

Texas A&M University-Commerce

A&M-Commerce Digital Commons

Honors Theses

Honors College

Fall 11-23-2011

Emotional Intensity and Persuasion

Laurencio Tamayo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.tamuc.edu/honorsthesis>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Tamayo, Laurencio, "Emotional Intensity and Persuasion" (2011). *Honors Theses*. 96.
<https://digitalcommons.tamuc.edu/honorsthesis/96>

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors College at A&M-Commerce Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of A&M-Commerce Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@tamuc.edu.

Running head: EMOTIONAL INTENSITY AND PERSUASION

Emotional Intensity and Persuasion

Laurencio Tamayo

Dr. Stephen Reysen-Advisor

Texas A&M University-Commerce

Emotional Intensity and Persuasion

Imagine you are walking around downtown Dallas, and you notice a nicely dressed person with a sign, claiming that the government put him out of business, and yelling in a frenzy and disorganized mess about the misfortune. You quickly turn around, dismissing him for crazy, and find an alternate route. Would the man's argument have been more effective if you didn't perceive him as a madman? Also if he had just been positioned nonchalantly on a street corner with the sign, would you be inclined to provide him with some spare change and a moment of your time? The present paper will review past research concerning why emotional intensity may affect the messages persuasive effectiveness. Additionally, an experiment is conducted to examine the effect of a speakers' emotional intensity on the message recipients' persuasion.

Elaboration Likelihood Model

The Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986), a dominant theory of persuasion in psychology, proposes that there are two routes to persuasion. The central route processes a message because the arguments are thought to provoke logical analysis, personal reflection, and produce change based on the interpretation of the evidence. The peripheral route processes a message because the arguments are thought to use unconscious cues and heuristics to persuade. Greater personal relevance, knowledge of the object, motivation, ability, and feelings of responsibility predict that the central route will be triggered (Petty & Wegener, 1998). In addition, the central route has longer lasting effects than the peripheral route to persuasion because central processing relates to thoughtful analyzing (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). Eagly & Chaiken (1993) also note that most people will follow past patterns of acceptance, and will continue to judge based on past experiences, and more readily accept what they like (following the heuristic model of persuasion). One tenet of the ELM is that message processing is on a

continuum. The message can either be processed with little thought (low elaboration) or scrutinized with great thought (high elaboration). Whether or not a person will elaborate on a message is based on the listener's ability and motivation to pay attention. Both motivation and ability to understand the message will lead to higher elaboration. Not only this, but emotional appeal can drastically affect how a speaker's message is perceived.

Emotional Intensity

Brehm (1999) proposed that the intensity of an emotion is based on the motivational arousal that a person has to obtain a goal or complete a task. He stated that the intensity of an emotion is based on the degree of deterrent that exists in any given situation. A deterrent is a distraction from your original motivation (Miron, Brummett, Ruggles, & Brehm, 2008; Silvia & Brehm, 2001). He established that if a small degree of deterrent is present, then emotional intensity is low. However, he noted that emotional intensity rises until a certain point, after which the degree of deterrent is too great, and the task or goal seems impossible or improbable, the emotional intensity rapidly decreases, represented by a curvilinear relation. For example, Fuegen and Brehm (2004) provided an example of repairing a car. If a person discovers that the cost and difficulty of fixing the car is low and easy, then the emotional intensity will be low, but as the difficulty and cost increase, so will the emotional intensity towards the situation. At some point, however, the person will realize that the difficulty and cost of fixing the car is too great and their emotional intensity towards repairing the car will decrease significantly. Following Brehm, we suggest that the motivation to elaborate on a persuasive message should exhibit a curvilinear relationship with a relevant deterrent.

Attribution Theory

Kelly's (1967) attribution theory (covariation theory) suggests that attribution occurs when

the perceiver seeks to find meaning behind a person's actions and determine why the person committed the action. Kelly's theory of attribution proposes three key factors (distinctiveness, consistency, and consensus) which when analyzed overall can determine the source of the attribution. The motivation responsible for believing the direct message is derived from the present conditions and characteristics of the speaker. Persuasion should not only connect to Brehm's theory of emotional intensity (1999), but Kelly's covariation theory may also contribute to our understanding of our expected findings. In line with Kelly (1967), the attributions made about a speaker may be determined by the degree of emotion the speaker is expressing. Overall, we suggest that we are more likely to elaborate and attend to messages that are from speakers perceived to be internally motivated rather than externally motivated. To the extent that emotional intensity of the speaker affects perceived external attribution should relate to the degree of persuasion.

Aspects of the Speaker

Although we have hypothesized that emotional intensity should be the determining factor of persuasion by recipients, when it comes to interactions among people, various other factors could influence the degree to which participants are persuaded, mainly what the participant thinks of the speaker. According to Mackie (1987), the speaker's attractiveness and similarity to the participant could contribute significantly to the results. We assessed these variables as well as other possible explanations for why participants are persuaded, such as the perception of the speaker's expertise, honesty, and likability. If we look at expertise, it can be assumed that a person who seems knowledgeable on the area that they are arguing is more likely to receive better feedback, than one who is not. Tobin and Raymundo (2009) support this, saying that a person with a strong argument will be perceived to have more expertise, and therefore have more

of an opportunity for persuasion. Once the speaker has been deemed an “expert” the participant will more readily listen to their content and from that, base their persuasion (Maddux & Rogers, 1980). Honesty is a trait that most people value, and it is related to less scrutiny of a person transmitting information (Priester & Petty, 1995). Overall, the perception that the speaker is an expert, honest, likable, and similar to the participant should be related to greater persuasion.

Present Study

In the present study we examine a communicator’s emotional intensity as a deterrent to a listener’s motivation to attend to a persuasive message. To test this idea, we first assessed participants’ citizenship (only U.S. participants will be eligible to participate) and motivation to learn more about illegal immigration during a prescreen at the beginning of the school semester. During the laboratory portion of the study (at a later point in the semester) participants were first asked to read and sign an informed consent form. Next, participants were asked to view a video of a female target giving a speech concerning the negative aspects of illegal immigration. The speeches varied based on the emotional intensity given by the communicator. Participants were randomly assigned to view the target person’s speech read with (1) no emotion, (2) a small degree of emotion, (3) a middle intensity of emotion, or (4) a high intensity of emotion. Participants were then asked to rate a number of measures regarding agreement with the message (i.e., persuasion), perceptions of the speaker, and demographic items. Lastly, participants were debriefed and thanked.

Given that the likelihood that a message recipient will elaborate on a message is partially determined by the recipient’s motivation to attend to the message, we predict that the communication’s emotional intensity would serve as a deterrent to this motivation. Overall, we predict that the no emotion speech will produce high persuasion, because there is no

deterrent, the small degree of emotion will produce some persuasion, the middle intensity of emotion will produce high persuasion, and the high emotional intensity speech will produce low persuasion. Thus, we predict a curvilinear pattern between degree of emotion and degree of persuasion following Brehm's (1999) emotional intensity theory.

Furthermore, we predict that the speaker's differing levels of emotional intensity will affect how participants will perceive the speaker. We predict linear trends whereby the increasing degrees of emotion (none, low, medium, and high) will lead participants to view the speaker as having less expertise, less honest, more unlikable, less similar to the self, and more externally motivated to be prejudiced against undocumented immigrants. Furthermore, we predict that greater emotional intensity result in participants' perception of the speaker as a racist. Overall, these predictions suggest that greater emotional intensity will be related to more negative ratings of the speaker.

Method

Participants were greeted upon entering the laboratory and given an informed consent form (see Appendix A). Participants viewed a video of a speech and completed measures regarding persuasion and perception of the speaker (see Appendix B). After completion of the survey, participants were debriefed (see Appendix C) and thanked. All scales use a 7-point Likert-type scale, from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*.

Participants

Participants included 76 undergraduate students (81.6% women, mean age = 23.66, SD = 9.12) from various psychology classes. Participants received credit toward their classes at the instructor's discretion. Based on responses to prescreen items, only U.S. citizens and participants who indicated on a prescreen survey at the beginning of the semester that they are motivated to

learn more about why illegal immigration is negative (equal to or above the midpoint of a 7-point Likert-type scale) were allowed to participate. In other words, all participants expressed a motivation to attend to a message regarding illegal immigration prior to the study.

Materials

Prescreen Items. This consists of two items that were aimed at assessing the citizenship status of the participant, as well their motivation to learn more about why illegal immigration is bad (“I am motivated to learn more about why illegal immigration is bad”). The prescreen was used to ensure that only participants that are motivated to attend to the persuasion message were afforded the opportunity to participate.

Vignette. A speech with fictitious arguments was constructed to provide arguments against illegal immigration (e.g., less financial aid and jobs for Americans). A female actor read the speech with (1) no emotion, (2) a little emotion, (3) medium emotion, and (4) high emotion.

Persuasion. A 4-item scale was constructed to assess participants’ belief that illegal immigration should be addressed and stopped. The items were compiled into a persuasion index ($\alpha = .76$). This served as the main dependent variable in this study.

Perceived Expertise. The expertise scale was constructed to assess a target person’s perceived expertise (Reysen, 2008). The measure contained six items that compose an expertise index ($\alpha = .87$). The emotional intensity of the communicator may be related to participant’s perceived expertise of the communicator.

Perceived Honesty. The honesty measure was constructed to assess a target person’s perceived honesty (Reysen, 2008). The measure contains eight items that compose an honesty index ($\alpha = .88$). The emotional intensity of the communicator may be related to participant’s perceived honesty of the communicator.

Perceived Likeability. The likability scale was constructed to assess a target person's perceived likeability (Reysen, 2005). The measure contains 11 items that compose a likeability index ($\alpha = .93$). The emotional intensity of the communicator may be related to participant's perceived likeability of the communicator.

Similarity of Beliefs. In order to control for participants who viewed the speaker as vastly different with respect to beliefs than themselves we created a 2-item scale to measure similarity of beliefs ($\alpha = .97$). Participants may reject the message simply because the speaker is viewed as an inadequate person with which to compare opinions, and thus ignore the message.

Attributions of Attitude. This 4-item measure was delivered to assess how perceived external reasons determined the speaker's attitude ($\alpha = .82$).

Emotional Intensity of the Speech. A one-item measure was constructed to assess how strongly the participant perceived the speaker's emotion. This served to ensure that participants in each condition did indeed perceive differences in the actor's emotional intensity.

Perceived Racial Bias. This two-item measure was constructed to see if the participant considers the speaker to be racist towards an intended group ($\alpha = .81$). If the target speaker was perceived to be racist, the participants may ignore any subsequent statements.

Demographic items. A manipulation check, and four demographic questions were added to assess if they understood the manipulation, and assess participant gender, age, political orientation, and ethnicity.

Results

The manipulation check showed that people were often unaware of which condition they were in. For example, participants in the medium emotion condition may have viewed the person in the video as displaying high emotion. Therefore, I used the manipulation check as the

independent variable instead of the researcher's defined conditions. In other words, the independent variable of emotion intensity represents participants' perception of whether the person in the video displayed (1) no emotion, (2) little emotion, (3) medium emotion, or (4) high emotion.

Preliminary Analyses

To examine if participants perceived the tone of the arguments made in the video were indeed perceived as reflecting anger, we conducted a univariate ANOVA with perceived emotional intensity (none, low, medium, high) as the independent variable, perceived tone of the argument as the dependent variable, and participants' gender, age, motivation to learn more about illegal immigration (measured on the prescreen at the beginning of the semester), and political orientation as covariates. The perception of emotional intensity was significant, $F(3, 68) = 14.13, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .38$. The perception of anger showed a significant linear trend, $p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI} = 1.57 \text{ to } 3.16$. Thus, participants accurately perceived the different videos to show increasing intensities of emotion.

Anti-Immigration

To examine if participants were deterred in their degree of persuasion we conducted a univariate ANOVA with perceived emotional intensity (none, low, medium, high) as the independent variable, attitudes toward illegal immigration as the dependent variable, and participants' gender, age, motivation to learn more, and political orientation as covariates. As predicted, we found a significant cubic effect on persuasion, $F(3, 68) = 2.91, p = .02, 95\% \text{ CI} = -1.35 \text{ to } -.118$. We conducted targeted contrasts (one-tailed), $1 -1 1 -1$, revealed a significant effect of the emotional intensity of the speaker manipulation on persuasion, $F(1, 68) = 8.14, p = .003, \eta_p^2 = .11$. A priori contrast $(1 -1 0 0)$ revealed that persuasion decreased significantly from

no emotion ($M = 4.84$, $SD = 1.87$) to the low emotional intensity condition ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 1.17$), $F(1, 68) = 2.94$, $p = .045$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. Persuasion (0 1 -1 0) increased from the low emotion to the medium emotion ($M = 4.90$, $SD = 1.44$) conditions, $F(1, 68) = 3.00$, $p = .044$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$. Persuasion (0 0 -1 1) decreased from the medium emotion to the high emotion ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.05$) conditions, $F(1, 68) = 5.52$, $p = .011$, $\eta_p^2 = .08$. Furthermore, as predicted, the low and high emotional intensity conditions (0 1 0 -1) did not differ significantly, $F(1, 68) = 0.32$, $p = .287$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$.

Emotional Intensity and Speaker Perception

To further examine the influence of a speaker's emotional intensity on person perception I conducted a series of univariate ANOVAs (none, low, medium, high) on assessed person perception variables, while controlling for participants' gender, age, motivation to learn more, and political orientation. As shown in Table 1, the speaker's emotional intensity significantly affected participants' perception. Perceived expertise was significantly lower in the high condition when compared to the none and low conditions. Participants rated the speaker as significantly less honest and less similar to the participant when the speaker displayed no emotion compared to high emotion. The speaker was perceived to be less likable and more racist in the high emotion condition than the other three conditions. Lastly, participants perceived the speaker to be externally motivated to give speech when displaying high compared to no emotion.

Table 1

Means (Standard Deviation) by Condition

Variable	None	Low	Medium	High	$F(3, 68)$	p -value	η_p^2
Expertise	4.20 (1.49) _a	4.34 (0.81) _a	4.07 (0.88) _{ab}	3.27 (1.13) _b	4.21	.009	.157
Honest	4.67 (1.23) _a	4.39 (0.86) _{ab}	4.47 (0.98) _{ab}	3.74 (0.93) _b	4.03	.011	.151
Likable	3.71 (1.19) _a	4.08 (1.00) _a	3.81 (1.09) _a	2.67 (0.89) _b	9.66	.000	.299
Similar	4.54 (2.03) _a	3.78 (1.65) _{ab}	4.00 (2.09) _{ab}	2.62 (1.47) _b	4.83	.004	.176
External	3.32 (1.53) _a	4.21 (0.94) _{ab}	4.53 (0.84) _b	4.89 (1.25) _b	5.47	.002	.194
Racist	2.86 (2.14) _a	2.90 (1.43) _a	3.24 (1.78) _a	4.68 (1.44) _b	5.46	.002	.194

Note: 7-point Likert-type scale, from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*. Means with differing subscripts differ significantly ($p < .05$). Controlling for participants' age, gender, political orientation, and prior motivation to more about negative aspects of illegal immigration.

Discussion

The goal of the present study was to examine the effect of a speaker's emotional intensity on message recipients' persuasion. We hypothesized that the communicator's emotional intensity would serve as a deterrent to persuasion following a curvilinear pattern. More specifically, we predicted that the no emotion speech would produce high persuasion, because there is no deterrent, the small degree of emotion will produce some persuasion, the middle intensity of emotion will produce high persuasion, and the high emotional intensity speech will produce low persuasion. Our predictions were supported by the data, as they suggested that the motivation to elaborate on a persuasive message exhibits a curvilinear relationship with a relevant deterrent (emotional intensity of the speaker).

Prior research states that the intensity of an emotion is based on the degree of deterrent that exists in any given situation (Brehm, 1999). Our results suggest that the relationship between a listener's motivation to attend to a persuasive message and the communicator's emotional intensity follows a similar pattern. Brehm suggests that a deterrent is a distraction from one's original motivation. The present study supports Brehm's theory, and further shows that a speaker's emotional expression can serve as a deterrent to message recipients' persuasion. This finding holds implications for prejudice reduction. For example, one practical application of the present findings is to expose individuals who are motivated to attend to racist messages (similar to the anti-immigration message used in the present study) to a highly emotionally charged racist message. Perhaps recipients will be less persuaded and show less prejudice where there is a high degree of deterrent to attending to the message. In other words, one way to reduce explicit racism is to expose individuals to a highly racist individual.

The present study was also novel in showing the relationship between the emotional

intensity of the speaker and message recipients' perception of the speaker. Prior research (Mackie, 1987; Tobin & Raymundo, 2009; Priester & Petty, 1995) showed that one's perception of a communicator can affect one's degree of persuasion. The results of the present study suggest that the degree of emotion displayed by a speaker can affect perceptions that message recipients hold of the speaker. Overall, participants rated the speaker as lower in expertise, more dishonest and unlikeable, less similar to the self, and more racist in the high emotion condition compared to the no emotion condition.

Following Kelly's (1967) theory of attribution, we predicted and found that emotional intensity of the speaker was related to perception of the speaker's motivation. Greater emotion expressed by the speaker was shown to result in a perception that the speaker was externally motivated to express anti-immigration views. Following this reasoning, participants may have been less persuaded by the message due to the perception that the speaker was not giving internally held beliefs in the high emotion condition compared to the no emotion condition.

Limitations

The present study was limited in the selection of participants, chosen outgroup for vignettes, and chosen emotion to examine. First, our sample consisted of 76 undergraduate psychology students in an east Texas town with a predominantly white population. This small and highly selective sample can limit the generalizability of the findings to older adults or individuals in other countries. Second, the study was constructed to examine negative attitudes to undocumented immigrants (outgroup), and felt anger toward that group. While the results were significant and in the expected direction, the degree of specificity in both outgroup and emotion chosen to examine in the present study limit the results being generalizable to other outgroups and emotions. Further research is needed outside of western settings that examine the curvilinear

relationship between emotional intensity of a speaker and persuasion for different outgroups and different emotions.

Conclusion

The present study examined the effect of emotional intensity of a speaker on message recipients' persuasion and perceptions of the speaker. Supporting Brehm's (1999) emotional intensity theory, message recipients showed the greatest persuasion when an optimal level of deterrent (emotional intensity) was expressed by the speaker. Furthermore, the results showed more negative perceptions of the speaker when a highly emotional speech was presented compared to the less emotional expression of the same speech. The results highlight the influence of a speakers' emotional intensity on message recipients' persuasion and perception of the speaker. Speakers wishing to make pervasive speeches are advised to express a moderate level of emotion and avoid highly emotionally toned arguments.

References

- Cacioppo, J. T., & Petty, R. E. (1983). Effects of need for cognition on message evaluation, recall, and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*, 805-816.
- Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., & Kao, C. F. (1984). The efficient assessment of need for cognition. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*, 306–307.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Fuegen, K., & Brehm, J. W. (2004). The intensity of affect and resistance to social influence. In E. S. Knowles, & J. A. Linn (Eds.), *Resistance and persuasion* (pp. 39-63). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Kelly, H. H. (1967). Attribution Theory in Social Psychology. *Nebraska's Symposium on Motivation, 15*, 192-238.
- Mackie, D. (1987). Systematic and nonsystematic processing of majority and minority persuasive communications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 41-52.
- Maddux, J. E., & Rogers, R. W. (1980) Effects of source expertness, physical attractiveness, and supporting arguments on persuasion: A case of brains over beauty. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*, 235-244.
- Miron, A. M., Brummett, B., Ruggles, B., & Brehm, J. W. (2008). Deterring anger and anger-motivated behaviors. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 30*, 326-338.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 19*, 123-205.
- Priester, J. R., & Petty, R. E. (1995). Source attributions and persuasion: Perceived honesty as a determinant of message scrutiny. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 637-654.

Tobin, S. J., & Raymundo, M. M., (2009). Persuasion by casual arguments: The motivating role of perceived casual expertise. *Social Cognition*, 27, 105-108.

APPENDIX A

[Informed Consent]

The Department of Psychology at Texas A&M - Commerce supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research. The following information is provided so you can decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty and still receive research participation credit. Completion of this questionnaire indicates that you are a willing participant in this study and that you are at least 18 years old.

This study assesses attitudes and emotions concerning group memberships. Research hypotheses for the study will be available once the study is complete though you may ask questions about the study at any time. You will be asked to give your views regarding your attitudes and emotions about your current group membership on number of items. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions; it is your opinion that interests us. We estimate that completion of this study will take no more than 30 minutes of your time. At the end of the study, you will be given complete information concerning the nature of our research and the hypotheses we are investigating. You will also be given the researchers' contact information again in case you have any questions. While your participation may not specifically benefit you, we believe it will improve our general understanding of human attitudes and judgment.

We may combine your present data with previous data, however we can assure you that your name will not be associated in any way with the research findings. You may be contacted in the future to participate in a related study. Your responses will be confidential, and entirely anonymous after the data are combined. If you have any questions about this study before, during, or after your participation feel free to contact the researcher listed below. Thank you very much for your cooperation. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact Dr. Robin Reid, Chair of the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, Department of Literature and Languages, Texas A&M University-Commerce, Commerce, TX 75429, at (903) 886-5268, or Robin_Reid@tamu-commerce.edu. If you would like additional information concerning this study, please feel free to contact us by phone, e-mail, or mail.

Sincerely,
 Laurencio Tamayo
 Principal Investigator
 Department of Psychology
 Texas A&M University-Commerce
 Commerce, TX 75429
 ltamayo@leo.tamu-commerce.edu

Stephen Reysen, Ph.D.
 Faculty Supervisor
 Department of Psychology
 Texas A&M University-Commerce
 Commerce, TX 75429
 (903) 886-5197
 Stephen_Reysen@tamu-commerce.edu

With my signature I affirm that I am at least 18 years old, that I have received a copy of this consent form, I have understood the above information, and I agree to voluntarily participate in this research.

Print Name: _____

Sign Name: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX B**[Prescreen Items]**

1. Are you a U.S. citizen?
 Yes No

2. I am motivated to learn more about why illegal immigration is bad.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

[Vignette]

Video Script: Actors will read this script with (1) no emotion, (2) a little emotion, (3) medium emotion intensity, and (4) high emotional intensity.

The U.S. Census Bureau recently revealed that there are now 30 million illegal aliens from Mexico in the U.S. This bill must be passed in order to protect the country. The U.S. needs to build a border between the U.S. and Mexico before it's too late. Many Americans are frustrated and angry about the overload of illegal immigrants because they are significantly depriving American student's spots in college, and also taking a large portion of their financial aid away. Parents are furious because there used to be a time when students had a descent amount of financial resources to get by in college. But now, students are irritated and mad about the immigration effect on their future because after working so hard in American school systems to finally get to college, their achievements are getting rejected instead of rewarded. These Mexican aliens are getting more financial aid and scholarship opportunities than American students. Since Mexican aliens are taking better spots in college from actual American students, hostility has increased because they are putting themselves in a better position to take away future job opportunities.

Even outside of the classrooms, the fragile U.S. economy is going from bad to worse because these Mexican aliens are taking salaries from American jobs and sending the money back to Mexico instead of putting it back into the economy where it belongs. Americans are outraged because all this money that is being taken out of the economy is damaging the U.S. welfare system. Many doctors and nurses are furious and enraged because their jobs are being snatched away from them. Patients are angry that hundreds of hospitals are being forced to close down due to a decrease in grants that used to be available to them before this sudden increase of illegal immigrants ruined the welfare system. Virtually every American's quality of life and opportunity is becoming jeopardized more and more everyday. It has become apparent that the American dream no longer applies to people with American birth certificates.

[Persuasion]

Instructions: Please rate your level of agreement with each item **BASED ON THE SPEECH.**

3 We will be more stable if there was a border between U.S. and Mexico.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

4. We should make sure that illegal immigrants going to school don't get as much financial aid

as American students.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

5. Our economy would be in better shape if illegal immigrants wouldn't send money back to Mexico.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

6. I would sign a petition to support the creation of a border to prevent illegal immigration.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

[Perceived Expertise]

7. This person is intelligent.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

8. This person is not experienced.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

9. I would seek this person's advice.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

10. This person is knowledgeable.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

11. This person is an expert.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

12. This person is not well qualified to speak.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

[Perceived Honesty]

13. I believe what this person says.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

14. This person is not ethical.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

15. This person has integrity.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

16. I trust this person will tell me the truth.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

17. This person is honorable.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

18. This person is a liar.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

19. This person is **not** believable.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

20. This person is honest.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

[Perceived Likeability]

21. This person is friendly.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

22. This person is likeable.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

23. This person is warm.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

24. This person is approachable.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

25. I would ask this person for advice.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

26. I would like this person as a coworker.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

27. I would like this person as a roommate.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

28. I would like to be friends with this person.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

29. This person is physically attractive.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

30. This person is similar to me.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

31. This person is knowledgeable.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

[Similarity to Self]

32. I have values that are similar to the speaker.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

33. The speaker and I have similar beliefs.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

[Attributions of Attitude]

Instructions: BASED ON THE VIDEO, rate your belief about the person in the video.

34. This person was influenced by friends to hold their position on this topic.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

35. This person was influenced by the media (television, newspaper, magazine, Internet, etc.) to hold their position on this topic.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

36. This person was influenced by parents to hold their position on this topic.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

37. This person was influenced by the potential disapproval of others if this person held the opposite position.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

[Emotional Intensity of the Speech]

Instructions: Please rate your agreement with the following items.

38. The tone of the arguments would best be described as angry.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

[Perceived Racial Bias]

39. This person is a racist.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

40. This person is clearly biased against Hispanics.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Strongly Agree*

[Manipulation Check and Demographic Questions]

41. At the beginning of this study you viewed a speaker talking about illegal immigration.

How would you describe the speaker's emotional intensity? (Circle One)

A. No emotion

B. A little emotion

C. Medium emotion

D. Over-emotional (high emotion)

42. Circle your Gender: Male Female

43. Write your Age: _____

44. Mark your Ethnicity:

Caucasian/White

African American

Native American

Asian American

Hispanic American

Other _____

APPENDIX C**[Debriefing]**

This study examines your views about another person saying that illegal immigration is bad, and how the actions of that person will affect you. You were randomly assigned to hear a speaker with no emotion, little emotion, medium emotion, or high emotion. **THE ARGUMENTS IN THE VIDEO WERE FICTIONAL.** You rated a number of statements regarding emotional, cognitive, and behavioral reactions. We believe that your level of agreement with the speaker will depend on the degree of emotional intensity from the speaker. The present study was designed to allow us to examine your reactions to such situations.

Please do not tell other TAMU-C students about the hypotheses we are investigating in this study— for that might influence their responses and it is people’s natural responses to beliefs about what others think that we are interested in. Thank you.

YOU MAY TAKE A COPY OF THE INFORMED CONSENT ON YOUR WAY OUT AS RECEIPT OF PARTICIPATION.

If you have any questions, concerns, or comments please contact...

Sincerely, Laurencio Tamayo
Principal Investigator
Department of Psychology
Texas A&M University–Commerce
Commerce, TX 75429
ltamayo@leo.tamu-commerce.edu

Stephen Reysen, Ph.D.
Faculty Supervisor
Department of Psychology
Texas A&M University–Commerce
Commerce, TX 75429
(903) 886-5197
Stephen_Reysen@tamu-commerce.edu