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Interesting differences often appear between the immediate and the delayed effects of a communication designed to produce opinion change. Apart from the simple forgetting of the content of the communication, which would lead to a reduced effect with time, certain motivational factors also seem to be at work. Observation of ordinary life situations reveals two opposing phenomena. On the one hand, an individual may be exposed to a communication, and accept the communicator's point of view, but after a period of time he may revert to his previous attitude. On the other hand, an individual may at first reject the communicator's point of view, but after a period of time "come around" to the communicator's position. This latter phenomenon has been described as the sleeper effect by Hovland, Lumsdaine, and Sheffield (4).

A recent experiment by Hovland and Weiss (5) suggests that the sleeper effect may be due to the removal with time of a tendency to discount the material presented by an untrustworthy source. These investigators presented identical communications to their subjects (Ss), attributing them to "trustworthy" sources with half the Ss and to "untrustworthy" sources with the other half. They found that there was initially a pronounced superiority in the amount of change produced by the trustworthy sources, but that with the passage of time the difference tended to disappear. Delayed measurements showed a decrease with time in extent of agreement with trustworthy sources and an apparent increase in agreement with the untrustworthy sources.

A more general formulation of this type of explanation would be to state that changes in opinion over time depend in part on the relationship between the stimuli in the communication situation and the stimuli that are present at later time periods (e.g., in the delayed measurement situation). If the communication situation contains factors which stimulate acceptance of the communication, and these factors disappear with time, we would expect a decrease in agreement at the time of delayed measurement. If, on the other hand, the communication situation contains factors which stimulate rejection, an increase in agreement at the time of the delayed measurement would be predicted. One important part of the stimulus pattern which may vary from the communication situation to the delayed measurement situation is the communicator. A "positive" (trustworthy, prestigious, or well-liked) communicator would be expected to boost initially the acceptance of the communication, and a "negative" (untrustworthy, low prestige, or disliked) communicator to lower it. The communicator constitutes a mediating cue for acceptance or rejection. With the communicator absent at the time of delayed testing the increase in agreement produced initially by the "positive" communicator would be removed (resulting in a greater decrease in agreement over time than could be accounted for by the amount of forgetting of the content). Similarly, the removal of the "negative" communicator would remove a cue for rejection. In many cases the removal of the negative effects of rejection would more than offset the loss due to forgetting of the content, and thus produce a net
increase in agreement with the communication (sleeper effect).

This analysis would suggest that the sleeper effect with a negative communicator as well as the decreased agreement with a positive communicator would be reduced or eliminated if the communicator again became a cue for rejection or acceptance at the time of delayed measurement. This would be the case if the individual’s association between the content and the source is so close that being asked about the issue automatically reinstates the communicator as an internalized cue. It would also occur if the communicator were experimentally reintroduced at the time of delayed testing. Such experimental “reinstatement” of the communicator would provide a test of the analysis presented above. This procedure is used in the present experiment.

In the Hovland and Weiss study the communicator was varied at the time of the initial presentation, but the extent to which the communicator served as a cue at the time of delayed testing was not manipulated. The present experiment involves the experimental manipulation of the communicator as a cue, both at the time of the communication and at the time of delayed measurement. Identical content is presented by positive, negative and neutral communicators. At the time of delayed measurement of opinion change, half of the Ss in each group are caused to recall the communicator before expressing their opinions while the other half express their opinions without reinstatement of the communicator. This design makes it possible to separate the effects produced by the communicator from those produced by the content of the communication. The “reinstatement” and “nonreinstatement” groups are alike as far as content and memory for content are concerned, and differ only with respect to the reintroduction of the communicator as a cue. According to the formulation presented here, reinstatement of the communicator should provide again cues for acceptance or rejection of the communication, and thus produce at least to some extent the effects produced initially. It is predicted, therefore, that reinstatement of the positive communicator should increase the extent of belief at the delayed period, while reinstatement of the negative communicator should decrease the degree of agreement.

**Procedure**

**Design**

Opinion changes brought about by a communication were studied at two time intervals: immediately after the communication, and again after a three-week delay. The difference between the delayed measurement and the immediate measurement provides a measure of change with time. Two experimental variables were introduced: one during the communication, and the other at the time of delayed measurement:

1. "Prestige" of the communicator. A communication with identical content was delivered by three different communicators: a positive (trustworthy, well-informed) communicator, a negative (untrustworthy, poorly informed) communicator, and a neutral communicator.

2. "Reinstatement" of the communicator. At the time of delayed measurement, the communicator was reinstated for half the Ss (i.e., the communicator was reintroduced to Ss, but gave no communication), and for the other half was not reinstated.

There are, thus, six experimental groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicator</th>
<th>Reinstated Group</th>
<th>Not Reinstated Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive communicator</td>
<td>Group A (2 classes)</td>
<td>Group B (2 classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative communicator</td>
<td>Group C (2 classes)</td>
<td>Group D (2 classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral communicator</td>
<td>Group E (1 class)</td>
<td>Group F (1 class)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subjects**

A total of 330 Ss participated in the experiment. Two hundred and seventy-three of these Ss were present at both experimental sessions and this was the number used for most of the analyses. The Ss were students in a summer high school in Brooklyn, New York, taking senior work in English. The majority of the Ss were “advance” students, i.e., students with better than average scholastic records who were taking summer courses in order to advance more quickly. Each experimental condition utilized either one or two classes, each of which contained an average of about 25 students.

**The Communication and the Attitude Chosen**

The communication dealt with the problem of the treatment of juvenile delinquents. On the basis of preliminary testing it was found that attitudes in this area are highly inconsistent and conflictful. Depending on the formulation of the issue the same individual might endorse lenient treatment at one time, and harsh treatment at another. It was felt, therefore, that it would be possible to produce attitude changes in this area with exposure to only a single communication. It was also felt that these attitudes would be particularly sensitive to differences in the “prestige” or “trustworthiness” of the communicator. Finally, this attitude dimension...
was chosen because it was timely and aroused great interest in the high school population.

Although it was necessary to have an attitude which could be influenced by a single communication, it was equally necessary to have a communication which would not influence everyone. This eliminated a middle-of-the-road position for the communication, because all Ss—regardless of the prestige of the communicator—would probably have accepted such a position. The communicator took, therefore, an extreme, unqualified position in favor of lenient treatment of juvenile delinquents. He made it clear that he was unalterably opposed to reform schools or any form of punishment for juvenile delinquents, regardless of the presumable needs of the community, the age of the delinquent, the frequency or seriousness of his delinquent acts, and so on. He opposed stricter discipline, and spoke in favor of treating the delinquent as a sick child, needing care.

When we speak of positive attitude changes in the rest of this paper, we shall be referring to changes in the direction of the communication, i.e., an increased endorsement of lenient treatment and a decreased endorsement of harsh treatment.

**Attitude Questionnaires**

The major block of questions was derived from the scale developed by Wang and Thurstone (11) to measure attitude toward the treatment of criminals. The questions were suitably modified to deal with the treatment of juvenile delinquents and were arranged with a five-point scale for each item, ranging from "agree very strongly" to "disagree very strongly." These were assigned weights from 5 for strong disagreement to 1 for strong agreement with the point of view advocated by the communicator or 0 for strong disagreement. Immediately after the communication the 20 items based on Form A of the Wang-Thurstone scale were presented, and three weeks later the 20 items based on Form B were presented. The 20 items in each form covered the entire range of attitudes: from extreme punitiveness (e.g., "Intense physical pain is the only way to make people fear the law"), through moderate punitiveness (e.g., "Failure to punish the juvenile delinquent encourages crime"), neutrality (e.g., "Corrective measures are just as necessary as punishment"), moderate leniency (e.g., "Petty offenders can be reformed without punishment"), to extreme leniency (e.g., "Punishment is never justified").

Eight additional multiple-choice items were used which were concerned with issues directly raised in the communication. These items were presented to Ss immediately before the communication, immediately afterwards, and three weeks later. Their principal use in the analysis is in establishing the comparability of the groups before the communication since the Wang-Thurstone scale questions were only employed after the communication.

**Session I**

The experiment was conducted during Ss' regular class meeting, with the teacher out of the room. The sequence of events was as follows:

After setting up recorder equipment, the experimenter introduced the experiment as part of a series of studies dealing with educational radio programs. He told Ss that he would play a transcription of a radio program on juvenile delinquency, and that he would then be interested in finding out their reactions to the program and to the specific topic.

The Ss were then asked to fill out the before-questionnaires, consisting of the eight multiple-choice items mentioned above.

The Ss now listened to the "transcribed radio program." Actually, this program was written and tape-recorded for the purposes of the experiment, but none of the Ss seemed to question its authenticity. The radio program involved the interview of a "guest," conducted by a moderator. The program consisted of two parts, both of which were conducted on an interview basis: the introduction of the speaker, and the discussion of content. In order to vary the "prestige" of the communicator, three different versions of the introduction were used. Four classes heard the positive version, four the negative, and two the neutral.

**Positive communicator.** In this version, the guest was introduced as "Judge Howard Elson, presiding judge of the Juvenile Court of this city, author of several books on delinquency, and well known for his views on the integration of the delinquent into society." In the course of the first part of the interview it became known that the Judge studied law at Columbia and later became interested in criminology. His visits to prisons convinced him that many criminal careers really begin in childhood and he therefore focused his interest on juvenile delinquency. He ran for the position of city magistrate, after being urged and endorsed by leading citizens of all kinds, and was elected. Later he accepted an appointment to the Juvenile Court, since he was most interested in that, and has held this position for nine years. In general, he gave the impression of being a sincere, honest, and public-spirited individual, with a great deal of warmth and understanding for juvenile delinquents.

**Negative communicator.** In this version, the guest was introduced as a "man on the street," picked from the studio audience. He gave the impression of being an obnoxious, self-centered individual with a shady past and present. He showed disrespect for the law and the community. In the course of the interview it became known that he was a near-delinquent himself when he was a youngster; he "got into many scrapes," but his parents usually "fixed it up" so that nothing would happen to him. But he seemed to show no appreciation for his parents' help, to take the attitude that they owed it to him, and to be very resentful of his family's "lecturing" and "picking" on him. He did not have the typical background of the delinquent; his parents were well-to-do and gave him a good education. It also turned out that he was picked up on a charge of dope-peddling recently, and was out on bail, and expected to get away with it. When asked about his occupation, he replied hesitatingly that he was in the importing
business, and admitted that they tried to tie him up with narcotics imports. In summary, it was made quite plain that his advocacy of lenient treatment was motivated by self-interest and disrespect for law.

Neutral communicator. In this version, the guest was also introduced as a member of the studio audience, chosen at random to appear on the program. No information beyond this and his name was given.

The second part of the radio program, the discussion of the content, was identical in wording for the three experimental groups. Differences in voice and style of delivery were introduced in keeping with the personalities suggested by the introductions. The interviews dealt with the treatment of juvenile delinquents, and revolved primarily around the discussion of a specific case. The guest took a position of extreme leniency, as was described earlier. This part of the program represents the communication, whose effects on attitude change are being studied.

After the completion of the radio program, Ss were asked to fill out the immediate after-questionnaires, consisting of the 20 items based on Form A of the Wang-Thurstone scale and the 8 multiple-choice questions used before the communication.

The Ss were also asked to answer several multiple-choice questions about their "perception" of the communicator. The key questions were as follows:

Would you say he [the guest speaker] is qualified to speak on the topic of juvenile delinquency?

Was the guest's presentation fair or was it one-sided?

Would you trust the guest's judgment?

Session II

Three weeks after session I, the delayed measurements of attitude change were obtained. The sequence of events was as follows:

At the beginning of this session, the second experimental variable was introduced. For half of the Ss who had heard each communicator (i.e., two classes in the positive group, two in the negative, and one in the neutral) the communicator was reinstated. For the other half, he was not reinstated.

Communicator reinstated. In these groups, the original experimenter conducted Session II. He reminded Ss that they had heard a program on juvenile delinquency, and told them that he would like them to fill out another questionnaire on the subject. He said that he would like to play back part of the program they had heard three weeks ago, to get them "back into the swing." He then played back the entire introduction of the radio program, but none of the communication proper.

Communicator not reinstated. In these groups, the experimenter stayed away entirely, and the teacher conducted Session II. He was asked to make no mention of Session I or of any connection between the questionnaire he distributed and the radio program. The procedure was designed to minimize the extent to which the original stimuli were reinstated.

The Ss then filled out the delayed after-questionnaires, which included the 20 items based on Form B of the Wang-Thurstone scale. The 8 multiple-choice attitude questions mentioned earlier were administered for the third time.

After completing the above, Ss were asked to fill out an open-ended questionnaire designed to measure their memory for the communicator and their memory for the content of the communication. They were simply asked to write down what they remembered about the guest speaker on the program and what were the views that he expressed.

Results

Perception of communicator by different groups. To test whether the experimental variations were effective in influencing the way the members of the audience regarded the communicators, several questions were introduced in the questionnaire given immediately after the communications. These dealt with the audience's "perception" of the competence, fairness, and trustworthiness of the communicator. Results concerning the audience's evaluations of these three characteristics for the three communicators are presented in Table 1. It will be observed that for all three questions the positive communicator is most favorably regarded, the negative least, and the neutral in between the other two. Differences between the positive and
negative communicators are all significant at less than the .001 level.

Initial equating of the groups. The eight items concerning attitudes toward delinquency which make up the before-questionnaires enable one to test the initial comparability of the groups which were subsequently given different treatments. The weights for each of the five alternative answers to each question ranged from 0 to +4 (for the answer most favorable to the communicator's position). The mean total score for each of the groups is given in Table 2. None of the groups show significant deviation from each other (p's range from .10 to .90), so the groups may be regarded as comparable before the introduction of the differential treatment.

Immediate effects of communication. Scale scores derived from the Wang-Thurstone attitude scale were the principal bases for evaluating the effects of the communications. The Ss expressed their extent of agreement with each item on a five-point rating scale. The 16 items which expressed either a favorable or unfavorable position with respect to leniency were given scores from 0 to +4 (most favorable to the point of view advocated by the communicator). Average scale scores (sums for the 16 questions) for the positive-communicator, neutral-communicator, and negative-communicator groups are presented in Table 3. The average scale score immediately after the communication is greatest for the positive communicator and least for the negative. The difference is significant at less than the .001 level of confidence. The communication by the neutral communicator is intermediate in effectiveness.

A significant difference between the positive-communicator and negative-communicator groups in the immediate effects of the communication was also obtained with the eight multiple-choice questions repeated from the before-questionnaires.

Check on intended effect of "reinstatement" procedure. The intent of the reinstatement procedure was to remind Ss of the communicator at the time of delayed testing. As a check on the effectiveness of this procedure, Ss were asked to write down, at the end of the second session, what they remembered about the communicator. From these responses, scores for "memory of source" were derived in the following manner: For each communicator, a list was made of all the points that were mentioned about him in the introduction (e.g., for the positive communicator the list included his name, his occupation, the fact that he started out as a lawyer, the fact that he had visited prisons, etc.). Then each S received a score corresponding to the number of items from the list that he mentioned in his response. The mean number of items was compared within each group for the reinstatement and nonreinstatement conditions (Table 4).

For the positive-communicator and negative-communicator groups the reinstatement procedure produced the intended effect of increasing S's memory for the communicator. There was no improvement in memory for the neutral communicator. This might be expected in view of the sketchy background
given concerning this communicator. In view of the absence of reinstatement effects for the neutral communicator, the effects of reinstatement on opinion change are presented in the table below only for the positive-communicator and negative-communicator groups.

**Delayed effects of the communications as a function of “reinstatement.”** Changes in opinion from immediately after the communication to three weeks later are presented in Table 5. Data are presented for reinstatement and nonreinstatement conditions for the positive-communicator and negative-communicator groups. The results for the nonreinstatement conditions (column 1) are in the same direction as those of Hovland and Weiss: There is a statistically significant decrease with time in extent of agreement with the positive communicator (—3.22) and a small and not quite significant increase (sleeper effect) with the negative communicator (+0.65). Under reinstatement conditions (column 2), the declines from immediately after the communication to three weeks later are approximately equal for the positive-communicator and negative-communicator groups (—1.44 and —1.29 scale units respectively).

The differences between the reinstatement and nonreinstatement conditions are presented in the third column. In line with the initial hypothesis, the effect of reinstatement of the positive communicator is to increase agreement with the communication ($M_{diff} = 1.78, p = .04$) and the effect of reinstatement of the negative communicator is to decrease agreement ($M_{diff} = —1.94, p = .04$). Reinstatement of the neutral communicator had no significant effect; the probability value for the decrease in agreement was only .25.

**DISCUSSION**

In the formulation being tested in the present experiment the assumption is made that the effects of communications are a joint

---

**TABLE 4**

**EFFECT OF “REINSTATEMENT” ON MEMORY FOR SOURCE**

(Mean scores for each of the six experimental groups.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>REINSTATED</th>
<th>NOT REINSTATED</th>
<th>EFFECT OF REINSTATEMENT</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive communicator</td>
<td>2.13 (N=52)</td>
<td>1.67 (N=45)</td>
<td>+0.46</td>
<td>&lt;.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative communicator</td>
<td>3.95 (N=38)</td>
<td>2.59 (N=51)</td>
<td>+1.36</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral communicator</td>
<td>0.56 (N=25)</td>
<td>0.77 (N=31)</td>
<td>—0.21</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One-tail test.

---

**TABLE 5**

**EFFECT OF “REINSTATEMENT” OF COMMUNICATOR ON OPINION**

(Change in mean scale scores from immediately after communication to three weeks later for “positive” and “negative” communicators.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>1 NONREINSTATEMENT CONDITIONS</th>
<th>2 REINSTATEMENT CONDITIONS</th>
<th>3 EFFECT OF REINSTATEMENT (Diff. 2—1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive communicator</td>
<td>—3.22</td>
<td>—1.44</td>
<td>+1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative communicator</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>—1.29</td>
<td>—1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One-tail test.
result of (a) "content" factors and (b) "acceptance" factors, here influenced by the prestige of the communicator. The data of Tables 3 and 5 provide information with which it is possible to subdivide hypothetically the contribution of these two sets of factors. From Table 3 it can be ascertained that the initial difference in effect between the positive and negative communicators was approximately four scale points. This difference covers the range extending from extreme "positive acceptance" to extreme "negative acceptance." It represents, thus, the total contribution of acceptance factors immediately after the communication.

From Table 5 it can be seen that the difference in delayed effects for the two communicators approaches zero under nonreinstatement conditions, since the initial four-point difference is almost exactly offset by the loss of 3.22 for the positive communicator and the rise of 0.65 for the negative. Also it can be seen that the effect of reinstatement is to restore almost completely the initial difference between the communications, since under these conditions each communication declines by approximately the same amount (—1.44 for the positive communicator and —1.29 for the negative). The values for the decline under these conditions provide a good estimate for the decrease attributable to forgetting of the content. Another independent estimate of this factor is found in the decline for the neutral communication, which was found to be about —1.5 scale points.

Using the values suggested from the preceding analysis it is possible to present a hypothetical picture of the changes with time which takes into account both forgetting of the content and removal and reinstatement of the communicator (Fig. 1). Let C stand for the effect on belief produced by content factors alone (without prestige effects). A positive prestige source may then be described as having an effect of +P, and a negative source an effect in the opposite direction of —P. Thus the combined effect of content and prestige will give C+P and C—P, respectively. The highest value, C+P, is used as a reference point in Fig. 1. It is arbitrarily given the value of 50. According to the data presented in Table 3, the value for C—P should be 3.95 scale points lower than C+P. For the purposes of the present analysis the values of +P and —P will be assumed to be equal and hence C is located half-way between the C+P and C—P values. Ideally this point should correspond with the amount of change produced by a neutral communicator, since presumably he achieves his effects only on the basis of the content of the arguments presented.

![Fig. 1. Effects of Content and Prestige Factors on Degree of Belief Immediately After the Communication, Three Weeks Later Without "Reinstatement" of the Communicator, and Three Weeks Later with "Reinstatement" of the Communicator](image_url)

The values for C and C' (effects of content) are hypothetical. The values for C+P (immediate effects of the positive-prestige communicator) and C—P (immediate effects of the negative-prestige communicator) are based on Table 3. The values for C'+P' and C'—P' (delayed effects of the positive-prestige and negative-prestige communicators, respectively, under nonreinstatement conditions) are based on Table 5, column 1. The values for C'+P*_pre* and C'—P*_pre* (delayed effects of the positive-prestige and negative-prestige communicators, respectively, under reinstatement conditions) are based on Table 5, column 2. These values are all shown relative to C+P, which is given the arbitrary value of 50. The values for +P*_pre* and —P*_pre* (effects of reinstatement of the positive and negative communicators, respectively) are taken from Table 5, column 3.

However, there is no assurance that in an experimental study one can find an ideal neutral, or that the effect of the positive communicator is equal and opposite to that of the negative. In the present study, for example, the value for the neutral was closer to the positive communicator than to the negative. The changes of the values with the pas-
The main finding from an analysis of these results is that more of the factual material is recalled when presented by a neutral communicator than when presented by either a positive or a negative communicator, and that more is recalled under nonreinstatement than reinstatement conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Number of Items Remembered from Communication</th>
<th>Reinstated M S.E.M.</th>
<th>Not Reinstated M S.E.M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive communicator</td>
<td>1.23 0.12</td>
<td>1.40 0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative communicator</td>
<td>0.82 0.13</td>
<td>1.22 0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral communicator</td>
<td>1.72 0.21</td>
<td>1.71 0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences between the neutral and the positive and the neutral and the negative communicators are both significant beyond the .02 level (two-tail test). The adverse effect of reinstatement is significant for the negative communicator at less than the .05 level. A possible explanation for these results is that both positive and negative communicators are respond to affectively and that affect adversely influences the amount learned and recalled.

Both in the present study (under conditions of nonreinstatement) and in the Hovland and Weiss study (5), the effects of prestige seem to disappear entirely by the time of delayed measurement. This is in marked contrast to the finding of Kulp (6) that there is no significant decline in the effects of a positive prestige suggestion in the course of an eight-week interval. One possible explanation for the greater permanency of prestige effects in the Kulp study is the method of introducing prestige: Subjects were asked to express agreement or disagreement with opinion items, using answer sheets which were marked with the responses of certain prestige groups. It may be that this direct association between the opinion items and the prestige led to a greater retention of prestige effects on subsequent responses to these items. The procedure followed by Kulp is similar to that used in most studies of prestige suggestion (see 2): Subjects are asked to express their opinions on various kinds of material; together with the material they are judging, they are presented with the judgments made by certain prestige figures (1, 3, 7), or else the material is ascribed to certain prestige figures (8, 9, 10). In the Hovland and Weiss study and in the present experiment the expression of opinion by the prestige figure was confined to the communication and was not alluded to in the attitude questionnaire.
ance in the positive-communicator group and increased acceptance (sleeper effect) in the negative-communicator group. (d) Reinstatement of the positive communicator increases acceptance and reinstatement of the negative communicator decreases acceptance.

**Summary and Conclusions**

The effects of the communicator, as a cue for acceptance, immediately following a communication and after a three-week delay were investigated with “positive,” “negative,” and “neutral” communicators. Identical communications dealing with the treatment of juvenile delinquents were presented to 330 senior high school students. The presentations were transcribed with an introductory discussion between the moderator and the guest speaker which served to establish the speaker as “positive” (well informed and fair), “negative” (poorly informed and biased), or “neutral.”

Opinion questionnaires were administered before the communication, immediately afterwards, and three weeks later. For half of the Ss in each group the communicator cues were reinstated at the time of the delayed (three-week) testing. Reinstatement was achieved by playing back the portion of the original transcription in which the speaker was introduced, before the opinion questionnaires were distributed.

1. The intended differences in the “perception” of the three communicators were achieved, as indicated by pronounced and statistically significant differences in the students' appraisal of the competence, fairness, and trustworthiness of the communicators.

2. The initial effect of the communication on the opinions of the Ss was greatest when presented by the “positive” communicator and least when presented by the “negative.” The “neutral” was in between the other two.

3. Under “nonreinstatement” conditions there was a decline over the three-week period in extent of agreement with the “positive” communicator and an increase with the “negative,” as in the Hovland-Weiss (5) study.

4. The reinstatement procedure had the intended effect of improving Ss' memory for the communicator in the case of the positive-communicator and negative-communicator groups.

5. Reinstatement increased the extent of agreement with the “positive” communicator and decreased the agreement with the “negative.” The magnitude of these effects was approximately equal to that obtained at the time of the initial communication.

6. An analysis of the results is made in terms of the learning and retention of the content of the communication and the effects of “positive” and “negative” prestige communicators on the acceptance of the material communicated.
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