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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Considerable investigative efforts have been expended by social scientists in attempts to characterize the process of persuasion. Many of these efforts have resulted in empirical studies which propounded and tested tactics and strategies for speakers engaged in the task of modifying the attitudes of others.

The present research also focused on persuasion. It did so in the social context of a person-to-persons situation in which persuasion was defined as an act in which messages were used to facilitate changes in the evaluative behavior of the respondents.

The end product of this study consisted of a systematic determination of the feasibility of applying a psychological model, specifically a transactional analysis model, to the persuasion process. In order to reach this goal, several steps were taken.

First, a frame of reference for examining the recent research related to this area was selected. Because the basic ingredients of the interpersonal communication process have been delineated by several authors, the examination of the relation of each of these elements to persuasion provides the rationale for this study.

Second, strategies which have been successful in eliciting audience attitude shift were examined.
Third, a taxonomic system for the evaluation of human communicative behavior and personality types was generated. This section serves to acquaint the reader with specifics of the model being tested.

Fourth, a systematic application of the personality model to the variables of the persuasion process was made in a controlled laboratory experimental situation. This step is operationally described in Section II, "Research Methods and Procedures."

Fifth, statistical evaluations were conducted in order to determine whether or not the relationships between personality and persuasability, between personality and persuasiveness, and their interactive effects were statistically significant at the appointed level of significance.

Sixth, a judgment was made regarding the feasibility of using transactional analysis and one of its extensions, the P-A-C model for structural analysis, as a basis for the construction of a predictive model of persuasion. Transactional analysis has been described as a relatively complete personality theory and psycho-therapeutic technology. It rests upon the notion that when individuals interact, their behavior in both the verbal and physical dimensions can be described as parent, adult, or child (hereafter referred to as P-A-C). One of the basic postulates of transactional analysis is that given the personality types of the individuals involved, be they P, A, or C, one can then predict the nature of the ensuing transaction.
These six steps represent the organization of the chapters which follow.

**Background**

**Models of Communication**

The first step in this investigation involved the review selection of a "suitable" model for examining communication and, in particular, the persuasive process. Although communication situations differ from one another in various ways, it is the common elements of these situations that were considered in this study. These elements and their interrelationships have tended to form a basis for constructing viable models. The primary concern at this point revolves around the utility and development of such a model.

Aristotle, in *Rhetoric*, suggested the examination of three communication ingredients: the speaker, the speech, and the audience (Roberts, 1946.) Many contemporary models have incorporated the elements of Aristotle's model, but also include some new components. One example is the model developed by Shannon and Weaver, (1949) which consists of a source, a transmitter, a signal, a receiver, and a destination. Several other paradigms reveal a great deal of similarity to Aristotle's basic notions, they include the models propounded by Schramm (1954), Westley and MacLean (1957), Fearing (1953), and Johnson (1953).

Perhaps the most widely-used model of communication was
that set forth by Berlo (1960). The elements he employed in his model were: the communication source, the encoder, the message, the channel, the decoder, and the communication receiver. The following example from Berlo (1960) can be used to illustrate the functions of the model's elements:

"Suppose it is Friday morning. We find Joe and Mary in the local coffee shop. There is a picnic scheduled for Sunday afternoon. Suddenly, Joe realizes that Mary is the girl to take on the picnic. Joe decides to ask her for a Sunday afternoon date. Joe is now ready to act as a communication source—he has a purpose: to get Mary to agree to accompany him on Sunday. (He may have other purposes as well, but they are not our concern.) Joe wants to produce a message. His central nervous system orders his speech mechanism to construct a message to express his purpose. The speech mechanism, serving as an encoder, produces the following message: 'Mary, will you go to the picnic with me on Sunday?'

The message is transmitted via sound waves through air, so that Mary can receive it. This is the channel. Mary's hearing mechanism serves as a decoder. She hears Joe's message, decodes the message into a nervous impulse, and sends it to her central nervous system. Mary's central nervous system responds to the message. It decides that Friday is too late to ask for a Sunday date. Mary intends to refuse the date, and sends an order to her speech mechanism. The message is produced: 'Thanks, Joe, but no thanks.' Or something somewhat more polite."

(pgs. 32-33)

Although this is an elementary and somewhat oversimplified treatment of communication, it serves as a foundation for the following discussion. As a matter of fact, it is the simplicity of this model which makes it acceptable for this purpose.

One example of the use of this type of model in dealing with persuasion was found in the work of Rosenthal (1966). He stated
that

"oral persuasion involves the generation of symbolic stimuli by a speaker and a reaction to these stimuli by a listener." (p.115)

Such a conceptualization delineates as model elements the source, the encoder, the message, the decoder, the receiver explicitly, and the channel implicitly. Analogous applications have also been made in research situations by Hovland, Lumsdaine, and Sheffield (1949), Hovland, Janis, and Kelly (1953), and Miller (1968). In communication situations the source and the encoder, as well as the receiver and the decoder can be grouped together in pairs; in other words, a source encodes a message that is decoded by a receiver, making the distinctions between them, to a large extent, irrelevant.

This model, Berlo's, represents the frame of reference used for this study. In order to accommodate the notion of measurability, the viewpoint of Schramm (1954) was incorporated. He said

"... A communicates B through channel C to D with effect E. Each of these letters is to some extent an unknown and the process can be solved for any one of them or any combination."

Equipped with the model provided by Berlo (1960) and the idea of measurable effect from Schramm (1954), the next step calls for the inspection of variables which have been associated with the selected elements of the model. The components comprising this model were the source, the message, the channel, and the receiver.
Source Variables

The variable most commonly associated with the source seemed to be credibility. Although Corts (1968) suggested that ethos is no longer used to mean what it did when discussed by Aristotle; it has in recent years been looked upon as the image held of a source at a given time by a receiver (Anderson and Clevenger, 1963.) More precise operational definitions have been propounded, however. For example, Baker (1965) indicated that

"a speaker who displays difficulty in accomplishing what is expected to be a systematic presentation of his ideas will be perceived as a low credibility source."

Credibility, according to Sharp and McClung (1966), is the influence of a speaker's ethical appeal on his ability to persuade.

For the purposes of this study it was significant to note the susceptibility to manipulation of source credibility. The rationale behind varying speaker ethos lies in the fact that highly credible sources were seemingly more persuasive than sources with low credibility. Anderson and Clevenger (1963) stated

"the finding is almost universal that the ethos of the source is related in some way to the impact of the message."

In their summary of experimental research dealing with credibility they went on to say

"research shows that expert opinion may be about as influential as majority opinion in inducing attitude change."
Similarly, McCroskey and Combs (1969), in studying the effects of analogy upon attitude change and source credibility, found attitude change scores higher for subjects exposed to an initially high credibility source. According to Brooks and Scheidel (1968), the exact magnitude of this effect has not, thus far, been determined. These authors did suggest, however, that this significant effect occurred soon after the speaker began his presentation. The short term nature of this effect will be discussed later. This concludes the discussion of those variables which have most often been associated with the source.

Message Variables

It is difficult to select variables that pertain solely to the message because message production exists as an obvious function of the source. McCroskey and Dunham (1966) addressed themselves to this issue when they reported:

"The overall impact of a message containing strong fear arousing appeals is dependent upon the interaction of a variety of source, message, and receiver variables that are only beginning to be isolated and analyzed." (p. 391)

As a basis for further discussion of message variables, the alleged relationships between source credibility and the message which have been reported in some of the literature are described. As mentioned earlier, Baker (1965) indicated that the evaluation of a speaker as having low credibility may have come about as a result of something less than a systematic presentation of his ideas. This seems to suggest that classifying a speaker as highly credible may be indicative of what
was judged to be a well-organized presentation. McCroskey and Mehrley (1969), in their study of disorganization and its effects on credibility, made conclusions similar to those of Baker. They indicated that the presence of serious disorganization, extensive non-fluencies, or both, were sufficient to reduce significantly the amount of attitude change produced by a speaker. Based on their own studies, as well as earlier research, they arrived at the following conclusion:

"Serious disorganization and extensive non-fluencies seriously restrict the amount of attitude change a communicator can produce and substantially reduce the communicator's credibility." (p. 21)

Studies other than those which seemed to concentrate on the interactive nature of the source and message have also been completed. They tend to examine the message from two divergent points of view: (1) a consideration of the structure of the message, or (2) a consideration of the delivery of the message.

One study of the first type was conducted by Dresser (1963). He posed the question:

"Does using sound evidence contribute significantly to the influence which a speech of advocacy has on the attitudes of the audience?" (p.302)

He concluded: (1) that the quality of the evidence has no significant persuasive effect, and (2) that listeners rarely perceive the weaknesses of evidence in persuasive speeches. This finding has since received partial support from McCroskey (1969) who, in summarizing research on the effects of evidence, suggested that its importance is a sometimes thing depending on
other variables for the magnitude of its effect.

There have been investigations which focused on components of the message other than evidence; for example, Tubb's (1968) consideration of explicit versus implicit conclusions, or Ragdale's (1966) work with brevity and its effects on persuasiveness. There seemed to be at least one idea common to all studies of this type; that being the possibility, if not the plausibility, of considering this interest in messages apart from the individuals involved in the persuasion process. In other words, the effectiveness of messages in shifting attitudes is not necessarily related to the functions of the source, the channel, or the receiver.

The other type of study dealing with messages, does, however, indicate a complex interrelationship among the other model variables. The importance of the distinction between the two types of studies becomes apparent in a later discussion of transactional analysis and a P-A-C model of persuasion. This second point of view has received investigative attention under the label of "effects of delivery."

The effects of delivery, according to Andersen (1971), designates the process which utilizes a potential message and gives it reality by encoding the message in a channel. Or, in terms which are more operational, it refers to the actions of the source in putting material into a channel. There were two reported studies, that of Heinberg (1963) and that of Bowers and Osborn (1966), which seem to have particular relevance
to this discussion.

Heinberg's (1963) study addressed itself to the ascertainment of the

"relative weightings of content and delivery in determining the general effectiveness of speeches of self introduction and speeches to persuade." (p.105)

This determination was made by three groups of eight judges each. The judges had at least fifty hours of graduate credit and at least one year experience as teachers of public speaking at the college level. An evaluation of the Judges' ratings indicated a high degree of reliability. The following conclusion was drawn from the study:

"according to regressions of general effectiveness on content and delivery ratings, delivery . . . is almost three times as influential as content in determining the effectiveness of attempts to 'sell' an idea." (p. 107)

Bowers and Osborn (1966) were concerned in part of their study with the effects of highly intense or emotional language on an audience as it related to persuasiveness. Used in the conclusion of a persuasive speech, the language used has this effect:

"High language intensity, whether metaphorical or not, is more effective than less intense language when it occurs in the conclusions of speeches after audiences have been appropriately prepared for strong value terms by the introduction and body." (p.153)

These two reports relate to this study in the following ways: (1) in the P-A-C paradigm the types of delivery are allegedly bound up with certain personality types, and (2) the experimental message used in this study contain what Bowers and
Osborn classified as a highly intense concluding metaphor.

Channel Variables

Bettinghaus (1966) discussed channels as the means by which a receiver assimilated a message sent by a source. For example, a receiver might hear a message (the aural channel), see a message (the visual channel), or some combination of both. Considerable effort has been expended in the field of communication dealing with this variable. Most of these studies concentrated in the area of nonverbal behavior.

Thompson (1967), in summarizing various studies dealing with nonverbal behavior in the process of persuasion, concluded that:

"(1) nonverbal stimuli have communicative value--i.e., much of the time the interpretations of these stimuli by listeners are accurate; (2) listeners often differ, however, in their responses to a stimulus, and the stereotypes of listeners may affect their perceptions more than reality; and (3) the extent to which nonverbal stimuli communicate the intended meanings successfully depends upon the fineness of the discrimination required." (p. 81)

Several of the studies from which these conclusions were drawn have a direct bearing on this investigation. For example, Starkweather (1961), writing for a symposium published in the Journal of Communication, stated that voice sounds alone, that are apart from any semantic components, are sufficient cues to the emotional state of the speaker. In the same journal, Davitz and Davitz (1961) suggested that, as of that time, "no general, systematic theory of nonverbal emotional communication has
emerged," but that a growing empirical basis for this type of theory was being provided.

More recent studies have addressed themselves to the issue of developing such a theory. Tolch (1963) endeavored to determine the reasons behind subjects'abilities to make accurate judgments of facial expressions. The author seemed to conclude that it is not a problem of correct judgment on the subject's part, but rather the lack of valid and reliable scales of measurement. He suggested that the use of semantic differential scales could alleviate a great proportion of the problem. This advice seems to have been accepted, for contemporary investigations have utilized the semantic differential often and with satisfactory results.

Further efforts have been expended toward the development of a general theory of nonverbal communication. One framework for investigating this form of behavior has been offered by Barnlund (1968). He suggested the examination of vocal-nonverbal behavior and nonvocal-nonverbal behavior. This dichotomy has apparently been accepted as viable in that similar systems have been propounded by Wepman, et al. (1960) and Osgood and Miron (1963) in their studies of aphasia. They referred to these stimuli as auditory and visual, however.

The distinction between vocal and nonvocal behavior is based upon the relationship of the behavior and a language code. In this situation the components of vocal behavior include those aspects of the message delivery which carry the burden of trans-
mitting the language code; nonverbal behavior, on the other hand, includes those aspects of human communication which are seen rather than heard.

According to Eisenberg and Smith (1971), paralanguage or nonverbal-vocal behavior consists of the two nonverbal components of the speech act: (1) voice set, and (2) nonverbal vocalizations. They indicated that voice set is measured in terms of volume, pitch, rate, quality, and is determined by the speaker's physiological and psychological condition.

The second category of the paralinguistic scheme offered by Eisenberg and Smith (1971)—nonverbal vocalizations—was divided into three types: (1) vocal characterizers, (2) vocal qualifiers, and (3) vocal segregates. Laughing or crying in a speaking situation were encompassed by the term vocal characterizers. Vocal qualifiers consisted of the variations in an individual's pitch and volume. Finally, vocal segregates were the sounds or silences which appeared between articulations.

Both of these paralinguistic features, voice set and nonverbal vocalizations, made up the vocal behavior referred to by Barnlund (1968). There was some evidence to indicate that these expressions were related to a speaker's choice of linguistic expression, i.e., his words and grammar. At this point, a statement of conclusions drawn from the studies of vocal behavior, which were alluded to earlier, seems appropriate.

To reiterate, the first aspect of vocal behavior mentioned was voice set—the volume, pitch, rate, and quality of the
speaker's voice. Clark (1951), in a study dealing with the volume of a speaker's voice, found that although excessive volume has a tiring effect upon the audience, adequate volume is rated as the most criteria for success in public speaking. A somewhat more tentative set of results were given by Diehl, White, and Satz (1961) in a study which varied pitch and inflection. They indicated that the variation of the inflection did not affect the comprehension of the listener. Their results did not lend any support to the belief "that pitch changes enhance the conveying of information." (p. 67) Although it appeared that variations in pitch and inflection did not influence information gathering, it was suggested that audiences preferred the use of appropriate inflection, a fact which may seem analogous to the preference for the variation in rate of speech, a lack of which may incur a loss of attention which Bettinghaus (1968) attributed directly to a lack of variety. Probably the least often considered aspect of voice set has been voice quality. This may be due in part to the extreme difficulty in measuring this characteristic since it is enhanced by the relaxing of muscles in the throat. Andersen (1971) did suggest, however, that a reasonable degree of voice quality was found to be desirable.

The contemporary view of voice set variables is, apparently, that their importance varies in a persuasive situation. (The P-A-C model to be proposed in this thesis, however, allows for a measurement of their total effect.)
The second component of paralinguistic behavior reviewed was that of nonverbal vocalizations. In specific terms, they include vocal characterizers, vocal qualifiers, and vocal segregates. These aspects of the speech process play a role in the determination of such things as sentence length, word selection, and usage of a particular tense. These components may also combine with the elements of voice set to distinguish one speaker from another. Mahl and Schulze (1964) addressed themselves to this point and stated:

"A self-confident person may speak in relatively simple sentences with well controlled pitch and volume, and with few sighs and nervous coughs. An insecure person, on the other hand, may speak in complex, involved, or even unfinished sentences, with poor pitch and volume control, and with frequent nervous mannerisms." (p. 51)

There have been studies which attempted to be more specific in the determination of the effects of nonverbal vocalizations. Although the consensus of these seems to indicate an awareness of some effect of this variable, it has been indicated by Thompson (1967) that further research is needed before any generalizations can be accurately drawn.

Some evidence exists which suggests that emotions which can be expressed via the vocal mode could also be expressed by what Barnlund (1968) indicated as the second element of his dichotomy, namely nonvocal or physical behavior. For example, in a study conducted by Williams and Sundene (1965), subjects were able to ascertain from either the visual or vocal cues whether an individual was feeling pleasure or pain, and whether
he was pleasant or unpleasant, lenient or severe.

Such susceptibility to bi-modal interpretation was not shared by all emotions however. At least seven categories of feeling have been found to be discernible from facial expression alone. Those isolated by Ekman, Frisen, and Ellsworth (1971) included happiness, fear, surprise, anger, sadness, contempt, and interest. All authors have not agreed completely with the idea of expression of emotion by only facial or only vocal means. It seemed most logical to adopt, at least temporarily, the viewpoint of Levitt (1964). He pointed out that what could be safely assumed was that the effectiveness of expressing emotions by vocal and facial means varied. To support this claim, a study which he conducted concluded that joy is most accurately judged from facial expressions, while fear is most accurately judged from the voice. It was also reported by Davitz and Davitz (1959), that wide individual differences have been found in the accuracy with which persons express and judge feelings.

Whatever the effects of facial and vocal behavior, three conclusions were tentatively drawn. First, as Ostwald (1964) has suggested, one cannot understand a message without understanding the body as one of its media. Second, the distinguishing characteristics of nonverbal behavior can now be studied due to the work of Birdwhistell (1970) in his development of a notational system for their classification. Third, an application of a P-A-C model may provide considerable insight regarding
the functions of both verbal and nonverbal behaviors in a persuasive situation.

This paper has thus far concerned itself with the source, the message, and the channel as variables in the communication, or more directly, in the persuasion process. The receiver is the reactor to the stimuli, and is also the last element of Berlo's (1960) model which will be discussed in the context which that author adopted.

**Receiver variables**

It is perhaps significant to note a seemingly paradoxical situation which exists in many studies of persuasion. This apparent inconsistence results from a frequent failure to examine the two necessary personalities in persuasive interaction, the source and the receiver, from a comparable measurement point of view. While the source is examined primarily in terms of credibility, the receiver is studied in accordance with what are known as 'stable audience characteristics.' (Cronkhite, 1969). This issue lies dormant for the time being; it is, however, discussed in considerable depth below.

It should be noted that Cronkhite's work formed the basis for the forthcoming discussion of audience characteristics. Stable audience characteristics are those considered by Cronkhite (1969) to remain relatively unchanged within an individual, and are not generally considered as related to a specific message topic. He considered the following to be such audience attributes: (1) personality traits, (2) sex, (3) age, and (4) intelligence.
The first of these personality traits; or, more specifically, the relationships between personality and persuasability received attention in a book edited by Carl Hovland and Irving L. Janis (1959), entitled *Personality and Persuasability*. In that book, Janis and Field (1959) defined the principle of general persuasability. This concept referred to an individual's degree of susceptibility to persuasive messages, regardless of the speaker or the topic.

Aside from this notion, Adorno, et al. (1950) suggested that an important personality trait is that of authoritarianism. Indeed it was Milton and Simpkins (1957) who, in reading a paper at the Sixty-Fifth Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, substantiated this point of view. The study was designed to test the validity of one of the correlates of authoritarianism, suggestibility to prestige figures. In their words:

"this was measured by comparing high and low F scale scores to the planted judgments of a prestige and a nonprestige partner, while making estimates of autokinetic movement." (p. 404)

They were able to report that the presumed relationship between prestige suggestibility and authoritarianism is substantial. In other words, authoritarian individuals are persuaded and are best persuaded by persons with high prestige. This finding was of supreme importance to this study and will appear in modified form as a major hypothesis.

Sex, as an audience characteristic which remains stable,
has been the recipient of extensive attention in empirical investigations. The plethora of conclusions which have resulted tend to indicate that where sex is concerned, there is a difference, but the effects of the difference are not clear.

Age seems to interact with persuasability in accordance with the adage which says "you can't teach an old dog new tricks." The studies of Marple (1933) and Janis and Rife (1959) were reported by Cronkhite (1969) to confirm this notion. The reasons for these reaction patterns for different persons of different ages remain undetermined. The possibility of a correlation between personality type and age as they influence attitude stability is one of the areas in which the P-A-C model may have application, however.

The final stable audience characteristic dealt with by Cronkhite was that of intelligence. In this regard there is little to suggest that an individual's cognitive abilities have a significant effect on his general persuasability. The scant evidence which points to a relationship between the variables indicates that intelligent persons may be less persuaded by "crude propaganda," and the more education a person has received, the more likely it becomes that he will be persuaded by logical arguments.

In summary, the research concerned with stable audience characteristics has yielded a surprisingly small amount of data of use to persuaders. One of the major problems is that the personality characteristics of listeners are difficult to
ascertain unless the speaker becomes familiar with an audience. This presents problems unless the audience is quite small. The needed research should deal with how personality characteristics interact with general persuasability.

The discussion thus far has concerned itself with persuasion from the point of view of Berlo's (1960) model. Before consideration of the P-A-C model and the experimental portion of this study, it may be beneficial to review what has been stated about: (1) Berlo's model, (2) the elements of the model, (3) the variables associated with the model's elements, and (4) the results of related studies.

Berlo's efforts centered around a graphic presentation of the communication process. It was to him of paramount importance that one view communication as the continual interplay of the elements of the model. In this way communicative events are "dynamic, on-going, ever-changing, and continuous." (Berlo, 1960, p. 24) The elements or ingredients of the process interact in such a way that each affects all of the others.

The ingredients which are both necessary and sufficient according to Berlo, include: (1) a source, (2) an encoder, (3) a message, (4) a channel, (5) a decoder, and (6) a receiver. For immediate purposes, the first and second as well as the fifth and sixth elements were merged to form a four-ingredient model. The source-encoder is an individual with needs, purposes, and reasons for communicating who translates his ideas, purposes, and intentions into a language code. The resultant systematic
set of symbols comprises a message. The message is then carried or put into a medium known as a channel. The receiver-decoder assimilates the message and translates it from a code into ideas, purposes, and intentions.

The greatest emphasis so far in this literature review has been placed upon the variables associated with the model's elements. As reported earlier, prime consideration in discussions dealing with the source-encoder has been given to credibility. This concept was defined as the image held of a source at a given time by a receiver (Corts, 1968). It was also noted that a speaker's credibility was susceptible to manipulation.

The next set of variables delineated were those commonly associated with the message. The notion that there may be a significant interaction among variables associated with the source and the message was discussed. Attention was then shifted to a consideration of two facets of the message—content and delivery.

A discussion of the channels of communication, the media of messages, was then undertaken. Verbal and nonverbal behaviors were emphasized as variables. In this regard, it was concluded that: (1) one must consider the human body as a message medium, and (2) nonverbal behavior is susceptible to codification.

The final element dealt with the receiver-decoder and related variables. Using the work of Cronkhite (1969), four so-called stable audience characteristics or variables were discussed: personality traits, sex, age, and intelligence. It should be made clear that these variables are by no means
considered as exhaustive; others of importance receive consideration later.

Now that these variables have been presented, it seems appropriate to discuss their effects on the dependent variable of attitude shift or persuasion. The focus and parameters for this portion of the paper came from the literature reviewed. It is felt that some issues can be presented which point to the adoption of a P-A-C model of persuasion as a means of accounting for attitude shift.

As has been mentioned, the variable most often referred to in studies which concentrate on the source as he attempted to persuade others was credibility. Present levels of knowledge indicate that a source perceived as having high credibility is: (1) more persuasive than low credibility sources (Anderson and Clevenger, 1963), and (2) able to quickly change attitudes from negative to positive (Brooks, 1970).

Various methods of enhancing credibility for experimental purposes have been suggested. Greenberg and Miller (1966), for example, indicated that if the presentation is recorded (e.g., video-taped, tape recorded), the speaker's credibility would be enhanced. Furthermore, Frandsen (1963) found that the recording method used made no significant difference in perceived credibility. Such studies are important for the laboratory researcher, but are limited in their applicability to the public speaking situation. The following guidelines have been developed for the public speaking situation, however. It has been determined that the
source can improve his "odds" at persuading listeners by:
(1) delaying his identity (Greenberg and Miller, 1966),
(2) increasing his frequency of self-reference (Ostermier, 1967); and (3) using appropriate humor (Gruner, 1967). Even these tactics seem of limited value, however. It was felt that there may have been a more general and effective way of enhancing credibility. A primary purpose of this study was to evaluate one such method. The source in the experimental message employed did not vary his humor or frequency of self-reference, but he did vary his personality type and correlated behavior.

In the past, extensive efforts have been made and considerable information gained on and about the use of effective messages. It is suggested, for example, that if a speaker fails to accomplish what is expected to be a systematic presentation of his ideas he will be perceived as having low credibility (Baker, 1965). It is also suggested that the effects of evidence (McCroskey, 1969), brevity (Ragsdale, 1968), and explicit in contrast to implicit conclusions (Tubbs, 1968) are important in the persuasive process. What does not seem to be conclusive is whether or not the cues that a speaker includes in his message which illustrate his psychological state have a great deal of effect on his ability to persuade.

Many of the cues used by a speaker illustrate not only his psychological state but also his method of approaching a problem and his general attitudinal structure. At least this
is, in part, the contention of persons who adopt points of view similar to that of transactional analysts. According to Harris (1969), one of the leading proponents of this system, an individual reveals his dominant ego state not only by what he says but also by what he does. Through the pioneering efforts of Birdwhistell (1970) we are now able to classify nonverbal gestural behavior and compare it to verbal behavior. Such comparisons were made as early as 1955 by Ruesch (1955). But more recent works have had access to tools to make finer and more valuable distinctions. As a result, an examination of the channels of communication, from a P-A-C point of view, could be both valuable and informative if personality does play as significant a role as expected in the persuasion process.

The type of research which most closely parallels that used in this study can be found in some of the studies dealing with the receivers of persuasive messages. In the past, considerable effort has been expended in attempting to delineate the role played by personality traits as they relate to the reception and acceptance of new and different attitudes propounded by speakers. Cronkhite's (1969) writings provide an excellent overview of these considerations. As has been mentioned, one of the benefits which could be realized from an applied P-A-C model of persuasion lies in the similar frame of reference with which the source and receiver are viewed.

In summary, the past research has pointed to some of the variables related to the elements included in Berlo's (1960) model of communication and demonstrated their importance. The
next logical step seemed to call for the presentation of a more parsimonious model of the persuasion process. One model which may well meet the objective rests in the work of a prominent California psychologist, the late Eric Berne. This paper now concerns itself with his work and the ultimate development of the P-A-C model. Attention will then be given to relating this paradigm to the predictable components in the persuasion process.

The P-A-C Model

Shapiro (1969) provided a critique of Berne's contributions to sub-self theory and the summary he provided will be used as a jumping-off point for this discussion.

"The theory and techniques of Eric Berne's transactional analysis are disseminated widely but there are few systematic reviews of his work. This paper attempts to fill the gap in the context of subself and self-group-theory, two aspects of the writer's ego therapy. The following highlights emerge from this assessment: (a) Berne's major contributions are the concepts of ego states and transactional analysis. (b) Transactional Analysis is a comparatively complete personality theory and psychotherapeutic technology. (c) Berne's theory is clinically based, rests on reinforcement theory and Freudian drive theory and is deficiency rather than growth oriented. (d) In general, he is 'adult' (intellectually) oriented. (e) His treatment model is therapist-centered and essentially medical. (f) Many of his descriptions and his theory involve (inner) group variables but do not treat the self as a group per se. (g) Berne's work deserves considerably more attention." (p.283)

Probably the best approach to discussing the work of Berne would be to examine these points as they were listed in the above summary.

The first point mentioned dealt with the concepts of ego states and transactional analysis. According to Berne (1961):
"an ego state may be described phenomenologically as a coherent system of feelings related to a given subject, and operationally as a set of coherent behavior patterns; or pragmatically, as a system of feelings which motivates a related set of behavior patterns." (p.17)

Transactional analysis, by way of a definition, is the diagnosis of the ego states active in each individual engaged in a given transaction or set of transactions where a transaction was the unit of social action (Berne, 1963). At this point it seems beneficial to elaborate somewhat on the origins and implications of these definitions.

Berne based his concept of ego states, in part, on the work of Penfield, a Canadian neurosurgeon. This surgeon demonstrated that an epileptic's memories are retained in the form of ego states. Penfield (1952) presented the Presidential Address at the Seventy-Sixth Annual Meeting of the American Neurological Association. The observations he made at that time were accumulated during years of operative treatments of focal epileptics. During these surgical treatments the subject were fully conscious under local anesthesia while explorations were made of their cerebral cortex.

Penfield stated that recollections derived from a patient's memory could sometimes be forced to consciousness through the application of a stimulating electrode. He also indicated that such results occurred from the stimulation of areas of the temporal cortex, but only from certain points in the temporal cortex. Details of such case studies have been reported in various publications, e.g., Penfield and Erickson (1941) and Penfield and Rasmussen (1968).
It was found that the recollections subsequent to the stimulation of the memory cortex were visual and/or auditory. These recollections differed significantly, however, from those evoked during the stimulation of the visual or auditory cortex. Stimulation of the visual cortex produced bright, lighted objects, which stimulation of the auditory cortex produced a buzzing or ringing sensation. There were, however, no words or similar verbal sensations.

The responses of the visual, auditory, and other sensory areas followed what Penfield called "inborn patterns." The responses of the memory cortex, on the other hand, were based on the experiences of the particular subject being stimulated.

Penfield drew some significant conclusions from his work. Among them was the finding that application of the stimulating electrode forced a recollection to appear. There was apparently no volitional control on the patient's part over the recollection. The subject also felt once more the emotional correlates of the original situation. The evoked recollection was not, in Penfield's words,

"the exact photographic or phonographie reproduction of past scenes and events, but rather the reproduction of what the patient saw and heard and felt and understood." (Penfield, 1952) (p.183)

In many cases it was felt that the evoked memory was more distinct than anything the patient voluntarily called to consciousness. This was significant in that normal recollections of single experiences would have been indistinguishable from other similar experiences. Based on this information, it seemed
reasonable to conclude, and Penfield did so, that a memory record continues intact even after the ability to voluntarily recall that memory disappears.

Penfield interpreted his results as an indication that a new experience may somehow be compared to the records of similar past experiences. The conclusions offered may indicate that people react to a new experience in a manner similar to their response in an earlier analogous situation.

The psychiatric basis for what Penfield demonstrated in a surgical situation was first discussed by Federn (1952). Federn's concern was that psychological reality had a basis in complete and discreet ego states. In this sense an ego state was considered to be the coherent system of feelings and related set of behaviors referred to earlier. Edvardo Weiss (1950) attempted to clarify Federn's system and has redefined an ego state as the actually experienced of one's mental and bodily ego with the contents of day-to-day experience. In so doing Weiss and Penfield arrived at the same conclusion; namely, ego states of earlier experiences are maintained in a latent state within the individual's personality.

The second new concept attributed to Berne by Shapiro (1969) was that of transactional analysis. In a general way, Berne used the term "transactional analysis" to refer to his psychotherapeutic technique and specifically to refer to his examination of social interaction. Drawing once again on medically based research, the writings of Spitz (1961) on emotional
deprivation, and Heron (1957) on sensory deprivation were cited by Berne as cornerstones for his methodology. These two articles examined the problems of a pathological nature which can arise in children when early physical contact and stroking are not given.

In the theory espoused by Berne this need for some sort of physical stimuli later emerged as a hunger for recognition which was a form of psychological stroking. He stated further that

"a great deal of linguistic, social, and cultural structure revolves around the question of mere recognition; special pronouns, inflections, gestures, postures, gifts, and offerings are designed to exhibit recognition of status and person." (p. 85)

Many of the situations in which recognition is gained have, at least in our society, become ritualized. There also seems to be a distinct pattern in which the recognition phenomenon takes place. For example, in everyday encounters Berne said the pattern may look something like this: (1) "Hello!", (2) "How are you?", (3) "Warm enough for you?", (4) "What's new?", and (5) "What else is now?" Those involved in these situations seem to apply meanings to the statements in a pattern which goes: (1) "Someone is there;" (2) "Someone with feelings is there;" (3) "Someone with feelings and sensations is there;" (4) "Someone with feelings, sensations, and a personality is there;" (5) "Someone with feelings, sensations, a personality, and in whom I have more than a passing interest, is there." (Berne, 1961) (p. 85)
When these elementary rituals have run their course, tension and anxiety begin to appear. The individual begins to concern himself with the structuring of his time so that he can gain the maximum amount or number of satisfactions. One way this satisfaction can be realized is through social contact. There are two forms of social contact—intimacy and play. When people establish social contact or more specifically social interaction, their transactions can be observed. The observation of these chains of transactions is the work of the transactional analyst.

It has been demonstrated that if the ego states of the participants in the interaction are known, the resulting interpersonal sequence of events is highly predictable. The converse is also apparent in certain cases. That is, given the initial stimulus and response, not only are the ensuing events predictable, but also the characteristic ego states of the participating individuals. In capsulized form this was the process known as transactional analysis.

The second point made by Shapiro (1969) regarding Berne's work was that transactional analysis is a comparatively complete personality theory and psychotherapeutic technology. The completeness of Berne's personality theory was established from two different points of view. The first of these centers on the clinical observations from which the theory was developed. It has been reviewed in the light of other individual and group-based theories of the personality. This brings up the second point of view, the relationship of transactional analysis to
As has been noted earlier, Weiss and Federn viewed psychological reality as being based upon complete ego states. In a more general sense, Shapiro (1969) pointed out that this theory was remarkably similar to those of Freud and contemporary psychologists such as Hartmann (1950) and Fairburn (1952). It is not difficult to view as analogous Berne's ego states of parent, adult, and child and Freud's of ego, id, and super-ego. The distinction arises from the differences between Freud's pure concepts and Berne's "phenomenological realities."

Further demonstrations of the completeness of Berne's theory are also available. For example, Freudian psychotherapy is but one facet of Berne's transactional analysis. Berne's techniques are not only rationalistic like Freud's, but are also actionistic; the patients operate in groups, are given lectures, and become involved in informal seminar situations.

The psychotherapeutic technique of transactional analysis also has a completeness based on procedures which have proven their worth in the past. The sequence of the therapy begins with an examination of the ego states of parent, adult, and child as they function within the individual. Next, an assessment is made of the personality as it involves itself in a group situation. As a matter of fact, Berne's book Games People Play (1964) is devoted almost entirely to the types of behaviors individuals employ in group situations. Finally the patient receives individual psychoanalytic treatment. Shapiro (1969) indicated that there is a dearth of evidence to support this
sequential approach." (pgs. 289-290)

Now that the concepts of ego states and transactional analysis, as well as the completeness of the theory and technique, have been discussed, the third point made by Shapiro (1969) shall be examined. He stated that "Berne's theory is clinically based, rests on reinforcement theory and Freudian drive theory, and is deficiency rather than growth oriented."

All of these points, with the exception of the last, have been mentioned before and will not be dealt with further. The focus on deficiencies does, however, merit further attention especially as it relates to this study.

One idea which seemed obvious from an examination of Berne's writing was that it was largely a taxonomic system. More attention has been given to classifying the patient and describing his behavior than to doing something about it. A possible exception to this generalization is the work done with "hooking," that is, the creation and maintenance of the parent, adult, or child role "played" by the subject. The relevance of this approach becomes apparent when considering the public speaker. If he were able not only to determine the type of audience he is working with but also how to shift his audience to a potentially more desirable attitudinal position, then he would be equipped with a valuable persuasive technique. In view of the difficulties involved in the development of such a tool it would be important to know how to persuade a particular portion of the audience who were classifiable according to some ego state or personality type, or even to discover which personality types
are most easily persuaded by which type of speaking approach. Differing somewhat from his deficiency orientation is Berne's notion that most personalities are adaptable and trainable to a specific ego state. If correlations could be established between personality types and persuasive abilities, the implications could have far reaching effects for the development of a P-A-C model of persuasion.

The fourth issue raised by Shapiro (1969) deals with Berne's adult orientation. It seemed to be the case that the adult of the therapist became the "major therapeutic ally of the patient." For purposes of this study it was significant to note that the patient's attitudes and behavior were conceivably changed as a result of exposure to adult types of messages and behaviors. This notion acted as a basis for the suspicion that certain personality types were indeed more effective than others as persuaders.

The therapist-centered and medical nature of the treatment model encompasses the fifth issue raised by Shapiro (1969). For present purposes this point need not be of great concern. It does, however, point to the fact that the model might be viewed as speaker-centered, and as having validity based on physiological studies.

The sixth and seventh issues raised by Shapiro (1969) seem to be interrelated. The sixth point refers to Berne's (1961) conception of the nature of inner group or inner-self variables. He proposed the existence of the Parent, the Adult, and the Child as elements of personality structure. The seventh
issue, that of allotting more attention to transactional analysis, has been handled in part by Harris (1969), especially with regard to the structural (P-A-C) analysis of the personality. Harris has gone so far as to delineate specific verbal and physical cues which indicate the element (parent, adult, or child) guiding an individual's behavior in a transaction or a set of transactions.

That which follows lists the cues to the dominant ego states which have thus far been isolated.

"Parent cues -- Physical: furrowed brow, pursed lips, pointing index finger, head-wagging, the 'horrified look,' foot tapping, hands on hips, arms folded across chest, wringing hands, tongue-clucking, sighing, patting another on the head.

Parent Cues -- Verbal: I am going to put a stop to this once and for all; I can't for the life of me; Now always remember; How many times have I told you?; If I were you ....; always; never; stupid; naughty; ridiculous; disgusting; shocking; asinine; lazy; nonsense; absurd; poor thing; poor dear; no! no!; sonny; honey; How dare you?; cute; there there; Now what?; Not again!

Adult Cues -- Physical: Listening with the adult is identified by continual movement--of the face, the eyes, the body--with an eyeblink every three to five seconds. If the head is tilted, the person is listening with an angle in mind. The adult also allows the curious, excited child to show its face.

Adult Cues -- Verbal: Why, what, where, when, who, how, how much, in what way, comparative, true, false, probable, possible, unknown, objective, I think, I see, it is my opinion.
Child Cues -- Physical: Tears, quivering lip, pouting, temper tantrums, high-pitched and whining voice, rolling eyes, shrugging shoulders, downcast eyes, teasing, delight, laughter, nail-biting, nose-thumbing, squirming, giggling.

Child Cues -- Verbal: I wish, I want, I dunno, I don't care, I guess, when I grow up, bigger, biggest, better, best, many other superlatives." (Harris, 1969)

It should be remembered that these are cues to the various ego states and as such do not represent the totality of the behaviors exhibited by various individuals.

In order to bring together the notions of ego states, cues, and transactional situations, Harris (1969) posits two "rules" of communication in transactional analysis. The first rule states that

"when stimulus and response of the P-A-C transactional diagram make parallel lines, the transaction is complementary and can go on indefinitely." (Harris, 1969, p. 70)

The second rule indicates that

"when stimulus and response cross on the P-A-C transactional diagram, communication stops." (Harris, 1969, p. 81)

These two rules form the basis for complementary and crossed transactions, respectively. There is also a third type of transaction known as a duplex transaction. All three are illustrated, and accompanied by appropriate verbal clues in Appendix I.

The following comments briefly summarize what has been discussed about P-A-C and transactional analysis. Transactional
analysis offers a method for examining human interaction. The theory is based upon clinical observations. It does resemble or have a basis in both reinforcement theory and drive theory. Three ego states have been identified and seem to guide or direct an individual's behavior. They are: the Parent, the Adult, and the Child. Typically, one ego state dominates during a transaction or set of transactions. A set of verbal as well as physical cues can be associated with a given ego state. In an interpersonal situation, communication can be initiated and maintained provided the stimulus and response are of a complementary rather than a crossed nature.

The literature which has been reviewed thus far was intended to accomplish two tasks: (1) to provide a general picture of some of the more pertinent information presently available concerning the persuasion process, and (2) to present background on a personality model which has applications in the study of the persuasion process. The task at hand involves the study of these relevant conditions from the frame of reference of transactional analysis.

Several questions became apparent regarding the application of a P-A-C model to the persuasion process. First, does a P-A-C model account for the elements involved in interpersonal communication? Second, does a P-A-C model account for source-encoder variables such as credibility? Third, does a P-A-C model account for message variables such as use of evidence? Fourth, does a P-A-C model account for variables such as verbal and nonverbal behavior? Fifth, does a P-A-C model account for receiver-decoder
variables such as the stable audience characteristics? Sixth, does the P-A-C model be predictive rather than descriptive in nature? Seventh, does the proposed model sacrifice comprehensiveness for parsimony?

Tentative answers to these questions were not, of course, available until this study had been completed. There have been indications in the literature reviewed, however, which suggest possible answers for the posited questions.

The first question dealt with the adequacy of a P-A-C model as it relates to the encompassing of elements involved in an interpersonal communicative situation. The elements or ingredients, as presented earlier, included: (1) the source, (2) the encoder, (3) the message, (4) the channel, (5) the receiver, and (6) the decoder. As has been mentioned, not all communication models include these specific ingredients. The similarities of the models in terms of elements seem to have been no accident. Smith (1967) presented a diagram of the "Lines of Influence in Communication Models." Of those models, the P-A-C model most closely resembles that of Newcomb (1952) known as the ABX model of communication.

Within the broader context of transactional models there have been significant recent developments. For example, BArnlund (1971) has proposed a transactional model of communication which accounted for the elements of: (1) person, (2) decoding, (3) encoding, (4) public cues, (5) private cues, (6) nonverbal behavioral cues, (7) behavioral verbal cues, and (8) the message.
Wenburg and Wilmot (1972) subscribed to the notion that the nature and essence of transactions could be presented diagramatically. They state that

"to date, there seems to be no model of communication which adequately captures and conceptualizes the essence of transaction. Our model is an attempt to present that notion in diagramatic form. We feel that our model better enables us, as communication scholars, to be organized observers of the personal communication process." (n.p.)

While these arguments do not directly confirm or deny the adequacy of the present model, they do lend considerable support for attempting a confirmation.

The second question raised was concerned with the ability of the P-A-C model to account for various source-encoder variables. A response to this question was seemingly absent in the literature reviewed. As has been mentioned, however, source-encoder variables are often bound up with message variables.

The third question concerned itself with the ability of the P-A-C model to handle message variables. Since the message is the physical and observable product of the source, these variables can be dealt with in an implicit manner. As was mentioned early in this paper, there appear to be two points of view for examining messages. The first of these calls for examination of the message structure. The second revolves around consideration of message delivery. The clues to the various ego states, as outlined by Harris (1969) seem to relate to the issue in the following ways. First, the messages of various individuals are structured so as to include clues to the dominant ego state.
Second, and this point is related to the channel variables, the nonverbal messages of individuals, vocal or nonvocal, correspond to the personality structure of that person.

The fourth question dealt with the acceptability of the P-A-C model as it concerned itself with channel variables. Bettinghaus (1968) defined channels as the means by which a receiver assimilates a message sent by a source. In this regard it is of primary concern to discuss the aural and visual modes of presentation. A P-A-C model can account for the aural channel variables due to the fact that paralinguistic features have been shown to be sufficient cues for determining the emotional state of the speaker (Starkweather, 1961). The visual channel variables could ostensibly be dealt with in a more than adequate fashion by the proposed model. This would probably come about as a result of the consistent set of nonverbal, nonvocal behaviors exhibited by persons when a particular ego state is dominant.

The fifth question focused upon the receiver-decoder variables as they relate to a P-A-C conceptualization. It is in the area of stable audience characteristics, as dealt with by Cronkhite (1969), that this model merits the most attention. That author suggested that these variables or characteristics included: (1) personality traits, (2) sex, (3) age, and (4) intelligence. Of these characteristics, personality traits and age seem to be the most important, i.e., variables with which the most progress has been made regarding the determination of their effects. Since personality type is a prime concern of this
model, it could conceivably be correlated with the other variables if the model proved viable.

The sixth question dealt with whether or not the proposed model would have predictive value. There are two points which tend to confirm a positive answer to this question. First, the model could have a remarkable similarity to Newcomb's (1953) ABX model which has been described by Barnlund (1968) as one which is explanatory or, in the sense in which it is viewed here, predictive in nature. Second, the transactional analysts have demonstrated that if the ego states of the participants in an interaction are known, the resulting interpersonal sequence of events is highly predictable. By definition, this is transactional analysis.

The seventh question dealt with what LaFave (1969) suggests as the motto for the empirical sciences: Comprehensiveness before parsimony. This question does not seem easily answerable. As a matter of fact, the "true" nature of the model in this regard will have to remain undetermined until the model can be constructed, tried, and verified. For present purposes it seems sufficient to say that by using aparsimonious model, a more comprehensive theory of the persuasion process can be constructed.

These seven questions have concerned themselves with the compatibility of the theories and research of transactional analysis and the persuasion process. Before concluding this review of the literature it seems appropriate to deal with the need of such a model for the study of persuasion. The following
remarks are based upon the literature reviewed and are addressed to the "need" issue.

Various models have been used, with considerable success, for describing the process of communication. It would appear, however, that this has not always been the case with the persuasion process. Such a model would allow for the examination of those variables which are associated with more than one model element.

Studies which concentrate on persuasive messages are typically undertaken from two points of view: (1) a consideration of the message structure, and (2) a consideration of the message delivery. The development of a P-A-C model of persuasion may facilitate the simultaneous examination of both the structure and delivery of a message.

It has become apparent that the use of aural and visual channels has a direct bearing on the amount of attitude change. A P-A-C model would allow for a determination of the complementary use of the various channels. In other words, some concern has been given to the problem of a speaker saying one thing with his words, and another thing with his nonverbal stimuli. This model would allow for an easy determination of the complementary or contradictory use of channels.

In a similar vein, Davitz and Davitz (1961) stated that "no general, systematic theory of nonverbal emotional communication has emerged." Tolch (1963), Barnlund (1968), Eisenberg and Smith (1971) and others have worked in this area. A P-A-C model may add considerably to the development of nonverbal communication theory.
One final argument seems in order. Cronkhite (1969) has shown the importance of personality traits as receiver variables. A review of the literature did not reveal a systematic method of examining these traits as they relate to the persuasion process, however.

These arguments serve to demonstrate the need for and possible uses of a P-A-C model of persuasion. Coupled with the notion of the compatibility of the proposed model and the communication process, and specifically the persuasion process, it seems obvious that the model should be designed and tested.

Summary

This review of literature was designed to accomplish three tasks: (1) to present a frame of reference for examining some of the recent literature related to persuasion research, (2) to present a system for the evaluation of personality types, and (3) to demonstrate the compatibility of a P-A-C model and some recent research findings related to persuasion.

The first objective was accomplished in the following way. Several models of the communication process were examined in the light of their history and development. Berlo's (1960) model was selected for final use and an examination of its elements ensued. These elements included: (1) the source-encoder, (2) the message, (3) the channels, and (4) the receiver-decoder. A discussion of the experimental variables which, in the past, have been associated with the model ingredients followed. Prime consideration was given to the variables: (1) source credibility, (2) message structure and delivery,
(3) channel usage, and (4) stable audience characteristics.

The second objective concerned the presentation of a system for personality evaluation. The system selected was Berne's (1961) transactional analysis, the P-A-C model of personality structure. Analysis was made using Shapiro's (1969) critique of Berne's work. The following points were used as a basis for that discussion:

"Berne's major contributions are the concepts of ego states and transactional analysis, (2) transactional analysis is a comparatively complete personality theory and psychotherapeutic technology, (3) Berne's theory is clinically based, rests on reinforcement theory and Freudian drive theory, and is deficiency rather than growth oriented, (4) in general, he is 'Adult' orientated, (5) his treatment model is therapist-centered and essentially medical, (6) many of his descriptions and his theory involve group variables, but do not treat the self as a group per se, (7) Berne's work deserves considerably more attention." (Shapiro, 1969, p. 283)

The third task accomplished in the review of literature was to demonstrate the compatibility of a P-A-C model and recent experimental findings related to persuasion. Although definite answers require experimentation, it was shown that a P-A-C model could conceivably account for: (1) the elements of interpersonal communication, (2) source-encoder variables, (3) message variables, (4) channel variables, (5) receiver-decoder variables, (6) prediction in the persuasion process, and (7) the complex nature of the persuasion process.

With these points in mind, it was felt that a case could be made for a predictive model of persuasion and, in particular, a P-A-C model.

Deutsch (1952) has discussed the four functions of models. They included organizing, heuristic, predictive, and measuring
functions.

"The model organizes by ordering and relating disjointed data, and by showing similarities or connections between these data which previously had remained unperceived. Models serve as heuristic devices which lead to the discovery of new facts and new methods. Models form a spectrum of prediction: from simple yes-or-no predictions to completely quantitative predictions which answer the questions of when and how much. At the latter extreme, models perform the function of measurement."

The traditional descriptive models were discussed earlier in this chapter. Berlo's (1960) model was used to provide a framework for reviewing the literature relevant to persuasion. According to the functions described by Deutsch, this model served to order and relate disjointed data. It may not be inaccurate to predict that conceptualizations, such as Berlo's, have also guided the development of new theories of communication. Such descriptive models failed, however, as paradigms for prediction, the third function of models described by Deutsch.

On this basis, five advantages for employing a possible P-A-C model for the persuasion process became evident. First, the present state of knowledge concerning persuasion can apparently be accounted for, in an extremely parsimonious manner, by such a model. Second, the predictive value of the P-A-C paradigm has been demonstrated by transactional analysis, a topic discussed earlier. Third, the nature of the elements of communication has received considerable attention; an application of the P-A-C model could provide a lateral (relating) rather than a horizontal (information stacking) approach to theory building for persuasion. Fourth, the interrelatedness of the variables
which have been associated with persuasion suggest that there may be a common denominator in all persuasive situations. It was felt that the common factor may be dominant ego states. Fifth, the possibility of satisfying the measurement function of models exists with the P-A-C model.

This completes the review of literature. Consideration will now be given to a statement of: (1) the purpose, (2) the variables, (3) the hypotheses, and (4) the pertinent definitions related to the study.

Statement of the Problem

Purpose of Study

The primary purpose of this study was to make a determination as to whether or not transactional analysis, and in particular the P-A-C paradigm, could be modified in such a manner as to allow for the development of a predictive model of persuasion. If developed, the model would take a form similar to the following:

\[ T_i \]

\[ P_1 \]

\[ P_2 \]

where:

\( T_i \) represents a transaction or set of transactions engaged in by \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \).

\( P_1 \) represents the personality type or dominant ego state of the first individual involved in the transaction or set of transactions.
P₂ represents the personality type or dominant ego state of the second individual involved in the transaction or set of transactions.

In order to examine the feasibility of the proposed model it was felt that several questions must be answered, and that tentative answers to these questions could come from the evaluation of data collected in an experimental situation. These questions include the following. First, can some measure be taken of the persuasibility which corresponds to a particular ego state? That is to say, can it be shown that one individual's dominant ego state, for example the Parent type, is more easily persuaded than another individual's dominant ego state, for example the Adult type. Second, can some measure be taken of the persuasiveness which corresponds to a particular ego state? What is really being asked here is whether one ego state, for example the Adult type with the peculiarities of word and gestural clues, is systematically more or less persuasive than another ego state such as the Parent or Child with their set verbal and physical clues. Third, is there a systematic variance in the perceived credibility of the various ego states? If there are systematic differences in the persuasiveness of the various ego states, there should also be corresponding differences in perceived credibility. Fourth, given the personality types of the individuals engaged in a transaction or set of transactions, can accurate predictions be made as to who persuades whom and the amount of attitude shift which takes place?

It was felt that if these questions could be answered
in specific ways, then an assessment could be made of the feasibility of a P-A-C model of persuasion.

**Variables**

1. **Independent:** Persuasive messages which are systematically varied according to the ego state of the source. The ego states were:
   1. Parent
   2. Adult
   3. Child

2. **Dependent:**
   1. The amount of attitude change as demonstrated by a comparison of pre-test and post-test scores on the semantic differential scales which appear in Appendix VI.
   2. The amount of perceived credibility as determined by the semantic differential scales which appear in Appendix VII.

3. **Control:** The personality types of individual subjects as determined by an evaluation of a video tape of their interpersonal behavior as examined by a panel of experts.

**Hypotheses**

For this study it is hypothesized that, at the .05 level of significance:
1. There are significant differences of attitude shift associated with the three (parent, adult, child) subject groups. That is to say, irrespective of the message and message source, there will be differences in attitude shift which are attributable to the dominant ego state of the receiver.

2. There are significant differences of attitude shift associated with the three (parent, adult, child) ego states portrayed by the speaker. That is to say, irrespective of the message and receiver personality type, there will be differences in attitude shift which are attributable to the dominant ego state of the message source.

3. There are significant differences of source credibility ratings given by the three (parent, adult, child) subject groups. That is to say, irrespective of the message and message source, there will be differences in credibility ratings which are attributable to the dominant ego state of the receiver.

4. There are significant differences of source credibility ratings received by the three (parent, adult, child) ego states portrayed by the speaker. That is to say, irrespective of the message and the dominant receiver ego state, there will be differences in credibility ratings which are attributable to the dominant ego state of the message source.

Definitions

Parent: That dominant ego state portrayed by the experimental speaker and recorded on video tape: (1) whose voice tones were "condescending, putting down, criticizing, or accusing," (2) who used the words
"Everyone knows that ...", "I can't understand why in the world you would ever ...", (3) whose posture was "puffed-up, super-correct, very proper", whose facial expressions included "frowns, worried or disapproving looks, chin jutted out", and (5) whose body gestures included "hands on hips, pointing finger in accusation, arms folded across chest."

(Randall, 1970. p. 7)

**Adult:** That dominant ego state portrayed by the experimental speaker and recorded on video tape: (1) whose voice tones were "matter of fact", (2) who used the words "how, what, when, where, why, who, probable", (3) whose posture was "attentive, eye-to-eye contact, listening and looking for maximum data", (4) whose facial expressions included "alert eyes, paying close attention", and (5) whose body gestures included leaning forward in chair toward other person, moving closer to hear and see better. (Randall, 1970. p. 7)

**Child:** That dominant ego state portrayed by the experimental speaker and recorded on video tape: (1) whose voice tones were "full of feeling", (2) who used the words "I'm mad at you . . .", "Hey, great", (3) whose posture was "slouching, playful, beat-down or burdened, self-conscious", (4) whose facial expressions included "excitement, surprise, down-cast eyes, quivering lip or chin", and (5) whose body gestures included
"spontaneous activity, wringing hands, withdrawing into corner or moving away from laughter". (Randal, 1970. p. 7)

Persuasability: The susceptibility to change in attitude as demonstrated by an attitude shift score derived from comparisons between pre-test and post-test semantic differential scales as listed in Appendix VI.

Persuasiveness: The ability of a source to bring about receiver attitude shift as demonstrated by a comparison between pre-test and post-test semantic differential scales as listed in Appendix VI.

Source Credibility: Those attributes of the source which receivers rated along the dimensions of safety, synamism, and qualification on the semantic differential scales designed for this purpose by Berlo, Lemert, Mertz (1966), and presented in Appendix VII.

Summary

This chapter has presented a review of the literature pertinent to the problem as well as a statement of the problem itself. Also included were the hypotheses and essential definitions.

Chapter II provides an explanation of the procedure followed in conducting the experiment. Additionally it provides a discussion on the manner in which the data were gathered, categorized and recorded for the statistical analyses.
CHAPTER II
RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this section is to describe the procedures of the experiment as they relate to: (1) sample selection, (2) message construction, and (3) measuring instruments employed. This chapter begins with an overview of the methods and procedures used in the experiment.

The general purpose of this study was to measure differences in "attitude" and source credibility ratings which could be attributed to either the dominant ego state of the speaker or the dominant ego states of the receiver-subjects. Briefly, and in chronological order, the steps involved in conducting the experiment are presented here.

First, a speaker was chosen to present the messages. He was David Fisher, Assistant Professor in the Department of Speech Communication at the University of Montana.

Second, the messages which were used were modified in order to allow Professor Fisher to depict three dominant ego states.

Third, the speaker presented the three messages and they were video-taped. The messages were considered acceptable when, in the judgment of the experimenter, they adequately depicted the called for ego state.

Fourth, the subjects were selected and exposed to the various experimental treatments. These treatments were varied in terms of the dominant ego state being portrayed by the speaker. The messages were presented to the subjects via
Fifth, during the experimental sessions the subjects had been video taped. These tapes were then evaluated by judges in order to determine the dominant ego state being portrayed by each subject.

Sixth, the data was analyzed by means of treatment by levels analyses of variance. In other words, both the dominant ego states of the speaker and the dominant ego states of the subjects were taken into account during the application of the statistical tests.

This has been a brief summary of the procedures involved in conducting this study. The details of these steps are presented in the appropriate sections of this chapter.

**Sample Selection**

Subjects for this study were drawn from various sections of Speech Communication 111, a basic public speaking course, at the University of Montana in May 1972. The students in these classes were predominantly freshmen and sophomores majoring in both Liberal Arts and Natural Science areas. A total of 68 subjects participated in the experiment. The 68 subjects were eventually reduced to 57. This reduction was necessary for two reasons: (1) some subjects were not recorded on video tape, and (2) it was not possible to make a clear determination of the dominant ego state being portrayed by some subjects. These are procedural problems and are discussed in the section entitled **Specific Experimental Procedures**.
The Messages

This section describes the procedures used in: (1) selecting a message topic, and (2) constructing the messages used in the experiment.

Leonard M. French (1970) conducted a study at the University of Montana in order to determine a topic for which Speech Communication 111 students indicated a relatively neutral attitude, but also indicated a high degree of ego-involvement. It was his determination that the topic "Public Demonstrations Should Not Be Strictly Controlled" best fit these criteria.

These three factors influenced that decision:

(1) this topic demonstrated "attitude" neutrality of 3.5 on a 7 point scale where a score of 1 indicated a very strong negative "attitude" and a score of 7 a very strong positive "attitude" toward the topic; (2) the topic demonstrated a rather high level ego-involvement mean of 4.50 on a 7 point where a score of 1 indicated slight ego-involvement and a score of 7 indicated high ego-involvement; and (3) a wealth of written material was readily available from which the message arguments could be constructed. (French, 1970, p 27)

It was for these reasons that the topic "Public Demonstrations Should Not Be Strictly Controlled" was chosen for use in this study.

Method of Message Construction

This section describes the guidelines and procedures which were followed in the construction of the messages.

Three messages were constructed in accordance with the three dominant ego states to be portrayed by the speaker. One message, designated "Parent", presented the information in such a manner as to portray that dominant ego state known
as the parent. The second message, termed "Adult", presented the information in such a way as to convey an adult ego state. The final message which was designated "Child", was prepared in such a manner as to illustrate the dominant ego state of the child.

In order to maintain consistency over all variables except the dominant ego state being portrayed, one of the messages prepared by French (1970) was used as a basis for the three messages employed in this experiment. Using the criteria established by Randall (1971) and Harris (1969) the experimenter and an individual who was familiar with the processes involved in analyzing transactions modified words and phrases which were appropriate in the text of the message in order to convey the desired ego state.

The format for all messages as well as their length was similar. All of the messages had identical titles.

The speaker was trained in the correct usage of the appropriate nonverbal behavior prior to delivering each message. These sets of behaviors are now described.

While portraying the dominant ego state known as the parent, the speaker's behavior was typified by "very proper, super-correct" posture as well as frowns and disapproving facial expressions. The body gestures of the speaker during this presentation included "hands on hips", an accusationally pointed finger and arms folded across the chest.

While playing an adult role the speaker maintained an "attentive, eye-to-eye contact, listening and looking for
maximum data" posture. His facial expressions could be described as being alert and paying close attention. The body gestures were characterized by moving closer as if to hear and see better.

The behaviors of a nonverbal nature which were portrayed by the speaker while playing a child role included a "slouching, playful, beat-down, self-conscious" posture, facial expressions showing "excitement" and "surprise" and body gestures characterized by "spontaneous activity".

The training of the speaker regarding the appropriate paralinguistic and nonverbal behaviors was a rather informal process. The speaker was given the text of the message at least one day prior to the time that the speech was to be video taped. On the day designated for recording the message, the speaker and the experimenter met and discussed the gestures etc. to be used during the speech. At these meetings the speaker delivered part of the speech and recorded it on a tape recorder. The speaker and experimenter then listened to a replay of the recorded message. This allowed the experimenter to critique the verbal aspects of the message and make comments designed to make the depiction of an ego state as accurate as possible. Following each meeting the speaker delivered the message while the experimenter video taped the delivery. The speaker and experimenter then viewed the video tape in order to make sure that the behaviors exhibited were appropriate to the given ego state. If, in the mind of the experimenter, the exhibited behaviors were
not consistent with the ego state being depicted, the message was re-recorded until the experimenter was satisfied with its adequacy for the purposes of the experiment.

It should be noted that it was those video taped presentations which were determined to be adequate by the experimenter which were shown to the subjects.

In summary, both the message content and the message delivery were manipulated in order to portray the dominant ego state, PA or C. Transcripts of the experimental appear in Appendices II, III, and IV.

The Measuring Instruments

The measuring instruments used in this study consisted of semantic differential scales. Four sets of scales were utilized; three of which were used to measure receiver "attitude" and the other to measure receiver ratings of source credibility.

Each set of bi-polar adjectives completed by the subjects on the attitudinal pre-test instruments were subjected to a method which allows for the determination of the number and nature of underlying variables which lie among a group of measures. In this case each bi-polar pair of adjectives constituted a message. Factor theory dictates that those bi-polar pairs factor highly, i. e., have high factor loadings, are the underlying variables among the measures. For this study the factor analysis was made using the computer facilities at the University of Montana's Computer Center.
The program used was controid in nature and was based upon a program developed by I.B.M. Modifications were made in that program as required by the present data.

Those scales incorporated in the "attitude" instruments consisted of bi-polar adjectives with high factor loadings on three dimensions. The bi-polar adjectives with high factor loadings on the first "attitude" devise were clean-dirty, safe-dangerous, solid-hollow, relaxed-tense, colorful-colorless, gentle-violent, deep-shallow, rich-thin, obvious-subtle, concentrated-diffuse, familiar-strange, hot-cold, wide-narrow, clear-hazy, and mild-intense. The bi-polar pairs exhibiting high factor loadings on the second "attitude" instrument were pleasant-unpleasant, clean-dirty, rumbling-whining, safe-dangerous, solid-hollow, relaxed-tense, colorful-colorless, gentle-violent, deep-shallow, rich-thin, familiar-strange, and clear-hazy. High factor loadings on the third "attitude" measurement instrument by bi-polar pairs which were active-passive, clean-dirty, rumbling-whining, solid-hollow, relaxed-tense, even-uneven, gentle-violent, deep-shallow, rich-thin, obvious-subtle, wide-narrow, clear-hazy, and mild-intense.

The pairs given below were developed for use as credibility measuring devices by Berlo, Lemert, and Mertz (1966). The bi-polar adjective pairs were just-unjust, energetic-tired, qualified-unqualified, kind-cruel, aggressive-meek, experienced-inexperienced, trained-untrained, skilled-unskilled, active-passive, and bold-timid.
The determination of factor loadings was made through the use of a centroid method factor analysis. The computer facilities on the University of Montana were employed for this purpose.

The instruments which were completed by the subjects are presented in Appendices V and VI.

This section has described the measuring instruments which were completed by the subjects in all experimental groups both before and after the presentation of the experimental messages. The next section gives the details of the specific experimental procedures which were followed while conducting the study.

**Specific Experimental Procedures**

Specific procedures followed while conducting the experiment are presented below. The diagram which is presented was designed to provide an overview of the steps followed in the experiment.

**Diagram Experimental Design**

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
G_1 & G_2 & G_3 \\
\text{Interaction} & \text{Interaction} & \text{Interaction} \\
SD_1 & SD_1 & SD_1 \\
P & A & C \\
SD_2 & SD_2 & SD_2 \\
SD_3 & SD_3 & SD_3 \\
\end{array}
\]

**B. Code**

- $G_1, G_2, G_3$ - indicates random assignment of subjects to one of three experimental groups.
- Interaction - indicates group discussion of speech topic.
SD₁ - indicates semantic differential scales designed to test pre-speech attitudes toward the message topic (presented in Appendix V).

P,A,C - indicates Parent, Adult or Child personality types as portrayed by the speaker as he presented the message.

SD₂ - indicates semantic differential scales designed to test post-speech attitudes toward the message topic (presented in Appendix V).

SD₃ - indicates semantic differential scales designed to test subjects' perception of the source's credibility (presented in Appendix VI).

Fig. 1 - Experimental design

Three different messages were constructed for use in the experiment. One presented a message on the topic "Public Demonstrations Should Not Be Strictly Controlled". It was delivered by an individual portraying a "Parent" dominant ego state. The other two presented essentially the same message content, the dominant ego state was carried, however, and they included "Adult" and "Child". The only differences in the messages were those which were commensurate with the dominant ego state depicted by the speaker. The speaker for all three messages was the same individual.

At the beginning of each experimental session the experimenter introduced himself as being a graduate student collecting data for a thesis. The subjects were then read the following instructions by the experimenter:

During the last several years, riots, student protest, and public demonstrations in general have become commonplace in the United States. There has been a lack, however, of studies designed to examine the beliefs, opinions, and attitudes of a cross section of American university students.

For this reason you are asked to take the next twelve minutes to discuss the following topic, "Public
Demonstrations Should Not Be Strictly Controlled."
Remember that for the purposes of this study there are no right or wrong, good or bad attitudes; there are only those which you choose to hold. Feel free to agree or disagree with any point that is made. The topic, once again, is "Public Demonstrations Should Not Be Strictly Controlled." There is one ground rule for this discussion, that is, please make sure that all the time is filled, in other words, avoid pauses or breaks in the discourse.

Are there any questions?

Begin.

Having read these instructions, the experimenter left the room while the subjects interacted for a period of 12 minutes. The final 10 minutes of each interaction period were recorded on video tape. The purpose of this recording was to allow for a later determination of the dominant ego state portrayed by each subject in order to facilitate the assignment of that subject to the appropriate experimental group in view of the dominant ego state he had portrayed. The exact nature of this assignment to experimental groups is described in the section entitled "Data Analysis." These same procedures were followed for all experimental groups.

Following the discussion period, subjects were given a test booklet and these instructions:

Please take the booklet which is being given to you and place your name in the upper right hand corner of each page. This will be used for identification purposes only; then please follow along as I read the instructions.

The subject read to themselves as the experimenter read aloud the following:

The purpose of this study is to measure your meanings of certain things by having you judge them against a series of descriptive scales.
In taking this test, please make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you.

As we proceed, you will see a concept illustrated at the top of the sheets which you will rate.

Here is how you are to use these scales: If you feel that the concept illustrated at the top of the sheet is extremely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check mark as follows:


or

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (But not extremely), you should place your check mark as follows:


A check mark in the position third from either end means slightly.

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the thing you are judging.

If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, or if the concept is completely irrelevant, then you should place your check mark in the middle space.


Important:

1. Please place your mark between the dividers rather than on them.

2. Be sure you check every scale for every concept -- do not omit any.

3. Never put more than one check mark on a single scale.

Remember:

Your name and ratings and all data will be treated
CONFIDENTIALLY. (We need your name on each rating sheet for purposes of identification only.)

Are there any questions?

Please complete the next three pages according to the instructions you have just been given.

The subjects then completed the three sets of scales which were described in an earlier section as "attitude" measuring instruments. These devices measured the subjects' "attitudes" on the concepts of "Public Demonstrations," "Student Protests," and "Riots." Each set of scales contained identical pairs of bi-polar adjectives and these are presented in Appendix V.

The subjects were then given these instructions:

For the next few minutes, please watch the video tape being presented. It is an editorial on the topic "Public Demonstrations Should Not Be Strictly Controlled."

The video tape was then played for the subjects. Three video tapes were used. The first depicted a speaker who portrayed a "Parent" ego state. The second and third showed a speaker displaying "Adult" and "Child" ego states respectively. The speaker for all three tapes was the same individual and he received training in the proper portrayal of the ego states. The ego states presented followed the guidelines established by Harris (1969) and Randall (1971).

Following the presentation of the video tape the subjects were given these instructions:

Now that you have seen the video tape, please complete the scales on the next four pages according to the instructions given earlier.
Are there any questions?

Begin.

The subjects then completed four sets of semantic differential scales. Three of these were used as post-test "attitude" measuring devices on the concepts of "Public Demonstrations," "Student Protests," and "Riots." The scales were identical in format to those used as pre-test attitude measuring devices. The fourth set of scales was used as a credibility measuring instrument. The concept it measured was "The Speaker."

When all subjects in each experimental group had completed this task, the group was advised of the purpose of the study, asked not to discuss the study with anyone who may become involved, and dismissed.

The next step involved a determination of the dominant ego state displayed by each individual subject. The rationale for this procedure becomes evident when examining the statistical test used. This information is presented in the later section entitled "Date Analysis."

Originally, four judges, Eldon E. Baker, Duane D. Pettersen, Brent D. Peterson, and David M. Fisher, were asked to view the video tapes and analyze the behavior of individual subjects along four dimensions. The first judge was asked to examine the "words used" by each subject. The second judge was requested to scrutinize the "body gestures" of the individual subjects. The third judge was asked to evaluate the facial expressions of the subjects. The fourth
judge was requested to note the voice tone used by the individual subjects. All four judges were given rating sheets and asked to make their determinations in the following manner: In each instance where a judge saw or heard a behavior which was clearly "Parent," "Adult," or "Child," he was to mark a "P", "A", or "C" for that individual.

The judges then viewed the video tapes of the subjects and made their determinations.

A later conversation with one of the judges, Dr. Baker, revealed a problem. It had become apparent to him in a conversation with the other judges that the ratings given by two judges, Brent Peterson and David Fisher, should become invalidated. This was done due to the fact that one judge made determinations on behaviors other than those prescribed and another judge did not completely understand the criteria for judging dominant ego states within his behavioral dimension.

The following course of action was then taken. John D. Holden, a fifth judge, well versed in transactional analysis, was asked to view each subject on video tape and make a determination of his dominant ego state based upon the totality of his behavior. The expertise of this judge lies in the fact that while working as a programs analyst for the U. S. Forest Service he has studied extensively as well as taught the theory of transactional analysis.

The evaluations of the two judges in the first group who had followed the prescribed procedures and the fifth judge were then compared. In the cases where all judges or
at least two of them agreed upon the dominant ego state portrayed by a subject, the subject was placed in the appropriate 'Parent,' 'Adult,' or 'Child' experimental group. In the five instances where no agreement was reached regarding the dominant ego state portrayed by an individual subject, that subject was not included in the statistical analysis.

This section has described the procedures followed while conducting the experiment. It also explained the methods used in determining the dominant ego state portrayed by the individual subjects. The next section discusses the processes involved in analyzing the data.

Data Analysis

This section describes the method by which the data were assembled and codified prior to the execution of the statistical analyses.

Data for each subject was gathered from both the "attitude" and credibility instruments. Each subject indicated attitudinal preferences toward each of the three concepts: "Public Demonstrations," "Student Protests," and "Riots," by placing an x on each of 22 scales. In a similar manner, each subject marked 15 items on the credibility instrument. As has been mentioned all of these bi-polar pairs were not included in the statistical analysis. This was due to the computing of a factor analysis for each set of scales.

In order to assign numerical values to each mark made
by the subjects, the following procedure was followed. It should be noted that this assignation procedure was followed for both the "attitude" and credibility measuring instruments.

First, the positive end of each scale was given the value +3. The negative pole of each bi-polar pair of adjectives was assigned the value of -3. The middle space was assigned the numerical value of zero. There were seven intervals on each scale.

Second, once numerical values had been assigned to each x, the pre- and post-test scores for each of the attitude measuring devices was compared. That is to say, that for each of 40 items used, the subject's shift in attitude was measured. This made a shift from one extreme to the other have a value of either plus or minus 7, while no shift represented a value of zero. These scores were then summed and divided by 40 in order to provide a mean shift score.

Third, for the credibility measuring instrument, the scores of from +3 to -3 were added and divided by 10, the number of scales used, in order to provide a credibility rating score.

It should be noted that there were 66 items in the "attitude" instrument and 15 items in the credibility instrument. These numbers were reduced due to the fact that those scales associated previously with low factor loadings were not included in the statistical analysis.

Finally, these scales were tabled for both the "attitude"
and credibility measuring devices according to individual subjects.

In summary, this chapter has presented the procedure by which the topic was selected. Specific steps used in conducting the experiment were also presented. The method by which the data was recorded for the statistical analyses was also described.

Chapter III provides information regarding the statistical analyses. The major findings of the study are also reported as they relate to each hypothesis.
CHAPTER III
RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the statistical analyses as they pertain to each of the hypotheses under study.

The results of this experiment are based upon data from sixteen groups of subjects with from three to five members per group. A total of 57 subjects were used in the statistical analyses.

Treatment by levels analyses of variance were used to test all hypotheses. As noted earlier, hypotheses one and two were concerned with "attitude change." Hypotheses three and four dealt with speaker credibility. Parametric statistical tests were used since an interval level of measurement was assumed. All evaluations of the statistical tests were made at the .05 level of significance, two-tailed tests.

There was one independent variable, one control variable, and two dependent variables. The independent or treatment variable was the dominant ego state portrayed by the speaker. These were labeled "Parent," "Adult," and "Child." The control variable was the assessed dominant ego state as judged from the subjects' behavior in a group situation. The dependent variable for the second set of hypotheses was source credibility ratings.

The results of this study are presented as follows. First, the results of the four analyses of variance are
presented. Second, decisions concerning the four hypotheses are given.

The first analysis dealt with the "attitude" shift scores which were generated through the use of the semantic differential scales presented in Appendix V. Scores for each set of bi-polar adjective pairs ranged from -3 to +3. This analysis was conducted in order to determine whether or not significant statistical differences in "attitude" shift could be attributed to: (1) the dominant ego state of the speaker, or (2) the dominant ego state of the subjects. The statistical test used was a 3x3, treatment by levels, analysis of variance. The results of this test are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Speaker's Dominant Ego State</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Ego State of Subjects</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 2: Analysis of Variance I.
The second analysis also concerned itself with "attitude" shift scores as generated through the use of semantic differential scales presented in Appendix V. In this case, however, the absolute value of the score was used as raw date rather than the actual value. Scores for each adjective pair ranged from zero to +3. This analysis was conducted in order to determine whether or not significant statistical differences in "attitude" shift could be attributed to: (1) the dominant ego state of the speaker, or (2) the dominant ego state of the subjects. The statistical test used was a 3x3, treatment by levels analysis of variance. The results of this test are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Speaker's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Ego State</td>
<td>623.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>311.52</td>
<td>1.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Ego State of Subjects</td>
<td>247.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>123.53</td>
<td>.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>3015.05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>753.76</td>
<td>2.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>14155.82</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>294.91</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18040.99</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 3: Analysis of Variance II.
The third analysis dealt with the credibility rating scores generated through the use of the semantic differential scales presented in Appendix VI. Scores for each adjective pair ranged from -3 to +3. This analysis was conducted in order to determine whether or not significant statistical differences in source credibility ratings could be attributed to: (1) the dominant ego state of the speaker, or (2) the dominant ego state of the subject. A 3x3, treatment by levels statistical test was used to analyze the data. The results of this analysis are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>S. S.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Speaker's Dominant Ego State</td>
<td>1063.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>531.95</td>
<td>5.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Ego State of Subjects</td>
<td>184.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92.31</td>
<td>.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>247.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61.89</td>
<td>.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5018.87</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>104.55</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6514.97</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Analysis of Variance III.

The fourth analysis also concerned itself with the source
credibility ratings which were generated through the use of the semantic differential scales presented in Appendix VI. In this case, however, the absolute value of the score was used as raw data rather than the actual value. Scores for each adjective pair ranged from zero to +3. This analysis was conducted in order to determine whether or not significant statistical differences in credibility ratings could be attributed to: (1) the dominant ego state of the speaker, or (2) the dominant ego state of the subjects. The statistical test used was a $3 \times 3$, treatment by levels analysis of variance. The results of this test are presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Speaker's Dominant Ego State</td>
<td>303.96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>151.98</td>
<td>4.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Ego State of Subjects</td>
<td>163.54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81.77</td>
<td>2.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>70.98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.74</td>
<td>0.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1560.40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2098.88</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 5: Analysis of Variance IV.
The next section discusses the results of the statistical
tests as they apply to the hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1: There are significant differences of at­
titude shift associated with the three
(parent, adult, child) subject groups. That is to say, irrespective of the
message and message source, there will be
differences in attitude shift which are
attributable to the dominant ego state
of the receiver.

The results of the treatment by levels analyses revealed that
there were no significant differences between the treatment
groups at the .05 level of significance. The results did not
support the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2: There are significant differences of
attitude shift associated with the three
(parent, adult, child) ego states portrayed
by the speaker. That is to say, irrespec­
tive of the message and receiver personality
type, there will be differences in attitude
shift which are attributable to the dominant
ego state of the message source.

The results of the treatment by levels analyses revealed that
there were no significant differences between the subject
groups at the .05 level of significance. The results did not
support the hypothesis.

The measured interaction in Analyses I and II was not
significant at the .05 level of significance. Partial support did not appear, therefore, for hypotheses 1 and 2.

Hypothesis 3: There are significant differences of source credibility ratings given by the three (parent, adult, child) subject groups. That is to say, irrespective of the message and message source, there will be differences in credibility ratings which are attributable to the dominant ego state of the receiver.

The results of the treatment by levels analyses revealed that there were no significant differences between the subject groups at the .05 level of significance. The results did not support the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4: There are significant differences of source credibility ratings received by the three (parent, adult, child) ego states portrayed by the speaker. That is to say, irrespective of the message and receiver's dominant ego state, there will be differences in credibility ratings which are attributable to the dominant ego state of the message source.

The results of the treatment by levels analyses revealed that there were significant differences between the treatment groups at the .05 level of significance. The results supported the hypothesis.
The measured interaction in Analyses III and IV was not significant at the .05 level of significance. Partial support did not appear, therefore, for hypotheses 3 and 4.

The following summarizes the results of this study with respect to the four hypotheses.

1. There are significant differences of attitude shift associated with the three (parent, adult, child) subject groups. That is to say, irrespective of the message and message source, there will be differences in attitude shift which are attributable to the dominant ego state of the receiver. (Not Supported)

2. There are significant differences of attitude shift associated with the three (parent, adult, child) ego states portrayed by the speaker. In other words, irrespective of the message and receiver personality type, there will be differences in attitude shift which are attributable to the dominant ego state of the message source. (Not Supported)

3. There are significant differences of source credibility ratings given by the three (parent, adult, child) subject groups, i.e., irrespective of the message and message source, there will be differences in credibility ratings which are attributable to the dominant ego state of the receiver. (Supported)

4. There are significant differences of source credi-
bility ratings received by the three (parent, adult, child) ego states portrayed by the speaker. That is to say, irrespective of the message and the receiver's dominant ego state, there will be differences in credibility ratings which are attributable to the dominant ego state of the message source. (Not Supported)

In summary, the statistical tests which were applied to the data gathered in this study indicate that hypotheses 1, 2, and 4 could not be accepted as tenable. The statistical evidence did support hypothesis 3.

Chapter IV discusses the implications and conclusions relevant to the hypotheses and results of this study.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY

General Conclusions

This section presents a summary of the study. Included are general and specific conclusions resulting from an analysis of the data gathered. Suggestions for replications of this study are given also.

This experiment tested four hypotheses. These hypotheses made predictions about the role played by dominant ego states in the persuasion process. More specifically, "attitude" shift score and speaker credibility ratings were examined in the light of the dominant ego state portrayed by both the speaker and the subjects. The relationships which were hypothesized had foundations in earlier work with the problems of "attitude" shift and speaker credibility.

Three experimental treatments were used. They consisted of messages delivered by an individual portraying three different dominant ego states. These ego states were: "Parent," "Adult," and "Child." There was a control variable which consisted of the dominant ego states displayed by each of the subjects. The statistical analysis was based upon the three experimental conditions as well as upon the subjects' dominant ego states.

All groups received and completed the same data gathering instruments. These were semantic differential scales.

All data were subjected to a factor analysis, as well as statistical tests appropriate for testing the hypotheses.
Three hypotheses were not supported. One hypothesis was supported. The experimental treatments employed did produce results significantly different from one another in terms of actual credibility ratings. The procedures which were followed did not demonstrate that the dominant ego state of either the speaker or the subjects brought about statistically significant differences in "attitude" shift.

In somewhat more specific terms the conclusions are as follows. The first hypothesis suggested that the dominant ego state of the subjects played a prominent role in determining the amount of attitude shift exhibited by the subjects. It further suggested that this would be the case over all treatments. In other words, in spite of the dominant ego state portrayed by the speaker, the receiver's displayed attitude shift would be commensurate with his own dominant ego state. Analyses I and II indicated that this was not the case in this study.

There are several probable reasons for the non support of these hypotheses. First, the interaction period may have reinforced, strengthened, or changed existing attitudes to a greater extent than the video taped presentation. Second, a misinterpretation of the purpose of the study may have brought about a type of experimental generosity which might well be called experimental persistence. This is based upon the remarkably identical or nearly identical pre- and post-test ratings on certain concepts by many of the subjects. Third, a somewhat less tenable reason for the lack of observed differences may
be attributed to the notion that dominant ego states do not, in reality, play a role in determining attitude shift. The precarious nature of this statement will be referred to later in this chapter.

The second hypothesis suggested that the persuasiveness of a speaker is determined to some extent by the dominant ego state which he portrays. In other words, in spite of the subjects' dominant ego state, the speaker's persuasiveness varies as his dominant ego state varies. Analyses I and II indicated that this was not the case in this experiment.

The probably reasons for the observed lack of differences in attitude shift which could be associated with the speaker's dominant ego state are similar to those of hypothesis I. First, by the time the subjects heard the speaker, their attitudes may have been formed to such an extent that in spite of the speaker's efforts, they wouldn't change their position on the topic. Second, the phenomenon of experimental persistence may have once more been evident. Third, the slight possibility that the dominant ego state of a speaker does not play a significant role in his persuasiveness does exist.

The notion that ego states do not effect persuasiveness and persuasibility seems weak for the following reason. Table 6, which shows the results of the analysis of the absolute values of the attitude shift scores, has a rather surprising entry. Interaction was measured at 2.55 with 2.56 required for statistical significance at the .05 level. The possibility then exists that ego states may determine the
polarity of attitude shift rather than the directionality of the same. This concept will be discussed below in the light of Analyses III and IV.

The third hypothesis suggested that the credibility rating given by the subjects were determined in part by their ego state. Analyses II and IV indicated that this was not the case. In view of the other findings, it was difficult to determine a probable "cause" of this result. One plausible explanation is given below.

The fourth hypothesis suggested that source credibility ratings were dependent upon the dominant ego state portrayed by the speaker. Analyses III and IV indicated that this was indeed the case. As the third and fourth hypotheses relate to one another, the following conclusion was drawn. Source credibility ratings were effected by the dominant ego state of the speaker; however, the ego states may have been so blatantly obvious that any differences which may have been attributable to subject ego state were immeasureable. This conclusion is further supported by the small measured interaction of Analysis IV, compared to the nearly significant interaction of Analysis II.

These are the general conclusions as they relate to each hypothesis. Six specific conclusions were accepted as the most plausible and are presented below.

**Specific Conclusions**

For purposes of brevity, the following conclusions are outlined.
1. Subject ego state had no significant effect on subject attitude shift.

2. Speaker ego state had no significant effect on subject attitude shift.

3. Speaker ego state and subject ego state may interact in such a way as to determine the polarity rather than the directionality of subject attitude shift.

4. Subject ego state had no significant effect on source credibility ratings. That is to say, the source's credibility ratings were not dependent upon the dominant ego state of the individual subject.

5. Speaker ego state had a significant effect on source credibility ratings. The "adult" received the highest source credibility ratings, the "child" received the lowest.

6. A transactional analysis model of persuasion needs further verification before it can be accepted. Although transactional analysis exists as a complete psychological theory, it did not, in this case account for the personality variables in the persuasion process.

Comments

The results of this study raise certain questions which appear quite interesting and worthy of further consideration in the area of personality models.

Perhaps the most fundamental question deals with the failure to support three of four hypotheses. In this study
the primary purpose was to test a P-A-C paradigm. The failure to support the hypotheses casts some doubt on the plausibility of such a model.

The literature review suggested that personality and personality types did play a significant role in the persuasion process. The exact nature of this role did not appear to be completely understood, however. The failure to adopt the model as well as a lack of information concerning the role played by personality in the persuasion process raise some questions deserving of explanation. There are several possible solutions to this problem and they are considered below.

The experimenter recently had a conversation with an individual who had participated in transactional analysis and worked with Harris in modifying the system and theory. This conversation is dealt with here because it may shed some light on why the model wasn't supported, as well as provide some insight into the role of personality types in the persuasion.

The source of this information was a young woman who, along with her husband, had participated in some transactional analysis sessions conducted by Harris. She later worked with Harris in an attempt to refine the theory of transactional analysis.

It seems that there has been something of a problem in making a determination of an individual's dominant ego state. There were times when it was blatantly obvious that a person
was playing the role of a "Parent," and "Adult," or a "Child." There were other instances, however, when the dominant ego state being displayed was not so apparent.

The problem seems to be a definitional one. Is it possible to make determinations of dominant ego states with the guidelines which have been provided by Harris (1969) and Randall (1971)? Harris and some of his cohorts are apparently having some doubts. There is some reason to believe by Harris and his colleagues that work is now being done in an effort to establish operational definitions of the various ego states which are more comprehensive.

This information is of interest here for the following reasons. First, it is possible that the judges involved in this study were unable to make completely accurate judgments of the subjects' dominant ego state due to inadequate criteria for judgment. Second, it may be the case that the role played by dominant ego states or personality types cannot be delineated because of an inappropriate notion of just what is involved in an ego state or personality type. Third, some subjects did not maintain any one dominant ego state over an extended period of time. This fluctuation presents serious procedural problems. It is suggested that further studies incorporate a method whereby a more in depth analysis of a subject's ego state is possible. One such method would call for the use of subjects who had undergone a form of treatment in which a transactional analyst had been able to make an accurate assessment of dominant ego states.
There are several areas which apply more specifically to this study than they do to the theory of transactional analysis.

For example, the assumption was made that the ego state portrayed by the subjects during the group discussion period was maintained until they had completed the semantic differential scales. It seems possible that either the video taped presentation or the completion of the semantic differential scales may have changed the dominant ego state of some of the subjects. An appropriate modification in the replication of this study might call for evaluations of the subjects' ego states not only prior to the video tape but also after the video tape presentation and after the completion of the semantic differential scales. Such a change would allow for a determination of any variance in subject ego state. Valuable information could also be gathered regarding the interplay of the ego states depicted by the speaker and the subjects. These suggestions indicate that the experimental procedures which were followed may have lacked sophistication. This idea is discussed below.

No pilot studies were conducted prior to the actual experiment. Although there were no evident problems in the methodology used for this study, several assumptions had to be made. This was especially the case in considering the messages which were used. A future replication could use a pilot study to determine a message topic of more current interest. It might also be suggested that ego-involvement levels on completed messages rather than message topics be
Although not requiring a pilot study, a procedural change could have allowed for the compilation of more information regarding the subjects used in the experiment. In this study the assumption was made that the sample of subjects was representational of the population under consideration. No information was collected which pertained to the age, sex, and academic interest area for the subjects. This, in a replication, would allow the experimenter to determine whether or not the sample was composed of a cross section of university students. Future researchers may also wish to use subjects other than college students. The possibility exists that college students of the type used in this experiment display a set of behaviors different from those of members of the community. If these differences do exist, a new approach to selecting subjects for experiments such as this one may be called for.

Now that consideration of procedural and methodological matters has taken place, the focus will shift to matters more closely related to the failure to support three of the four hypotheses.

The first question to be dealt with is why didn't the subjects in the three treatment groups display differences in "attitude" shift? There are many possible explanations, only a few of which are discussed here.

The night before they were to participate in the experiment, each subject was informed via the telephone that he
would be involved in a group discussion and advised of the message topic. There are at least two possible problems with this strategy. It is possible that the subjects had already given so much thought to the topic prior to their notification of the discussion which was to ensue that any attempt at persuasion was destined to be fruitless. It is also possible that by notifying the subject of the message topic, he was able to commit himself to a certain stand before he entered the experimental situation.

There also existed the possibility that the messages were not persuasive. Although French (1970) had indicated that the message topic was highly ego-involving and capable of facilitating attitude shift, this may not have been the case in the present study. In the two years since French made his determinations, the attitudes toward the message topic may have become less neutral and more fixed. Therefore, it is once again suggested that the message used in a replication of this study be thoroughly scrutinized.

A third possible explanation exists for the lack of demonstrated differences in "attitude" shift between the subject groups. This reason was referred to earlier as "experimental persistence." This apparent phenomenon seemed to be closely related to experimental generosity. It was believed that some subjects displayed an uncanny ability to maintain identical ratings on the adjective pairs in the pre- and post-tests. Although this was not done in the present study, it is suggested as a useful modification to include
in a replication.

These suggestions and modifications given here as recommended changes in replications of this study have implications regarding the source credibility ratings. It was interesting to note that although differences were not statistically different on the "attitude" shift dimensions, they were on the actual source credibility ratings. It is important to note that the suggested modifications regarding "attitude" shift measurement and facilitation may bring about changes in the source credibility ratings. It may be the case that subjects rate the credibility of the source differently, depending on their previous knowledge of the message topic, or the persuasiveness of the messages. It is in this regard that the results of this study conflict with those of earlier studies. The generally accepted notion to this point has been that highly credible sources are more persuasive than sources with low credibility. This study suggests however that source credibility may not play such a clear cut role in the persuasion process at least in the context of the transactional analysis model coupling message sources and message receivers. The reader may once again wish to refer to the introduction of this paper, especially to the section entitled Source Variables.

It should be noted that in this study, the speaker's credibility was generated intrinsically. There may have been different results for both the "attitude" and credibility measuring instruments if some extrinsically generated credibility would have been provided. Since it may be the
case that the more a subject knows of a message source, the
greater the differences in "attitude" shift and credibility
rating attributable to the dominant ego state being portrayed
by that source, a study designed to investigate this possibil-
ity is suggested.

A final point must be considered regarding the relationship
ships which exist between ego states, persuasion, and
credibility. The results indicated that personality types
and particularly dominant ego states may have a greater effect
on polarity of a judgment made on a bi-polar adjective pair
than they do on the direction of that rating. In other
words, one dominant ego state may facilitate the adoption
of a more extreme position on an issue than another dominant
ego state. Although the results did not indicate that this
was clearly the case, they did open up that possibility.
Future experimentation may indicate that this is indeed the
role played by personality types in the persuasion process.

One area which has, to this point, received little
attention is the P-A-C model of persuasion. This considera-
tion will now be given, and the model's failure to be
accepted, discussed.

In order to suggest that the model be viable, it was
felt that the research hypotheses would have to be accepted.
Since all the hypotheses were not supported, this model is
not now being set forth as acceptable. This is not to say,
however, that such a model does not merit further attention.
There are several factors which indicate that further
research is needed before a decision on the worth of the model can be made. First, it was found that there were differences significant at the .05 level on the source credibility rating which were attributable to the dominant ego state portrayed by the speaker. Second, there is some reason to believe that the role played by dominant ego states in the persuasion process may have been more to do with the extremity of an individual's position on an issue than it does with that individual's favorable or unfavorable attitude toward that issue. This is evidenced by the fact that the analysis made of the absolute values of the "attitude" ratings were closer to reaching statistical significance than were the actual values of these ratings. Third, it may be the case that a replication of this study which utilizes the modifications which were recommended might support the model entirely.

In summary, this study suggests that although the model did not receive total support, it is suggested that further research in the area be conducted. The questions raised in this study will hopefully provide the impetus necessary for more detailed research in an effort to determine the relationships existing between dominant ego states, "attitude" shift, and credibility.
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APPENDIX I

1. Complementary Transactions

This type of transaction takes the forms diagrammed below. The cues come, in whole or in part, from Harris (1969) .

1. Parent-Parent

Stimulus: "Her duty is home with the children."
Response: "She obviously has no sense of duty." (p. 72)

2. Adult-Adult

Stimulus: "Will the bus be in Berkeley on time?"
Response: "Yes--at 11:15." (p. 71)

3. Child-Child

Stimulus: "I'll be the mamma and you be the little girl."
Response: "I always have to ill he feels and is willing be the Little girl." (p. 75)

4. Parent-Child

Stimulus: "Mr. Smith has a fever and wants attention."
Response: "Mrs. Smith knows how to mother him." (p. 76)
5. Child-Adult

Stimulus: "I'm not going to make it."
Response: "You have the qualifications."
(p. 79)

6. Adult-Parent

Stimulus: "A man knows he should quit smoking and is desirous of doing so, he asks his wife to help him."
Response: "The wife helps by hiding the husband's cigarettes."
II. Crossed Transactions

This type of transaction takes the forms diagrammed below. The cues come, in whole or in part, from Harris (1969)\(^{57}\).

1. Stimulus: "Dear, where are my cuff links?"
   Response: "Where you left them, stupid!" (p. 80)

2. Stimulus: "Dear, where are my cuff links?"
   Response: "Why do you always have to yell at me?" (p. 81)

3. Stimulus: "Why don't you live up to your responsibilities?"
   Response: "Why don't you mind your own business?" (p. 86)

4. Stimulus: "Why do you always yell at me?"
   Response: "Why do you always pick on me?" (p. 87)
III. Duplex Transactions

A sense of the complex nature of this type of transaction can be gained from an example presented by Harris (1969).57

"Husband says to wife, 'Where did you hide the can opener?' The main stimulus in Adult is that it seeks objective information. But there is a secondary communication in the word 'hide'. (Your housekeeping is a mystery to me. We'd go broke if I were as disorganized as you. If I could once, just once, find something where it belongs!) This is Parent. It is thinly veiled criticism. This stimulates a 'duplex transaction'."
Public Demonstrations Should Not Be Strictly Controlled

Many inadequate books have been written which have attempted an in-depth analysis of the pros and cons of this issue. Absolutely no such attempt will be made in this short message because I know better and I will think you do, too. The intent is to quickly, concisely, and adequately present the three reasons why we should force the elimination of inane controls on demonstrations.

First of all, as I have said time and time again, protests, riots, and mass political demonstration are not useless, unnecessary, and un-American. History clearly shows the way that such demonstrations serve purposes contradictory to such claims. However, reactions to recent riots, protest, and demonstrations reveal a widely held, albeit disgusting, belief that these kinds of occurrences are unnecessary and anti-American. The stupid assumption underlying such reactions is that all other domestic groups advanced themselves by other more peaceful means. This is definitely an asinine assumption. History is full of examples which illustrate this point, so sit up and listen and learn something.

You should know that the revolts of eighteenth-century farmers and tumultuous urban demonstrations in sympathy with the French Revolution were obviously used by Jeffersonians to create a new two-party system over the horrified protest of the reactionary Federalists.
You should know that northern violence obliterated the southern slave kingdom and after the Civil War, southern terrorism ruined the Radical Reconstructionist Yankee's efforts.

You should know that changes that have occurred in labor's struggle against the oppressive management were undoubtedly achieved only through a wave of bloody strikes in the midst of an unnecessary depression caused by "big business."

You should know that blacks in urban ghettos, struggling against a bigoted society, made their greatest political gains in Congress and the cities only because of race riots of the 1960's.

You should know that American Indian uprisings beginning early in the seventeenth century and extending into the later 1800's were ineffectually aimed at protecting their land and freedom against the invading white settlers. Unsuccessful though these uprisings were, they were the only means by which the American Indian could attain his goals and slow the on-rushing horde of foreigners.

The chapter now being written in history regarding student protests which began in the middle 1960's is yet to be completed. You ought to realize that these protests are the only means by which American students can have their demands recognized and met in a complacent society.

Thus, time and time again history has told you that domestic violence is not un-American; it is not unnecessary; and it is not useless. My friends, it is a fact of life in a degenerate society.
Furthermore, another reason to force the elimination of inane controls on public demonstrations is that an over-mature economy wrecks the peaceful emergence of minority groups. Such an economy is absurdly biased toward the majority to the extent that violence is the only avenue open to minorities. The mature economy always demonstrates several easily identifiable characteristics which work against the minority groups. These characteristics are: stifling of economic growth rate; labor unions monopolize jobs and multiply archaic apprenticeship requirements; family firms, as well as small businesses become obsolete; and, educational and professional standards for employment are inappropriately raised. These obstacles make peaceful minority group emergence a fantasy and at the same time increase the demand for violence. Again, history gives us numerous examples which support this argument.

In the years between 1940 and 1960 the United States economy entered a state of over-maturity. This economy found itself dominated by an age of giant corporations and under the overwhelming influence of post-industrial automation. It is no wonder that rural Negroes who entered northern cities by the millions during these years found their financial, social, and political mobility smashed by this over-mature economy. Race riots in the 1960's were obviously needed; peaceful methods had failed to assist the Negro in accomplishing his goals and needs.

The American Indian has always encountered extreme
difficulty in his attempts to gain full membership in all phases of American society. The American Indian finds his frustrations intolerable as he is faced with the problems an over-mature economy provides for such a minority group. His educational opportunities are without a doubt the worst they have ever been. He still encounters obstacles today that stalemate his societal emergence.

Farmers and ranchers within the last ten years have also met such frustration and dissolutionment as their desires, needs, and peaceful demands are always neglected. Thus we have the emergence of violence-oriented agricultural organizations.

So, it must now be as obvious to you as it is to me that a mature economy definitely cripples the peaceful emergence of minority groups.

And now, a final reason you should learn about forcing the elimination of inane controls on public demonstrations is the transformation or evolution is history's best indicated answer to minority group violence. As I have so often said, if we wait long enough, conditions will change naturally which will eliminate or render unnecessary minority group violence. Obviously such violence, whether in the form of protest, riot, or mass public demonstration, can in no way be effectively resolved through any form of positive action on the part of the inept majority. You should realize that constantly changing circumstances following the course of time have always provided the ultimate answer to the unrest experienced by minority groups. Once again, history is replete with examples
which demonstrate the validity of this line of reasoning.

A few such examples include:

During the years 1880-1920 the United States experienced its greatest period of industrial growth. As such, the growing urban population needed the services of urban entrepreneurs even if they were lazy Irish barkeeps and stingy Jewish tailors.

This same industrializing economy experienced the need for strong backs, even those of Italian and Polish peasant farmers.

Numerous other system-transforming explosions allowed the integration of minority group demands to take place. Westward expansion, the Civil War, the world wars, and the great depression are obvious examples.

Farmer violence on the Appalachian frontier ended between 1799 and 1828, and a national transformation brought about the exercise of collective power by the West.

The Louisiana Purchase solved the needs of greedy farmers by providing them with a continent to till and rule.

Organized labor's rise to power resulted from a depression and a war which transformed America beyond recognition. This same transformation made whole collectives rise rapidly into the suburban middle class.

Thus, transformation or evolution is an effective answer to minority group violence. The majority must be patient in the face of minority violence as the passing of time will bring about changes that will satisfy minority needs.
Those of you who were convinced that we should control public demonstrations should now know better. If I were you I would always remember what has been said here today. Do not return to the stupid, ridiculous and disgusting views which you once held. Your position should be to put a stop once and for all to those who maintain a negative view of public demonstrations. When you meet the opposition, the question on your mind must always be, "How dare you?" Now that you know your obligations, go out and satisfy them!
Public Demonstrations Should Not Be Strictly Controlled

Many books have been written which have attempted an in-depth analysis of the pros and cons of this issue. No such attempt will be made in this short message. The intent is, however, to quickly, concisely, and as adequately as a message of this short nature allows, present three probable reasons why, as I see it, we should not strictly control public demonstrations.

First of all, protests, riots, and mass political demonstrations are in my opinion not always useless, unnecessary, and un-American. History indicates that such demonstrations have possibly served purposes contradictory to such claims. However, they do reveal a belief held by some that these kinds of occurrences are unnecessary and anti-American. The assumption underlying such reactions, I think, is that all other domestic groups advanced themselves by other seemingly more peaceful means. This is probably a false assumption. History is full of examples which tend to support this point. A few such examples include:

The revolts of eighteenth century farmers and tumultuous urban demonstrations in sympathy with the French Revolution were apparently used by Jeffersonians to create a new two-party system over the comparatively horrified protests of the Federalists.
In my opinion, northern violence ended what we know as the southern slave kingdom. Subsequent southern terrorism, according to some historians, ended Radical Reconstruction.

The changes that occurred in labor-management relations have been attributed to a wave of bloody strikes in the midst of a depression.

Black people in urban ghettos made what are often thought to be great political gains in Congress and the cities during the 1960's race riots.

American Indian uprisings beginning early in the seventeenth century and extending into the later 1800's were aimed at protecting their land and freedom against the invading white settlers. Unsuccessful though these uprisings were, they remained one of the few available means by which the American Indian could hope to attain his goals.

The chapter now being written in history regarding student protests which began in the middle 1960's is yet to be completed. Current indications suggest, however, that these protests are a useful means by which American students can expect their demands to be first recognized and then met.

Thus, history often suggests that domestic violence is probably neither un-American nor, in every case, unnecessary and useless.

The second reason for not controlling public demonstrations, I think, is that a mature economy works against the peaceful emergence of minority groups. Such an economy seemingly favors
the majority to the extent that violence is frequently one of
the few avenues open to minorities. The mature economy demon­
strates several identifiable characteristics which work against
the minority groups. These characteristics include: slowing
down of economic growth rate; labor unions usually monopolize
jobs and multiply apprenticeship requirements; family firms,
as well as small businesses, become obsolete; and, educational
and professional standards for employment are raised. These
obstacles tend to render peaceful minority group emergence
a comparative fantasy, and at the same time facilitate
violence. Again, history indicates numerous examples which
serve as support for this argument.

In the years between 1940 and 1960 the United States
economy entered a stage of comparatively advanced maturity.
This economy found itself dominated by an age of large cor­
porations and under the influence of post-industrial
automation. Small wonder that rural Negroes who entered
northern cities by the millions during these years found their
financial, social, and political mobility curtailed by this
mature economy. Race riots in the 1960's seemed to be the
subsequent result because peaceful methods had apparently
failed to assist the Negro in accomplishing his goals and needs.

The American Indian has encountered considerable diffi­
culty in his attempts to gain full membership in most phases
of American society. Faced with the problems a mature
economy provides such a minority group, the American Indian
finds his frustrations on the increase. His educational
opportunities are probably greater now in the mature United States economy than they were prior to the 1940's. Yet, he still encounters numerous other obstacles today that tend toward stalemating his complete societal emergence.

Farmers and ranchers within the last ten years have also met with some frustration and disillusionment as their desires, needs, and peaceful demands are often neglected.

So, it would seem logical to say that a mature economy often does work against the peaceful emergence of minority groups.

A final reason for not controlling public demonstrations is that transformation or evolution is sometimes thought to be one of history's best-indicated answers to minority group violence. The basic belief seems to be that if we wait long enough conditions will change naturally which will eliminate or render unnecessary minority group violence. Such violence, whether in the form of protest, riot, or mass public demonstration, it would seem, cannot be effectively resolved through positive action on the part of the majority. Constantly changing circumstances following the course of time usually provide satisfactory answers to the unrest experienced by minority groups. Once again, history seems replete with examples which support the validity of this line of reasoning. A few examples include:

During the years 1880-1920 the United States experienced its greatest period of industrial growth to date. As such the growing urban population began to need the services of urban entrepreneurs including Irish bartenders and Jewish tailors.
This same industrializing economy experienced the need for strong backs, including men of Italian and Polish descent.

Numerous other system-transforming explosions allowed the integration of minority-group needs to take place. Westward expansion, the Civil War, the World wars, and the great depression are but a few such examples.

Farmer violence on the Appalachian frontier ended between 1799 (the date of the Fries Rebellion) and 1828 (Andrew Jackson's election) and a national transformation allowed for the exercise of collective power by the West.

The Louisiana Purchase solved some of the needs of farmers by providing them with a continent to till and rule.

It would probably be true to say that organized labor's rise to power resulted from a depression and a war which transformed America almost beyond recognition. This same transformation made it possible for collectives to rise rapidly into the suburban middle class.

Thus, transformation or evolution does seem to be an effective answer to minority group violence. The majority should then be patient in the face of minority violence as the passing of time will bring about changes that will naturally satisfy minority needs.

Hopefully, in the short time we've had together, those of you who were not convinced that we should avoid strict control of public demonstrations are now at least leaning in that direction. For those of you who already favored the position of no control, it is my hope that this conviction has become even stronger.
Although I do not have any desire to tell you how you must deal with the issue of public demonstrations, I would like to suggest some possibilities. I have, from my own experience, found it helpful to ask the following question: How much or in what way do public demonstrations help or hinder the progress of minority groups? Although definite answers may be unknown, the possibility for a comparatively objective point of view seems to be enhanced.
APPENDIX IV
"Child Speech"

Public Demonstrations Should Not Be Strictly Controlled

Many books have been written by important authors which have attempted an in-depth analysis of the pros and cons of this issue, and I have read them. As much as I'd like to I just can't cover them all in this short message. I want to quickly, concisely, and as adequately as I can, present three of the reasons why you should not strictly control public demonstrations.

First of all I guess, protests, riots, and mass political demonstrations are not always useless, unnecessary, and un-American. Other people have told me that such demonstrations have often served purposes contradictory to such claims. However, reactions to recent riots, protests, and demonstrations reveal a belief held by important people that these kinds of occurrences are unnecessary and anti-American. I guess the assumption underlying such reactions is that other domestic groups advanced themselves the most by other more peaceful means. I hope this is a false assumption. History is full of real good examples which illustrate this point.

Here are a few tentative examples I hope you will agree with.

The revolts of eighteenth-century farmers and tumultuous urban demonstrations in sympathy with the French Revolution were supposedly used by Jeffersonians to create a great new two-party system over the large protests of the Federalists.
I also found that northern violence ended the southern slave kingdom and subsequent southern terrorism ended Radical Reconstruction.

The changes that occurred in the labor-management relations were achieved during a huge wave of bloody strikes in the midst of the great depression.

I dunno, but some people say that black people in urban ghettos made their greatest political gains in Congress and the cities during the 1960's race riots.

American Indian uprisings beginning early in the seventeenth century and extending into the later 1800's were aimed at protecting their precious land and freedom against those mean old white settlers. These uprisings weren't successful though, but they remained the only available means by which the American Indian could hope to get what he wanted.

The chapter now being written in history regarding student protests which began in the middle 1960's isn't done yet. I've found out that indications from all sides suggest that these protests are the only useful means by which American students can expect their demands to be recognized and met.

I think that history has suggested to us time and time again that domestic violence is neither un-American nor, in every case, unnecessary and useless.

Another reason I have found out about for not controlling public demonstrations is that a mature economy works against the peaceful emergence of minority groups. Such an economy favors the majority to the extent that violence is frequently the only avenue open to minorities. The mature economy
demonstrates several easily identifiable characteristics which work against the poor minority groups. These characteristics include: slowing down of economic growth rate; labor unions usually monopolize jobs and multiply apprenticeship requirements; family farms as well as small businesses become obsolete; and, educational and professional standards for employment are made too tough. These obstacles tend to render peaceful minority group emergence to fantasy and at the same time increase the need for violence.

Again I've found out, unfortunately, that history indicates numerous examples which serve as support for this argument, and predicts that there will be more traumatic unrest and uncertainty for us in the future.

In the years between 1940 and 1960 the United States economy entered a state of advance maturity. This economy found itself dominated by an ege of giant corporations and under the strong influence of post-industrial automation. So isn't it a small wonder that rural negroes who entered northern cities by the millions during these years found their financial, social, and political mobility curtailed by this mature economy. Race riots in the 1960's resulted because peaceful methods had failed to help the negro in accomplishing his goals and needs.

The poor American Indian has always encountered considerable difficulty in his attempts to gain full membership in all phases of American society. Faced with the problems of a mature
economy provides such a minority group, the American Indian finds his frustrations getting larger. That is strange because they are the original Americans. His educational opportunities are greater now in the mature United States economy than they were prior to the 1940's. Yet, he still encounters numerous other obstacles today that tend toward stopping his complete societal emergence.

Farmers and ranchers within the last ten years have also met with frustration and disillusionment as their desires, needs, and peaceful demands are continually neglected.

So, I hope you agree that it is obvious that a mature economy definitely does work against the peaceful emergence of minority groups.

A final reason for not controlling public demonstrations is that transformation or evolution is sometimes thought, by experts, to be one of history's best indicated answers to minority group violence. The basic belief is that if you wait long enough conditions will change naturally which will eliminate or render unnecessary minority group violence. Such violence, whether in the form of protest, riot, or mass public demonstration cannot be effectively resolved through positive action on the part of the majority. Constantly changing circumstances following the course of time will hopefully provide satisfactory answers to the unrest experienced by minority groups. Once again, history is replete with example which demonstrate the validity of this line of reasoning.
A few such examples include:

During the years 1880-1920 the United States experienced its greatest period of industrial growth. As such the growing urban population began to need the services of urban entrepreneurs such as Irish barkeeps and Jewish tailors.

I found that this same industrializing economy experienced the need for the strong backs of Italian and Polish peasant farmers.

Numerous other system transforming explosions let the integration of minority group needs to take place. Westward expansion, the civil war, the world wars, and the great depression are but a few such examples.

Farmer violence on the Appalachian frontier ended between 1799 (which I discovered was the date of the Fries Rebellion) and 1828 (Andrew Jackson's election) and a national transformation allowed for the exercise of collective power by the West.

The Louisiana Purchase solved the crying needs of farmers by providing them with a continent to till and rule.

Organized labor's rise to power resulted from a depression and a war which transformed America almost beyond recognition. This same transformation made it possible for whole collectives to rise rapidly into the suburban middle class.

Thus, transformation or evolution does seem to me, and I hope to you, to be an effective answer to minority group violence. If the majority will be patient in the face of
minority violence, the passing of time will I hope bring about changes that will naturally satisfy minority needs. At least this is what some important people have told me.

In conclusion, I want to thank you for your attentiveness; I hope you have enjoyed what has been said. I would prefer that you adopt a position similar to mine on this issue, but I know that whatever you decide is best.
APPENDIX V

Public Demonstrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Adj.</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Adj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pleasant</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>unpleasant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirty</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>clean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rumbling</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>whining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safe</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>dangerous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hollow</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>solid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaxed</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>tense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uneven</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>even</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resting</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>busy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colorless</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>colorful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violent</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>gentle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shallow</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>deep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rich</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>thin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtle</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>obvious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concentrated</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>diffuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strange</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>familiar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hot</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>cold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heavy</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>light</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrow</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>wide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>hazy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mild</td>
<td><em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em>:<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
<td>intense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Adjective 1</td>
<td>Adjective 2</td>
<td>Adjective 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rumbling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hollow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaxed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uneven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colorless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shallow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concentrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heavy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RIOTS

pleasant  unpleasant
passive    active
dirty      clean
rumbling   whining
safe       dangerous
hollow     solid
relaxed    tense
small      large
even      even
resting    busy
colorless  colorful
violent    gentle
shallow    deep
rich       thin
subtle     obvious
concentrated diffuse
strange    familiar
hot        cold
heavy      light
narrow     wide
clear      hazy
mild       intense
## APPENDIX VI

### The Speaker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>adjective</th>
<th>frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>emphatic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unjust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsafe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uninformed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggressive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfriendly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experienced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>untrained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unskilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hesitant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dishonest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unqualified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>informed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inexperienced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>