

SOCIAL POWER AND INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION

by 6408

RUSSELL VEITCH

B. S., Wisconsin State University - Whitewater, 1967

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Psychology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1971

Approved by:

William Griffith
Major Professor

LD
2668
T4
1971
V4
C.2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank William Griffitt for his technical and material assistance in preparing this manuscript. The author would also like to extend his special thanks to his wife, Jan, whose invaluable and steadfast transforming of "henscratch" penmanship into typescript must have been most perplexing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Part I	1
Part II	8
Part III	11
Method	12
Procedure	13
Experiment I: Expert Power and Attraction	17
Results	17
Discussion	20
Experiment II: Legitimate Power and Attraction	23
Results	23
Discussion	26
Experiment III: Reward Power and Attraction	29
Results	29
Discussion	32
Discussion	36
Appendix	40
Appendix A: Interpersonal Judgment Scale	40
Appendix B-1	42
Appendix B-2	43
Appendix B-3	44
Appendix C: Survey of Attitudes	45
References	50

INTRODUCTION

PART I

A great deal of recent research on interpersonal attraction has focused its attention on the effects of attitude similarity-dissimilarity on attraction. It has been repeatedly found that persons are attracted (exhibit positive affect) toward others who hold similar attitudes and are repelled (exhibit negative affect) by others who hold dissimilar attitudes (Byrne, 1961; Byrne & Clore, 1966; Byrne & Griffitt, 1966; Newcomb, 1961). The most general explanatory concept to account for these effects is reward and punishment. Similar and dissimilar attitudes represent within this framework special cases of reward and punishment, respectively.

It is assumed that when one individual receives positive reinforcement from another, positive affect is elicited and, through classical conditioning, becomes associated with the other individual. It is further assumed and consistently substantiated (Byrne, 1961; Byrne & Clore, 1966; Byrne & Griffitt, 1966; Byrne, Griffitt, Hudgins, & Reeves, 1966) that subsequent evaluative responses directed toward that other individual will be positive. Conversely, when one individual receives negative reinforcement from another, negative affect is elicited and becomes associated with the other individual. Subsequent evaluative responses toward that other individual under these circumstances will be negative. The relative amounts of reward and punishment (positive and negative reinforcement) associated with a given individual determine the strength and direction of attraction toward him.

It has been further proposed and substantiated that attitude statements are affect arousing (Byrne & Clore, 1967). The motive involved in this arousal has variously been labeled the learned drive to be logical, to interpret

"correctly" the world around us (Byrne, 1961; Dollard & Miller, 1950), the "need for certainty" (Brim & Hoff, 1957) or the "need to control and predict" (Pervin, 1963). All of these, however, can be subsumed under the label "effectance motive" (White, 1959). However, unlike White, who stressed the "positive" aspects of the motive to explain why organisms avoid the monotonous, repetitious and familiar in order to seek stimulation via play, intellectual curiosity, and manipulation of the environment, Byrne and Clore (1967) propose that this same motivational construct (effectance) also accounts for a negative response to stimuli which lie further along the continuum of unfamiliarity, unpredictability and unexpectedness. When an individual is exposed to an attitude expressed by another individual which is similar to his own, he is rewarded through what Festinger (1954) calls consensual validation. It is gratifying to know that others feel the same way about a particular issue as one does and this lends credence to the belief that one has correctly interpreted his stimulus world. On the other hand, having another individual expound a dissimilar attitude frustrates the belief that one has correctly interpreted his world and thereby arouses negative affect.

That attitude similarity does have reinforcement value has been demonstrated by Byrne, Young, and Griffitt (1966), Clore (1966), and Golightly and Byrne (1964). In these studies employing a discrimination task attitude similarity was found to act as a positive reinforcer and attitude dissimilarity as a negative reinforcer. Based on the linear relationship between proportion of similar attitudes and attraction, Byrne and Nelson (1965) proposed a tentative law of attraction:

$A_x = mPRx + k$ or attraction toward x is a positive linear function
function of the proportion of positive reinforcements received from x.

Subsequent research and increased sophistication in methodology as well as theorizing has led to the present conceptualization:

$$Y = \left(\frac{\Sigma(SXM)}{\Sigma(SXM) + \Sigma(DXM)} \right) + k$$

where Y = attraction

S & D = similar and dissimilar attitudes

M = weighting coefficient corresponding to the reinforcement
magnitude of a particular item

m & k = empirically determined constants

That the linear relationship between proportion of similar attitudes and attraction as expressed by the above formula holds, is by now well established (Byrne, in press).

One should remember that in reviewing the research in this area, however, that there is nearly always to be inferred the ceterus paribus assumption. To understand the necessity for this caveat one needs only to look at the methodology of the typical study. Each subject to be used fills out an attitude questionnaire dealing with a number of issues (see Appendix C). At a later experimental session S receives a questionnaire of the type he has completed, which purportedly has been answered by an anonymous stranger. Each scale, however, has actually been filled out by E to correspond to a prearranged schedule of agreement. Any combination of agreements is possible, from total agreement to complete disagreement. (A more complete description of this manipulation will be given in the "Methods" section.) S is given no other information about the stranger other than that he is the same sex and of approximately the same age as S. S is then asked to make a series of judgments about the stranger by filling out the Interpersonal Judgment Scale (IJS) to be more fully described in the "Methods" section.

The subjects employed in the typical study on interpersonal attraction, then, are given only very limited amounts of information about the stranger

who is to be judged. Specifically, they are given faked responses to a series of attitude items; they are told that the stranger is the same sex as they are; and that the stranger is of approximately the same age.

Festinger (1950, 1954) has noted that in the social environment it is not always possible to find objective criteria for evaluating the correctness of one's beliefs, capabilities, values and attitudes. He proposes that when objective criteria are not available, the only other criterion is consensual validation. The typical study in the interpersonal attraction area capitalized on the omission of objective criteria for evaluating beliefs.

It is true, however, that in the social environment persons do have access to other bits of information which elicit affective responses even though this information may not act as validating criteria for the correctness of one's beliefs. Information such as physical appearance, race, competence, and prestige or status are often available at the outset of the acquaintance process.

What happens when an individual is given, in addition to or in lieu of attitudinal information, knowledge of the stranger's appearance, race, competence, or prestige or status?

Physical Appearance

Physical attractiveness has been shown to be related to attraction when the dependent variable was the subject's affective response to photographs of strangers (Byrne, London, & Reeves, 1968), when the dependent variable was response to photographs plus attitudes (Byrne & Ervin, 1969) and in face to face interactions (Byrne & Ervin, 1969). In each case attraction was measured by use of the IJS with additional items included in the Byrne and Ervin study.

In line with this research on physical attractiveness, it has also been found that attraction is affected by such variables as quality of clothing (Hoult, 1954; Lefkowitz, Blake and Mouton, 1955) and vocal attractiveness (Lerner, 1965).

Race

Byrne and Andres (1964) proposed that those individuals high on anti-Negro prejudice, as measured by instruments such as the Desegregation Scale (Holtzman & Young, 1966), expect negative reinforcements from a stranger identified as a Negro while individuals low in prejudice expect positive reinforcements from such a stranger. They found just that to be the case. It comes as no real surprise, then, that Byrne and McGraw (1964) found low prejudice individuals tending to respond more positively to Negro strangers than high prejudice individuals. Furthermore, proportion of similar attitudes influenced attraction toward Negro strangers in subjects scoring at both extremes of the Desegregation Scale.

Byrne and Ervin (1970) in synthesizing an entire series of studies in the area utilized a multiple correlational analysis. It was found that the multiple correlation involving proportion of similar attitudes, scores on the Desegregation Scale, personal evaluations of S by the stranger, and the physical attractiveness of the stranger (photograph) was .84. This indicates that about 70% of the response variance is attributable to these four independent variables. That is, attraction toward Negroes is a positive function of similarity of attitudes, a function of the degree of prejudice held by S, a function of the Negro stranger's evaluation of S, and a function of the physical attractiveness of the Negro stranger as perceived by S.

Competence

In manipulating competence, Palmer (1969) defined a competent stranger as

having the ability to form valid opinions on important social, moral, and political issues. Operationally, his competent strangers had a dominant profile on Leary's Interpersonal Checklist, scores of 675 to 750 on the verbal and quantitative subsections of the Scholastic Aptitude Test, and an A- average in his freshman year with the highest grades in courses such as American Government and Philosophy of Ethics. The incompetent stranger was submissive, had verbal and quantitative scores of 350 to 425, and had a C- average with lowest grades in courses such as Government and Ethics. Palmer found that with respect to attitude similarity and attraction there is a highly significant effect when the stranger is high in competence, but the similarity effect does not approach significance when the stranger is incompetent. That is, attraction is a positive function of similarity only when the stranger who is similar is seen as competent. Palmer concludes (1969, p. 55) "At the purely empirical level, it is clear that the competence of the stranger, at least as operationally defined in this experiment, defines a boundary condition or limit to the similarity-attraction relationship." Further evidence of the effect of this variable comes from Novak and Lerner (1968) despite the fact that they did not conceive of their manipulation within a competence-incompetence context. They found that the usual similarity attraction effect which is found with a normal stranger is modified when the stranger is described as emotionally disturbed. There is still a preference for the similar stranger, but the attraction response is less positive than in a parallel normal condition. Additionally, and perhaps more interesting is the finding that there is a slightly less negative rating for the disturbed-dissimilar stranger than for the normal-dissimilar stranger. It is quite possible that emotional disturbance is seen as incompetence or a corollary to it. At any rate, one again sees the successful creation of stimulus characteristics which mitigate the similarity effect.

Prestige

There have been a number of sociometric studies which have reported a positive relationship between prestige and the number of friendship choices received within a group (Bonney, 1946; Grossman & Wrighter, 1948; Loomis & Proctor, 1950). In addition, prestige as defined by military rank has been found to be positively related to attraction as measured by sociometric choices (Kipnis, 1957; Mashing, Greer, & Gilmore, 1955). Byrne, Griffitt, and Golightly (1966) found that attraction was not affected by occupational prestige or military rank when attitude information is present. In a further study (Bond, Byrne, & Diamond, 1968) it was found that prestige level does not affect attraction when attitude information is present. However, in the absence of attitude information, the effects of prestige on attraction are quite apparent and very much in line with the earlier sociometric studies.

Summary

In synthesizing the results of these studies into a definitive statement one can say that attitude similarity plays an overwhelming role in determining attraction between persons. So overwhelming that it often overrides factors which if presented in the absence of attitude information very definitely influence attraction. One should not overlook those studies, however, where the similarity effect is overridden (Palmer, 1970), for example. It is possible that only when very limited amounts of information about a stranger are available and this information is predominantly attitudinal (specifically those attitudes contained in the Survey of Attitudes) will one obtain the striking results reported.

PART II

A construct seemingly related to attraction (although the relationship is not yet clearly defined) and also used as a descriptive characteristic of social relationships is "power". The most prevalent definition of power appearing in the literature has its roots in Lewinian field theory. Within this framework power is defined as the maximum "resultant" force A* can bring to bear on B with respect to a particular area of B's life space. The resultant force is in turn composed of the strength of the force to "comply" minus the strength of the force to resist (i.e. A has power over B if A enacts a particular behavior or holds a particular position which induces a compliance force on B to locomote in a particular direction which is greater than the accompanying resistance force).

However, in order for A to be able to activate a compliance force, his act or position must have some significance for B; it must in some way mesh with B's motive base. For example, consider a politician who wishes to obtain votes in a predominantly rundown urban area. He is more likely to obtain votes (compliance) by promising garbage pick-up, lowcost housing, more jobs, and a decrease in income taxes than he is by promising increased subsidies to agriculture, decreases in excise taxes, and import embargoes on low cost goods. It is this feature of power relationships which has given rise to definitions of power based on A's possession of valuable resources, or on his control of B's need satisfaction or goal attainment (Berkowitz, 1957; Cohen, 1959; Pepitone, 1950; Stotland, 1959).

In principle, then, any need or desire of B (including the need to "Correctly interpret one's world") could serve as a source of A's power.

*Throughout this paper A & B will be used to designate the more powerful and less powerful individuals, respectively, although other mnemonics abound in the literature.

French and Raven (1959) have devised a taxonomy of bases that is consistent with the field-force framework, but that can be worked with very conveniently within a reinforcement model. Their bases of power are distinguished by the meaning A's acts or position have to B and the kind of relationships they imply. Within their taxonomy five types of power bases are specified: reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and expert.

REWARD POWER

Reward power has as its basis the ability of A to reward B. The strength of the reward power of A over B is a function of the magnitude of the rewards A can administer and the probability, as perceived by B, that A can and will (given the right circumstances), administer the reward.

COERCIVE POWER

Coercive power is similar to reward power. It stems from the expectation on the part of B that A has the ability to dole out punishments if B fails to conform to the attempt at compliance. According to French and Raven (1959) "The strength of coercive power depends on the magnitude of the negative valence of the threatened punishment multiplied by the perceived probability that O (B) can avoid the punishment by conformity."

LEGITIMATE POWER

Legitimate power of A over B is defined as that power which stems from internalized values in B which dictate that A has a legitimate right to influence B and that B has an obligation to comply. Cultural values, acceptance of the social structure, and designation by a legitimizing authority are but three bases for legitimate power (French & Raven, 1959).

REFERENT POWER

Referent power has its basis in the identification of B with A. A verbalization of referent power might be "I want to be like A, and I will be more

like A if I believe or behave as A does" (French & Raven, 1959).

EXPERT POWER

Expert power emanates from the belief by B that A has special knowledge within a given area. This special knowledge, of course, has no absolute standard but is relative to B's own knowledge within that area. It is also true that if expert power is to be present, it is necessary for B to believe that A in fact does "know" and for B to trust that A is telling the truth.

PART III

The question to be asked at this point is what kinds of relationships have been found between the power of A over B and the attractiveness of A for B?

It has been found that reward power will tend to increase the attraction of B toward A; coercive power will decrease this attraction (French, Levinger, & Morrison, 1960; Kipnis, 1958). With respect to legitimate power it has alternately been found that legitimacy is positively correlated with attraction (Raven & French, 1958) and that attraction toward A decreases with increasing legitimacy of his power base (Zipf, 1960), and that attraction is not reliably related to the legitimacy of A's power base (Raven & French, 1958b). Obviously more work is needed to determine under what conditions nonlegitimate access to a power position leads to attraction and under what conditions it leads to penalization of the occupant through decreased attraction. Levinger, and Morrison (1960) have found that attempted use of legitimate power outside the range of the legitimate power of the authority figure will decrease the attraction of B toward A.

Zander and Curtis (1962) in contrasting referent power with coercive power deduced that there was more attraction toward A in the referent group condition (the questions asked of the subject did not deal directly with the attraction of B toward A, but rather the attraction of B toward a group of which A was a member).

Despite the above findings, there has been no systematic research to determine the relationship between power and attraction. Attraction scores were typically obtained as part of a battery at the end of the experiment and no attempt was made to relate the findings to actual or perceived attitude similarity. In addition, the results that have been reported are equivocal,

partly, one would assume, from the lack of consistency in methodology.

It would seem that research in the area of attitude similarity-dissimilarity and in the area of social power provides several propositions concerning the determinants of interpersonal attraction. Of these propositions some have been only superficially tested while others have gone virtually untested. As a starting point in what is foreseen as a series of studies in this area, reward power, legitimate power, expert power* and attitude similarity were manipulated in three 2x2 factorial designs using one measuring device consistently in order to determine the effect on interpersonal attraction.

More specifically the major hypotheses tested were as follows:

1. Attraction of B toward A is a positive function of the similarity of A's attitudes to those of B regardless of the power or lack of power held by A.
2. Attraction of B toward A is a positive function of A's ability to administer rewards (reward power).
3. Attraction of B toward A is a positive function of the degree of expertise held by A (expert power).
4. Attraction of B toward A is a positive function of the legitimacy of A's power base (legitimate power).

METHOD

The experiments, then, utilized three 2x2 factorial analysis of variance models with two levels of legitimate power combined with two levels of attitude

*Because of the difficulty in establishing referent power without manipulating the dependent variable (attraction) and because of the inability to operationally define coercive power such that it does not become a special case of reward power, referent power and coercive power were deleted from study in this experiment. The test for functional relationships between these bases and attraction would necessitate a separate design of somewhat different format.

similarity (.75 or .25 similarity in all cases), two levels of expert power combined with the two levels of attitude similarity and two levels of reward power combined with the two levels of attitude similarity.

Measuring Instruments

Attraction Ratings. Ratings of the strangers (foremen) were made on a six item rating scale (Byrne, 1961) labeled Interpersonal Judgment Scale (IJS). The IJS is composed of six, 7-point scales on which S is asked to rate the stranger on intelligence, knowledge of current events, morality, adjustment, S's probable liking of the stranger and his desirability as a work partner. The ratings of the latter two items are summed to yield a measure of attraction ranging from 2 to 14 with a split-half reliability of .85 (Byrne & Nelson, 1965). (See Appendix A)

Effectiveness of the Manipulations. A questionnaire was administered including questions designed to ascertain whether essential elements of information were, in fact, attended to by the subjects, and whether subjects differentiated between the power levels. (See Appendix B)

PROCEDURE

Students enrolled in the General Psychology classes were asked to fill out the Survey of Attitudes (see Appendix C) on the pretext that it was part of a campus wide survey to ascertain students' opinions in certain areas affecting their lives. Several weeks after having taken this scale the experiments began, employing 120 subjects, who received credit for their participation. Although all three experiments were carried out simultaneously, with any given session perhaps containing subjects assigned to each of the experiments, they will be treated in the results section as if they were carried out independently.

Subjects met in small groups, the number ranging from 2 to 5, and the following printed instructions were given to them:

For the past several years we have been engaged in research dealing with peoples' ability to form valid judgments about others on the basis of limited information. Subjects were given limited information about strangers and were then asked to form opinions about the stranger's intelligence, knowledge of current events, morality and adjustment just on the basis of knowing a few bits of information about the person's past and present life. We found in all cases that students could guess these things with better than chance accuracy.

However, in all previous studies we have had students judging other students. The purpose of this study is to determine whether students can judge non-students as accurately as they can their peers.

Electronics Unlimited of Kansas City has graciously allowed us access to their personnel files to obtain information about their employees as well as giving us time to interview them and administer various psychological tests.

What you will be given is a dossier containing information about one of their foremen. Please read this information carefully and try to form an opinion about this person. As soon as you have studied the information carefully, fill out the attached Interpersonal Judgment Scale (IJS) and indicate your best guess as to the person's intelligence, knowledge of current events, morality and adjustment. Also indicate how much you think you would like this person if you met him and how much you think you would like to work with this person.

Please give us what you consider to be your most accurate impression of this person on the basis of the information given.

Information included in the dossiers

The information given to the subjects established the power base of the foreman and reflected proportion (.75 or .25) of attitude similarity. The placement of information in the dossier was counterbalanced, i.e. in one half the dossiers for each condition the attitude information came first and in one half the information establishing power base came first. Two levels of each of the power bases, in keeping with the previously given definitions, were established by providing the following descriptions:

High expert power

John has been with Electronics Unlimited of Kansas City for the past two years. He is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin where compiled an overall grade point average of 3.5 majoring in electrical engineering. John is the only college graduate in the circuitry division of which he is foreman and only one of three graduates in the entire plant.

Low expert power

John has been with Electronics Unlimited of Kansas City for the past year. He attended the University of Wisconsin for two years previous to taking employment here, majored in history and compiled a grade point average of 1.56. Due to his lack of background and experience in electronics, he has made technical errors which have proved somewhat costly to his employer.

High legitimate power

John has been a foreman in the circuitry division for the past two months. When the previous foreman (Scott) retired two months ago Electronics Unlimited of Kansas City decided to let the workers in the division choose their own foreman to fill the position during the interim period between Scott's retirement until an employee evaluation and foreman search was completed. The workers decided the best way to choose a foreman was by the democratic method. They thereby voted by secret ballot and John was a 22-1 selection for foreman.

Low legitimate power

John has been a foreman in the circuitry division for the past two months. When the previous foreman (Scott) retired two months ago Electronics Unlimited of Kansas City decided to let the workers in the division choose their own foreman to fill the position during the interim period between Scott's retirement until an employee evaluation and foreman search was completed. The workers decided the best way to choose a foreman was by the democratic method. They thereby voted by secret ballot and a man named Bill was a 22-1 selection for foreman. John, who is the superintendent's cousin was, however, appointed foreman by the management one day later and has held the position since that time.

High reward power

At Electronics Unlimited of Kansas City, foreman make the decision (within limits) as to the rate of pay for their subordinates. John has given his subordinates an average salary of \$4.23 per hour as compared to the all plant average of \$3.62 per hour. (All divisions require comparable skills and are of comparable difficulty)

Low reward power

At Electronics Unlimited of Kansas City the foremen make the decision (within limits) as to the rate of pay for their subordinates. John has given his subordinates an average salary of \$3.01 per hour as compared to the all plant average of \$3.62 per hour. (All divisions require comparable skills and are of comparable difficulty)

Attitude information was manipulated in the following manner:

.75 similar A bogus Survey of Attitudes Scale was filled out for one half the subjects such that the foreman agreed with the subject on .75 of the items (2,4,5,6,8,9,11,12,13,14,15,16,18,19,20,22,23,24).

Similarity was defined as a response one scale point away and on the same side of neutral as the subjects response.

.25 similar A bogus Survey of Attitude Scale was filled out for one half of the subjects such that the foreman agreed with them on .25 of the items (1,3,7,10,17,21).

In each of the above those items not designated as being similar showed dissimilarity. Dissimilarity was defined as a response three scale points away and on the opposite side of neutral as the subject's response. This is the constant discrepancy method outlined by Byrne (1969).

In summary, subjects came to the experimental session in groups of from two to five. Each was given one of sixteen possible dossiers contained in a manila folder and was asked to open it and read the instructions to himself as E read them aloud. They were then told to read all information contained in the dossier and having done so to fill out the IJS and attached questionnaire. Having done so they were asked to hand them to E after which the purposes of the experiment were disclosed and any questions asked by the subjects were answered.

EXPERIMENT I: EXPERT POWER AND ATTRACTION

Results

The effectiveness of the expert power manipulation was tested by analysis of question 7, Appendix B1. A checking of the first statement: "I strongly believe he has the educational background to be foreman" was scored as 6; checking the last statement: "I strongly believe that he does not have the educational background to be foreman" was given a score of 1. The intermediate statements were scored from 5-2. Analysis of variance revealed main effects for proportion of similarity ($F = 4.34, p < .05$) and power ($F = 69.38, p < .001$), there was also a significant Power by Proportion by Sex ($P \times Pr \times S$) interaction ($F = 4.34, p < .05$). For this and further results see Table 1. Having found that the manipulated differences in the two levels of expert power were in fact, appropriately perceived (The mean for the high level of expert power condition was 5.12; for the low level of expert power condition it was 2.35)* further analyses were conducted to determine how the perceived differential levels of power affected the subjects' response on the IJS.

Main effects for proportion of similarity were found for assumed stronger adjustment ($F = 13.12, p < .005$), the feelings component,** of attraction, item 5 ($F = 33.06, p < .001$), the instrumental component of attraction, item 6 ($F = 10.36, p < .005$), and the summed measure of attraction ($F = 43.06, p < .001$).

*For a breakdown of means by individual cells see Table 2.

**"Feelings component" refers to that element of attraction associated with emotion, or attitudes, with liking or admiration, whereas the "instrumental component" refers to one man's willingness to approach another, to be near him, to interact with him. The latter refers to overt behavior; the former refers to attitudes. The distinction is an important one because it is often assumed, and often mistakenly, that emotional attraction (the feelings component) and behavioral attraction (the instrumental component) are bound to go together, are necessarily concomittant consequences of the same antecedents.

TABLE 1

Expert Power

Response Item Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8										
Source	df	F	% $\hat{\sigma}^2$ *	F	% $\hat{\sigma}^2$	F	% $\hat{\sigma}^2$	F	% $\hat{\sigma}^2$									
Proportions																		
of Attitude	1	1.58	.42	<1	0	<1	0	13.12	21.58	33.06	58.76	10.36	25.89	43.06	61.89	4.34	4.27	
Similarity (Pr)																		
Power	(P)	1	129.79	97.13	13.92	37.31	1.17	.76	25.02	42.79	<1	0	7.19	17.14	6.89	8.67	69.38	87.81
Sex	(S)	1	<1	0	2.00	2.90	3.60	11.25	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0
Pr x P	1	1.59	.92	<1	0	1.17	1.52	<1	0	1.63	2.31	<1	0	<1	0	1.42	1.06	
Pr x S	1	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	1.15	.83	<1	0	<1	0	
P x S	1	<1	0	1.34	1.99	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	1.15	.83	<1	0	<1	0	
Pr x P x S	1	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	1.63	2.31	<1	0	<1	0	4.34	4.27	
w/g (error)	32		1.5		57.18		86.45		35.62		36.63		55.25		29.42		2.56	

*The procedure involved in calculating $\% \hat{\sigma}^2$ (the proportion of variance accounted for) is a modified version of that method outlined by Meyer (1966) Pp. 294-299.

TABLE 2
Means for Variables 1-8 (Expert Power)

Variable	Power Level	.75	.25	.75	.25
1. Intelligence	High Expert	5.80	6.00	6.00	5.80
	Low Expert	3.80	3.20	4.00	3.60
2. Knowledge of Current Events	High Expert	5.20	5.40	5.60	5.20
	Low Expert	3.60	3.20	4.40	4.40
3. Morality	High Expert	5.00	5.00	5.40	6.40
	Low Expert	5.00	4.60	5.40	5.20
4. Adjustment	High Expert	5.60	5.00	5.80	4.60
	Low Expert	4.40	3.00	4.40	3.40
5. Personal feelings	High Expert	5.20	3.60	5.00	3.80
	Low Expert	4.80	3.20	5.80	3.00
6. Working together	High Expert	4.60	3.20	5.00	3.80
	Low Expert	4.20	2.40	3.20	2.80
7. Summed Measure	High Expert	9.80	6.80	10.00	7.60
	Low Expert	9.00	5.60	9.00	5.80
8. Perceived Power	High Expert	5.00	5.20	5.60	4.80
	Low Expert	2.20	2.00	3.60	1.60

Power was found to affect responses on assumed intelligence, item 1 ($F = 129.79$, $p < .001$) assumed knowledge of current events, item 2 ($F = 13.92$, $p < .001$) assumed adjustment of stranger, item 4 ($F = 25.02$, $p < .001$) the instrumental component of attraction, item 6 ($F = 7.19$, $p < .025$) and the summed measure of attraction, item 7 ($F = 6.89$, $p < .025$). There were no significant interactions between the independent variables on measures 1 through 7.

Discussion

It is not surprising that subjects who judged strangers that held .75 similar attitudes saw them as being better adjusted, liked them more, and found them more desirable work partners than those subjects who judged strangers that held .25 similar attitudes, for this has been shown to occur in a number of previous studies (Byrne, in press). It is also not surprising that proportion of similarity had very little effect on the subjects' judgments of the stranger's intelligence and knowledge of current events and that the power variable did have an effect. Examination of the descriptions used reveals that under one level of expert power the stranger is a virtual genius, whereas in the other level the stranger falls a bit short of being even the "typical all-American boy". This manipulation is so strong that it completely washes out any effect one might usually expect to get for proportion of similar attitudes. This mitigation of an effect for proportion of similar attitudes is consistent with the results obtained by Palmer (1970) cited above.

It is a bit surprising that proportion of similarity did affect responses to and that there was a $Pr \times P \times S$ interaction involving the question: "To what extent do you believe this person has the educational background to be foreman?" However, inspection of the cell means (see Table 2) reveals that two cells account for both effects. Females were less likely than were males to rate the stranger as not having sufficient educational background if the

stranger had a high proportion of attitude similarity (The mean for males was 5.00, the mean for females was 5.60 under conditions of .75 similarity). Females were also more likely than males to rate the foreman as not having sufficient background to be foreman if there was a low proportion of attitude similarity (The mean for males was 2.00, the mean for females was 1.60 when the proportion of attitude similarity was .25). It may have been that females viewed the role of foreman more as socio-emotional* (in which case attitude similarity might be a requisite to attraction), whereas males viewed the role as being task-oriented (in which case training and "know-how" would be a requisite to attraction). However, this line of thought is not clearly substantiated by differentiation by sex on measures 5 and 6 (i.e. there was no reliable $Pr \times P \times S$ interaction found for either the feelings or instrumental components of attraction). There is also no direct evidence one way or the other in the literature to corroborate the suspicion that males and females view the role of foreman differently.

Indirect evidence, however, comes from two separate lines of research. First, Griffitt (1968, 1969) has obtained evidence to suggest that attraction is a function of anticipated positiveness of future contact and that at least in some cases attitude similarity-dissimilarity affects the anticipated positiveness of future contacts. Secondly, W. W. Ronan (1970a) has summarized in a monograph that "the results here indicate it (the nature of supervision) is the major link between job satisfaction and personnel behavior" (p. 27). Further, Wild (1970) has shown that social relations with workmates rates

*The terms "socio-emotional" and "task-oriented" are used here in essentially the same manner as used by Bales, (1952). Socio-emotional leaders are identified as showing solidarity, behaving so as to reduce tension, showing understanding and passive acceptance. The task oriented leader on the other hand gives suggestions, opinions, evaluations, analysis and information related to the task of the group (Bales, 1952).

second only to wages as a determiner of job satisfaction for women. Ronan (1970b) has found that women tend to be more concerned than males with their managers and feel less secure in their jobs. Men felt that the work itself, pay, and the company were most important for job satisfaction.

Now, to the extent that women viewed the foreman as fulfilling her apparently quite salient social needs she could anticipate positive future contacts and thus would be attracted to him; to the extent that males saw the foreman as fulfilling pay needs and adding to the productive situation they could anticipate positive future contacts and thus would be attracted to him. These perceptions and their conjectured consequences may reflect what occurred in this situation. The answer awaits additional research.

Incidentally, the estimated proportion of variance accounted for (see Table 1) by these particular effects, although reliable, is of very small magnitude and perhaps not worth pursuing. The main effect and interaction each account for only 4.27% of the variance in the dependent measure.

That responses to question 4, dealing with the stranger's adjustment were differentially affected by the level of expert power purportedly possessed by that stranger is again not surprising. In one level a stranger who is quite successful, finishes what he starts and works at a job that is consistent with his educational background is described; in the other condition the stranger is portrayed as a bit of a bungler, a college drop-out, and engaging in work that is not consistent with his educational background. Certainly the former stranger better fits the naive model of what is termed adjustment and consequently the subjects rated him as better adjusted.

Responses measures 5,6, and 7 and their relationships with the independent variables are quite consistent across experiments and will be discussed after consideration of the other two experiments, separately.

EXPERIMENT II: LEGITIMATE POWER AND ATTRACTION

Results

The effectiveness of the legitimate power manipulation was tested by analysis of variance of question 7, Appendix B2. This question was scored the same as question 7, Appendix B1. Analysis of variance indicated that this manipulation was effective. A main effect for power ($F = 34.82$, $p < .001$) was obtained. The mean for the high legitimate power condition was 4.65 and for the low legitimate power condition was 2.95.* Additionally, a main effect for proportion of similar attitudes ($F = 7.71$, $p < .01$) was obtained with those having a greater proportion of similar attitudes being perceived as having a more legitimate right to be foreman than those who held a low proportion of similar attitudes. However, the power variable accounted for 55.89% of the variance in the dependent variable, whereas the proportion variable accounted for only 11.06%. This information, in addition to the analysis of variance for all other dependent variables, as well as the estimated proportion of variance in the dependent variables accounted for by each independent variable is shown in Table 3.

Again, having found that the differences in the two levels of legitimate power were appropriately perceived by the subjects, analyses of the other six dependent variables were conducted to see what, if any, effects the power variable had on attraction, assumed knowledge of current events, etc. Proportion of similarity was a reliable influencer of judgments of the strangers intelligence, morality, and adjustment yielding F 's of 6.03 ($p < .025$), 6.92 ($p < .025$), and 24.38 ($p < .001$) respectively. The greater the similarity between S and the stranger the more intelligent, more moral and better adjusted the stranger was perceived to be. Proportion of similarity also affected the

*For a breakdown of means by individual cells see Table 4.

TABLE 3

Legitimate Power

Response Item Number		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8								
Source	df	F	$\hat{\sigma}^2$	F	$\hat{\sigma}^2$	F	$\hat{\sigma}^2$	F	$\hat{\sigma}^2$								
Proportion (Pr)	1	6.03	48.21	1.20	0.76	6.92	21.16	24.38	41.04	19.58	37.15	19.91	30.47	21.90	38.74	7.71	11.06
Power (P)	1	<1	0	<1	0	1.01	0	<1	0	4.04	6.06	7.17	9.96	6.01	9.28	34.82	53.89
Sex (S)	1	2.89	18.08	2.71	6.68	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	3.19	3.51	<1	0	<1	0
Pr x P	1	<1	0	<1	0	1.01	0.11	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0
Pr x S	1	<1	0	1.05	0.41	1.01	0.11	<1	0	5.20	16.79	2.12	3.90	4.02	11.21	<1	0
P x S	1	1.76	14.52	2.71	13.43	2.01	7.25	3.43	7.95	<1	0	7.17	19.89	1.99	3.68	<1	0
Pr x P x S	1	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	3.43	15.90	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0
error	32	19.17	78.69	71.34	35.09	39.97	32.24	37.07	33.04								

TABLE 4
Means for Variables 1-8 (Legitimate Power)

Variable	Power Level	.75	.25	.75	.25
1. Intelligence	High Legitimate	5.20	4.60	5.80	5.60
	Low Legitimate	5.60	4.40	5.40	4.80
2. Knowledge of Current Events	High Legitimate	3.80	3.60	5.00	4.80
	Low Legitimate	4.40	4.20	4.80	3.80
3. Morality	High Legitimate	5.60	5.60	5.80	5.00
	Low Legitimate	5.40	4.60	6.00	5.00
4. Adjustment	High Legitimate	5.80	4.00	5.80	4.80
	Low Legitimate	5.80	4.80	5.80	3.20
5. Personal feelings	High Legitimate	5.00	4.40	5.40	3.40
	Low Legitimate	4.40	3.40	5.20	2.20
6. Working together	High Legitimate	5.20	4.20	5.60	3.20
	Low Legitimate	3.40	2.40	5.20	3.60
7. Summed Measure	High Legitimate	10.20	8.60	11.00	6.60
	Low Legitimate	7.80	5.80	10.40	5.80
8. Perceived Power	High Legitimate	5.00	4.40	5.00	4.20
	Low Legitimate	3.20	2.40	3.60	2.60

personal feelings component of attraction ($F = 19.58, p < .001$), the instrumental component, working together, ($F = 19.91, p < .001$), and the summed measure of attraction ($F = 21.90, p < .001$). In each case the greater the proportion of similarity between S and foreman (.75 as opposed to .25) the more positive was the attraction response by S.

The power manipulation reliably affected only the instrumental component ($F = 7.17, p < .01$) and the summed measure of attraction ($F = 6.01, p < .025$). On these two measures the S's responded more positively to the foreman who had more legitimately obtained his position. There was also a $Pr \times S$ interaction ($F = 5.20, p < .05$) for the personal feelings component, with females responding more positively than males to similar strangers and more negatively to dissimilar strangers, and a $P \times S$ ($F = 7.17, p < .01$) interaction for the instrumental component of attraction. Males responded to the manner in which the foreman obtained his position, being more attracted to the foreman who obtained his position legitimately, whereas females did not respond differentially to this aspect of the stimulus.

Discussion

The effects of the proportion of similar attitudes manipulation were to be expected on the basis of previous investigations and from the theoretical framework from which this and other investigations were derived (Byrne, in press). If a person is exposed to others who are very much like him (.75 similar attitudes), all other things being equal, he will be attracted to them and will attribute to them what he considers to be healthy characteristics; high intelligence, high morality, etc. On the other hand if a person is asked to judge another who is dissimilar (.25 similar attitudes) he will be less attracted to him, and attribute to him less favorable characteristics; low intelligence, lack of high moral standards, etc.

What is of importance in this study is the $Pr \times S$ interaction on question 5, the feelings component of attraction, the $P \times S$ interaction on question 6, the instrumental component of attraction, and the P effect on question 6 and concomittant lack of it on question 5. This last finding will be discussed later in the overall discussion because it is a consistent finding across the three experiments.

Data in Table 5a and 5b reveal that with respect to the feelings component of attraction females are more affected by proportion of similarity than by the legitimacy of one's access to a power position. Males, on the other hand, are about equally affected by proportion of similarity and the legitimacy of one's access to a power position. The difference between males and females on this latter variable is, however, not significant. Tables 5c and 5d reveal that, with respect to the instrumental component of attraction, both males and females are affected by proportion of similarity, with the subjects being more attracted by the legitimacy of the access to a power position i.e. only the attraction responses of males are differentially affected by the legitimate power manipulation. It should be recalled that no such effects were found on question 8: "To what extent do you believe this person has a legitimate right to be foreman?"

It would seem, then, that although both sexes see nepotism as a less than legitimate means of attaining a power position, males are more likely than females to be sensitive to it with respect to choosing work mates. This finding, as in the case of expert power, may be a reflection of the way in which the sexes define the role of a foreman. Is he or should he be a socio-emotional or task-oriented leader? It is possible that males and females answer this question differently. The answer to this question will only be determined by further research.

TABLE 5

Legitimate Power

Question 5 - (feelings component of attraction)

(a)			(b)		
Mean Scores			Mean Scores		
	Male	Female		Male	Female
.75 Similar	4.70	5.30	High Legitimacy	4.70	4.40
.25 Similar	3.90	2.80	Low Legitimacy	3.90	3.70

Question 6 - (instrumental component of attraction)

(c)			(d)		
Mean Scores			Mean Scores		
	Male	Female		Male	Female
.75 Similar	4.30	5.40	High Legitimacy	4.70	4.40
.25 Similar	3.30	3.40	Low Legitimacy	2.90	4.40

EXPERIMENT III: REWARD POWER AND ATTRACTION

Results

The effectiveness of the reward power manipulation was tested by analysis of variance of question 7, Appendix B-3. This question was scored the same as question 7, Appendix B1. Analysis of variance indicated that the power manipulation was effective; a main effect for power was obtained ($F = 21.25$, $p < .001$) where the mean for the high reward condition was 4.55 and the mean for the low reward condition was 3.00*. This effect, in addition to the analysis of variance for all other dependent variables, as well as the estimated proportion of variance in the dependent variable accounted for by each independent variable is shown in Table 6.

Having found that the manipulated differences in the two levels of reward power were appropriately perceived by the subjects, analyses of the other 7 (the six items on the IJS plus the summed measure of attraction) dependent variables were conducted. Measures 1,2, and 3 concerning intelligence, knowledge of current events and morality yielded no significant main effects nor interactions.

Measure 4 dealing with the adjustment of the foreman yielded a main effect for proportion of similar attitudes ($F = 29.60$, $p < .001$) where the greater the proportion of attitude similarity between the subject and foreman, the better adjusted the foreman was perceived as being. Additionally, a $Pr \times P$ interaction ($F = 5.92$, $p < .025$) and a $P \times S$ interaction ($F = 5.95$, $p < .025$) occurred. The low paying similar foreman was seen as the most well adjusted (the mean equals 5.50) and the low paying dissimilar foreman was seen as least well adjusted (the mean equals 2.40). Males, however perceived the high paying foreman across

*For a breakdown of means by individual cells see Table 7.

TABLE 6

Reward Power

Response Item Number		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8								
Source	df	F	$\hat{\sigma}^2$	F	$\hat{\sigma}^2$	F	$\hat{\sigma}^2$	F	$\hat{\sigma}^2$								
Proportions of Attitude Similarity (Pr)																	
Power	1	<1	0	2.97	8.16	<1	0	29.60	53.61	22.23	47.73	170.52	61.92	35.06	54.68	1.07	0.13

TABLE 7
Mean Scores for Variables 1-7 (Reward Power)

Variable	Power Level	Male		Female	
		.75	.25	.75	.25
1. Intelligence	High Reward	4.80	4.80	5.20	5.40
	Low Reward	4.60	4.40	5.20	5.00
2. Knowledge of Current Events	High Reward	4.80	4.40	4.80	5.00
	Low Reward	4.80	4.00	5.40	4.00
3. Morality	High Reward	5.40	5.80	5.20	4.60
	Low Reward	4.80	4.40	5.40	4.20
4. Adjustment	High Reward	5.80	4.80	4.60	4.00
	Low Reward	5.60	3.00	5.40	3.80
5. Personal feelings	High Reward	5.60	3.80	5.60	3.00
	Low Reward	4.00	3.00	5.20	2.80
6. Working together	High Reward	5.60	3.40	4.80	3.00
	Low Reward	3.80	2.60	5.00	3.00
7. Summed Measure	High Reward	11.60	7.20	10.40	6.00
	Low Reward	7.80	5.60	10.20	5.80
8. Perceived Power	High Reward	5.00	4.60	4.40	4.20
	Low Reward	2.80	2.00	3.60	3.60

similarity-dissimilarity as most well adjusted, whereas females, across similarity-dissimilarity, saw the poorer paying foreman as the most well adjusted.

Measure 5 on "feelings" yielded a main effect for proportion of similar attitudes ($F = 22.23$, $p < .001$) indicating that the subjects felt they would like, to a greater extent, the foreman whose attitudes were similar than the foreman who held dissimilar attitudes. Measure 6, the instrumental component of attraction, yielded main effects for proportion of similar attitudes ($F = 170.52$, $p < .001$) and power ($F = 18.94$, $p < .001$) indicating that the subjects exhibited a greater desire to approach those foreman who held similar attitudes and additionally those who payed their subordinates at a higher rate of pay. Measure 6 also yielded two significant interactions to be described and discussed later: power x sex ($F = 25.78$, $p < .001$); and proportion x power x sex ($F = 4.73$, $p < .05$). Analysis of the summed measure of attraction, yielded main effects for proportion of similar attitudes ($F = 35.06$, $p < .001$) and power ($F = 4.54$, $p < .05$). This finding will be described and discussed at the conclusion of this paper.

Discussion

Unexpected findings in this particular experiment were the P x S interactions for measures 4, 6, and 8. Looking first at the means for measure 8 (see Table 8d), one finds that females were less likely than males to be influenced, with respect to the foreman's use of reward power, by the differences in pay awarded subordinates by the foreman (i.e. the differential rate of pay meted out by the foreman was a non-predicting factor for females). Tables 8b and 8c reveal that females did not differentially respond to the differential pay schedules as predicted, whereas males did. As a matter of fact for measures 4 (adjustment) and 6 (the instrumental component of attraction) there is a

TABLE 8

Question 4 - Mean Scores - (Adjustment)

(a)			(b)		
	High Reward	Low Reward		Male	Female
.75	5.20	5.50	High Reward	5.30	4.30
.25	4.40	3.40	Low Reward	4.30	4.60

Question 6 - Mean Scores - (Instrumental Component of Attraction)

(c)

	Male	Female
High Reward	4.50	3.90
Low Reward	3.20	4.00

Question 8 - Mean Scores - (Use of Power to Reward)

(d)

	Male	Female
High Reward	4.80	4.30
Low Reward	2.40	3.60

reversal of the hypothesized power effect for females, however the differences in means are not reliably different. (See Table 8b & c.)

It is possible that females perceived the low paying schedule (\$3.01/hr) as very attractive and that the \$4.23/hr was perceived as either unreasonable, unattainable or both and therefore the differences were not considered important. On the other hand males may have perceived both schedules, in addition to the all plant average (\$3.62/hr) as being both reasonable and attainable and therefore attended to them. It is conceivable, therefore, that males and females differentially attended to different aspects of the stimulus, and specifically to those aspects which they felt best provided satisfaction of their perhaps quite different needs. This differential attending is apparent in the responses relating to the instrumental component of attraction and the summed measure of attraction but not to the feelings component. A lengthier discussion of this is found in the overall discussion.

Two other findings to be discussed with respect to this experiment before attempting to look at all three together are the $Pr \times P$ interaction in question 4 and the triple-order ($Pr \times P \times S$) interaction in question 6. The latter of these (the triple-order) interactions can again be explained upon inspection of means (see Table 7) in terms of females being nonsensitive to rate of pay as compared to males, and males being slightly more, although not reliably more sensitive to proportion of similar attitudes. Males, then, were sensitive to both the power and proportion of similarity manipulation whereas females were sensitive only to, and to a lesser extent than males, proportion of similar attitudes. The significant $Pr \times P$ interaction on measure 4, (upon inspection of means in Table 8a) indicates that, the power variable and proportion of similarity variable interact to determine ratings of adjustment. The lesser paying, dissimilar foreman is perceived as least well adjusted. Upon closer

inspection (see Table 7, question 4) it is found that, for males, the poorer paying, dissimilar foreman is seen as least well adjusted (mean equals 3.00), and the high paying, similar foreman is seen as most well adjusted (mean equals 5.80). This latter finding does not hold for females. It again seems apparent that females are not as sensitive to the differential rates of pay as are the males. As suggested earlier this may be due to the fact that the particular rates chosen may have been beyond the rate which females could reasonably expect to obtain and thus the rates were indistinguishable, both appearing unreasonable. Or that rate of pay within the circumstances of this experiment was not a major consideration for women.

DISCUSSION

As has been previously noted, the measures of attraction (5,6, and 7) yield very consistent results across experiments. In all experiments main effects for proportion of similar attitudes and power were obtained for measures 6 and 7 and only a main effect for proportion of similar attitudes on measure 5. What this seems to indicate is that, whereas proportion of similar attitudes influences both the emotional and instrumental components of attraction, power significantly influences only the instrumental aspect. The effect of power on the summed measure of attraction is an artifact of the process of summation of the very slight tendency toward a power effect on measure 5 and the significant effect on measure 6. It should also be noted that even when there is a reliable main effect for power the greatest proportion of variance for which it accounts is only 17.14%, whereas even under these circumstances proportion of similar attitudes accounts for 25.89% of the variance in the response variable (see Table 1).

Again proportion of similar attitudes acts as a major determinant of attraction. The fact that differential effects of power for the two components of attraction is obtained, is however, worth notation and speculation. In the literature on attraction there is a paucity of research in which the kinds of variables investigated are directly relevant to the context of the work situation. The prestige, competence, race, and physical attractiveness of the stranger give the subject very little information concerning the work situation in which he is asked whether he would like to participate with the stranger. On the other hand, when the subject is given information concerning power relationships, the work situation is more clearly defined. He knows, for example, that the stranger is well-regarded by his peers regardless of attitudes held, or that he is not; or that, comparably, the stranger (foreman)

pays his subordinates poorly, or well; or that he has made costly mistakes, or that he is well-prepared for his position. This latter kind of information may be relevant to the work situation and thus be more likely to influence responses reflecting the instrumental component of attraction. This appears to be what happened. As Homans (in press) points out "One may be eager to interact with another without in the least liking him, or though this is probably rarer, may like him without being eager to interact" (p. 1). Whether the two components of attraction occur concomitantly may very likely depend on the reasons for liking (the needs being satisfied) and the kinds of interactions about which the subject is queried as well as the kinds and amounts of information about the stranger to which he is exposed.

Summarily it can be said that persons are attracted to those other persons who can best meet their needs, and that needs and their placement in need hierarchies are situation dependent. That is, particular needs and their strengths relative to all other needs of the individual are dependent upon the situation in which the individual finds himself. In the absence of further information, attitude similarity through consensual validation serves the need to "correctly interpret" the world around us and thus mediates attraction. Different kinds of social power differentially provide reinforcements for other needs such as the need for work-relevant information, the need for money, or the need to see justice done and thus, given the right conditions, social power may also mediate attraction. It is quite likely that if in a particular situation there is no information present regarding the possibility of the "need to see justice done" being satisfied, and if there is information present indicating that the "need to correctly interpret the world" will be satisfied, then the stranger who is a satisfier of this latter need will be perceived as attractive. However, if the stranger is perceived as being likely to serve the

need to see justice done, but not the need to correctly interpret the world, then the satisfaction of the former may become the basis for attraction. That is, if power is based on A's possession of valuable resources, or his control of B's need satisfaction or goal attainment, and if the attraction of A for B is a linear function of the degree of rewardingness (need satisfaction, goal attainment) associated with A, then the attraction of A for B should be a function of the degree of power or number of power bases held by A with respect to B. There is some evidence in these studies indicating that this is true regarding degree of power, if only for the instrumental component of attraction.

Further research should focus on extending the variety of social situations in which the target person maintains the various power bases and noting any effect on attraction; and in endowing the target person with various combinations of these bases to determine what effect the simultaneous exercise of power stemming from different bases has on the attraction of other persons for the power figure. Incidentally, perhaps what is most needed in this area of research is a classification of needs for particular kinds of social settings and a delineation of the kinds of behaviors on the part of others which persons see as satisfying those needs. Then, by knowing a person's needs and others' capacities to serve those needs (i.e. the power relationships existing between them) one would be able, with greater certainty, to rank order the effective attractiveness of those others.

In this short series of experiments, then, it was found, as expected, that the determinants of the effective attractiveness of others change as their stimulus characteristics change or become more extensively enumerated, and that specific stimulus changes differentially affect the two components of attraction. It was also found, as expected, that regardless of those specific changes that were made (changes in the power base of the foreman)

proportion of similar attitudes overwhelmingly affected attraction responses. It was further suggested, however, that as the social setting becomes more explicitly defined it may be that needs other than the need to "correctly interpret" one's world come into play and it is those needs and their satisfaction which may become the determinants of attraction.

Appendix A

Your Name: _____

INTERPERSONAL JUDGMENT SCALE

1. Intelligence (check one)
 - ☐ I believe that this person is very much above average in intelligence.
 - ☐ I believe that this person is above average in intelligence.
 - ☐ I believe that this person is slightly above average in intelligence.
 - ☐ I believe that this person is average in intelligence.
 - ☐ I believe that this person is slightly below average in intelligence.
 - ☐ I believe that this person is below average in intelligence.
 - ☐ I believe that this person is very much below average in intelligence.

2. Knowledge of Current Events (check one)
 - ☐ I believe that this person is very much below average in his (her) knowledge of current events.
 - ☐ I believe that this person is below average in his (her) knowledge of current events.
 - ☐ I believe that this person is slightly below average in his (her) knowledge of current events.
 - ☐ I believe that this person is average in his (her) knowledge of current events.
 - ☐ I believe that this person is slightly above average in his (her) knowledge of current events.
 - ☐ I believe that this person is above average in his (her) knowledge of current events.
 - ☐ I believe that this person is very much above average in his (her) knowledge of current events.

3. Morality (check one)
 - ☐ This person impresses me as being extremely moral.
 - ☐ This person impresses me as being moral.
 - ☐ This person impresses me as being moral to a slight degree.
 - ☐ This person impresses me as being neither particularly moral nor particularly immoral.
 - ☐ This person impresses me as being immoral to a slight degree.
 - ☐ This person impresses me as being immoral.
 - ☐ This person impresses me as being extremely immoral.

INTERPERSONAL JUDGMENT SCALE

4. Adjustment (check one)

- ☐ I believe that this person is extremely maladjusted.
☐ I believe that this person is maladjusted.
☐ I believe that this person is maladjusted to a slight degree.
☐ I believe that this person is neither particularly maladjusted nor particularly well adjusted.
☐ I believe that this person is well adjusted to a slight degree.
☐ I believe that this person is well adjusted.
☐ I believe that this person is extremely well adjusted.

5. Personal Feelings (check one)

- ☐ I feel that I would probably like this person very much.
☐ I feel that I would probably like this person.
☐ I feel that I would probably like this person to a slight degree.
☐ I feel that I would probably neither particularly like nor particularly dislike this person.
☐ I feel that I would probably dislike this person to a slight degree.
☐ I feel that I would probably dislike this person.
☐ I feel that I would probably dislike this person very much.

6. Working Together (check one)

- ☐ I believe that I would very much dislike working with this person.
☐ I believe that I would dislike working with this person.
☐ I believe that I would dislike working with this person to a slight degree.
☐ I believe that I would neither particularly dislike nor particularly enjoy working with this person.
☐ I believe that I would enjoy working with this person to a slight degree.
☐ I believe that I would enjoy working with this person.
☐ I believe that I would very much enjoy working with this person.

Appendix B-1

1. What is the name of the person whose dossier you have read? _____
2. What was his college major? _____
3. What do you find most impressive about this person?
4. What do you find least impressive about this person?
5. Is there any one or few characteristics that make this person a desirable work partner? If so, please indicate.
6. Is there any one or few characteristics that make this person an undesirable work partner? If so, please indicate.
7. To what extent do you believe this person has the educational background to be foreman? (check one)

____ I strongly believe he has the educational background to be foreman.

____ I believe he has the educational background to be foreman.

____ I believe that perhaps he has the educational background to be foreman.

____ I believe that perhaps he does not have the educational background to be foreman.

____ I believe he does not have the educational background to be foreman.

____ I strongly believe that he does not have the educational background to be foreman.
8. Any additional comments?

Appendix B-2

1. What is the name of the person whose dossier you have read? _____
2. How much, as compared to other foremen, does he pay his subordinates? _____
3. What do you find most impressive about this person?
4. What do you find least impressive about this person?
5. Is there any one or few characteristics that makes this person a desirable work partner? If so, please indicate.
6. Is there any one or few characteristics that make this person an undesirable work partner? If so, please indicate.
7. To what extent do you believe this person is making good use of his powers to reward subordinates? (Check one)

_____ I strongly believe he is making good use of his powers to reward subordinates.

_____ I believe he is making good use of his powers to reward subordinates.

_____ I believe that perhaps he is making good use of his powers to reward subordinates.

_____ I believe that perhaps he is not making good use of his powers to reward subordinates.

_____ I believe he is not making good use of his powers to reward subordinates.

_____ I strongly believe he is not making good use of his powers to reward subordinates.
8. Any additional comments?

Appendix B-3

1. What is the name of the person whose dossier you have read? _____
2. How did he get to be foreman? _____
3. What do you find most impressive about this person?
4. What do you find least impressive about this person?
5. Is there any one or few characteristics that make this person a desirable work partner? If so, please indicate.
6. Is there any one or few characteristics that make this person an undesirable work partner? If so, please indicate.
7. To what extent do you believe this person has a legitimate right to be foreman? (check one)

____ I strongly believe he has a legitimate right to be foreman.

____ I believe he has a legitimate right to be foreman.

____ I believe that perhaps he has a legitimate right to be foreman.

____ I believe that perhaps he does not have a legitimate right to be foreman.

____ I believe he does not have a legitimate right to be foreman.

____ I strongly believe he does not have a legitimate right to be foreman.
8. Any additional comments?

Appendix C

SURVEY OF ATTITUDES

Name: _____ Psychol: _____ Sect: _____ Date: _____

Age: _____ Sex: _____ Class: Fr. _____ Soph. _____ Jr. _____ Sr. _____

Hometown: _____ Phone No. _____

1. Fraternities and Sororities (Check one)

- _____ I am very much against fraternities and sororities as they usually function.
- _____ I am against fraternities and sororities as they usually function.
- _____ To a slight degree, I am against fraternities and sororities as they usually function.
- _____ To a slight degree, I am in favor of fraternities and sororities as they usually function.
- _____ I am in favor of fraternities and sororities as they usually function.
- _____ I am very much in favor of fraternities and sororities as they usually function.

2. Undergraduates Getting Married (Check one)

- _____ In general, I am very much in favor of undergraduates getting married.
- _____ In general, I am in favor of undergraduates getting married.
- _____ In general, I am mildly in favor of undergraduates getting married.
- _____ In general, I am mildly against undergraduates getting married.
- _____ In general, I am against undergraduates getting married.
- _____ In general, I am very much against undergraduates getting married.

3. Belief in God (Check one)

- _____ I strongly believe that there is a God.
- _____ I believe that there is a God.
- _____ I feel that perhaps there is a God.
- _____ I feel that perhaps there is no God.
- _____ I believe that there is no God.
- _____ I strongly believe that there is no God.

4. Smoking (Check one)

- _____ In general, I am very much in favor of smoking.
- _____ In general, I am in favor of smoking.
- _____ In general, I am mildly in favor of smoking.
- _____ In general, I am mildly against smoking.
- _____ In general, I am against smoking.
- _____ In general, I am very much against smoking.

SURVEY OF ATTITUDES

5. Integration in Public Schools (Check one)

- ☐ Racial integration in public schools is a mistake, and I am very much against it.
- ☐ Racial integration in public schools is a mistake, and I am against it.
- ☐ Racial integration in public schools is a mistake, and I am mildly against it.
- ☐ Racial integration in public schools is a good plan, and I am mildly in favor of it.
- ☐ Racial integration in public schools is a good plan, and I am in favor of it.
- ☐ Racial integration in public schools is a good plan, and I am very much in favor of it.

6. Social Aspects of College Life (Check one)

- ☐ In general, I am very much against an emphasis on the social aspects of college life.
- ☐ In general, I am against an emphasis on the social aspects of college life.
- ☐ In general, I am mildly against an emphasis on the social aspects of college life.
- ☐ In general, I am mildly in favor of an emphasis on the social aspects of college life.
- ☐ In general, I am in favor of an emphasis on the social aspects of college life.
- ☐ In general, I am very much in favor of an emphasis on the social aspects of college life.

7. Classical Music (Check one)

- ☐ I dislike classical music very much.
- ☐ I dislike classical music.
- ☐ I dislike classical music to a slight degree.
- ☐ I enjoy classical music to a slight degree.
- ☐ I enjoy classical music.
- ☐ I enjoy classical music very much.

8. Drinking (Check one)

- ☐ In general, I am very much in favor of college students drinking alcoholic beverages.
- ☐ In general, I am in favor of college students drinking alcoholic beverages.
- ☐ In general, I am mildly in favor of college students drinking alcoholic beverages.
- ☐ In general, I am mildly opposed to college students drinking alcoholic beverages.
- ☐ In general, I am opposed to college students drinking alcoholic beverages.
- ☐ In general, I am very much opposed to college students drinking alcoholic beverages.

SURVEY OF ATTITUDES

9. American Way of Life (Check one)

- ☐ I strongly believe that the American way of life is not the best.
- ☐ I believe that the American way of life is not the best.
- ☐ I feel that perhaps the American way of life is not the best.
- ☐ I feel that perhaps the American way of life is the best.
- ☐ I believe that the American way of life is the best.
- ☐ I strongly believe that the American way of life is the best.

10. Sports (Check one)

- ☐ I enjoy sports very much.
- ☐ I enjoy sports.
- ☐ I enjoy sports to a slight degree.
- ☐ I dislike sports to a slight degree.
- ☐ I dislike sports.
- ☐ I dislike sports very much.

11. Political Parties (Check one)

- ☐ I am a strong supporter of the Democratic party.
- ☐ I prefer the Democratic party.
- ☐ I have a slight preference for the Democratic party.
- ☐ I have a slight preference for the Republican party.
- ☐ I prefer the Republican party.
- ☐ I am a strong supporter of the Republican party.

12. Preparedness for War (Check one)

- ☐ I strongly believe that preparedness for war will not tend to precipitate war.
- ☐ I believe that preparedness for war will not tend to precipitate war.
- ☐ I feel that perhaps preparedness for war will not tend to precipitate war.
- ☐ I feel that perhaps preparedness for war will tend to precipitate war.
- ☐ I believe that preparedness for war will tend to precipitate war.
- ☐ I strongly believe that preparedness for war will tend to precipitate war.

13. Welfare Legislation (Check one)

- ☐ I am very much opposed to increased welfare legislation.
- ☐ I am opposed to increased welfare legislation.
- ☐ I am mildly opposed to increased welfare legislation.
- ☐ I am mildly in favor of increased welfare legislation.
- ☐ I am in favor of increased welfare legislation.
- ☐ I am very much in favor of increased welfare legislation.

14. Creative Work (Check one)

- ☐ I enjoy doing creative work very much.
- ☐ I enjoy doing creative work.
- ☐ I enjoy doing creative work to a slight degree.
- ☐ I dislike doing creative work to a slight degree.
- ☐ I dislike doing creative work.
- ☐ I dislike doing creative work very much.

SURVEY OF ATTITUDES

15. Dating (Check one)

- ☐ I strongly believe that girls should be allowed to date before they are in high school.
- ☐ I believe that girls should be allowed to date before they are in high school.
- ☐ I feel that perhaps girls should be allowed to date before they are in high school.
- ☐ I feel that perhaps girls should not be allowed to date until they are in high school.
- ☐ I believe that girls should not be allowed to date until they are in high school.
- ☐ I strongly believe that girls should not be allowed to date until they are in high school.

16. Red China and the U.N. (Check one)

- ☐ I strongly believe that Red China should not be admitted to the U.N.
- ☐ I believe that Red China should not be admitted to the U.N.
- ☐ I feel that perhaps Red China should not be admitted to the U.N.
- ☐ I feel that perhaps Red China should be admitted to the U.N.
- ☐ I believe that Red China should be admitted to the U.N.
- ☐ I strongly believe that Red China should be admitted to the U.N.

17. Novels (Check one)

- ☐ I dislike reading novels very much.
- ☐ I dislike reading novels.
- ☐ I dislike reading novels to a slight degree.
- ☐ I enjoy reading novels to a slight degree.
- ☐ I enjoy reading novels.
- ☐ I enjoy reading novels very much.

18. Strict discipline (Check one)

- ☐ I am very much against strict disciplining of children.
- ☐ I am against strict disciplining of children.
- ☐ I am mildly against strict disciplining of children.
- ☐ I am mildly in favor of strict disciplining of children.
- ☐ I am in favor of strict disciplining of children.
- ☐ I am very much in favor of strict disciplining of children.

19. Financial Help from Parents (Check one)

- ☐ I strongly believe that parents should provide financial help to young married couples.
- ☐ I believe that parents should provide financial help to young married couples.
- ☐ I feel that perhaps parents should provide financial help to young married couples.
- ☐ I feel that perhaps parents should not provide financial help to young married couples.
- ☐ I believe that parents should not provide financial help to young married couples.
- ☐ I strongly believe that parents should not provide financial help to young married couples.

SURVEY OF ATTITUDES

20. Foreign Language (Check one)

- ☐ I am very much in favor of requiring students to learn a foreign language.
- ☐ I am in favor of requiring students to learn a foreign language.
- ☐ I am mildly in favor of requiring students to learn a foreign language.
- ☐ I am mildly opposed to requiring students to learn a foreign language.
- ☐ I am opposed to requiring students to learn a foreign language.
- ☐ I am very much opposed to requiring students to learn a foreign language.

21. Dancing (Check one)

- ☐ I enjoy dancing very much.
- ☐ I enjoy dancing.
- ☐ I enjoy dancing to a slight degree.
- ☐ I dislike dancing to a slight degree.
- ☐ I dislike dancing.
- ☐ I dislike dancing very much.

22. Draft (Check one)

- ☐ I am very much in favor of the draft.
- ☐ I am in favor of the draft.
- ☐ I am mildly in favor of the draft.
- ☐ I am mildly opposed to the draft.
- ☐ I am opposed to the draft.
- ☐ I am very much opposed to the draft.

23. Family Finances (Check one)

- ☐ I strongly believe that the man in the family should handle the finances.
- ☐ I believe that the man in the family should handle the finances.
- ☐ I feel that perhaps the man in the family should handle the finances.
- ☐ I feel that perhaps the woman in the family should handle the finances.
- ☐ I feel that the woman in the family should handle the finances.
- ☐ I strongly believe that the woman in the family should handle the finances.

24. Men's Adjustment to Stress (Check one)

- ☐ I strongly believe that men adjust to stress better than women.
- ☐ I believe that men adjust to stress better than women.
- ☐ I feel that perhaps men adjust to stress better than women.
- ☐ I feel that perhaps women adjust to stress better than men.
- ☐ I believe that women adjust to stress better than men.
- ☐ I strongly believe that women adjust to stress better than men.

References

- Bales, R. F. Some uniformities of behavior in small social systems. In G. E. Swaasm, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley (Eds.) Readings in Social Psychology (ed. 3). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1952.
- Berkowitz, L. Effects of perceived dependency relationships upon conformity to group expectations. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 350-354.
- Bone, M., Byrne, D., and Diamond, M. J. Effect of occupational prestige and attitude similarity on attraction as a function of assumed similarity of attitude. Psychological Reports, 1968, 23, 1167-1172.
- Bonney, M. E. A sociometric study of the relationship of some factors to mutual friendships on the elementary, secondary and college levels. Sociometry, 1946, 2, 21-47.
- Brim, O. G., Jr., and Hoff, D. B. Individual and situational differences in desire for certainty. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 54, 225-229.
- Byrne, D. Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 713-715.
- Byrne, D. Attitudes and attraction. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental social psychology. Vol. 4. New York: Academic Press, 1969, Pp. 35-89.
- Byrne, D. The Attraction Paradigm. New York: Academic Press, in press.
- Byrne, D., and Andres, D. Prejudice and interpersonal expectancies. Journal of Negro Education, 1964, 33, 441-445.
- Byrne, D., and Clore, G. L., Jr. Effectance arousal and attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 6, No. 4 (Whole No. 638).
- Byrne, D., and Ervin, C. R. The continuity between the experimental study of attraction and "real life" computer dating. Unpublished manuscript, Purdue University, 1969.
- Byrne, D., and Ervin, C. R. Attraction toward a Negro stranger as a function of prejudice, attitude similarity, and the stranger's evaluation of the subject. Human Relations, 1970, 22, 397-404.
- Byrne, D., and Griffitt, W. A developmental investigation of the law of attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 699-702.
- Byrne, D., Griffitt, W., and Golightly, C. Prestige as a factor in determining the effect of attitude similarity-dissimilarity on attraction. Journal of Personality, 1966, 34, 434-444.

- Byrne, D., Griffitt, W., Hudgins, W., and Reeves, K. Attitude similarity-dissimilarity and attraction: generality beyond the college sophomore. Journal of Social Psychology, 1966.
- Byrne, D., London, O., and Reeves, K. The effects of physical attractiveness, sex, and attitude similarity on interpersonal attraction. Journal of Personality, 1968, 36, 259-271.
- Byrne, D., and McGraw, C. Interpersonal attraction toward Negroes. Human Relations, 1964, 17, 201-213.
- Byrne, D., and Nelson, D. Attraction as a linear function of proportion of positive reinforcements. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 659-663.
- Byrne, D., Young, R. K., and Griffitt, W. The reinforcement properties of attitude statements. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1966, 1, 266-276.
- Clore, G. L., Jr. Discriminative learning as a function of awareness of magnitude of attitudinal reinforcement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1966.
- Cohen, A. R. Situational structure, self-esteem, and threat oriented reactions to power, In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in Social Power, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, Pp. 35-52.
- Dillard, J., and Miller, N. Personality and Psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957.
- Festinger, L. Informal Social Communication. Psychological Review, 1950, 57, 271-282.
- Festinger, L. A theory of social comparison processes. Human Relations, 1954, 1, 117-140.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., Levinger, G., Morrison, H. W. Coercive power and factors affecting conformity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 93-101.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., and Raven, B. The bases of social power, In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in Social Power, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, Pp. 150-167.
- Golightly, Carole, and Byrne, D. Attitude statements as positive and negative reinforcements. Science, 1964, 146, 798-799.
- Griffitt, W. Anticipated reinforcement and attraction. Psychonomic Science, 1968, 11, 355.
- Griffitt, W. Attitude evoked anticipatory responses and attraction. Psychonomic Science, 1969, 14, 153-155.

- Grossman, Beverly and Wrighter, Joyce. The relationship between selection-rejection and intelligence, social status and personality amongst sixth grade children. Sociometry, 1948, 11, 346-355.
- Holtzman, Wayne H., and Young, Robert K. Scales for measuring attitudes toward the Negro and toward organized religion. Psychological Reports, 1966, 18, 31-34.
- Homans, George C. Attraction and power. In B. Murstein (Ed.) Theories of Interpersonal attraction in the dyad. New York: Academic Press, In press.
- Hoult, T. F. Experimental measurement of clothing as a factor in some social ratings of selected American Men. American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, 324-328.
- Kipnis, Dorothy McB. Interaction between members of bomber crews as a determinant of sociometric choice. Human Relations, 1957, 10, 263-270.
- Kipnis, D. The effects of leadership style and leadership power upon the inducement of an attitude change. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 57, 173-180.
- Krauss, R. M. Structural and attitudinal factors in interpersonal bargaining. Journal of Experimental and Social Psychology. 1966, 2, 42-55.
- Lefkowitz, M. M., Blake, R. R., and Mouton, Jane S. Status factors in pedestrian violation of traffic signals. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 704-706.
- Lerner, Melvin J. Evaluation of performance as a function of performer's reward and attractiveness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 355-360.
- Loomis, C. P., and Proctor, C. The relationship between choice status and economic status in social systems. Sociometry, 1950, 13, 307-313.
- Masling, J., Greer, F. L., and Gilmore, R. Status, authoritarianism and sociometric choice. Journal of Social Psychology, 1955, 41, 297-310.
- Meyers, Jerome L. Fundamentals of Experimental Designs, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1966.
- Newcomb, T. M. The Acquaintance Process. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1961.
- Novak, D. W., and Lerner, M. H. Rejection as a consequence of perceived similarity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 147-152.
- Palmer, J. A. Vindication, evaluation and the effect of the strangers competence on the attitude similarity-attraction function. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1969.

- Pepitone, A. Motivational effects in social perception. Human Relations, 1950, 3, 57-76.
- Pervin, C. A. The need to predict and control under conditions of threat. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 570-587.
- Raven, B. H., and French, J. R. P., Jr. Group support, legitimate power and social influence. Journal of Personality, 1958, 26, 400-409. (a)
- Raven, B. H., and French, J. R. P. Legitimate power, coercive power and observability in social influence. Sociometry, 1958, 25, 83-97. (b)
- Ronan, W. W. Individual and situational variables relating to job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, Monograph, 1970a, 54, 1-31.
- Ronan, W. W. Relative importance of job characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970b, 54, 192-200.
- Stotland, E. Peer groups and reactions to power figures, In D. Cartwright (Ed.) Studies in Social Power. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, Pp. 53-68.
- White, R. W. Motivation reconsidered: the concept of competence. Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 297-333.
- Wild, Roy. Job needs, job satisfaction, and job behavior of women manual workers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54, 157-162.
- Zander, A., and Curtis, T. Effects of social power on aspiration setting and striving. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 64, 63-74.
- Zipf, Sheila G. Resistance and conformity under reward and punishment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 102-109.

SOCIAL POWER AND INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION

by

RUSSELL VEITCH

B. S., Wisconsin State University - Whitewater, 1967

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Psychology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1971

One hundred and twenty undergraduate males and females participated in three 2x2 factorially designed experiments to investigate the combined effects of social power and attitude similarity on attraction. It was hypothesized that: (1) attraction of B toward A is a positive function of the similarity of A's attitudes to those of B regardless of the power or lack of power held by A. (2) attraction of B toward A is a positive function of A's ability to administer rewards (reward power). (3) attraction of B toward A is a positive function of the degree of expertise held by A (expert power). (4) attraction of B toward A is a positive function of the legitimacy of A's power base (legitimate power). Results indicated an affirmation of all four hypotheses and were discussed in terms of a reinforcement model of interpersonal attraction.

Whereas most of the literature in the area of interpersonal attraction assumes that the emotional and instrumental components of attraction are necessarily bound to go together, results of this study indicate that this is not necessarily so. It was noted that when no information is present regarding the context of the work situation within which the subject is asked whether he would like to participate with the stranger, the two components correlate highly. However, when the subject is given information concerning power relationships, the work situation is more clearly defined and the relationship between the emotional and instrumental components of attraction is more variant.

There was an indication of sex differences with respect to the effects of social power on attraction. These differences were discussed in terms of differential role definition on the part of the sexes.