# THE EFFECTS OF ASSERTION INTENSITY ON THE CONGRUITY MODEL

By

William J. McEwen

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Communication

1967

Accepted by the faculty of the Department of Communication, College of Communication Arts, Michigan State University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree.

Bradley S. Greenberg
Director of Thesis

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his great appreciation and thanks to his advisor, Dr. Bradley S. Greenberg for his continued assistance and guidance throughout the writing of this thesis. The author also wishes to thank the other members of his committee, Dr. Erwin Bettinghaus and Dr. Gerald Miller.

For their invaluable assistance in the collection of the data, the author wishes to express his gratitude to Mr. Walter Combs, Mr. Jack Basehart, Mr. Gary Wilson, and Miss Ann Christiansen.

The author also wishes to express his thanks and appreciation to his wife for constant understanding, encouragement, and occasional needed prodding throughout the course of his graduate studies and especially during the preparation of this thesis.

Finally, the author wishes to express special thanks to Mrs. Shirley Sherman for the typing of this thesis as well as her valuable assistance in its final preparation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

## LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF ASSERTION INTENSITY
ON THE CONGRUITY MODEL

by William J. McEwen

Since the congruity principle was originally postulated, a number of researchers have utilized this model of cognitive interaction in investigating the effects of psychological imbalance.

The congruity model has typically been applied to the prediction of evaluative attitudinal shift resulting from inconsistent associations among three basic elements. These three elements are: 1) the receiver's existing attitude toward the source of a message, 2) the receiver's existing attitude toward the topic (or concept) of the message, and 3) the nature of the assertion which relates source and topic.

A range of evaluative rating of both source and topic has been provided for by the congruity principle (most frequently a range of seven values from highly negative to highly positive). The congruity formulations have, however, neglected to provide such a possibility for variance in the intensity of the assertion or message. According to the congruity principle, a given message may only assume two values: positive (associative) or negative (disassociative).

This seeming oversimplification of the relationship between source and concept gave rise to the present study. It was hypothesized that, in situations where source and topic are of equal intensity, congruity model predictions of attitude change will conform most closely to obtained

evaluative shift when the message is of the same intensity as that of the source and topic.

Two general cases were investigated: a) source and message topic both evaluated as lightly positive (+1); b) source and topic both evaluated as highly positive (+3). Within each case, experimental messages expressing different levels of evaluative intensity (highly negative and mildly negative) were constructed.

Judgments of assertion intensity were created by the experimental manipulation of verbs and modifiers connoting varying levels of evaluative intensity. Measurement of resultant perceived message intensity confirmed the success of the manipulations. Highly negative messages were perceived as more negative than mildly negative messages.

Subjects for the experiment were 161 undergraduate students. Each subject completed a pretest designed to tap existing evaluative attitudes toward a source and a topic. After completing an irrelevant intervening task, subjects were then exposed to either a (-3) or a (-1) experimental message linking the source and the topic. Posttest ratings of source and message topic were then obtained.

Results confirmed the hypothesis in terms of the topic variable, but failed to confirm the hypothesis in terms of the source variable. Obtained attitudinal shift toward the message topic conformed more closely to that predicted by the congruity model when the intensity of the message was equal to the intensity of the topic. Failure to find parallel results for the source variable may be due in part to the fact that obtained source ratings for the source designated as highly positive were somewhat

lower than the experimental criteria demanded.

The findings of the study suggest that message or assertion intensity is a crucial variable which should be taken into account when making predictions according to the congruity model. Additional consequent effects of variance in message intensity are also suggested.

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

In 1955, Osgood and Tannenbaum postulated the principle of congruity and applied it to the prediction of attitude change. In the years after this initial postulation, a considerable amount of research has been undertaken employing their model for cognitive interaction. Tannenbaum (1956; 1965; 1966; 1966) and Fishbein (1963; 1964), for example, have utilized the congruity model in investigating cognitive imbalance as it applies to person perception, generalization of attitude change, and various strategies for the reduction of persuasion. The notion of cognitive consistency was, however, not unique to Osgood and Tannenbaum. Newcomb (1953), Heider (1958), and Festinger (1957), among others, had previously concerned themselves with theories of cognitive balance or consistency.

What has distinguished the congruity principle as proposed by Osgood and Tannenbaum has not been, then, their theoretic rationale. Its uniqueness has derived from the fact that their model has provided a precise mathematical prediction of the consequences of psychological imbalance. The congruity principle not only has predicted a general attitudinal shift toward cognitive consistency, it also has rigorously stated both the intensity and direction of that shift for the interacting elements in an incongruous relationship. No other theoretical model has attempted quite so precisely to predict the results of the cognitive interaction of two concepts.

In addition, the congruity model has made specific use of communication interactions. Balance or imbalance, according to this principle, occurs as a function of the connective assertion. Osgood and Tannenbaum's principle was therefore unique among balance models both in its attempt at affording precision to the prediction of attitude change and in the importance it has placed on the operation of a message in an interacting relationship.

The congruity principle, as stated by its authors, is:

> "Whenever two signs are related by an assertion, the mediating characteristic of each shifts toward congruence with that characteristic of the other, the magnitude of the shift being inversely proportional to the intensities of the interacting reactions."
>
> (Osgood and Tannenbaum; 1955)

The authors have proceeded from this general statement of the congruity principle to a specific prediction of evaluative cognitive shift resulting from situations involving inconsistent associations. Osgood (1957) has proposed that connotative meaning exists generally in three major dimensions: evaluative, potency, and activity. Factor analytic studies cited by the author have confirmed these notions. Osgood has further stated that attitudes, as generally defined, exist along the evaluative dimension of meaning. Attitudes have been defined by Osgood as predispositions toward evaluative responses. Thus, the congruity principle, having concerned itself with attitudinal shift, has made predictions of cognitive shift along the particular dimension of meaning which has been labelled "evaluative".

The congruity principle has focused on the relationship of three significant variables: 1) the existing evaluative attitude toward

the source of a message; 2) the existing evaluative attitude toward the concept or topic which the source is evaluating in the message; and 3) the nature of the assertion which relates source and concept in the message.

The evaluation of both the source and concept variables may take values ranging from highly favorable (score of 7) to highly unfavorable (score of 1), as measured by the semantic differential (Osgood; 1957). The assertion, however, according to the Osgood and Tannenbaum model, may only be associative (positive) or disassociative (negative).

Thus the ratings of the source and the topic of the message may range in evaluative intensity from one to seven. One may have varied attitudes toward President Johnson as a message source and toward Medicare as a message topic. Any assertion that Johnson might make concerning Medicare, according to the congruity principle, could nevertheless be merely one of liking or disliking. There has been no provision for degrees of intensity of liking or disliking. The model has not distinguished between a message strongly condemning Medicare and a message indicating moderate disapproval of Medicare. Both would be classified as "disassociative" assertions and the amount of evaluative shift resulting from the messages would be predicted to be equal.

What Osgood and Tannenbaum proposed, therefore, was as follows. While the receiver of an evaluative message may evaluate the topic of the message along a range of values, seven in their particular model, the source of the message is provided with only two alternative possibilities. He may describe or talk about the topic as "good", in which case his

resultant communication behavior would be associative, or he may describe the topic as "bad", in which case his resultant communication behavior would be disassociative. The model has not allowed for different degrees of association or disassociation. Thus, there has been no provision in the congruity model for the source to have, or to be perceived as having, as many varying states of attitude toward the concept as the receiver of the message may have.

The authors have acknowledged that the intensity of associative or disassociative assertions might vary. They have stated that the assertion "A gives 100% support to B" appears more intense than "A is cordial to B". Their principle nevertheless has not accounted for such possible differences in intensity. The model has ignored this, perhaps as somewhat irrelevant. At any rate, no research to date has investigated: a) whether variations in assertion intensity are indeed possible; or b) whether these variations have results other than predicted by the congruity model; or c) whether such variations would then need to be accounted for when making congruity principle predictions.

Osgood has developed a method for determining the evaluative intensity of a message, which has been termed "evaluative assertion analysis" (1959). The author has stated that connectors may vary in the intensity or degree to which they associate or disassociate source and concept. The overall intensity of a given message may be considered, according to this method, as a function of the intensities of the various connectors (verbs) and evaluative modifiers (adverbs and adjectives). Thus, "Source A is extremely in favor of topic X, since it is definitely

desirable" is seen as more intense than "Source A may be somewhat in favor of topic X, since it is slightly desirable". The intensities of the modifiers ("extremely"; "definitely") and the verb ("is") in the first example are greater than the intensities of the modifiers ("somewhat"; "slightly") and the verb ("may be") in the second example. Thus the first assertion would be rated as stronger, or more intense than the second assertion.

Evaluative assertion analysis has not, however, been widely employed. The author has attested to its laboriousness and complexity. Each message must first be broken down into the smallest possible units (each consisting of source, assertion, and concept). These simple units must then be judged according to their apparent level of evaluative intensity by a number of judges. The total of the individual evaluative intensities of the simple units is then taken as an index of the overall evaluative intensity of the particular message. A message in which the judged ratings of the simple units were all highly intense (+3) would thus contrast in intensity with a message of a similar length in which the judged ratings were all (+2) or (+1).

With longer messages, however, the result is a large task for coders and judges. The complex message must be broken down into its smallest possible units, all anouns must be blacked out, and judges must make a rating of the evaluative intensity of each unit thereby obtained.

Westley et al. (1963) have attempted a simplification of the Osgood technique. The authors selected from a given message only those evaluative statements which applied directly to a previously selected topic or concept.

Each individual statement thus obtained was then rated by judges as to whether it was positive or negative. No degrees of "positive" or "negative" were permitted. The total number of positive and negative statements was taken as an index of the evaluative intensity of the message. It was assumed by the authors that three mildly positive statements made about a given concept were the equivalent of one extremely positive statement. This basic assumption is questionable. An entire message consisting of mild endorsements hardly seems the equivalent in expressed evaluative intensity of even as few as one or two highly favorable endorsements.

In any case, the Westley method has not been employed with any greater frequency than the Osgood method. Westley has stated that, while his method may have been an improvement on the Osgood method in terms of amount of labor required, it also confronts the coder with a large task. Neither appears adequate to the task of rapidly and reliably arriving at some overall measure of the evaluative intensity of a message.

Development of adequate measurement procedures appears a worthwhile area for future research and will be discussed in Chapter IV. The measurement attempts of Osgood and of Westley have been noted here merely to point out that some attention has been paid to assertion intensity. Neither of these techniques was employed in the present experiment. Since both procedures are lengthy and perhaps questionable, it was decided to experimentally manipulate intensity and leave the unsolved problem of measuring evaluative intensity for future inquiry.

In addition, neither the Westley nor the Osgood method has been applied to the prediction of evaluative shift in terms of the congruity principle. While researchers have acknowledged the possibility of varying levels of intensity, and even developed instruments to attest to this possibility, the congruity model has failed to account for such a possibility. The mathematical formulation of the principle has made no allowance for anything other than a dichotomous (either positive or negative) assertion. At least at this original framework, then, the authors have discarded any notion that assertions might vary in amount of expressed intensity.

Osgood and Tannenbaum (1957) have stated that stronger assertions (or more intense assertions) should increase the congruity effect. The authors have contended that, since "gives 100% support to" is more intense than "is cordial to", the former should increase the probability of obtaining results consistent with congruity model predictions. This appears to be fallacious, as the following example may indicate.

For ease of explication, one of the situations which the authors have termed "congruent" would serve. Congruent relationships occur, according to the authors when source and concept are of equal polarization and: a) of opposite directions if the assertion is disassociative, or b) in the same direction if the assertion is associative. All other possible relationships are incongruent, to a degree dependent upon the extent to which ratings of source and concept deviate from these ideal, congruent conditions.

An evaluatively rated (+1) source linked associatively (positively)

with an evaluatively rated (+1) concept would be such a case of congruence. The congruity model would predict no change as a function of this association. The authors, however, have speculated that greater assertion intensity should lead to a greater strain toward congruity. They have thus claimed that there should be even less chance of any attitudinal shift occurring if linkage was accomplished by a very intense (+3) assertion than if a less intense (+1) assertion had been used to link the two elements. For example, assume that the Governor of Nebraska is rated as (+1) and federal regulations to control water pollution is also rated as (+1). Osgood and Tannenbaum's speculation would predict that a statement from this Governor expressing extreme favorability toward federal regulations should be perceived as more congruent than one which expressed mild favorability toward the concept.

Two cases exist in the above example. In the first instance, a mildly-liked source is extremely in favor of a mildly liked concept. In the second case, a mildly favored source is mildly in favor of a mildly liked concept. Not only does the first case not seem more cognitively consistent than the second, the first case actually appears somewhat incongruous. It rather appears that people I like should feel the same as I do (that is, with the same degree of intensity - not with greater or lesser intensity) toward concepts that I like. A positive source should ideally evaluate a positive concept to the same degree as I do. If this source expresses a greater or lesser intensity of liking or disliking than I feel toward a particular concept, a certain amount of incongruity should result. It appears more consistent for the Governor of Nebraska to exhibit mild favorability toward federal pollution regulations than for him

to very strongly praise such regulations and advocate and endorse their passage. It should be psychologically inconsistent for a favored source to express a degree of favorability toward a concept that is different from that which the receiver would express. The authors of the congruity model thus have proposed a notion which does not seem intuitively or logically to hold for most cases.

Despite some amount of theorizing and a limited quantity of empirical measurement of message intensity, no research has yet investigated the consequences of assertion intensity on the congruity principle. This thesis proposes to do so. More specifically, it is proposed that the strength of an assertion is a crucial variable which must be taken into account when predicting attitude change.

The hypothesis proposed is therefore:

$H_1$: When source and topic are of equal intensity, evaluative attitudinal shifts predicted by the congruity principle will more likely be obtained when the assertion linking source and concept is of the same intensity than when it differs in intensity.

In order to illustrate the hypothesis, the following possible cases are provided as examples. For the sake of simplicity, only mild and extreme cases are shown.

| | Source | Assertion | Concept |
|---|---|---|---|
| Case I | +3 | -3 or +3 | +3 |
| | +3 | -1 or +1 | +3 |
| Case II | +1 | -3 or +3 | +1 |
| | +1 | -1 or +1 | +1 |
| Case III | -3 | -3 or +3 | -3 |
| | -3 | -1 or +1 | -3 |
| Case IV | -1 | -3 or +3 | -1 |
| | -1 | -1 or +1 | -1 |

It would appear that the obtained evaluative shifts occurring in cases where a (+3) source was linked with a (-3) assertion to a (+3) concept would be quite similar to cases where a (-3) source was linked with a (+3) assertion to a (-3) concept. For this reason, Cases I and III would be expected to be similar and, through analogous reasoning, cases II and IV would be expected to likewise be similar. In regards to cases I and III, the hypothesis would state that the congruity principle will better predict resultant attitude change when the assertion is highly intense (+3) than when the assertion is mildly intense (+1). In cases II and IV, the hypothesis would state that the congruity model will better predict attitudinal shift when the assertion is mildly intense (+1) than when the assertion is highly intense (+3).

# CHAPTER II

## METHODS

It is possible to study a total of 343 different cases or source-assertion-concept linkage, allowing each variable to assume a range of seven values. Since Osgood and Tannenbaum have stated that all incongruous situations will result in at least some attitude change, it was decided to limit the investigation to cases of incongruity, thus affording a comparison of obtained shift with predicted shift.

Two major subsets of incongruous relationships may be examined: 1) a positive source opposed to a positive concept (or a negative source opposed to a negative concept); and 2) a positive source in favor of a negative concept (or a negative source in favor of a positive concept). Since it was assumed that assertion intensity would yield similar results in both cases (in terms of correspondence of obtained and predicted changes), it was decided to investigate only the first relationship. In order to further reduce the complexity of the experiment, it was decided to investigate only mild and extreme cases within this subject. In keeping with the hypothesis, the investigation was limited to situations where source and concept were of equal intensity or polarization.

The four cases selected for experimentation were as follows:

| | Source | Assertion | Concept |
|---|---|---|---|
| I. | +3 | -3 | +3 |
| II. | +3 | -1 | +3 |
| III. | +1 | -3 | +1 |
| IV. | +1 | -1 | +1 |

Two different source-assertion-concept combinations were investigated in each case, thus resulting in a total of eight experimental message linkages. The use of different sources, assertions and concepts at each level of evaluative rating was undertaken in order to assure less chance of any resultant effects being topic bound. Obtaining the same results across message linkages would thus increase the generalizability of the experimental findings.

The independent variable manipulated in this experiment was the degree of evaluative intensity expressed by the specially constructed messages. The dependent variables were two. Subjects (n=177) judged the degree of evaluative intensity perceived in the messages. In addition, subjects' change scores (from pretest to posttest) in attitude toward the message source and topic were obtained for subjects in each of the experimental conditions.

Eight experimental messages were prepared. All messages presented the source as having negative evaluations of the message topic (a disassociative assertion). Swurces and topics were selected on the basis of consensually positive evaluative pretest ratings from a separate group of students. There were eight experimental groups, each of which received

one experimental message.

It was decided, when making predictions according to the congruity model, to disregard the "correction for incredulity". This is a mathematical correction factor variably applied to cases of incongruity, with the greatest correction to be used in cases of maximum incongruity. The authors of the congruity model first noted this correction factor (Osgood and Tannenbaum; 1955) when obtained evaluative shifts failed to conform to predicted changes. The utility of the correction term may be suspect, and there appears to have been insufficient additional research to confirm the mathematical corrections made post facto in the original study. Since there was, then, some question about the empirical reproducibility of the correction for incredulity, it was decided to make predictions without accounting for incredulity.

Pretest

In order to find sources and concepts with a mean evaluative rating at or near (+3) and (+1), 16 sources and 16 concepts were originally pretested. The total of 32 concepts were rated on six semantic differential scales which loaded highly on the evaluative dimension (Osgood; 1957). The scales employed were: a) valuable...worthless; b) important...unimportant; c) good...bad; d) fair...unfair; e) nice...awful; f) wise...foolish.

The sources and concepts were administered in two halves. Each half contained eight sources and eight concepts. The two halves were randomly given to 121 subjects from introductory advertising classes at Michigan State University. All subjects were asked to rate each source and concept on the six evaluative semantic differential scales. All data means may

be found in Appendix B.

From this pretest, three sources and four concepts were selected for the experiment. Only one source was found to have a mean evaluative rating near (+3). It was therefore decided to pair this same source in the experimental messages with each of the two concepts which were rated at or near (+3).

The obtained results are presented in Table 1. Higher scores indicate greater favorability. The range of possible scores was from one to seven, with a mean rating of seven equivalent to a rating of (+3), and a mean rating of five equivalent to a rating of (+1).

None of the sources and concepts within each level of evaluation were significantly different from each other. All comparisons between sources and concepts rated as approximately (+3) and sources and concepts rated as approximately (+1) resulted in significant differences.*

On the basis of the pretest results, the following associations were employed in constructing the experimental messages.

(+3) Source linked with (+3) Concept

1. George Romney linked disassociatively with student voice in university affairs.

2. George Romney linked disassociatively with the Peace Corps.

(+1) Source linked with (+1) Concept

3. Jacob Javits linked disassociatively with permitting Communist speakers to talk on campus.

4. William Scranton linked disassociatively with raising the minimum wage.

---

*All obtained probabilities for these comparisons were less than .005.

Table 1. Pretest Results

| SOURCES | Mean Scale Rating | CONCEPTS | Mean Scale Rating |
|---|---|---|---|
| Romney | 6.02 | "Student Voice in University Affairs" | 6.04 |
| | | "the Peace Corps" | 5.96 |
| Scranton | 4.99 | "Raising the Minimum Wage" | 5.08 |
| Javits | 5.10 | "Permitting Communist Speakers to talk on Campus" | 5.22 |

Manipulations

The independent variable was the evaluative intensity of the message or assertion. Two experimental messages were constructed for each of the four basic source-concept linkage combinations listed above. One experimental message was mildly intense (-1) and the other experimental message for each combination was strongly intense (-3). All messages were negative or disassociative in order to create incongruous situations.

Within each source-concept linkage, modifiers and verbs were manipulated so as to result in two messages (one mild; one strong). Words changed were those which would indicate the source's evaluative position toward the message topic as either strongly negative or mildly negative.

The basis for the experimental manipulations was the work of Osgood (1959). In discussing evaluative assertion analysis, the author has pointed to a number of high intensity ($\pm 3$) modifiers (very; extremely; absolutely; definitely; positively) and a number of weak intensity ($\pm 1$) modifiers (slightly; occasionally; somewhat). Osgood has further discussed the distinctions between high intensity connectors (verbs "to be"; "to have" - most unqualified simple verbs) and weak intensity connectors ("many"; "might" - verbs implying a possible or hypothetical relation between source and concept).

In addition, research conducted by Dodd and Gerbrick (1960) has reported differences between highly polarized modifiers (very strongly; very much; complete) and mildly polarized modifiers (moderately; somewhat; a little).

On the basis of such reported differences in expressed attitudinal intensity in verbs and modifiers, the eight experimental messages were prepared. To avoid excessive repetition, synonyms for these modifiers were also used.

The two messages constructed from each source-concept linkage combination were identical, except for the experimental manipulation of adverbs and verbs. All messages were written in the manner of typical newspaper reports. This was done to maximize the believability of the messages and therefore rule out as much as possible the chance that the reader would find the source-concept linkage incredulous.

Messages contained an average of approximately 18 manipulations (range from 15 to 20). Broken down according to type of manipulation, each message had an average of 4 verb manipulations (range from 2 to 6) and 14 adverb manipulations (range 12 to 16).

Sample manipulations from the eight experimental messages are listed below.

| Low Intensity (-1) Message | High Intensity (-3) Message |
|---|---|
| staunchly opposed | somewhat opposed |
| strongly | moderately |
| severely | mildly |
| repeatedly | occasionally |
| obviously | possibly |
| complete | partial |
| must | might |
| strongly | somewhat |
| highly | slightly |
| is | may be |
| requires | asks |
| definitely | probably |
| evidently | seemingly |
| no | little |
| definitely | possibly |
| would | might |

The complete text of the eight messages may be found in Appendix D.

Measurement

Two dependent variables were measured. The first was the perceived intensity of the messages. Subjects were asked, after reading the message, to rate how strongly they perceived the message source had felt about the topic of the message. A seven point verbal rating scale (ranging from "very strongly opposed" to "very strongly in favor") determined the degree of attitudinal intensity subjects felt was expressed by the message source.

Two control groups were employed to check the success of the intensity manipulations. Subjects in these groups (n=16) read experimental messages of either strong or mild intensity from which all mention of a specific source was deleted.

Control group procedures were as follows:

1. Subjects rated eight concepts and were given an intervening task. All prior ratings were irrelevant to the control group purpose.
2. Control subjects read either a very intense (-3) message (n=7) or a mildly intense (-1) message (n=9). Messages were randomly selected from the eight experimental messages. All reference to the message sources were blocked out. The control messages were thus essentially either strong or mild attacks on various topics ostensibly from an unidentified source.

3. Subjects rated the message according to how strongly they felt the unknown source was in favor of or opposed to the message topic.

The second dependent variable was attitude change toward source and concept. The same six evaluative semantic differential scales which had been employed with the pretest sample were given to the subjects before and after message presentation. Subjects rated both source and concept on each of the six scales. Change in attitude toward source and concept were analyzed separately.

## Design

Subjects were 177 students from an introductory communication course at Michigan State University. 161 subjects were randomly assigned to the eight experimental conditions. The remaining 16 subjects were randomly assigned to the two control conditions.

The design employed is listed in Table 2.

## Procedures

Experimental group procedures, sequentially:

1. Each subject rated eight concepts (four sources; four message topics) on the six semantic differential scales. Only two concepts (one source and one topic) were relevant to each subject's particular experimental condition. The other six concepts were included in an attempt to reduce possible consistency or carry-over effects on the posttest ratings.

2. After rating the concepts, all subjects were given an intervening task. This task consisted of reading a message on wire-tapping practices which was unrelated to the purposes of the experiment and then rating the concept "wire-tapping" on a number of scales. The intervening task required approximately 20 minutes to complete.
3. Subjects then read one of the eight experimental messages. Messages were presented as having appeared recently in a major newspaper. Subjects were asked to underline the main points in the message, thus motivating careful, thorough reading of the message.
4. Subjects rated the message on the seven point verbal rating scale according to how strongly in favor of or opposed to the message topic they perceived the source to be.
5. Subjects rated source and topic on nine semantic differential scales, six of which were used in the subsequent analysis. The other three scales were included in a masking attempt. The six critical scales were the same as had been used to obtain ratings before reading the message. The order of the scales and the reflection of the scale ends were changed from the prior measurement.
6. Congruity principle predictions for shift on both source and concept ratings were determined for each subject. The specific predictions were obtained in accordance with the formula supplied by Osgood and Tannenbaum (1955).

Table 2. Experimental Design

(A)

(+3) Source linked with (+3) Concept (total n = 83)

| | Romney-the Peace Corps | Romney-student voice in university affairs. |
|---|---|---|
| (-3) Intensity Message | n = 19 | n = 20 |
| (-1) Intensity Message | n = 21 | n = 23 |

(B)

(+1) Source linked with (+1) Concept (total n = 78)

| | Javits-permitting Communist speakers to talk on campus | Scranton-raising the minimum wage |
|---|---|---|
| (-3) Intensity Message | n = 18 | n = 19 |
| (-1) Intensity Message | n = 20 | n = 21 |

7. Obtained shifts in ratings of source and concept were compared with predicted changes.

# CHAPTER III

## RESULTS

The experimental results are divided into three major sections: 1) ratings of message intensity; 2) persuasibility of the experimental messages; and 3) tests of the hypothesis. The first section reports the results obtained from the measurement of perceived message intensity. The second section reports changes in attitude toward source and concept resultant from the experimental messages. The third section reports comparisons between predicted and obtained attitudinal shift for both source and concept variables.

### Ratings of Message Intensity

The manipulation of message intensity was apparently successful. Subjects in both the experimental and the control groups who received the mildly intense (-1) messages rated the messages as less intense than did subjects who received the highly intense (-3) messages.

The two control groups differed significantly in their ratings of how strongly the source felt about the message topic. For these two groups, all mention of a specific source had been deleted, thus minimizing the possibility that judgments of a source's position were dependent upon prior attitudes toward the source. Subjects rated the intensity of an unknown source's position. The results are reported in Table 3. All reported values are mean perceived intensity ratings. Higher absolute values indicate greater message intensity.

Table 3. Control Group Ratings of Message Intensity

| Treatments | |
|---|---|
| High Intensity Message (n=7) | Low Intensity Message (n=9) |
| -2.14* | -1.33 |

*$p < .01$

A t-test for uncorrelated means resulted in a significant obtained difference between the two groups.* The high intensity (-3) message was rated as significantly more intense than the low intensity (-1) message.

The perceived message intensity ratings for the eight experimental groups showed similar differences. Results are reported in Table 4. Again all reported values are mean scale ratings. In three of the four comparisons the (-3) experimental message was judged by subjects to be more intense than the (-1) message.** In the fourth comparison, differences in ratings of message intensity approached significance.*** It made no difference if the source was well known or anonymous, or whether he was evaluated as highly positive or mildly positive. Subjects perceived the source's position to be more strongly negative toward the message topic in the (-3) condition than in the (-1) condition.

Message Persuasibility

Posttest ratings of both source and concept, when compared with pre-test ratings, indicate at least some change in every case in the direction of greater congruity. Thus the experimental messages seem to have provided some impetus toward changing attitudes. The tendency in all cases was for ratings of source and concept to be somewhat lower (that is, less favorable) following exposure to the experimental messages. This is a general trend which the notions of cognitive imbalance or incongruity would predict.

---

*$p < .01$ (one tailed)
** probabilities less than .05 (one tailed)
***$p < .10$ (one tailed)

Table 4. Experimental Group Ratings of Message Intensity

| Source-Concept Linkage | High Intensity Message | Low Intensity Message |
|---|---|---|
| a. Romney-Peace Corps | -2.17 (n = 19) | -0.74 (n = 21) |
| b. Romney-Student Voice | -1.80 (n = 20) | -0.70 (n = 23) |
| c. Javits-Communist Speakers | -2.00 (n = 18) | -1.21 (n = 20) |
| d. Scranton-Minimum Wage | -2.59 (n = 19) | -1.80 (n = 21) |

Significance Tests

| Linkage | t Values (High vs. Low Intensity) |
|---|---|
| a. | 3.437* |
| b. | 2.513** |
| c. | 1.431*** |
| d. | 1.948**** |

*$p < .005$
**$p < .01$
***$p < .10$
****$p < .05$

Table 5. Experimental Group Ratings of Source

| Sources | (-1) Intensity Condition | | (-3) Intensity Condition | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pretest | Posttest | Pretest | Posttest |
| Romney (linked with Peace Corps) | 5.51 | 5.04 | 5.42 | 5.19 |
| Romney (linked with Student Voice) | 5.94 | 5.25 | 5.69 | 4.50 |
| Javits | 4.81 | 4.68 | 4.79 | 4.52 |
| Scranton | 4.92 | 4.85 | 5.27 | 5.00 |

Significance Tests

| Correlated t Values | |
|---|---|
| (-1) Intensity Condition | (-3) Intensity Condition |
| 1.34* | 1.21* |

*both probabilities less than .20

Table 6. Experimental Group Ratings of Concept

| Concepts | (-1) Intensity Condition | | (-3) Intensity Condition | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pretest | Posttest | Pretest | Posttest |
| Peace Corps | 6.05 | 5.51 | 5.92 | 5.39 |
| Student Voice | 6.42 | 5.63 | 6.64 | 6.10 |
| Communist Speakers | 5.30 | 4.46 | 5.53 | 4.60 |
| Minimum Wage | 5.08 | 4.72 | 5.44 | 5.01 |

Significance Tests

| Correlated t Values | |
|---|---|
| (-1) Intensity Condition | (-3) Intensity Condition |
| 5.66* | 8.88** |

* $p < .01$

** $p < .005$

Mean evaluative ratings obtained from the pretest and posttest measurements are reported in Tables 5 and 6. Higher evaluative ratings are indicated by greater mean values.

In regards to the concept variable, both forms of the experimental messages (high and low intensity) resulted in a significant amount of attitudinal shift.* Neither the high nor the low intensity messages resulted in a significant amount of shift in evaluation of the message source, although differences between pretest and posttest ratings were in the predicted direction and approached significance.**

Tests of the Hypothesis

Tests of the main hypothesis were made using a treatments by levels analysis of variance. Subjects had been randomly assigned to receive either a strongly intense or a mildly intense message. In addition, the level of evaluative favorability toward source and concept was used as a control variable. For these reasons, the treatments by levels design was most appropriate.

Tests of the major hypothesis were performed separately on source and concept ratings. Predictions of evaluative shift in source and concept ratings were obtained according to the previously mentioned Osgood and Tannenbaum congruity formulae. Mean absolute deviations of obtained evaluative shift from predicted evaluative shift were determined. Analyses were then performed on these deviation scores for both source and concept.

---

*$p < .01$ (one tailed
**$p < .20$ (one tailed)

Table 7. Mean Deviation Scores for Sources

| | | Message Intensity | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | (-3) | (-1) |
| Source Intensity | (+3) | 1.64 | 1.60 |
| | (+1) | 1.39 | 1.31 |

Significance Tests

| Source of Variance | Sums of Squares | df | Mean Square | F Values |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Columns | 0.14 | 1 | 0.14 | 0.144 |
| Between Rows | 2.84 | 1 | 2.84 | 2.928 |
| Interaction (RxC) | 0.02 | 1 | 0.02 | 0.021 |
| Within | 152.62 | 157 | 0.97 | |

Critical F (p = .05) is 3.91

Table 8. Mean Deviation Scores for Concepts

| | | Message Intensity | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | (-3) | (-1) |
| Concept Intensity | (+3) | 1.24 | 1.37 |
| | (+1) | 1.27 | 0.88 |

Significance Tests

| Source of Variance | Sums of Squares | df | Mean Squares | F Values |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Columns | 0.56 | 1 | 0.56 | 0.070 |
| Between Rows | 2.35 | 1 | 2.35 | 2.970 |
| Interaction (RxC) | 3.96 | 1 | 3.96 | 5.006* |
| Within | 124.20 | 157 | .79 | |

Critical F ($p = .05$) is 3.91

* $p < .05$

The results of these analyses are in Tables 7 and 8. Values reported are mean absolute deviation scores.

For the source variable, only the effects of the levels variable (intensity of evaluative rating of the source) approached significance.* There was thus some tendency for obtained changes in the evaluation of sources to correspond more closely to predicted changes when the sources were initially rated as mildly favorable (+1) than when the sources were initially rated as highly favorable (+3).

In regards to the concept variable, the interaction of concept evaluative intensity and message intensity reached significance.** The source of this significant interaction would appear to derive in large part from one cell. Where the concept was rated as (+1), there was less deviation of predicted shift from obtained shift when the message was mildly intense (deviation of 0.88) than when the message was highly intense (deviation of 1.27).

There was some tendency for the opposite reaction to occur in cases where the concept was rated as (+3). The deviation of predicted and obtained shift was somewhat less for the highly intense message (deviation of 1.24) than for the mildly intense message (deviation of 1.37).

There was, therefore, a significant tendency for the congruity principle predictions to conform more closely with the obtained evaluative shifts in judgments of the source or topic when the message was of the same absolute intensity as the evaluation of the topic of the message.

---

*$p < .10$
**$p < .05$

# CHAPTER IV

# DISCUSSION

## Summary

Eight groups of subjects received experimental messages in which the level of evaluative intensity was manipulated. Subjects were exposed to messages in which a source either strongly or mildly attacked the message topic. Pretest ratings indicated that subjects were highly or moderately favorable toward the source and the topic. Obtained post-message attitudinal shifts were compared with changes predicted by the Osgood and Tannenbaum congruity model.

The proposed hypothesis stated that, when source and topic are of equal evaluative intensity, changes in the evaluative ratings of source and topic predicted by the congruity model will more likely be obtained when the connective assertion is of the same intensity than when it differs in intensity.

Results were analyzed separately for the source and topic variables. A significant interaction between concept intensity and message intensity was obtained. No significant differences were found in the case of the source variable.

The major hypothesis was confirmed in terms of predicted attitude change toward the message topic. Changes in topic evaluation predicted by the congruity principle corresponded more closely to obtained changes when the intensity of the assertion was the same as the intensities of the source and topic.

The experimental results failed to confirm the major hypothesis in terms of predicted attitude change toward the source. Differences in assertion intensity apparently made little difference in how well the obtained evaluative shift in source conformed to that predicted by the congruity principle.

## Discussion

There are several possible reasons why the evaluative ratings of the source did not shift in the manner in which the ratings of the topic did. These will be discussed in terms of two general areas: 1) methodological shortcomings; and 2) theoretical problems.

## Methodological Shortcomings

a. Persuasibility of the Messages- Perhaps the messages were not persuasive at all. This alternative would appear to be partially ruled out by the fact that the overall change in concept evaluation proved significant. In addition, a nonparametric sign test (Siegel; 1956) performed on the changes in source ratings showed that three of the eight messages yielded statistically significant attitudinal shifts. Also, all eight messages resulted in at least some amount of shift in source evaluation in the direction which the notion of congruity would predict.

Thus, despite the fact that the overall changes in subjects' evaluations of the message sources were not significant, there was nevertheless some amount of evidence that the experimental messages were persuasive. Overall change in attitude toward the message topics was significant. Also, there is evidence that the messages were somewhat effective in inducing attitudinal shift toward the source of the message.

b. Evaluative Ratings of the Source- The original pretest sample employed for source and concept selection resulted in the source designated as (+3) receiving a mean evaluative rating of 6.02. The experimental group pretest ratings of the same source were, however, somewhat lower (the average rating was approximately 5.64). The mean ratings of the message topics linked with that source were 5.98 and 6.53. The result is that, for these particular groups of subjects, the source and topic in the (+3)-(+3) linkage condition may have been of sufficiently unequal intensity to have not met the preestablished criteria for the experimentation.

No hypotheses were offered for cases in which the source and topic are of differing evaluative intensities. If such was actually the case in this experiment, the failure to obtain significant results in terms of the source variable may not be due to a deficiency in the experimental hypothesis. Perhaps it was rather a function of the source not proving sufficiently highly intense to meet the experimental conditions.

The need for further investigation into cases of unequal intensities will be discussed later. At this point it is only necessary to note the possibility for some confounding factors in the source variable results which may have been due to a lower initial or pretest source evaluative rating than was originally desired.

## Theoretical Problems

a. Osgood and Tannenbaum (1955) have posited a construct which they have termed the assertion constant. According to this mathematical correction factor, the concept in a source-concept linkage will show a greater post-message shift in evaluative ratings than will the source.

Perhaps this may be one reason why changes in ratings of the message sources failed to reach significance, while evaluative shift in concept was significant.

Application of this correction factor would not, however, alter the relationship between message intensity and the evaluative intensity of the source. Perhaps the addition of the assertion constant might aid in the explanation of the lack of significant overall shift in source ratings. Nevertheless, taking this factor into account adds little in the way of explaining the failure of the experimental results to confirm the major hypothesis in terms of attitudinal shift toward the message source.

b. The present experiment did not appear to provide support for the correction for incredulity. Highly positive concepts and sources shifted as much or more than did the mildly positive sources and concepts. A nonparametric sign test performed on the changes in ratings of source and topic showed that six of the eight highly positive (+3) concepts and shifted significantly after exposure to the experimental messages. The correction for incredulity would state that no change at all should occur in such situations, where a (+3) source has exhibited unfavorability toward a (+3) concept. Thus, the experimental results would appear to provide little support for the Osgood and Tannenbaum incredulity notions. Failure to account for incredulity effects therefore seems an unacceptable explanation for the experimental results in the case of the source variable.

Implications

Results from both experimental and control groups would indicate that the experimental manipulations were successful in creating impressions of various levels of message intensity. In each case, the direction and level of intensity were perceived in accord with the particular manipulations. The manipulation of modifiers and verbs connoting evaluative intensity would thus appear to result in perceptions of message intensity consistent with these manipulations. It has been shown that it is possible to induce judgments of differing levels of message intensity. There may of course be other ways.

Only a small subset of the possible intra-message manipulations were used in the experiment. The eight messages have hardly exhausted the available verbs and modifiers which might result in perceptions of differing levels of intensity. Additional inquiry into the many adverbs, adjectives and verbs available for manipulation is needed. Only those few verbs for which there had been some a priori reason for assuming a predictable resultant effect on intensity were used. There are a multitude of verbs for which there was no such available information. It seems probable that different levels of intensity are connoted by verbs such as: love; like; is enamored of; finds tolerable; adores; worships; pities; is kindly toward; and a number of others. Without some rigorous way of determining precisely what degree of intensity these verbs connote, it is impossible to create messages which can be said to be of one particular level of intensity.

Contextual variables might also be considered for their relationships to perceived message intensity. The size and style of type used for

relaying certain pieces of information within the message, the amount of "white space" setting off a particular passage, use of punctuation and a wide variety of other non-verbal cues have previously been related to attention to and retention of various message segments. Contextual cues can apparently increase the amount of attention paid to particular stimuli within the message. Thus, cues could be used which would increase the attention given to those words which influence judgments of message intensity. The result would be that the intensity of the message would then become a greater factor in determining the effects of that message, whether those effects be in terms of resultant persuasion, strain toward congruity, or whatever. Message intensity is a significant variable.

Variables which would increase the probability of message intensity having a major influence on what effects a message may have should therefore prove similarly significant. If one expects greater absolute evaluative shift to result from higher levels of message intensity, it appears logical that those contextual variables which would increase the importance of the particular variable (intensity) would then increase the likelihood that such effects would be found.

The present experiment has viewed intensity within the written message. It would be valuable to examine intensity within other code systems as well. The variables which contribute to perceived intensity in gestural communication, music, spoken messages, pictorial communication, and written messages might well be different. The function of intensity, however, should remain somewhat similar.

It seems obvious that more research which would investigate the predictions made by the congruity principle is needed. While this experiment found the principle quite successful in predicting direction of evaluative change, the mathematical predictions of the amount of attitudinal shift did not correspond well to the amount of shift actually obtained. The average deviation between predicted and obtained change was 1.34 scale units on a seven point scale. Although taking account of assertion intensity appears a step toward increased predictability, additional steps are necessary if the congruity model is to be a useful tool.

Rokeach (1965) has suggested that the congruity principle fails to account for the relative importance of the various attitudinal objects to the message receiver. This might be given further consideration. Perhaps the notion of relative importance is an additional variable which might also provide some increased precision.

In any event, the congruity principle in its present state seems oversimplified and, probably as a result, quite imprecise. Other variables must be investigated and their relationships to congruity model predictions must be determined. Then, and perhaps only then, can the congruity principle be employed as any sort of rigorous scientific principle.

## Research Extension

To begin with, an enlarged program of research into the effects of varied levels of intensity in combination with differentially

polarized sources and concepts is required. Both congruous and incongruous relationships should be reexamined and investigated. More experimental inquiry into the effects of manipulations of evaluative assertion intensity would at least be a start toward examining an area which stands in need of a substantial amount of future research.

Some investigation into the correlation of message intensity and attitude change is warranted. Is there a simple, direct relation between level of intensity and amount of attitudinal shift? Perhaps this relationship is dependent upon the evaluative intensity of the source and the message topic. If more intense messages do not necessarily result in greater attitude change, then under what conditions will they do so? This is an area into which additional experimentation is necessary.

Message intensity itself appears to be an interesting variable. Stimulus intensity has been shown to be related to attention and perception. More intense stimuli are more likely to be oriented toward or noticed. Stimulus intensity would thus have some effect on the probability of exposure to a given stimulus complex. If messages are indeed perceived in terms of differential amounts of stimulus intensity, some resultant consequences in the probability of exposure would be expected. Tannenbaum (1955) has stated that headlines, as message "indices", should affect the interpretation of a message, as well as the probability that the message will be read. The intensity of a headline (or the intensity of the assertion expressed in the headline) should thus affect

both the interpretation of the message and the probability that exposure to the message will occur.

If selective exposure is at all related to cognitive consistency as some authors (Klapper; 1960) have claimed, those variables which affect perceived balance or consistency should then have some consequences related to selective exposure. Since message intensity would seem to have some effects on the perception of cognitive congruity, any possible effects on selective exposure should then be worthy of study.

Somewhat related to the notions of consistency is the work of Sherif and Hovland (1961) and Manis (1961). These authors have postulated latitudes of acceptance and rejection. Their research has found that ambiguous messages are more readily assimilated than unambiguous messages. Highly intense messages would appear to be somewhat less ambiguous than mildly intense messages. Message intensity might thus have some effects upon the probabilities that a given message would be assimilated or contrasted. This thus appears to be another area which would warrant some amount of future empirical concern.

Message intensity may be a more persimonious way of examining some message characteristics. The researcher could well examine those variables which would serve to make a message perceived as more intense (for example: level of fear arousal; how one-sided the message is; to what degree so-called "opinionated language" is employed). Thus, message intensity could perhaps serve as a more general framework within which various message elements and characteristics might be studied. One could examine various message elements in terms of how they contribute

to some overall index of how strongly the source is perceived to feel about the message topic.

If message characteristics such as those listed above can be shown to have direct consequences on the perceived intensity of a message, message intensity might well serve as an organizing principle among areas which have not been related by prior research. Research findings might thus be coordinated in a more meaningful structure, thus facilitating both future research into these variables as well as the development of some organized theoretical propositions. Employed in this way, message intensity could well have value, not only in stimulating additional research, but in providing some framework within which to view prior research. The latter function could hopefully provide some aid in constructing significant theories of communication.

There is a definite need for future research into the ways of manipulating and measuring the level of intensity in a message or assertion. Message intensity should prove to be a significant variable, with probable effects on perception of consistency, amount of attitude change, probability of exposure, probability of assimilation and perhaps other criterion variables as well. What is first required, however, is a rigorous, specific set of operations whereby one may successfully manipulate intensity as well as a valid and reliable instrument with which to measure levels of evaluative intensity. If any amount of research is to be devoted to the effects of message intensity, some scientific method of determining exactly what is being dealt with is needed. When some information about the variable itself has been acquired, it would then be profitable to investigate its resultant effects.

The attempts at measurement of intensity by Osgood and Westley should provide some impetus and some aid in developing a less cumbersome measuring instrument. Certainly the present experiment has at least provided some indication that message intensity might be manipulated as well as one possible means of doing so. Expansion and explication of the possible ways of manipulating intensity is now required.

Message intensity may well be any entire new area for research, or perhaps some new synthesis of prior research. At any rate, it is hoped that this experiment has at least provided some initial inquiry into this area which might aid in generating future research and perhaps assist in providing an additional framework within which to view some of the existing research.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dodd, S. C. and Gerbrick, T. R. Word scales for degree of opinion. Language and Speech, 1960, 3, 18-31.

Festinger, L. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance New York: Row, Peterson, 1957.

Fishbein, M. and Hunter, R. Summation versus balance in attitude organization and change. Journ. Abnorm. Soc. Psych., 1964, 69, 505-510.

Heider, F. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations New York: Wiley, 1958.

Klapper, J. T. The Effects of Communication New York: The Free Press, 1960.

Manis, M. The interpretation of opinion statements as a function of message ambiguity and recipient attitude. Journ. Abnorm. Soc. Psych., 1961, 63, 76-81.

Newcomb, T. M. An approach to the study of communicative acts. Psychol. Review, 1953, 60, 393-404.

Osgood, C. E. The representational model and relevant research methods. in Pool, I. (ed.) Trends in Content Analysis Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1959, 33-88.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. and Tannenbaum, P. H. The Measurement of Meaning Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Osgood, C. E. and Tannenbaum, P. H. The principle of congruity in the prediction of attitude change. Psychol. Review, 1955, 62, 42-55.

Rokeach, M. and Rothman, G. The principle of belief congruence and the congruity principle as models of cognitive interaction. Psychol. Review, 1965, 72, 128-143.

Sherif, M. and Hovland, C. Social Judgment New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Siegel, S. Nonparametric Statistics New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Tannenbaum, P. H. The indexing process in communication. Public Opinion Quart., 1955, 19, 292-302.

Tannenbaum, P. H. Initial attitude toward source and concept as factors in attitude change through communication. Public Opinion Quart., 1956, 20, 413-425.

Tannenbaum, P. H. Mediated generalization of attitude change via the principle of congruity. Journ. Person. Soc. Psych., 1966, 3, 493-499.

Tannenbaum, P. H. and Norris E. Effects of combining congruity principle strategies for the reduction of persuasion. Sociometry, 1965, 28, 145-157.

Tannenbaum, P. H., Mcaulay, J. and Norris, E. The principle of congruity and reduction of persuasion. Journ. Person. Soc. Psych., 1966, 3, 233-238.

Triandis, H. and Fishbein, M. Cognitive interaction in person perception. Journ. Abnorm. Soc. Psych., 1963, 67, 446-453.

Walker, H. and Lev, J. Statistical Inference New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953.

Westley, B., Higbie, C., Burke, T., Lippert, D., Maurer, L. and Stone, V. The news magazines and the 1960 conventions. Journ. Quart., 1963, 40, 525-531.

# APPENDIX A

## FIRST PRETEST QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE

We are trying to find out what Michigan State University students think about certain current topics and people in the news. For this reason we are asking that you fill out the following questionnaire.

INSTRUCTIONS:

On the following pages of the questionnaire are a number of topics and people. Each concept is accompanied by a number of adjective pairs. You are asked to rate the concepts on each of the scales according to your personal feelings about the concept.

For example:

"Admission of Red China to the United Nations"

| Wise | | | | | | | Foolish |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| +3 | +2 | +1 | 0 | -1 | -2 | -3 | |

If you thought the idea put forth was very wise, you would put a check at (+3). If you thought it was wise, you would check (+2). If you thought it was slightly wise, you would check (+1). If you thought it was neither wise nor foolish, or about equally wise and foolish, you would check (0). If you thought that it was very foolish, you would check (-3), foolish (-2), or just slightly foolish, you would check (-1).

An example of a completed scale would be:

| Good | | | X | | | | Bad |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

This indicates that the person thought that the topic was "slightly good."

Please complete the following items. DO NOT OMIT ANY SCALES. If you feel that a particular scale does not apply to the concept, please CIRCLE the scale.

"FLUORIDATED WATER"

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

"WAR ON POVERTY"

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

John Glenn, Astronaut

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

Frank Kelley, Michigan State Attorney General

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

"Student Voice in University Affairs"

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | : | : | : | : | : | : | Worthless |
| Nice | : | : | : | : | : | : | Awful |
| Bad | : | : | : | : | : | : | Good |
| Wise | : | : | : | : | : | : | Foolish |
| Unimportant | : | : | : | : | : | : | Important |
| Fair | : | : | : | : | : | : | Unfair |

Arthur Goldberg, Ambassador to the U. N.

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | : | : | : | : | : | : | Worthless |
| Nice | : | : | : | : | : | : | Awful |
| Bad | : | : | : | : | : | : | Good |
| Wise | : | : | : | : | : | : | Foolish |
| Unimportant | : | : | : | : | : | : | Important |
| Fair | : | : | : | : | : | : | Unfair |

William Scranton, former Republican Governor of Pennsylvania

Valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____Worthless

Nice____:____:____:____:____:____:____Awful

Bad____:____:____:____:____:____:____Good

Wise____:____:____:____:____:____:____Foolish

Unimportant____:____:____:____:____:____:____Important

Fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unfair

"Federal Regulations for Auto Safety Devices"

Valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____Worthless

Nice____:____:____:____:____:____:____Awful

Bad____:____:____:____:____:____:____Good

Wise____:____:____:____:____:____:____Foolish

Unimportant____:____:____:____:____:____:____Important

Fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unfair

"Community Chest Campaigns"

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

Robert Kennedy, Democratic Senator from New York

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

Ralph Nader, Author of Unsafe at Any Speed

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

"Raising the Minimum Wage"

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

"Increasing the Number of Cultural Centers in the U.S."

Valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____Worthless

Nice____:____:____:____:____:____:____Awful

Bad____:____:____:____:____:____:____Good

Wise____:____:____:____:____:____:____Foolish

Unimportant____:____:____:____:____:____:____Important

Fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unfair

Walter Cronkite, CBS News Commentator

Valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____Worthless

Nice____:____:____:____:____:____:____Awful

Bad____:____:____:____:____:____:____Good

Wise____:____:____:____:____:____:____Foolish

Unimportant____:____:____:____:____:____:____Important

Fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unfair

John Steinbeck, Nobel Prize-Winning Author

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

"Permitting Communist Speakers to Talk on Campus"

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

"Reduction of Macinac Bridge Tolls"

Valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____Worthless

Nice____:____:____:____:____:____:____Awful

Bad____:____:____:____:____:____:____Good

Wise____:____:____:____:____:____:____Foolish

Unimportant____:____:____:____:____:____:____Important

Fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unfair

"Federal Education Loans to Students"

Valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____Worthless

Nice____:____:____:____:____:____:____Awful

Bad____:____:____:____:____:____:____Good

Wise____:____:____:____:____:____:____Foolish

Unimportant____:____:____:____:____:____:____Important

Fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unfair

Dwight D. Eisenhower, former President

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

Jacob Javitz, Republican Senator from New York

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

"Use of Hypnosis in Psychological Research"

Valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____Worthless

Nice____:____:____:____:____:____:____Awful

Bad____:____:____:____:____:____:____Good

Wise____:____:____:____:____:____:____Foolish

Unimportant____:____:____:____:____:____:____Important

Fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unfair

The Surgeon General of the United States

Valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____Worthless

Nice____:____:____:____:____:____:____Awful

Bad____:____:____:____:____:____:____Good

Wise____:____:____:____:____:____:____Foolish

Unimportant____:____:____:____:____:____:____Important

Fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unfair

The Peace Corps

Valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____Worthless

Nice____:____:____:____:____:____:____Awful

Bad____:____:____:____:____:____:____Good

Wise____:____:____:____:____:____:____Foolish

Unimportant____:____:____:____:____:____:____Important

Fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unfair

"Dissection of Animals for Laboratory Research"

Valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____Worthless

Nice____:____:____:____:____:____:____Awful

Bad____:____:____:____:____:____:____Good

Wise____:____:____:____:____:____:____Foolish

Unimportant____:____:____:____:____:____:____Important

Fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unfair

Bertrand Russell, British Author and Philosopher

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

Max Murningham, Mayor of Lansing

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

The Committee to Rescue Italian Art

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | Unfair |

"Federal Regulations to Guard Against Air Pollution"

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | Unfair |

George Romney, Republican Governor of Michigan

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

"Academy Awards for Movie Performances"

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

Henry Fowler, Secretary of the U.S. Treasury

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

United States Public Health Service

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

# APPENDIX B

# FIRST PRETEST RESULTS

| CONCEPTS | Mean Pretest Ratings |
|---|---|
| "Fluoridated Water" | 5.91 |
| "The War on Poverty" | 5.25 |
| John Glenn | 5.75 |
| Frank Kelley | 4.76 |
| "Student Voice in University Affairs" | 6.04 |
| Arthur Goldberg | 5.63 |
| William Scranton | 4.99 |
| "Federal Regulations for Auto Safety Devices" | 5.43 |
| "Community Chest Campaigns" | 5.48 |
| Robert Kennedy | 4.59 |
| Ralph Nader | 4.42 |
| "Raising the Minimum Wage" | 5.08 |
| "Increasing the Number of Cultural Centers" | 5.63 |
| Walter Cronkite | 5.82 |
| John Steinbeck | 5.61 |
| "Permitting Communist Speakers to Talk on Campus" | 5.22 |
| "Reduction of Macinac Bridge Tolls" | 5.66 |
| "Federal Education Loans" | 6.28 |
| Dwight Eisenhower | 5.13 |
| Jacob Javits | 5.10 |
| "Use of Hypnosis in Psychological Research" | 5.36 |
| The Surgeon General | 5.20 |
| The Peace Corps | 5.95 |
| "Dissection of Animals for Laboratory Research" | 5.85 |

| CONCEPTS | Mean Pretest Ratings |
|---|---|
| Bertrand Russell | 4.78 |
| Max Murninghan | 4.19 |
| "The Committee to Rescue Italian Art" | 5.76 |
| "Federal Regulations to Guard Against Air Pollution" | 6.34 |
| George Romney | 6.02 |
| "Academy Awards for Movie Performances" | 4.55 |
| Henry Fowler | 4.80 |
| United States Public Health Service | 5.99 |

# APPENDIX C

# EXPERIMENTAL PRETEST QUESTIONNAIRE

Name:

STUDENT OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

We are presently conducting a student opinion poll at Michigan State University. Our purpose is to determine what students think about certain topics and people in the news. For this reason we hope that you will help us by filling out the following questionnaire.

INSTRUCTIONS:

On the following pages of the questionnaire are a number of topics and people. Below, each concept is a number of adjective scales. You are asked to rate the concepts on each of the accompanying scales according to your own, personal feelings about the concept.

For example:

"Admission of Red China to the United Nations"

| Wise | : | : | : | : | : | : | Foolish |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Very | Quite | Slightly | Neutral | Slightly | Quite | Very |

If you thought that the idea put forth was very wise, you would check the scale at that point. Similarly, if you thought that it was quite wise, slightly wise, very foolish, quite foolish, or slightly foolish, you would check the appropriate scale position. If you thought that the idea was neither wise nor foolish, or about equally wise and foolish, you would check the neutral position on the scale.

| Good | : | : | : | : | : | : | Bad |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | X | | | | |

This indicates that the person thought that the topic was "slightly good."

Please complete the following items. Make only one check mark on each scale. DO NOT OMIT ANY SCALES.

Please write your name on the top of this paper. Your answers to the items in this questionnaire will be strictly confidential. Your name is required only for opinion data collection and compilation purposes. It will not be used in reporting any results.

Jacob Javits, Republican Senator from New York

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

The Peace Corps

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

"Raising the Minimum Wage"

Valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____Worthless

Nice____:____:____:____:____:____:____Awful

Bad____:____:____:____:____:____:____Good

Wise____:____:____:____:____:____:____Foolish

Unimportant____:____:____:____:____:____:____Important

Fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unfair

George Romney, Republican Governor of Michigan

Valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____Worthless

Nice____:____:____:____:____:____:____Awful

Bad____:____:____:____:____:____:____Good

Wise____:____:____:____:____:____:____Foolish

Unimportant____:____:____:____:____:____:____Important

Fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unfair

William Scranton, former Pennsylvania Governor

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

"Permitting Communist Speakers to Talk on Campus"

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valuable | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Worthless |
| Nice | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Awful |
| Bad | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Good |
| Wise | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Foolish |
| Unimportant | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Important |
| Fair | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ Unfair |

"Student Voice in University Affairs"

Valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____Worthless

Nice____:____:____:____:____:____:____Awful

Bad____:____:____:____:____:____:____Good

Wise____:____:____:____:____:____:____Foolish

Unimportant____:____:____:____:____:____:____Important

Fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unfair

General William C. Westmoreland
Commander in Chief of Armed Forces/Vietnam

Valuable____:____:____:____:____:____:____Worthless

Nice____:____:____:____:____:____:____Awful

Bad____:____:____:____:____:____:____Good

Wise____:____:____:____:____:____:____Foolish

Unimportant____:____:____:____:____:____:____Important

Fair____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unfair

# APPENDIX D

# EXPERIMENTAL MESSAGES

SCRANTON OPPOSED TO RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

New York (AP) -

In addressing a New York meeting of federal economists, William Scranton has somewhat disagreed with those who would propose an increase in the hourly minimum wage. The present federal minimum hourly wage is $1.40. Proposals have asked for an increase to between $1.55 and $1.70 an hour.

Scranton stated that there is very little need for an increase in wages at the present time. He added, "Not only would an increase seem fairly unwarranted at this time, it would perhaps be detrimental to the economy." Scranton said that the proposed increase might possibly endanger our present rate of economic growth.

The former Pennsylvania Governor said that the present move to raise the minimum wage is probably unnecessary. He contended that part of our present labor force would be unaffected by a raise from the current hourly baseline.

Scranton stated that any increase might serve to moderately harm the future of the small businessman. Also, it would probably deplete our available part-time labor supply.

It was pointed out to the economists that increasing the present minimum wage might possibly restrict some of management's training programs. He said, "Management perhaps cannot afford to increase their present level of expenditure in this area. Certainly they cannot without somewhat reducing their involvement in essential work-training programs."

Scranton concluded his talk by stating, "I can see little worthwhile purpose that might be served by altering the minimum wage. I can only point out the possible foolishness of this somewhat wasteful action."

# JAVITS AGAINST COMMUNIST CAMPUS SPEAKERS

New York (AP) -

In addressing a New York meeting of newspaper editors, Senator Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) has somewhat objected to the practice of allowing Communist Party members to speak on university campuses.

Javits told the editors that the issue, as far as he is concerned, is probably not one of free speech. According to the New York Senator, a somewhat important issue is that we appear to be indicating to the taxpayers that we might welcome Communist or Socialist extremists to our state-supported schools.

The Republican Senator indicated that he did not completely believe that students were easily influenced by radical speakers. He added, "However, subjecting some students to extreme philosophies may be slightly undesirable and a bit dangerous."

Javits stated that his primary concern is whether we appear to be turning over the nation's colleges and universities as platforms for proponents of comparatively extreme positions - all in the name of so-called "free speech".

He said, "The possible danger of Communist speakers may be in their moderate ability to harm the good image of our state schools." The Senator added that such a practice also asks the majority to be exposed to an extremist minority.

ROMNEY STRONGLY AGAINST INCREASING STUDENT INFLUENCE

Detroit (AP) -

Michigan Governor George Romney has come out in strong opposition to proposals that student influence in university affairs be increased.

In a speech delivered at a Tuesday press luncheon, Romney pointedly objected to the trend toward enlarging the role of student voice in the operation of the nation's colleges and universities.

The Republican Presidential hopeful contended that most students are not emotionally prepared to involve themselves to any extent in the complex workings of a large university. He said, "A person must achieve an adequate maturational level before seeking additional responsibilities. Most students have not arrived at a high enough level of responsibility-taking to significantly participate in the university system."

The Governor added that a majority of our university students are definitely incapable of seeing the long-term consequences of their actions.

Romney stated that he could see no reason at all why students should feel the need to participate in the affairs of their colleges and universities. He said, "The present system has very evidently been more than adequate to produce the world's finest institutions of higher learning. I see no need to make any changes in this system at the present."

# ROMNEY OPPOSES PEACE CORPS

Detroit (AP) -

Governor George Romney has come out as somewhat opposed to the present efforts of the Peace Corps.

In a speech delivered at a Tuesday press luncheon, the Michigan Governor moderately attacked the current lack of significant effects coming from the organization. Romney stated that the governments of the nations involved in Peace Corps projects have mildly criticized the Corps.

Little actual progress appears to have been made in increasing literacy, reducing disease, or establishing good will, he said. "In short, the Peace Corps has occasionally failed to accomplish its stated goals", Romney pointed out.

Romney added that returning Peace Corps members are partially disillusioned and, to some degree, dissatisfied with the comparative lack of action and accomplishment. He claimed that our national image has possibly suffered.

In addition, Romney said, "We may be endangering the potential talent of those who have volunteered by perhaps destroying their high ideals with our present inactivity."

The Governor concluded his remarks by stating that, at present, the Peace Corps seems to be a partial waste of public funds. He added that the situation is somewhat in need of change. This change might well come very soon if we are to maximally salvage the effectiveness of the Peace Corps, he said.

# APPENDIX E

# EXPERIMENTAL POSTTEST

# NEWS REACTION STUDY

The purpose of this study is to determine the general reaction of students to various current events news items. You will be asked to read a selected story from a major daily newspaper, and to express your opinions about this story. All the stories appeared sometime within the last four weeks.

On the next page is such a news story. Please read the story, after which we will ask for your opinions about it. As you read the article, please underline what you consider to be the main points. Underline the phrase or sentence (or as much as you think necessary) which indicate the main points.

TURN THE PAGE AND BEGIN.

INSTRUCTIONS:

We would now like to ask you your personal opinions about this particular story. There are no right or wrong answers. We are merely attempting to determine your personal opinions about the person and what he said.

On the next page are a number of topics related to the story. The scales associated with the topics are similar to those which you have used before. Please complete each scale. Mark each scale according to the way you presently feel, now, after having read the news story.

TURN THE PAGE AND BEGIN.

1. Now strongly would you say that the person described in the article felt about the topic he was discussing? (CIRCLE one)

| VERY STRONGLY OPPOSED | QUITE OPPOSED | SLIGHTLY OPPOSED | NEUTRAL | SLIGHTLY IN FAVOR | QUITE IN FAVOR | VERY STRONGLY IN FAVOR |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

2. Jacob Javits

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Active | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Passive |
| Valuable | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Worthless |
| Unimportant | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Important |
| Good | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Bad |
| Weak | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Strong |
| Unfair | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Fair |
| Nice | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Awful |
| Cool | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Warm |
| Wise | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Foolish |

"Permitting Communist Speakers to Talk on Campus"

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Active | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Passive |
| Valuable | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Worthless |
| Unimportant | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Important |
| Good | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Bad |
| Weak | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Strong |
| Unfair | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Fair |
| Nice | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Awful |
| Cool | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Warm |
| Wise | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | Foolish |

PLEASE CHECK TO BE SURE YOU HAVE MADE ONE, AND ONLY ONE, MARK ON EACH SCALE.