advantage of 20, most closely span the punishment levels of 5, 10, and 20 points.

REFERENCES

- GAHAGAN, J., TEDESCHI, J., FALEY, T., & LINDSKOLD, S. Patterns of punishment and reactions to threats. University of Miami Mimeograph, 1969.
- HORAI, J., & TEDESCHI, J. The effects of credibility and magnitude of punishment on compliance to threats. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, in press.
- JONES, B., STEELE, M., GAHAGAN, J., & TEDESCHI, J. Matrix values and cooperative behavior in the prisoner's dilemma game. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 1968, 8, 148-153.
- LINDSKOLD, S., BONOMA, T., & TEDESCHI, J. T. Reactions to a threatening simulated opponent. University of Miami Mimeograph, 1969.
- LINDSKOLD, S., & TEDESCHI, J. T. Effects of contingent promises on interpersonal conflict. University of Miami Mimeograph, 1969.
- OSGOOD, C. E., SUCI, G. J., & TANNENBAUM, P. H. *The measurement of meaning*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- RAPOPORT, A., & CHAMMAH, A. M. *Prisoner's dilemma*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.
- STEELE, M. W., & TEDESCHI, J. T. Matrix indices and strategy choices in mixed-motive games. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1967, 11, 198-205.
- TEDESCHI, J. T., HORAI, J., LINDSKOLD, S., & GAHAGAN, J. The effects of threat upon prevarication and compliance in social conflict. *Proceedings, 76th Annual Convention, APA*, 1968, 399-400.

NOTES

1. This research was supported in part by NIH Grant No. SB26FR07622029121902 made to the University of Miami (Florida). The authors wish to thank Joann Horai, John Powell, James Gahagan, and Thomas Faley for their assistance in all phases of this study.
2. The use of this notation for representing matrix values has been adopted from Rapoport & Chammah (1965).
3. Message related behavior was also analyzed by covariance, but no significant findings were obtained.

The effectiveness of several types of ingratiation techniques following argument

DAVID L. McMILLEN, *Mississippi State University, State College, Miss. 39762*, and ROBERT L. HELMREICH, *University of Texas, Austin, Tex. 78712*

The hypothesis was tested that requesting a small favor is an effective means of re-establishing a favorable relationship following an argument. Experimental conditions consisted of (1) request of a favor, (2) offer of a favor, (3) apology, (4) apology and favor request, (5) apology and favor offer. The effect of the stimulus person on the S was most positive in the ask-favor condition.

The purpose of the present experiment was to investigate the reactions of one person to various behaviors on the part of another person following an argument. The authors were particularly interested in situations where P and O were already close friends, but a temporary breakdown had

occurred in their relationship as a result of an argument.

Five types of behavior were employed by P in an attempt to restore a positive relationship with O: (1) P apologized, (2) P apologized and offered a favor to O, (3) P apologized and asked a favor of O, (4) P offered a favor to O, (5) P asked a favor of O. In addition, a base or control condition was employed in which P said nothing to O.

It was predicted that each of the above behaviors, with the exception of the control, would produce some positive effect in O. The degree of positive effect was predicted to be different for different types of behavior. The main hypothesis was that P's asking a small favor of O would produce greater positive effect than the other behaviors mentioned above. Positive effect was defined as a composite of three things: (1) amount of O's discomfort that is removed, (2) amount of O's anger that is removed, and (3) degree of positive evaluation of P by O.

It was hypothesized that an apology is an

awkward experience not only for the person making the apology but also for the person receiving it. This is especially true if there is ambiguity about who was at fault in the argument. In such a situation an apology might cause the person receiving it to experience guilt because he is aware that part of the blame is his, yet the other person is making the apology. It seems reasonable to assume that, in this situation, guilt feelings might arise which could produce tension, anger, and possibly a tendency to find the other person unpleasant.

There is also the possibility that O will interpret P's apology as an attempt to gain approval of his behavior from O. By reprimanding his own behavior, the apologizer almost forces O to make some sort of condoning statement to him.

A final alternative is that an apology acts as a stimulus which forces recall of the unpleasant situation which preceded the apology. This could cause the recipient to feel awkward or tense.

For any of the above reasons the positive effect of an apology might be reduced. But what if the other person offers to do something for the recipient instead of apologizing to him? Such a technique should be somewhat more effective than an apology; however, it does contain several pitfalls. Perhaps the most obvious disadvantage is that offering a favor may be interpreted by the recipient as a case of one-up-manship.

Another disadvantage is that the offering of a favor may be viewed by the recipient as an attempt to buy back his friendship. If this occurs, the recipient is almost certain to be annoyed by the other person and/or to feel awkward. Finally, the offer of a favor, like an apology, may call attention to a situation which is better forgotten. The offer of a favor may attach an importance to the argument which it does not deserve, and thereby increase discomfort and reduce the attractiveness of P.

Another technique for restoring friendly relations is for the stimulus person to ask a favor of the other person. At first glance this would seem an ineffective method. However, such a technique, if handled properly, could be quite effective. The crucial point to be considered regarding any tension relieving or ingratiating technique is how it is perceived by the person to whom it is directed. Asking a favor will be ineffective when O (1) perceives the favor as large or (2) feels he is the only one available and thus that the subject had to seek his assistance. The asking of a favor will also be ineffective when it is interpreted as an obvious attempt at ingratiation. Conversely, asking a favor should yield best results when the favor is small and there are other people available that the stimulus person could ask.

In addition to the main hypothesis, the authors predicted that a combination of an apology and request of a favor would be the least effective of the behavior techniques tested. The strength of asking a favor is its subtlety as reconciliation technique. Preceding it with an apology should make it an obvious attempt at ingratiation and destroy its effectiveness.

METHOD

Subjects were 48 male introductory psychology students in the summer session at the University of Texas. Eight students were randomly assigned to each of six groups.

After arriving for the experiment, Ss were conducted to an experimental cubical containing two chairs and a table with a portable television on it. The E seated the S and informed him that the experiment was designed to investigate reactions to various types of social situations. The S was instructed in the specific purposes of the experiment and in his task of role-playing the situation shown on the T.V. The instructions were concluded with the following statement:

"Now, the first situation which you are going to watch deals with an *argument* between two roommates. You will see the last portion of the *argument* on the T.V. They have been arguing for some time on a topic about which they have completely different opinions and by now the discussion has become loud and heated. What I want you to do is to imagine that the person you see on the screen is your own roommate. You will hear another person's voice but you will not see him. I want you to imagine that the other voice is yours. In other words try to imagine you are having this argument with your roommate. Try to make a real effort to put yourself into the situation."

At this point the E retired from the cubicle and then played a previously recorded *argument* between two actors. To insure that the S's reactions were to the situation rather than to the topic of the argument, the tape recorded portion of the *argument* was constant free. It consisted mainly of each person's declaring the other's unwillingness to listen or try to understand and terminated with the S's "roommate" storming out of the apartment saying that he was going to class.

After the recording was played, E returned to the cubicle and gave the S a questionnaire to fill out. The questionnaire contained 10 word pairs of semantic differential type. For each pair there was a seven-point scale. Three of the word pairs on the questionnaire yielded a measure of how comfortable or uncomfortable the S was. Another three pairs indicated how annoyed

Group	Relaxed-tense	Pleased-annoyed	Feelings toward "roommate"	Total
1	29.8	29.8	37.0	96.5
2	34.5	38.3	49.6	122.4
3	34.0	34.9	51.0	122.4
4	37.8	39.0	55.3	129.5
5	34.5	37.0	50.9	122.4
6	30.1	33.3	45.1	108.5

Note: In order to yield positive numbers, a constant was added to each person's score. This accounts for the mean change scores being larger than would normally be possible on a seven-point scale.

or pleased the S felt. The remaining four pairs gave a measure of the S's positive or negative feelings toward "the roommate."

After collecting the questionnaire, the E informed the S that there was another scene which he wanted him to watch. He was told to continue considering the person on the T.V. to be his roommate.

There were six different versions of this final scene; they varied in length from 33 sec to 50 sec.

(1) Control—"roommate" enters apartment, sits down on the couch and begins reading a book. He does not speak to the other person at all. (33 sec.)

(2) Same as control except roommate apologizes for his behavior that morning. (33 sec.)

(3) Same as control except he pauses from reading and asks his roommate if he wants to go down to a local tavern (frequented by students). He offers to pay for the beer. (34 sec.)

(4) Same as control except he pauses from reading and asks for help on a few math problems. (33 sec.)

(5) Same as control except he pauses from reading and apologizes for his behavior that morning. After another pause he offers to buy his roommate a couple of beers. (48 sec.)

(6) Same as control except he pauses from reading and apologizes for his behavior that morning. After another pause he asks for some help on a few math problems. (50 sec.)

After the S viewed the final scene, the E returned and asked him to fill out a second questionnaire exactly like the first one. The S was told to fill it out with regard to how he felt at the end of the last scene.

When the S had completed the last questionnaire, the purpose of the experiment was explained and he was dismissed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Difference scores between responses on the first and second administration of the questionnaire furnished the data for statistical analysis. The items on the questionnaire were grouped into the three a priori categories mentioned previously. In addition, a fourth scale was included. This was a sum of the scores of all 10 pairs. The mean change scores for the treatment groups are shown in Table 1.

An analysis of variance, including orthogonal comparisons was performed on the data from each of the four categories. There was a highly significant difference between the control group mean and the means of experimental groups in all categories. $F(1,42) = 9.13, 31.90, 45.12$, and 74.95 , respectively, for relaxed-tense and pleased-annoyed feelings toward "roommate" and total categories; $p < .01$ in all cases. As expected, most Ss in the control group had negative change scores. The sole action of the stimulus person in this condition is silence. Silence by itself is a neutral act; however, when one considers the argument which occurred earlier, silence was probably interpreted as a hostile act. In contrast to the control condition all the experimental manipulations are attempts at positive action. As the data indicate, these positive attempts were successful; however, the degree of their success varied.

It was predicted that the "ask favor" group would exhibit a greater amount of positive change than the other groups. The data support this prediction [$F(1,42) = 10.35$ and 14.64 , respectively, for relaxed-tense category and total ($p < .01$)]. The remaining categories yielded $F_s(1,4)$ of 2.89 and 3.29 , $.05 < p < .10$.

The comparisons of the "apology-ask favor" group with the remaining three groups were significant at the .01 level in all categories [$F(1,42) = 7.33, 10.14, 7.84$, and 22.77]. This difference, as predicted, was in the direction of less positive change for the "apology-ask favor" condition.

The differences between the remaining three groups were small and did not reach significance.

The results indicate that, at least in the situation used in this experiment, asking a favor is an effective way of restoring a friendly relationship after an argument. It is likely that the main reasons for the effectiveness of asking a favor are its subtlety and its implicit ego-building properties. In situations such as the one in this experiment, the disagreement is just as well forgotten; however, something must be done to reestablish friendly relations. Asking a favor serves this purpose while avoiding the negative factors associated with an apology or offer of a favor.