavitt, S., Swan, S., Lowrey, R. M., & Waenke, M. (1994). The interaction of endorser attractiveness and involvement in persuasion depends on the goal that guides message processing. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 3, 137-162.

Stiff, J. B. (1994). Persuasive Communication. New York: The Guilford Press.

Waldron, V. R., & Applegate, J. L. (1998). Person-centered tactics during verbal disagreements: Effects on student perceptions of persuasiveness and social attractiveness. Communication Education, 47, 53-66.

Wilson, W. R. (1979). Feeling more than we can know: Exposure effects without learning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 811-821.

Woodward, G. C. & Denton, R. E. (1988). Persuasion and Influence in American Life. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.

We are conducting a survey on Persuasion. It is for a Research Strategies & Methods class supervised by Daniel Cochece Davis Ph.D. at extension 2878. This survey is completely voluntary. You can choose not to answer any of the questions. All information is confidential.

Age:

Sex:

Ethnicity:

Year in School (ex. freshman, senior):

Relational Status (ex. married, dating, single):

If you are in a relationship, how long have you been in one?

How serious is your relationship?
"hooked" up    dating    couple    serious    plans for marriage

What is your temperament?
stubborn    bold    serious    gullible    easy going

Do you consider yourself:
very friendly    friendly    neutral    not friendly    anti-social

What level of persistence are you?
never give in    mildly persistent    neutral    tend to give up easily    always give in

How often do you get your own way?
never    rarely    sometimes    often    always

How easily are you persuaded?
always    easily    neutral    not easily    never

How much do these things affect how easily you are persuaded?

|  | Always | A lot | Often | Neutral | Sometimes | Rarely | Not at all |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Physical Attractiveness | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 2. Intelligence | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 3. Reputation | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 4. Personality | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |
| 5. Aggressiveness | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ | ___ |

What methods or tactics have you used to persuade a member of the opposite sex to do something out of the ordinary?

We are conducting a focus group on persuasion. It is for a Research Strategies and Methods class supervised by Daniel Cochece Davis Ph.D. at extension 2878. It is completely voluntary, and you can choose not to answer any questions. All information is confidential.

1. Do you think that you can be easily persuaded by the opposite sex?
2. Do you think in a male/female situation that females will get their way more often then males and why?
3. What qualities of a member of the opposite sex will make you give in to their demands?
4. What is the most outrageous thing that a member of the opposite sex has persuaded you to do?
5. What methods or tactics have you used to persuade a member of the opposite sex to do something out of the ordinary?
6. How persistent do you have to be to get what you want?
7. Do you think that people in a relationship give in easier to their significant others demands than people who are not in a relationship?
8. Who do you think is more stubborn when it comes to giving in to persuasion tactics?
9. Are you more easily persuaded by a person who is friendly or a person who is bossy and controlling? Why?

You have been asked to participate in a very important research study. It is for a communication research strategies and methods class supervised by Daniel Cochece Davis Ph.D. at extension 2878. It is completely voluntary and all information is confidential. We ask you to fill it upon completion (as soon as possible) and to be honest.

Instructions:

Males:

Every time a girl gets you to do something out of the ordinary, or something that you wouldn't do for just anyone, write it in the log. Also write how she got you to do whatever you did and what it was.

Females:

Whenever you get a male to do something he wouldn't normally do for anyone, write it down along with the methods/tactics you used.

*If you are the only one in a relationship who is doing a log **PLEASE DO NOT** let the other person know.

We ask that you finish the logs by November 21. We will be coming around to all rooms to pick them up. If you finish earlier you can call us and we will come and pick the logs up.

Thank you for participating.

Contact Information:

Erika x-5759

Christina x-5774

Gloria x-4904

Lesley x-5609

**U.S. Department of Education**
*Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)*
*National Library of Education (NLE)*
*Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)*

**ERIC**®

# Reproduction Release
(Specific Document)

CS 510 582

## I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

| | |
|---|---|
| Title: Persuasion tactics used by college age females on college age males. | |
| Author(s): Erika J. Hanson, Christina M. Williams, Gloria D. Pollard | |
| Corporate Source: .—— | Publication Date: 12 8 1999 |

## II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction·Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

| The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents | The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents | The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents |
|---|---|---|
| PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <br><br> SAMPLE <br><br> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) | PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <br><br> SAMPLE <br><br> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) | PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <br><br> SAMPLE <br><br> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) |
| Level 1 | Level 2A | Level 2B |
| ↑ <br> ✓ | ↑ <br> ☐ | ↑ <br> ☐ |
| Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) *and* paper copy. | Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only | Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only |
| Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. <br> If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1. | | |

*I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.*

| Signature: *Erika Hanson* | Printed Name/Position/Title: Erika J. Hanson / Student |
|---|---|
| Organization/Address:<br>34 Farnham Dr.<br>Plymouth MA 02360 | Telephone: 508-224-3834  Fax: — |
| | E-mail Address: ErikaJHanson @aol.com  Date: 5/22/01 |

## III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

| Publisher/Distributor: |
|---|
| Address: |
| Price: |

## IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

| Name: |
|---|
| Address: |

## V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

| Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: |
|---|
| |

ERIC/REC Clearinghouse
2805 E 10th St Suite 140
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698
Telephone: 812-855-5847
Toll Free: 800-759-4723
FAX: 812-856-5512
e-mail: ericcs@indiana.edu
WWW: http://eric.indiana.edu

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)