

ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: COMMUNICATOR ATTRACTIVENESS VERSUS
SIMILARITY IN PERSUASION

Jarrod D. Hyman, Master of Arts, 2003

Thesis Directed by: Professor Judson R. Mills
Department of Psychology

The purpose of the present research was to investigate circumstances under which an attractive but non-similar communicator will be more persuasive than a similar but non-attractive communicator and circumstances under which a similar but non-attractive communicator will be more persuasive than an attractive but non-similar communicator. In the context of a study of memory for ads, female college students listened to an advertisement, after having received information that the speaker of the advertisement was either an attractive African-American male or a similar female student. The speaker described the product as something everyone needs, something everyone would like, something you need, or something you would like. Participants then indicated their attitude toward the product and rated characteristics of the speaker. It was found that when the product was described as something for everyone, participants liked the product more than when it was described as something for you (the listener).

COMMUNICATOR ATTRACTIVENESS VERSUS SIMILARITY IN
PERSUASION

by

Jarrold D. Hyman

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
2003

Advisory Committee:

Professor Judson R. Mills, Chair
Professor Harold Sigall
Professor Charles Stangor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	iii
Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Communicator Attractiveness.....	1
Communicator Similarity.....	3
Purpose and Hypotheses.....	5
Chapter II: Method.....	9
Overview.....	9
Participants.....	9
Procedure.....	9
Chapter III: Results.....	12
Memory Check.....	12
Correlations Among Questionnaire Items and Calculations of Measures.....	13
Source Attractiveness Index.....	14
Ratings of Similarity.....	14
Ratings of Knowledgeability.....	15
Ratings of Objectivity.....	15
Ratings of Sincerity.....	15
Product Attitude Index.....	15
Chapter IV: Discussion.....	17
Appendices:	
Appendix A: Attractive Source Form.....	26
Appendix B: Similar Source Form.....	27
Appendix C: Product Message “Everyone Needs”.....	28
Appendix D: Product Message “Everyone Likes”.....	29
Appendix E: Product Message “You Need”.....	30
Appendix F: Product Message “You Like”.....	31
Appendix G: Questionnaire Items.....	32
Appendix H: Memory Test.....	33
References:.....	34

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Predictions of Persuasion for Attractive/Similar and Everyone/You.....	20
Table 2: Predictions of Persuasion for Attractive/Similar and Like/Need.....	21
Table 3: Predictions of Persuasion for Attractive/Similar, Everyone/You, and Like/Need.....	22
Table 4: Intercorrelations of Questionnaire Items.....	23
Table 5: Intercorrelations of Product Attitude Index, Source Attractiveness Index, and Other Measures.....	24
Table 6: Means of Product Attitude Index.....	25

COMMUNICATOR ATTRACTIVENESS VERSUS SIMILARITY IN PERSUASION

Chapter I: Introduction

Communicator Attractiveness

That persuasion is greater the greater the attractiveness of the communicator to the audience is not a new idea in social psychology. Attractiveness of the communicator is determined by physical characteristics of the communicator and also by likable attributes of the communicator.

Previous research has investigated circumstances under which attractive communicators are more persuasive than less attractive communicators. According to Petty and Wegner in the recent Handbook of Social Psychology by Gilbert, Fiske, and Lindzey (1998), "Source attractiveness or liking has been observed to exert a greater impact when relevance is low rather than high (Chaiken, 1980; Petty, Cacioppo, & Schumann, 1983), when attitude-relevant knowledge is low rather than high (e.g., Wood & Kallgren, 1988), and when messages are externally paced on audio- or videotapes rather than self-paced and written (Chaiken & Eagly, 1983)."

Some other studies not cited by Petty and Wegner looked at circumstances under which attractive communicators are more persuasive than less attractive communicators. In a study by Mills and Aronson (1965) a female communicator was made to look either very attractive or less attractive. She indicated to male audiences either that she would like people to agree with her or that she did not care if people agreed with her. Persuasion was greater when the attractive communicator expressed an overt desire to persuade than when she did not.

Mills (1966) investigated whether the audience thinks a communicator likes or dislikes them on how the perception of a desire to persuade affects opinion change.

College Students read a transcript from an interview with a male communicator who said that he either liked college students or disliked college students and then said that he either wanted to influence students or that he did not care whether he influenced students. If the communicator was described as liking the audience, the audience was more persuaded when the communicator said he wanted to persuade them than when he said he did not care if they were persuaded. When the communicator disliked the audience, the audience agreed with him less when he said that he wanted to persuade them than when he said he did not care if they were persuaded.

Mills and Harvey (1972) investigated the effectiveness of attractive non-expert communicators versus non-attractive expert communicators. Their study varied whether the source information was given before or after the message. It was found that when the source information was given before the message, the attractive non-expert communicator was equally persuasive as a non-attractive expert communicator. However, when the source information was given after the message, the attractive non-expert communicator was more persuasive than the non-attractive expert communicator. The non-attractive expert communicator was more persuasive when the source information was given before the message than when the source information was given after the message. The attractive non-expert communicator was equally persuasive when the source information was given before or after the message.

Norman (1976) looked at the persuasiveness of an attractive non-expert communicator versus a non-attractive expert communicator and the number of arguments in the message (either six or zero). Norman found that the attractive non-expert was less persuasive than the non-attractive expert when the message had six arguments. When there were zero arguments in the message, the attractive non-expert was more persuasive

than the non-attractive expert communicator. The non-attractive expert was more persuasive with six arguments than with zero. The attractive non-expert was just as persuasive with zero arguments as with six.

One possible explanation for attractive communicators being more persuasive than less attractive communicators is based on identification, as defined by Kelman (1961). Kelman states, "Identification can be said to occur when an individual adopts behavior derived from another person or a group because this behavior is associated with a satisfying self-defining relationship to this person or group" (p.63). Kelman assumed that, "To the extent that the agent's power is based on his attractiveness; influence will tend to take the form of identification" (p.68).

Another possible explanation for attractive communicators being more persuasive than less attractive communicators is based on Heider's Balance Theory (1946, 1958). According to Balance Theory if a person (P) likes another person (O) and O likes attitude object X, then person P should also like attitude object X.

Communicator Similarity

That similarity of the communicator to the audience influences persuasion is also not a new idea in social psychology. Source-audience similarity has been shown to increase persuasion in a field experiment by Brock (1965) in which a paint salesman was trying to sell customers a certain brand of paint. Sometimes the paint salesman said that he had used the same amount of the brand that the customer intended to purchase and sometimes he said he had used twenty times as much as the customer intended to purchase. Persuasion was greater when the amount he said he used was similar to the amount the customer intended to purchase.

Previous research has also investigated circumstances under which similar communicators are more persuasive than less similar communicators. A study by Berscheid (1966) showed that background similarity between the listener and the communicator is more influential when the listener perceived the background similarity as relevant to the issue than when the listener perceived the background similarity as irrelevant to the issue. In her study, participants received messages about either returning to the gold standard or awarding scholarships on need or merit, and the communicator was either similar on international affairs values and dissimilar on educational values or dissimilar on international affairs values and similar on educational values. She found that if the listener and the communicator had dissimilar positions on an issue, the listener changed to move closer to the communicator's position when the communicator and the listener were similar on a relevant background characteristic (something perceived by the person to be relevant to the issue) than when the communicator and the listener were similar on an irrelevant background characteristic.

Mills and Kimble (1973) asked participants to rank poetry after they saw the rankings of another student who was either similar or dissimilar to them on background characteristics. Sometimes ranking the poetry was described as subjective (a matter of personal taste). Other times ranking the poetry was described as objective (a matter of artistic knowledge). Mills and Kimble found that when the topic was perceived as subjective, the participant's ratings agreed more with the similar other's ratings than with the dissimilar other's ratings. When the topic was perceived as objective, the opposite occurred. This study by Mills and Kimble (1973) was based on an idea suggested by Hovland, Janis, and Kelley (1953).

Hovland, Janis, and Kelley stated that, “In certain matters persons similar to the recipient of influence may be considered more expert than persons different from him. An individual is likely to feel that persons with status, values, interests, and needs similar to his own see things as he does and judge them from the same point of view. Because of this, their assertions about matters of which the individual is ignorant but where he feels the viewpoint makes a difference (e.g., about the satisfaction of a given job or the attractiveness of some personality) will tend to carry special credibility [p.22].” In the aforementioned study by Mills and Kimble (1973) it was assumed that when the topic was perceived as subjective the viewpoint was expected to make a difference, whereas it was not when the topic was perceived as objective.

Purpose and Hypotheses

The purpose of the present research was to investigate circumstances under which an attractive but non-similar communicator will be more persuasive than a similar but non-attractive communicator and circumstances under which a similar but non-attractive communicator will be more persuasive than an attractive but non-similar communicator. In this study the attitude object was a product.

For simplicity the attractive but non-similar communicator will be called the Attractive Source and the similar but non-attractive communicator will be called the Similar Source. This variable will be abbreviated as Attractive/Similar.

One variable that was investigated was whether the product was described as something for everyone or something for you (the listener). This variable will be abbreviated as Everyone/You. From Balance Theory it was assumed that people want to like the same things as people they like, like. That should occur especially if the liked person wants people to like the attitude object. If the Attractive Source endorses the

product, it may be assumed to have objectively desirable properties when the source addresses everyone and also when the source addresses you (the listener). So, persuasion could be expected to be the same whether the Attractive Source describes the product as something for everyone or something for you (the listener).

From the idea that Similar Sources are seen as more expert when the similarity is perceived as relevant to the topic, persuasion was expected to be greater when the Similar Source describes the product as something for you than when the Similar Source describes the product as something for everyone. If the Similar Source says that the message applies specifically to the recipient, similarity will be seen as directly relevant. If the source is addressing everyone, then similarity to the recipient will not be seen as particularly relevant.

It was thought that persuasion by a similar person would be very strong when the source addresses you and might be stronger than when an attractive person addresses you. On the other hand, it was thought that the effect of the Similar Source who addresses everyone would be relatively weak and less than the effect of the Attractive Source who addresses everyone. The prediction concerning the effects of the type of source and whether the message addresses everyone or you (the listener) are depicted in Table 1. Greater predicted persuasion is indicated by a higher number.

Another variable that was investigated was whether the product was described as something people like or something people need. This variable will be abbreviated as Like/Need. If an Attractive Source describes the product as something everyone likes or everyone needs then persuasion might be expected to be the same. Also, if the Attractive Source describes the product as something you will need or you will like, persuasion would be expected to be the same. The reasoning behind this is that people want to like

the things that an attractive person endorses, and, if so, they will assume that the attitude object has objectively desirable properties.

It was assumed that persuasion would be greater if a Similar Source describes the product as something people need rather than something people like. The rationale was that needs are seen as varying from one person to another, whereas likes are seen as based on objective properties of the attitude object and so would not be expected to vary as much from person to person. If needs are seen as especially personal, then the similarity of the source will be seen as particularly relevant when the topic is needs. Thus similarity should produce considerable agreement in that situation. This idea is based on the assumption that the similar person will be seen as more expert when similarity is relevant to the topic.

It was thought that persuasion by a similar person would be very strong when the source describes the product as something that a person needs and stronger than when an attractive person describes the product as something that a person needs. On the other hand, it was thought that the effect of the similar person who speaks about likes would be relatively weak. So, it was thought that the effect of the Attractive Source who speaks about likes would be greater than the Similar Source who speaks about likes. The prediction concerning the effects of the type of source and whether the message describes the product as something that a person would like or something that a person would need are depicted in Table 2. Greater predicted persuasion is indicated by a higher number.

Combining the predictions in Tables 1 and 2 into one table involving a 2x2x2 design yields the predictions displayed in Table 3. An experiment was conducted which attempted to vary whether the source was attractive or similar, whether the message spoke of everyone or you (the listener), and whether the message described the product as

something that everyone/you will like or something everyone/you will need. It was expected that persuasion would be greater when the Attractive Source describes the product as something everyone will like than when the Similar Source describes the product as something everyone will like. It was expected that persuasion would be greater when the Similar Source describes the product as something you will need than when the Attractive Source describes the product as something you will need.

Chapter II: Method

Overview

In the context of a study of memory for ads, female college students listened to an advertisement for a cellular phone after having received information that the speaker of the advertisement was either an attractive African-American male or a similar female student. The speaker described the product as something everyone needs, something everyone would like, something you need, or something you would like. After listening to the advertisement, participants indicated their attitude toward the product and rated characteristics of the speaker.

Participants

The participants were 141 undergraduate women from an introductory psychology course. For their participation in the experiment they were given credit towards a class requirement. Participants were randomly assigned to one of eight experimental conditions: Attractive Source-Everyone Needs, Attractive Source-Everyone Likes, Attractive Source-You Need, Attractive Source-You Like, Similar Source-Everyone Needs, Similar Source-Everyone Likes, Similar Source-You Need, and Similar Source-You Like. There were 16 to 18 usable participants in each condition.

Procedure

Participants signed up for an experiment called “Memory for ads.” They were informed that the purpose was to investigate how much information people can recall from advertisements. They were also told that the procedure involves listening to an advertisement and then answering some questions about that advertisement.

The study was conducted in a lab in the psychology department at the University of Maryland, College Park. Upon entering the lab, participants were seated in separate cubicles. In each cubicle there was a walkman type tape recorder that contained a version of the advertisement, a consent form, and a speaker information form (face down on the desk). Participants were reminded that the experimenters were interested in people's memory for advertisements and that their task was to listen to an advertisement and try to remember the content of the ad. They were told, "There are two conditions in the experiment, "In one condition participants will be watching the advertisement on a TV screen and in the other condition participants will be listening to the advertisement on headphones. Because we have enough people in the TV condition, you will be in the headphone condition." Participants were also told that because in the TV condition participants will be able to see the speaker and get some information about that speaker, participants in the headphone condition will be given some information about the speaker on a sheet of paper in an effort to keep both conditions equal. The speaker information form (Appendix A & B) was designed to indicate that the speaker was either attractive or similar to the participants.

There was no picture included in the similar source condition because pre-testing using a form containing a picture of a female student revealed that the speaker got low ratings on the check of perceived similarity. As a result, the picture was removed from the similar speaker form and only the description of the speaker was included.

After the instructions, participants listened to an advertisement for a cell phone, on headphones. It described the product as something "everyone needs, everyone will like, you need, or you will like" (Appendix C, D, E, & F).

After the participants were done listening to the recording, their headphones and speaker information form was collected. Prior to the memory test, participants were given a questionnaire which they were told was to control for other variables. There were nine items on this questionnaire which were answered on a scale from -10 to +10 (Appendix G).

After completing the questionnaire, participants were given the memory test which asked them to fill in the blanks of sentences that were used in the ad. The memory test had 30 blanks to be filled in (Appendix H).

Accompanying the memory test was a form that asked for the participant's race and age. Once all the forms were completed, participants were told that the experimenters are also interested in their impressions of the experiment and asked to write their reactions on the back of the last form. This served as a suspicion check to determine whether participants were aware of the true nature of the experiment. The data of four participants were excluded due to suspicion resulting in usable data from 137 participants.

After the participants had written their reactions to the experiment, their materials were collected. Participants were then debriefed; they were told the true nature of the study and asked not to discuss the experiment with others.

Chapter III: Results

Memory Check

The first question on the memory test provides a check on the participant's memory for how the speaker described the product. This question asked the participant to fill in blanks where the correct answers were "you need," "you like," "everyone needs," or "everyone likes" depending on which of the four conditions the participant was in. The responses were scored separately for answers to Everyone/You and Like/Need, to examine whether participants in the Everyone and You Conditions got the Everyone/You answer correct and also to examine whether participants in the Like and Needs Conditions got the Like/Need answer correct.

An analysis of variance of the Everyone/You answer of the memory check with Attractive/Similar, Everyone/You, and Like/Need as between-subject factors revealed a significant main effect of Like/Need, $F(1, 137)= 17.58, p<.001$. No other main effects or interactions were significant. For the Everyone/You answer of the memory check, 52% of the 69 participants in the Like Condition answered correctly, and 19% of the 68 participants in the Need Condition answered correctly.

An analysis of variance of the Like/Need portion of the memory check with Attractive/Similar, Everyone/You, and Like/Need as between-subject factors revealed a significant main effect of Like/Need, $F(1, 137)=12.06, p=.001$. No other main effects or interactions were significant. For the Like/Need answer of the memory check, 54% of the 69 participants in the Like Condition answered correctly, and 25% of the 68 participants in the Need Condition answered correctly.

These analyses show that the Like/Need Condition affected participants' recall of both the Everyone/You answer and the Like/Need answer of the memory check, with

better recall of both answers in the Like Condition than in the Need Condition. It is not at all clear why the manipulation of Like/Need affected memory in these ways.

Correlations Among Questionnaire Items and Calculations of Measures

The first three items in the questionnaire were (1) “How much would you like/dislike having the NeoTel 2000?” (2) “How positive/negative is your evaluation of the NeoTel 2000?” and (3) “How much do you like/dislike the features of the NeoTel 2000?” These items were assumed to measure attitude toward the product and to be highly intercorrelated. To check on this assumption, intercorrelations of these items, and of these and all the other items, were calculated. The results are presented in Table 4. From the correlation matrix it can be seen that the first three items were all highly and significantly correlated with each other. The first item was correlated .71 with the second item and correlated .78 with the third item. The second item was correlated .69 with the third item. The three items were added together and divided by 3, to serve as the dependent measure, which will be called “Product Attitude Index.” The Coefficient-Alpha for the Product Attitude Index was .88.

A check on the manipulation of source attractiveness is provided by the items, “How attractive do you consider the speaker of the ad?” and “How likable do you consider the speaker?” It was assumed they would be highly correlated. The correlation between these two items was .70. These two items were added together and divided by 2, to serve as a measure of source attractiveness, which will be called, “Source Attractiveness Index.” The intercorrelations of the Product Attitude Index and the Source Attractiveness Index with the other questionnaire items are presented in Table 5.

Source Attractiveness Index

Before looking at the results for the product attitude index, it is appropriate to examine the results on the measures that provide checks on the manipulations of perceptions of the source. All measures were analyzed including participant race as a factor but no significant main effects or interactions with race were found.

An analysis of variance of source attractiveness index with Attractive/Similar, Everyone/You, and Like/Need as between-subject factors revealed a significant main effect of Attractive/Similar, $F(1, 137)=16.29, p<.001$. No other main effects or interactions were significant.

The mean on the Source Attractiveness Index for the Attractive Condition was 5.38 and the mean for the Similar Condition was 2.86. The results provide evidence that the manipulation of source attractiveness created differences in source attractiveness.

Ratings of Similarity

A check on the manipulation of source similarity was provided by the item on the questionnaire which asked, "How similar to you is the speaker?" An analysis of variance for the ratings of similarity with Attractive/Similar, Everyone/You, and Like/Need as between-subject factors revealed a significant main effect of Attractive/Similar $F(1, 137)=14.54, p<.001$, and a significant main effect of Everyone/You $F(1, 137)=6.77, p=.01$. No other main effects or interactions were significant.

The mean for the Similar Condition was 1.94 and the mean for the Attractive Condition was -1.37. The results provide evidence that the manipulation of similarity created differences in source attractiveness. The mean for the Everyone Condition was 1.48 and the mean for the You Condition was -.76. This indicates that participants in the

Everyone Condition found the Similar Source as more similar than those in the You Condition.

Ratings of Knowledgeability

For ratings on the item, “How knowledgeable do you consider the speaker?” an analysis of variance with Attractive/Similar, Everyone/You, and Like/Need as between-subject factors revealed no significant effects.

Ratings of Objectivity

For ratings on the item, “How objective do you consider the speaker?” an analysis of variance with Attractive/Similar, Everyone/You, and Like/Need as between-subject factors revealed no significant effects.

Ratings of Sincerity

For ratings on the item, “How sincere do you consider the speaker?” an analysis of variance with Attractive/Similar, Everyone/You, and Like/Need as between-subject factors revealed a significant interaction of Attractive/Similar and Everyone/You $F(1,137)=5.14, p<.05$. No main effects or other interactions were significant.

The means for the significant interaction of Attractive/Similar and Everyone/You, were 2.13 for the Attractive Source-Everyone Condition, -.53 for the Similar Source-Everyone Condition, .26 for the Attractive Source-You Condition, and 1.36 for the Similar Source-You Condition.

Product Attitude Index

An analysis of variance of the Product Attitude Index with Attractive/Similar, Everyone/You, and Like/Need as between-subject factors revealed a significant main effect of Everyone/You $F(1,137)=4.26, p=.04$. No other main effects or interactions were significant.

The means on the Product Attitude Index for the experimental conditions are presented in Table 6. The overall mean for the Everyone Condition was 6.91 and the overall mean for the You Condition was 5.97.

Chapter IV: Discussion

One prediction of this research was that persuasion would be greater when the Attractive Source spoke of everyone than when the Similar Source spoke of everyone and would be greater when the Similar Source spoke of you than when the Attractive Source spoke of you. This prediction was not supported by the data. The analysis of variance of the Product Attitude Index did not reveal a significant interaction of Attractive/Similar and Everyone/You.

A second prediction was that persuasion would be greater when the Attractive Source describes the product as something people will like than when the Similar Source describes the product as something people will like and would be greater when the Similar Source describes the product as something people will need than when the Attractive Source describes the product as something people will need. This prediction was not supported by the data. The analysis of variance for the Product Attitude Index did not reveal a significant interaction of Attractive/Similar and Like/Need.

It is not clear why these predictions were not supported by the data. One possibility is that the predictions are incorrect. Another possibility is that the predictions were not adequately tested. The data from the check on the manipulation of attractiveness and the check on the manipulation of similarity show that the conditions did create differences in source attractiveness and source similarity. However, the differences that were created in source attractiveness and source similarity may not have been strong enough to produce the predicted interactions.

The significant main effect of Everyone/You on the Product Attitude Index was not predicted. When the product was described as something for everyone, participants liked the product more than when it was described as something for you (the listener).

The theoretical underpinnings of this finding are unclear. One possible explanation for the finding could be that describing the product as something for everyone implies to the participants that the source has some reason to use that phrase, such as knowledge of others' responses to the product. Perceiving the source as having more bases for using the term "everyone" may in turn send the message to participants that this product is accepted and found favorable by many. The perception that this product is liked by many people may cause participants to think, "If everyone likes this product, it must be good." This could increase liking for the product.

Another possible explanation for the finding is that in the condition where the source describes the product as something for you (the listener), the participants assume that the source does not know who is currently listening to the recorded advertisement and question, "How can this source possibly know what fits my needs or likes?" This could cause participants to doubt that there are any bases for the source to know that this product is something for them (personally), which could reduce liking of the product.

The finding is intriguing that when the source described the product as something for everyone, liking for the product was greater than when the source described the product as something for you. This effect occurred for both the Attractive Source Condition and the Similar Source Condition. It also occurred both when the source described the product in terms of a like and when the source described the product in terms of a need. If anything, it might have been expected that when a source refers to "You" they would have more influence than when they refer to "Everyone." That might have been expected because the language is more direct and personal when the source refers to "You" as opposed to when the source refers to "Everyone" which is quite general and impersonal.

The intriguing finding that using the term “Everyone” rather than “You” increased liking for a product warrants further testing to investigate its generality and also to establish its theoretical basis. This finding, if substantiated by further research, would be relevant to advertising practices and thus have potential applied value in that area. It might also have relevance for understanding the effectiveness of persuasive communications in other broader contexts such as messages promoting education or promoting healthy behaviors.

Table 1

Predictions of Persuasion for Attractive/Similar and Everyone/You

Source	Source Addresses	
	Everyone	You
Attractive	2	2
Similar	1	3
Difference	+1	-1

Note: Larger numbers indicate greater persuasion. Difference equals Attractive minus Similar.

Table 2

Predictions of Persuasion for Attractive/Similar and Like/Need

Source	Message Focuses On	
	Like	Need
Attractive	2	2
Similar	1	3
Difference	+1	-1

Note: Larger numbers indicate greater persuasion. Difference equals Attractive minus Similar.

Table 3

Predictions of Persuasion for Attractive/Similar, Everyone/You, and Like/Need

Source	Source Addresses:			
	Everyone		You	
	Like	Need	Like	Need
Attractive	4	4	4	4
Similar	2	4	4	6
Difference	+2	0	0	-2

Note: Larger numbers indicate greater persuasion. Difference equals Attractive minus Similar.

Table 4

Intercorrelations of Questionnaire Items

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Liking of product		.71**	.78**	.21*	.12	.21*	.31**	.19	.33**
2. Evaluation of product			.69**	.38**	.17*	.35**	.33**	.17	.41**
3. Liking of features				.14	.04	.12	.38**	.15	.28**
4. Source attractiveness					.17*	.70**	.29**	.21*	.51**
5. Source similarity						.28**	.19*	.07	.15
6. Source likeability							.43**	.23**	.59**
7. Source knowledgeability								.35**	.50**
8. Source objectiveness									.43**
9. Source sincerity									

Note: N=137 *p<.05. **p<.01

Table 5

Intercorrelations of Product Attitude Index, Source Attractiveness Index, and other

Measures

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Product attitude index		.29**	.13	.37**	.17*	.38**
2. Source attractiveness index			.24**	.38**	.24**	.59**
3. Source similarity						
4. Source knowledge						
5. Source objectiveness						
6. Source sincerity						

Note: Note: N=137 *p<.05. **p<.01

Table 6

Means of Product Attitude Index

Source	Source Addresses			
	Everyone		You	
	Like	Need	Like	Need
Attractive	6.92 (16)	7.15 (16)	6.41 (17)	5.54 (18)
Similar	7.28 (18)	6.25 (16)	6.33 (18)	5.61 (18)
Difference	-.36 (34)	+.90 (32)	+.08 (35)	-.07 (36)

Note: N's are in parenthesis. Difference equals Attractive minus Similar.

Appendix A

Attractive Source Form (picture was presented in color)



He is a former theatre major from the University of California, Los Angeles who is currently an actor with a lead role on a daytime soap opera. He recently signed a deal with NeoTel Communications to be their spokes person.

Appendix B

Similar Source Form

She is currently an undergraduate student who is enrolled in an introductory psychology course at the University of Maryland, College Park. She recently began an internship for NeoTel Communications.

Appendix C

Product Message - Source Discusses "Everyone Needs"

Let me tell you about a new type of cell phone that will meet everyone's needs. It's the NeoTel 2000. The NeoTel 2000 has a number of features that everyone needs in a cell phone. The features of the NeoTel 2000 include long battery life, so it requires no more than one charging per day. Another feature of the NeoTel 2000 that everyone'll need is the crystal clear quality that guarantees great reception, even miles outside the standard calling area. The exceptional light weight and slim profile are features everyone needs. I am confident that those who experience the features of the NeoTel 2000 will realize how much everyone needs this phone. The NeoTel 2000 also has the capability to take and send pictures via the wireless web and to download other phone accessories, features that everyone needs. Plus, the phone's sleek full color screen comes with a protective cover. So look for this new NeoTel product at your local electronics outlet. The NeoTel 2000, a cell phone that will meet everyone's needs, with a surprisingly low price. NeoTel, enhancing communication for the future.

Appendix D

Product Message - Source Discusses "Everyone Likes"

Let me tell you about a new type of cell phone that everyone'll like. It's the NeoTel 2000. The NeoTel 2000 has a number of features that everyone'll like in a cell phone. The features of the NeoTel 2000 include long battery life, so it requires no more than one charging per day. Another feature of the NeoTel 2000 that everyone'll like is the crystal clear quality that guarantees great reception, even miles outside the standard calling area. The exceptional light weight and slim profile are features everyone'll like. I am confident that those who experience the features of the NeoTel 2000 will realize how much everyone'll like this phone. The NeoTel 2000 also has the capability to take and send pictures via the wireless web and to download other phone accessories, features that everyone'll like. Plus, the phone's sleek full color screen comes with a protective cover. So look for this new NeoTel product at your local electronics outlet. The NeoTel 2000, a cell phone that everyone'll like, with a surprisingly low price. NeoTel, enhancing communication for the future.

Appendix E

Product Message - Source Discusses "You Need"

Let me tell you about a new type of cell phone that will meet your needs. It's the NeoTel 2000. The NeoTel 2000 has a number of features that you need in a cell phone. The features of the NeoTel 2000 include long battery life, so it requires no more than one charging per day. Another feature of the NeoTel 2000 that you'll need is the crystal clear quality that guarantees great reception, even miles outside the standard calling area. The exceptional light weight and slim profile are features you'll need. I am confident that once you experience the features of the NeoTel 2000 you will realize how much you need this phone. The NeoTel 2000 also has the capability to take and send pictures via the wireless web and to download other phone accessories, features that you need. Plus, the phone's sleek full color screen comes with a protective cover. So look for this new NeoTel product at your local electronics outlet. The NeoTel 2000, a cell phone that will meet your needs, with a surprisingly low price. NeoTel, enhancing communication for the future.

Appendix F

Product Message - Source Discusses "You Like"

Let me tell you about a new type of cell phone that you'll like. It's the NeoTel 2000. The NeoTel 2000 has a number of features that you'll like in a cell phone. The features of the NeoTel 2000 include long battery life, so it requires no more than one charging per day. Another feature of the NeoTel 2000 that you'll like is the crystal clear quality that guarantees great reception, even miles outside the standard calling area. The exceptional light weight and slim profile are features you'll like. I am confident that once you experience the features of the NeoTel 2000 you will realize how much you'll like this phone. The NeoTel 2000 also has the capability to take and send pictures via the wireless web and to download other phone accessories, features that you'll like. Plus, the phone's sleek full color screen comes with a protective cover. So look for this new NeoTel product at your local electronics outlet. The NeoTel 2000, a cell phone that you'll like, with a surprisingly low price. NeoTel, enhancing communication for the future.

Appendix G

Questionnaire Items

1. How much would you like/ dislike having the NeoTel 2000?

Dislike -10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10 Like
Extremely Extremely

2. How positive/ negative is your evaluation of the NeoTel 2000?

Extremely -10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10 Extremely
Negative Positive

3. How much do you like/ dislike the features of the NeoTel 2000?

Dislike -10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10 Like
Extremely Extremely

4. How attractive do you consider the speaker of the ad?

Extremely -10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10 Extremely
Unattractive Attractive

5. How similar to you is the speaker?

Extremely -10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10 Extremely
Dissimilar Similar

6. How likable do you consider the speaker?

Extremely -10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10 Extremely
Unlikable Likable

7. How knowledgeable do you consider the speaker?

Extremely -10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10 Extremely
Unknowledgeable Knowledgeable

8. How objective do you consider the speaker?

Extremely -10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10 Extremely
Unobjective Objective

9. How sincere do you consider the speaker?

Extremely -10 -9 -8 -7 -6 -5 -4 -3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 +4 +5 +6 +7 +8 +9 +10 Extremely
Insincere Sincere

Appendix H

Memory Test

Directions: Try to recall the exact words used in the advertisement and write them in the blank spaces.

Let me tell you about a new type of cell phone that _____.

The features of the NeoTel 2000 include _____ battery _____, so it

 no more than _____ charging per _____.

_____ quality that guarantees _____ even
 _____ outside the _____ area.

_____ weight and _____ profile.

Has the capability to _____ and _____ via the _____
 _____ and to download other _____.

Plus, the phone's _____ full _____ screen comes with a _____.

NeoTel, _____ for the future.

References

- Berscheid, E. (1966). Opinion change and communicator-communicatee similarity and dissimilarity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 670-680.
- Brock, T.C. (1965). Communicator-recipient similarity and decision change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1, 650-654.
- Chaiken, S. (1980). Heuristic versus systematic information processing and the use of source versus message cues in persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 752-766.
- Chaiken, S., & Eagly, A. H. (1983). Communication modality as a determinant of persuasion: The role of communicator salience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 241-256.
- Heider, F. (1946). Attitudes and cognitive organization. *Journal of Psychology*, 21, 107-112.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., and Kelley, H H. (1953). *Communication and Persuasion*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kelman, H. C. (1961). Processes of opinion change. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 25, 57-78.
- Mills, J. (1966). Opinion change as a function of the communicator's desire to influence and liking for the audience. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 152-159.
- Mills, J., & Aronson, E. (1965). Opinion change as a function of the communicator's attractiveness and desire to influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1, 173-177.

- Mills, J., & Harvey, J. (1972). Opinion change as a function of when information about the communicator is received and whether he is attractive or expert. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 21, 52-55.
- Mills, J., & Kimble, C.E. (1973). Opinion change as a function of perceived similarity of the communicator and subjectivity of the issue. *Bulletin of Psychonomic Society*, 2, 35-36.
- Norman, R. (1976). When what is said is important: A comparison of expert and attractive sources. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 12, 294-300.
- Petty, R.E., Cacioppo, J.T., & Schumann, D.W. (1983). Central and peripheral routes to advertising effectiveness: The moderating role of involvement. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 10, 135-146.
- Petty, R.E., & Wegner, D.T. (1998) Attitude change: Multiple rules for persuasion variables. In D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.) *The Handbook of Social Psychology: Vol.4.* (4th ed., pp. 323-390) New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Wood, W., & Kallgren, C.A. (1988). Communicator attributes and persuasion: Recipients' access to attitude-relevant information in memory. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 14, 172-182.