Table 1

Role Choices by High (H), Medium (M), and Low (L) Status Subjects as a Function of the Attractiveness of the Other Person: Experiment I

Subjects' True Status	Attractive Other			Unattractive Other			Control		
	H	M	L	H	M	L	H	M	L
High	4	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	0
Medium	7	5	0	1	9	1	1	8	2
Low	0	4	0	1	0	4	1	1	5
Totals	11	9	0	6	9	5	4	9	7

status. Therefore, unless rewards are expected to be greater from the enactment of a different role/status, the male (P) will choose his own role for enactment. In the unattractive female (O) and control conditions, P would be expected to choose a role that is most similar to this true role. When O is attractive, however, P may expect his rewards from the interaction to vary with the status reflected by the role he enacts. Thus, in the attractive O condition, P's choices should deviate in the direction of choosing a role that reflects a higher status than his own, except of course when his true status is high.

Two experiments were conducted to test these predictions.

EXPERIMENT I

Method

The general design of the experiment was essentially the same as that described in the example used above. Male subjects were told that they would interact with a female who was waiting in an adjacent room. In the attractive condition, he could see an attractive female via a one-way mirror; in the unattractive condition, he could see an unattractive female via the one-way mirror; and in the control condition he could not see the other person. Prior to the interaction, the subject was asked to choose one of three roles to enact during the interaction and to indicate which of the three roles most closely corresponded to his own role.

Subject. The subjects were 60 male undergraduates who volunteered to serve in this particular experiment in order to satisfy a portion of the requirements of a course in introductory psychology. Twenty subjects served in each of the three experiment conditions. In addition, two female undergraduates served as confederates and played the role of the person with whom the subject would interact. In the attractive condition, the confederate was made up to appear physically attractive whereas in the unattractive condition she was made up to appear physically unattractive. In the control condition, she gave no special attention to make-up. Each confederate served in each of the three experimental conditions an equal number of times.

Materials. Prior to the beginning of the experiment, a questionnaire was designed to determine what kinds of information about another person is viewed as evidence of high, medium, or low status by college undergraduates. Six categories of status position were included (type of housing, total weekly spending money, kind of car, college major, social affiliations, and family background), with eight items in each category. One hundred male undergraduates were asked to indicate whether each item represented high, medium, or low status, where status was defined as relative standing in the eyes of others. Using these ratings, three role descriptions were formed to represent high, medium, or low status. The item in each of the six general categories that received the largest number of high ratings was selected for the high status role, those receiving the largest number of medium ratings constituted the medium role description, and those items receiving the largest number of low ratings constituted the low status rule description.

Procedure. When the subject reported to the laboratory, he was taken into a room with a one-way mirror and allowed to view the female confederate in another room (except in the control condition where the one-way mirror was covered by a window shade). The female appeared to be another subject who had reported early. During the time that the subject was viewing her she walked around the room, ostensibly to look at pictures on the walls. This made it possible for the subject to get a good impression of her appearance. The subject was told that he would hold a conversation with the girl in the other room, during which he would be asked to adopt a particular role. He was then given the three role descriptions and asked to select the one that he wished to adopt. After making this selection, he was asked to indicate which of the three roles corresponded most closely to his real life situation. Finally, in the attractive and unattractive conditions, he was asked to indicate whether he thought the confederate was attractive or unattractive. The experimenter asked this final question casually, as if this were only an unplanned query.

The subject was then told that he would interact with the confederate for 5 min, during which time he should try to sell her a magazine subscription, using only the information from the chosen role when talking about himself. It was emphasized that he could use other means of persuasion, so long as he did not behave in ways that were inconsistent with his adopted role. For example, he could say that he was selling magazines to earn money for a good cause such as a scholarship fund.

The subject and confederate then conversed for 5 min, after which the experminter answered any questions that the subject had about the experiment.

Results and Discussion

Manipulation check. In response to the question about the attractiveness of the female confederate, 18 subjects in the attractive and 18 in the unattractive condition gave responses that could be evaluated. Five judges rated each comment on a scale ranging from 1 (typically assigned to comments such as "definitely not a swinger," "uuk!") to 7 (typically assigned to statements such as "very beautiful," "very attractive"). The mean attractiveness score for the "attractive" confederate was 6.0 as compared with a mean score of 2.2 for the "unattractive" confederate ($t = 14.07$, $p < .001$), thus providing strong evidence that the attractiveness of the confederate was perceived appropriately by the subjects.

Role choices. Subjects were categorized according to their statements about their real life situation. If a subject selected the high status role description as being most similar to his real life situation, he was classfied as true status high (TSH), if he chose the medium status role description, he was classified as true status medium (TSM), and if he chose the low status role description he was classified as true status low (TSL). Table 1 gives the number and percentage of subjects in each category who selected high, medium, and low status roles for enactment.

Role choices correspond rather closely with choices predicted by exchange theory as can be seen in Table 1.

Role choice distribution in the attractive condition differed significantly from chance (χ^2 = 10.24, df = 2, p < .01) whereas distributions did not differ significantly from chance in the unattractive (χ^2 = 1.29, df = 2, p < .70) or in the control condition (χ^2 = 1.89, df = 2, p < .50).

A more direct test of exchange theory predictions may be made by examining the number of role choices that are higher, lower, and the same status as the subject's true role status. These data are given in Table 2. This distribution in the attractive condition differed significantly from the distribution in the unattractive condition (χ^2 =9.68, df = 2, p < .01) and from the distribution in the control condition (χ^2 = 8.08, df = 2, p < .02). Distribution of choices in the unattractive condition did not differ significantly from the distribution in the control condition (χ^2 = .64, df = 2, p < .90). These results are of course consistent with exchange theory predictions.

EXPERIMENT II

Method

Subjects. The subjects were 66 male undergraduates who volunteered for this experiment as one way of satisfying part of the requirements of a course in introductory psychology. Twenty-two subjects were randomly assigned to each of the three experimental conditions. As in Experiment I, a female confederate played the role of the person with whom the subject would interact. She was made up to be physically attractive, physically unattractive, or "natural," according to the experimental condition.

Procedure. The procedure was basically the same as in Experiment I, with the following exceptions: (1) the experimenter was an attractive female; (2) the manipulation check consisted of subject ratings of attractiveness of the confederate using a seven-point scale; and (3) records were kept of the number of role characteristics mentioned by the subject during his conversation with the confederate. (There was no significant difference in role characteristics mentioned, so this will not be referred to again.) In all other respects the procedure was identical to the procedure in Experiment I.

Results and Discussion

Manipulation check. Subjects' ratings of the attractive and unattractive confederate differed significantly (mean attractive = 5.2; mean unattractive = 3.5; t = 8.09, p < .001). The manipulation apparently created the intended effect, although the magnitude of the difference was not as great as in Experiment I.

Role choices. Table 3 presents the number of observed role choices that were higher, lower, and the same status as the subject's true role status. This distribution in the attractive condition differed significantly from the distribution in the unattractive condition (χ^2 = 6.68, p < .05); no other difference was significant.

It is obvious that the results from Experiment II are not altogether consistent with the results of Experiment I and appear to be somewhat inconsistent with the predictions of exchange theory. In an attempt to understand these differences, it is necessary to consider the differences in procedures in the two

Table 2
Number of Role Choices that Were Same, Higher, and Lower Status than the Subject's Own Role: Experiment I

	Same	Higher	Lower
Attractive Other	9	11	0
Unattractive Other	17	2	1
Control	15	3	2

Table 3
Number of Role Choices that Were the Same, Higher, and Lower Status than the Subject's Own Role: Experiment II

	Same	Higher	Lower
Attractive Other	10	6	6
Unattractive Other	19	1	2
Control	11	5	6

Table 4
Status of Reported Real-Life Roles in the Two Experiments

	High	Medium	Low
Experiment I	10	34	16
Experiment II	13	48	5

experiments. The major difference was that the experimenter was male in the first experiment and female in the second experiment. Furthermore, the female experimenter was very attractive. Therefore, it seemed reasonable to suppose that the male subjects' reports concerning their role in "real life" were affected by the presence of the attractive female. Such an effect is consistent with the proposals of Heider (1958) and Goffman (1959) and also with exchange theory. Table 4 shows the distributions of reported true role status by subjects in the two experiments. It can be seen that the distribution of reported "real life" roles reflects a generally higher status in Experiment II than in Experiment I (χ^2 = 6.90, df = 2, p < .05). Thus, self-presentation in Experiment II was influenced by the attractiveness of another person, but the effect occurred in response to the female experimenter, leaving little room for further shifting in response to the confederate.

In summary, the data from the two experiments clearly supports the proposition that a person's behavior in social interaction is determined, in part, by the kind of perception that he wants the other person to have of him. The data from Experiment I clearly support exchange theory predictions if one accepts the finding that the sex of the experimenter influences the subject's report of his real life role status.

In conclusion, the data from these studies provide good support for the proposition that a person's behavior in social interaction is determined, in part, by the kind of perception that he wants the other person to have of him, and that the kind of impression desired is determined, in part, by the characteristics of the other person (O). If P wants O to have a good impression of him, he will present himself in as favorable a light as possible; e.g., by enacting a high status role as in the

attractive condition of Experiment I. If P is indifferent as to O's impression of him, as in the control and unattractive conditions, factors extrinsic to the interaction will govern his behavior. These effects are generally consistent with exchange theory predictions.

REFERENCES

Gergen, K. J., & Taylor, M. G. Social expectancy and self-presentation in a status hierarchy. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1969, 5, 79-92.

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

Heider, F. Attitudes and cognitive organization. Journal of Psychology, 1946, 21, 107-112.

Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Jones, E. E. Ingratiation: A social psychological analysis. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.

Jones, E. E., Gergen, K. J., & Jones, R. G. Tactics of ingratiation among leaders and subordinates in a status hierarchy. Psychological Monographs, 1963, 77, (Whole No. 566).

Newcomb, T. M. The prediction of interpersonal attraction. American Psychologist, 1956, 11, 575-586.

Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. The social psychology of groups. New York: Wiley, 1959.