

DOGMATISM AND RIGIDITY AS DETERMINANTS OF COGNITION

Thosis for the Degree of M. A. MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE Warren Carl Mc Govney
1953



This is to certify that the

DOGMATISM AND RIGIDITY AS DETERMINANTS OF COGNITION

presented by

WARREN CARL McGOVNEY

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

M.A. degree in Psychology

Date June

0-169

Oc 31 '53 7101-16 53 Apr 13 53

DCGRATISM AND RIGIDITY AS DETERMINANTS OF COGNITION

 $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{y}$

Warren Carl McGovney

A THESIS

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

THESIS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his most sincere thanks to Dr. Milton Rokeach, whose guidance, interest and encouragement made this investigation a valuable and fascinating experience for the author. Loving thanks are also due the writer's wife, Suzanne, for her constant patience and help.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction		Fage]			
II.	The Denny Doodlebug Problem						
III.	II. Subjects and Procedure						
IV.	Results		Page	18			
V.	Discussion		Page	28			
VI.	Summary and Conclusio	ns	Page	33			
Bibli	ography						
Ap	pendix A The Californ Inventory Ri	ia Psychological gidity Scale					
Ap	pendix B The Dogmatis	m Scale					
Ap	pendix C Battery of T to the 109 S		đ				

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	1	MEAN DOGNATISM AND RIGIDITY SCORES FOR THE GROUPS TESTED	Page	19
TABLE	2	COMPARISON BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW DOGNATIC GROUPS AND BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW RIGID GROUPS ON THE TOTAL TIME TAKEN TO SOLVE THE DENNY DOODLEBUG PROBLEM	Page	19
TABLE	3	COMPARISON BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW RIGID GROUPS AND BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW DOGMATIC GROUPS ON THE VARIOUS MEASURES INVOLVING THE OVERCOMING OF SETS	Page	22
TABLE	4	TIME TAKEN TO SOLVE THE DENNY DOODLEBUG PROBLEM AFTER THE FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD SETS WERE OVER- COME BY HIGH AND LOW DOGMATIC GROUPS AND HIGH AND LOW RIGID GROUPS	Page	24

INTRODUCTION

The present study is part of a larger project presently underway under the direction of Dr. Milton Rokeach of Michigan State College on the phenomenon of dogmatism. The primary aim here will be to investigate certain cognitive aspects of dogmatism and to distinguish such aspects from rigidity. Within the past several years, a great volume of research has been done concerning the concept of rigidity (1) (3) (4) (5) (6). On the contrary, very little has been undertaken concerning the nature of dogmatism until quite recently (7) (8). It is not the intent of this research to present the historical development of the concept of rigidity since the data available is so voluminous that this would constitute a major task in itself. However, the concept of dogmatism is a relatively new one and will be discussed rather fully in the paragraphs to follow.

Rokeach (8) bases his concept of dogmatism on the observations of a number of persons in real life situations who, in various social contexts, were observed to be dogmatic. He defines dogmatism as follows: "(1) a closed cognitive system of thinking and believing about reality, (2) organized around a set of authoritarian beliefs and (3) providing a frame of reference for attitudes of intolerance and qualified tolerance toward people in general." (8, p. 3)

This investigation concerns itself primarily with the first defining characteristic of dogmatism, namely, its closed character. Rokeach conceives further of two levels of resistance to change, rigidity and dogmatism. "Rigidity refers to person-to-thing or animal-to-thing relations (and) dogmatism by its very nature refers to person-to-person communication." (8, p. 4)

Dogmatism is distinguished from rigidity as follows, according to Rokeach:

Both dogmatism and rigidity refer to forms of resistance to change but dogmatism is conceived to represent a relatively more intellectualized and abstract form than rigidity. Where dogmatism refers to organizations of ideas, beliefs and attitudes into closed ideological systems, rigidity has been generally defined in terms of the way a person or an animal attacks, solves or learns specific tasks and problems having alternative solutions. Thus dogmatism is seen as a higher-order, more organized form of resistance to change (8, p. 4).

Experiments on rigidity have been confined to the subject's ability or inability to overcome a <u>single</u> experimental set or approach to a problem. This is true of the map studies undertaken by Rokeach (5), the jar problems of Luchins (4) and many of the various measures reported by Cattell and Tiner (1). It is also evident in the following definition of rigidity:

Rigidity is defined as "...the inability to change one's set when the objective conditions demand it, as the inability to restructure a field in which there are alternative solutions to a problem in order to solve that problem more efficiently." (5)

Dogmatism, on the other hand, refers to <u>organizations</u> of sets rather than single sets. These closed sets are organized into a belief system and a disbelief system. The former refers to those beliefs accepted as true; the latter refers to all other alternatives accepted as false. These alternatives are not all salient to the belief system, but those which are the closest are the ones most vehemently attacked. Thus while the Communists attack Capitalism they are most vehement in their attack on the Trotskyites (8).

The cognitive structure of the dogmatic individual is further differentiated in terms of central and peripheral parts. The central part has to do with those about positive and negative authority; peripheral are those which are seen to emanate from positive and negative authority. Those beliefs seen to emanate from positive authority are perceived as true and those seen to emanate from negative authority are perceived as false. It is this relationship between central and peripheral which gives the closed system its systematic character. Dogmatic individuals do not resist change per se, for a change can be brought about rapidly if it is initiated by the central authority figure. Rokeach points out further that there is no communication between the peripheral beliefs but only between central and peripheral parts. A change in one peripheral belief will not affect a change in any other peripheral beliefs; the cognitive structure remains the same although the content may change. Thus it can be said

that while various peripheral beliefs are systematically related to each other via the central authority region there is nevertheless a lack of intercommunication or integration among the various peripheral beliefs.

Rokeach points out further differentiation between dogmatism and rigidity (8) by stating that one can tie his shoelaces rigidly but he can never tie his shoelaces dogmatically. The expression of dogmatism depends upon a social situation; an individual can never be dogmatic when alone, its expression depends on the interchange of ideas or beliefs. It is in regard to this social aspect that Rokeach has introduced the idea that the dogmatic individual has a closed cognitive system (8) in that his own views are impervious to change. He insulates himself from the recognition of views which are in opposition to his own beliefs. In this respect Rokeach discusses a number of cognitive mechanisms which the individual may use to coerce reality so that it conforms with his own particular belief system (8). Methods designed to preserve one's belief-disbelief system intact are: (a) cognitive isolation between belief and disbelief system, (b) assimilation into the belief system, (c) cognitive isolation within the belief system, (d) de-differentiation within the disbelief system: the accentuation of similarities and the minimization of differences and (e) cognitive narrowing.

Set may be defined as an expectancy that a particular

type of behavior will lead to a particular result. The purpose of the present investigation is to demonstrate experimentally the difference between dogmatism and rigidity. The intent is to confront subjects with a cognitive task which, if it is to be solved, involves two discrete stages of problem solution: (1) the overcoming of two or more separate sets and (2) the integration of the sets overcome into a solution of the problem. It is the general hypothesis that individuals high and low in rigidity, as measured by a personality scale, will be distinguished from each other on (1) above, namely, their relative ease in overcoming separate sets. On the other hand, it is further hypothesized that individuals high and low in dogmatism, as measured by a personality scale, will be distinguished from each other on (2) above, namely, their relative ease in integrating sets already overcome. More specifically, the following six hypotheses will be tested:

- A. Concerning total time taken to solve the problem which involves both the overcoming of sets and their integration:
 - 1. Persons high in rigidity should take more time to complete the problem than persons low in rigidity.
 - 2. Persons high in dogmatism should take more time to complete the problem than persons low in dogmatism.
- B. Concerning the overcoming of specific sets:
 - Persons known to be high in rigidity should take more time in the overcoming of the sets than persons low in rigidity.

- 2. Persons high in dogmatism should take no more time in overcoming the sets than persons low in dogmatism.
- C. Concerning the integration of sets already overcome:
 - 1. Persons high in dogmatism should take more time in integrating the sets already overcome than persons low in dogmatism.
 - 2. Persons high in rigidity should take no more time in integrating the sets already overcome than persons low in rigidity.

THE DENNY DOODLEBUG PROBLEM

The cognitive task employed will be called the Denny Doodlebug Problem. This problem was devised by Dr. M. Ray Denny of Michigan State College while he was a student at the University of Iowa and revised by Dr. Milton Rokeach, Dr. M. Ray Denny, Mr. Elliot Beitner and the writer.

The problem as given to the subjects is as follows:
THE CONDITIONS:

Joe Doodlebug is a strange sort of imaginary bug. He can and cannot do the following things:

- 1. He can jump in only four different directions, north, south, east and west, not diagonally. (Not southeast, northwest, etc.)
- 2. Once he starts in any direction, that is north, south, east or west, he must jump four times in that same direction before he can switch to another direction.
- 3. He can only jump, not crawl, fly or walk.
- 4. He can jump very large distances or very small distances, but not less than one inch per jump.
- 5. Joe cannot turn around.

THE SITUATION:

Joe has been jumping all over the place getting some exercise when his master places a pile of food three feet directly west of him. Joe notices that the pile of food is a little larger than he. As soon as Joe sees all this food he stops dead in his tracks facing north. After all his exercise Joe is very hungry and wants to get to the food as quickly as he possibly can. Joe examines the situation and then says, "Darn it, I'll have to jump four times to get the food!"

THE PROBLEM:

Joe Doodlebug was a smart bug and he was dead right in his conclusion. Why do you suppose Joe Doodlebug had to take four jumps, no more and no less, to reach the food?

The correct solution is that Joe had already taken one jump east before the food was placed down and therefore had to take three more jumps east before he could change his direction and then take one big sideways jump west to the food; a total of four jumps as required by the problem.

To be noted first is that this problem includes three discrete sets or, if you will, three isolated beliefs which must first be overcome and then interrelated in order to arrive at the correct solution. The mere overcoming of the three sets will not in itself lead to the solution. The sets must also be integrated. The sets in the problem are as follows:

- (a) The facing set: Joe does not have to face the food in order to eat it.
- (b) The direction set: Joe can jump sideways and backwards as well as forward.
- (c) The movement set: Joe was moving east when the food was presented.

The overcoming of each of these sets necessitates the removal of older sets. The subject is asked during the experiment to go along with a hypothetical system of reality which contradicts present reality and which involves the overcoming, at least temporarily, of sets inherent in present reality

for the sake of solving the problem. In the case of set

(a) above (the facing set) the subjects must overcome the

notion that the food must be faced from the north, south,

the east or the west and arrive at the notion that Joe

can face the food by landing on top of it. As can be

seen from the conditions set forth the food is a bit larger

in area than Joe. In the case of set (b) the subjects had

to overcome the idea that Joe could only jump forward. He

could, of course, also jump sideways and backwards. Set

(c) requires the subject to perceive Joe in the process of

moving rather than at the beginning of a sequence of four

jumps in a given direction as the problem begins.

It should be noted further that the overcoming of each of the sets itself will not necessarily lead to the solution. An integration of these three sets is indispensable for the solution. The solution of the problem, namely, that Joe jumps three times sideways to the east and once sideways to the west to land on top of the food, involves the integration of each of the three sets.

If the theoretical distinction between the two concepts, dogmatism and rigidity, is a valid one then one should expect that subjects high in rigidity, as measured by a personality scale, should take more time to overcome the first set, more time to overcome the second set and more time to overcome the third set than subjects low in rigidity (Hypothesis B,1). Conversely, subjects high in dogmatism, as

measured by another personality scale, by virtue of the greater strength of their closed system should take more time to integrate the sets already overcome into a new system as compared with those low in dogmatism (Hypothesis C,1). Furthermore, one should not expect that subjects differing in dogmatism would differ significantly in speed of overcoming specific sets (Hypothesis B,2), nor should one expect subjects differing in rigidity to differ significantly in speed of integration (Hypothesis C,2).

SUBJECTS AND PROCEDURE

One hundred and nine students, mostly sophomores, enrolled in Psychology 201 at Michigan State College were employed as subjects. These students were all native white and non-Jewish with a mean age of 20.44 years. There were 64 males and 45 females in this group. These subjects were given a battery of tests which included the twenty-two item "California Psychological Inventory Rigidity Scale" devised by Dr. Harrison Gough and Dr. Nevitt Sanford (3). This test is shown in Appendix A. Dr. Gough and Dr. Sanford report an uncorrected split-half reliability of .93. In another study by Rokeach, it was found to have a reliability of .83, corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula.

Also given was the "Dogmatism Scale" (7) as devised by Dr. Milton Rokeach. This is a thirty-six item test and is shown in Appendix B. This test, in the present study, was found to have a reliability of .73, corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula. Both of these tests were scored by the use of a Likert-type scale ranging from plus three for complete agreement to a minus three for complete disagreement.

From the total group of 109 subjects, four groups of fifteen subjects each were chosen as follows:

- A. Fifteen subjects, eight males and seven females, who scored highest both on the Rigidity and the Dogmatism Scales.
- B. Fifteen subjects, seven males and eight females, who scored lowest both on the Rigidity and the Dogmatism Scales.
- C. Fifteen subjects, eleven males and four females, who scored low on the Rigidity Scale and high on the Dogmatism Scale.
- D. Fifteen subjects, seven males and eight females, who scored high on the Rigidity Scale and low on the Dogmatism Scale.

Thus there were a total of thirty subjects high in rigidity, (Groups A and D) and thirty subjects low in rigidity (Groups B and C). There were also a total of thirty subjects high in dogmatism, (Groups A and C) and thirty subjects low in dogmatism (Groups B and D).

These sixty subjects were then individually scheduled to take the Denny Doodlebug Froblem. Each problem interview required approximately forty-five minutes and the sixty interviews were conducted over a three and one-half week period. All of the interviews were conducted within the space of one school quarter. At no time was the writer aware of the scores obtained by the subjects on the personality tests. This information was obtained only after the data on the Denny Doodlebug Problem were analyzed by the writer.

Of the sixty subjects initially selected for individual testing, 58 showed up. Two additional subjects were selected from the larger pool of subjects to complete the sample.

Each interview was conducted in the same manner and timed with a wrist watch. The procedure and instructions were as follows:

"Today you are going to be given a newly devised test of general intelligence. The problem is not a simple one but the solution can be reached by good logical analysis. Here is the problem. Read it over carefully."

After the subject reads the problem, the experimenter continues:

"I'd like to ask you to think out loud as you work the problem so I can let you know whether you are correct or not. You may ask questions as you go along and may refer to the problem at any time and you can use the scratch paper any way you see fit. Now let's read the problem over together."

The total time allowed for the solution of the problem was thirty minutes. The experimenter willingly answered all questions pertaining to possible solutions.

For the first fifteen minutes of the problem the subject was permitted to work continuously regardless of whether he was able to overcome any or all of the three sets by himself. If he overcame any of the three sets by himself, the time taken to overcome the set was recorded. At the end of the fifteen minutes the experimenter interrupted the subject and asked:

"Have you figured it out yet?"

If the subject had not, the experimenter gave a hint designed to overcome one of the three sets. Which hint was given by the experimenter depended upon which sets the

subjects had overcome on their own. If the subjects had not solved the problem and had not overcome any of the sets, as indicated by verbal report, then the experimenter gave the first hint designed to overcome the facing set. The subjects were then told that they would be given five minutes more to solve the problem. If no solution was forthcoming at the end of this time, the subjects were given a second hint designed to overcome the direction set. The subjects were then told that they would be given five minutes more to solve the problem. If no solution was forthcoming at the end of this time, the subjects were given the third hint designed to overcome the movement set. The subjects were then told that they would be given five minutes more to solve the problem. The problem was terminated at the end of thirty minutes whether or not a solution had been reached.

In the case where subjects overcame one set on their own within the first fifteen minutes of the problem, they were given the second set at the end of that fifteen minute period and the third set at the end of the twenty minute period. In the case where subjects overcame two sets on their own within the first fifteen minutes of the problem, they were given the third hint at the end of that fifteen minute period.

By means of the procedure outlined above, three types of time measures were obtained as follows:

- 1. Total time taken to solve the problem. This total time was then broken down into two types of set scores as shown below.
- 2. Time taken to overcome sets.
 - a. Time taken to overcome the first set.
 - b. Time taken to overcome the second set.
 - c. Time taken to overcome the third set.
- 3. Time taken to integrate sets already overcome.
 - a. Time taken after the first set was overcome.
 - b. Time taken after the second set was overcome.
 - c. Time taken after the third set was overcome.

The subjects began working on the problem after the following instructions were given:

"Unless you have any questions about the problem itself, we will begin. You have fifteen minutes to solve the problem."

If the correct solution had not been reached within the fifteen minutes, the experimenter then said:

"OK, time's up. Have you figured it out yet?"
The hints were given as needed and as follows:

- 1. The facing set was given in the following way as needed:
 - "I'm going to give you a hint. 'Joe does not have to face the food in order to eat it.' (Repeat hint.) CK, I'll give you five more minutes."
- 2. The direction set was given in the following way as needed:
 - "I'll give you another hint: Joe can jump sideways and backwards as well as forward. (Repeat hint.) I'll give you five more minutes."
- 3. The movement set was given in the following way as needed:

"Let's read the problem again. (E and S reread the problem.) Now here is a last hint: 'Joe was moving east when the food was presented.' (Repeat hint.) You have five more minutes."

The interview was concluded with the following instructions:

"write down on the sheet of scratch paper just what you thought of this problem as a test of your intelligence. Your opinion is valuable to us."

When this was completed, the experimenter continued as follows:

"Before you leave I want to tell you a couple of things about the problem. First of all, it was not a test of general intelligence. Secondly, here is the solution. (This was told if S had not solved the problem.) Mrs. Thomas (the subjects' class teacher) will give you some idea as to how this problem is related to the other tests you took in class. It is extremely important that you do not discuss this problem with your classmates for previous knowledge of the problem would ruin the experiment. I might also tell you that your name will in no way be connected with the results of this experiment. Thanks for your help."

During the interview period, the experimenter recorded all the statements made by the subjects.

As an illustration of the scoring technique employed, the writer will present a typical case and indicate how it was scored. After five minutes of the problem had elapsed, the subject stated that Joe could jump sideways. At the end of the fifteen minute period only this set had been overcome and the experimenter then gave the subject the hint which gave him the facing set. After a total of twenty minutes had elapsed and the subject had not overcome

the third set, it was presented to him by the experimenter in the form of a hint. Four minutes later, twenty-four minutes after the start of the problem, the subject reached the correct solution.

In this illustration, the following scores were obtained:

- 1. The total time taken to solve the problem was twenty-four minutes.
- 2. Time taken to overcome sets.
 - a. Time taken to overcome the first set was five minutes.
 - b. Time taken to overcome the second set was fifteen minutes.
 - c. Time taken to overcome the third set was twenty minutes.
- 3. Time taken to integrate sets already overcome.
 - a. Time taken after the first set was overcome was nineteen minutes.
 - b. Time taken after the second set was overcome was nine minutes.
 - c. Time taken after the third set was overcome was four minutes.

This scoring procedure was followed for all of the subjects.

RESULIS

First some relevant findings of the initial group of 10S subjects will be presented. The mean personality rigidity score was a plus 4.74 and the mean personality dogmatism score was a negative 19.05. A Pearson r was computed between rigidity and dogmatism which was found to be a positive .47. American Council of Education total scores were available for 93 of these subjects. The Pearson correlation between these scores and dogmatism was a plus .13. The Pearson correlation between these scores and rigidity was a negative .22. These correlations suggest that dogmatism and rigidity are related to I.Q., as measured by the American Council of Education test, to a very small extent.

For the sixty subjects who were given the Denny Doodlebug Problem, the mean rigidity score was a negative 4.42 and the mean dogmatism score was a negative 19.75. The mean dogmatism and rigidity scores of each of the four groups of fifteen subjects is shown in Table 1, page 19.

Table 1 is merely an informative table indicating the actual mean differences between the four selected groups. It should be noted that the mean rigidity scores

TABLE 1

MEAN DOGMATISM AND RIGIDITY
SCORES FOR THE GROUPS TESTED

Group	Mean	Dogmatism Score	Mean Rigidity Score
Group A High In Dogmatism And High In Rigidity	у	3.40	21.00
Group B Low In Dogmatism And Low In Rigidity	-4	45.00	- 18.27
Group C High In Dogmatism And Low In Rigidity	-	6.80	07
Group D Low In Dogmatism And High In Rigidity	y -	30.60	15.00

TABLE 2

COMPARISON BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW DOGMATIC GROUPS
AND BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW RIGID GROUPS ON THE
TOTAL TIME TAKEN TO SOLVE THE DENNY DOODLEBUG PROBLEM*

Group	N	Mean	<i>o</i> -	Fest- inger's F	D.F.**	Signif- icance Level
High Dogmatic Low Dogmatic	30 30	22.62 21.37	5.13 5.18	1.06	L=1022 S=1168	5%
High Rigid Low Rigid	30 30	23.05 20.93	4.31 5.78	1.10	L= 786 S=1714	5%

^{*} Using a one tail test of significance.

^{**} Under Degrees of Freedom, L stands for the larger variance and S stands for the smaller variance.

range from a plus 21.00 to a minus 18.27 and the dogmatism scores from a plus 3.40 to a minus 45.00. From this it can be noted that while the rigidity scores are relatively equally distributed, the dogmatism scores are definitely positively skewed. The N of 109 from which this sample was chosen was similarly skewed for the dogmatism measure and skewed in the opposite direction, to a lesser degree, for the rigidity measure.

In Table 2, page 19, is presented the mean total times taken to solve the problem by those high and low in dogmatism and those high and low in rigidity. As can be seen from this table, the highly dogmatic group took a mean total time of 22.62 minutes to solve the problem as compared with a mean total time of 21.37 minutes for the low dogmatic group. Similarly, the highly rigid group took a mean total time of 23.05 minutes to solve the problem as compared with a mean total time of 20.93 minutes for the low rigid group.

Because of the fact that the distributions of the various time scores were positively skewed, a one-tailed application of Festinger's F test was employed throughout (2). The test assumes that the measure used varies freely from zero to infinity. When the values of both p and n are greater than fifteen there is little difference between this test and the normal t test since the larger the value of p the less the skewness of the population (2). With the present data p was often less than 15.

It should be pointed out that ordinarily the F test is a two tail test but since the direction of the differences was predicted in advance, a one tail test should be used.

The general formula of this non-parametric test is as follows: $F = \frac{M_1}{M_2}$ where M_1 is the larger mean. The degrees of freedom for the larger and smaller variance is obtained by the formula: df 2np where n is the number of cases and $p = \frac{M^2}{-2}$. The values of n and p are found for both the larger and smaller variances by the use of this group of formuli. The significance of the F obtained may be determined by reference to Snedecor's Tables of F.

The difference in the mean total times taken by the High and Low Dogmatic groups were found to be significantly different from each other beyond the five percent level of confidence when Festinger's F test was employed. The difference in the mean total times taken by the High and Low Rigid groups were also found to be significantly different from each other beyond the five percent level.

These findings corroborate the first two hypotheses (A,1 and A,2), namely that persons high in rigidity should take more time to complete the problem than persons low in rigidity and that persons high in dogmatism should take more time to solve the problem or to complete it than persons low in dogmatism. The total time taken to complete the Denny Doodlebug Problem differentiates significantly the High from the Low dogmatic groups and also the High from the Low rigid groups. The analysis thus far, however, does not tell une to what extent these

COMPARISON BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW RIGID GROUPS AND BETWEEN HIGH AND LOW DOGMATIC GROUPS ON THE VARIOUS MEASURES INVOLVING THE OVERCOMING OF SETS*

I.	Number	of	minutes	t.a.ken	t.o	overcome	first	set.
	1100111001	\sim $_{\perp}$	miliated		~~		11100	DC U .

				Fest- inger's		Significance
Group	N	Mean	•	F	D.F.**	Level
High Rigid Low Rigid	30 30	8.55 5.85	5.49 5.17	1.46	L: 145 S: 77	5%
High Dogmatic Low Dogmatic	30 30	7.40 7.00	5.39 5.64	1.06	L = 92 S = 113	N.S.

II. Number of minutes taken to overcome second set.

				Fest- inger's		Significance
Group	N	Mean	•	F	D.F.**	Level
High Rigid Low Rigid	30 30	15.95 14.37	1.55 3.45	1.11	L=1049 S=6334	1%
High Dogmatic Low Dogmatic	30 30	15.28 14.93	2.84 3.29	1.02	L=1238 S=1745	N.S.

III. Number of minutes taken to overcome third set.

				Fest- inger's		Significance
Group	N	Mean	<i>~</i>	r F	D.F.**	Level
High Rigid Low Rigid	30 30	19.87 18.37	2.73 3.85	1.08	L=1364 S=3179	1%
High Dogmatic Low Dogmatic	30 30	19.23 19.00	3.05 4.02	1.01	L=1343 S=2383	N.S.

IV. Number of sets overcome within the first fifteen minutes.

				Fest- inger's		Significance
Group	N	Mean	T	F	D.F.**	Level
High Rigid Low Rigid	30 30	.80 1.30	•70 •94	1.62	L: 115 S: 79	1%
High Dogmatic Low Dogmatic	30 30	1.07 1.03	•93 •80	1.04	L= 80 S=100	N.S.

^{*} Using a one tail test of significance.

^{**} Under Degrees of Freedom, L stands for the larger variance and S stands for the smaller variance.

differences are attributable to relative differences in ease or difficulty of overcoming individual sets or to ease or difficulty of integration of new sets after the old sets had been overcome.

Let us consider first the problem of the amount of time taken to overcome the individual sets. The results relevant to this are shown in Table 3, page 22.

With respect to time taken to overcome the first set, one finds that the High and Low Rigid groups are significantly different from each other in the amount of time taken. The former took a mean time of 8.55 minutes while the latter took a mean time of only 5.85 minutes. This difference is significant at the five percent level of confidence. In contrast, the High Dogmatic group is not significantly different from the Low Dogmatic group on this measure. This same method of interpretation may be used on all of the measures presented in Table 3. It will be noted that for the time taken to overcome the second and third sets, the High and Low Rigid groups are also significantly different from each other at the one percent level of confidence. Furthermore, as was found to be the case with the first measure, the High and Low Dogmatic groups again do not differ significantly from each other.

The results shown on time taken to overcome one, two or three sets are further corroborated by a fourth measure

TABLE 4

TIME TAKEN TO SOLVE THE DENNY LOCDLEBUG PROBLEM AFTER THE FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD SETS WERE OVERCOME BY HIGH AND LOW DOGMATIC GROUPS AND HIGH AND LOW RIGID GROUPS*

I. Number of minutes taken to solve problem after first set overcome.

				Fest- inger's		Significance
Group	N	Mean	σ	F	D.F.**	Level
High Dogmatic Low Dogmatic	30 30	15.22 14.37	5.68 5.35	1.06	L= 431 S= 433	N.S.
High Rigid Low Rigid	30 30	15.08 14.50	5.59 5.50	1.08	L = 437 S = 418	N.S.

II. Number of minutes taken to solve problem after second set overcome.

				Fest- inger's		Significance
Group	N	Mean	T	F	D.F.**	Level
High Dogmati Low Dogmati		7.68 6.08	4.35 3.57	1.26	L = 187 S = 174	5%
High Rigid Low Rigid	30 30	7.20 6.57	4.09 3.98	1.10	L = 187 S = 163	N.S.

III. Number of minutes taken to solve problem after third set overcome.

				Fest- inger's		Significance
Group	N	Mean	T	F	D.F.**	Level
High Dogmatic Low Dogmatic	30 30	3.25 2.50	3.37 2.99	1.30	L= 56 S= 42	N.S.
High Rigid Low Rigid	30 30	3.82 2.80	3.16 2.16	1.36	L = 88 S = 101	N.S.

^{*} Using a one tail test of significance.

^{**} Under Degrees of Freedom, L stands for the larger variance and S stands for the smaller variance.

number of sets overcome within the first fifteen minutes. These data are also shown in Table 3, page 22. In support of the findings discussed with respect to time taken to overcome the first, the second and the third sets, it is found that the High and Low Rigid groups are significantly different from each other but that the High and Low Dogmatic groups are not. The mean number of sets overcome by the High Rigid group was .80 while the mean number of sets overcome being statistically significant at the one percent level of confidence. In contrast, the mean number of sets overcome within the first fifteen minutes by the High and Low Dogmatic group are 1.07 and 1.03 respectively. This difference is not significant.

It is thus seen that the High and Low Rigid are significantly different from each other on all four measures involving ease of overcoming individual sets while High and Low Dogmatic groups are insignificantly different from each other on all four measures. These findings confirm, in a dramatic way, Hypotheses B,1 and B,2 namely that persons known to be high in rigidity should take more time in the overcoming of sets than persons low in rigidity and persons high in dogmatism should take no more time in overcoming the sets than persons low in dogmatism.

Table 4, page 24, indicates the results on time taken to solve the Denny Doodlebug Problem <u>after</u> the first,

second and third sets were overcome. In line With Hypotheses C,1 and 2, it is anticipated that the High and Low Dogmatic groups will differ significantly on time taken to integrate the new sets after the older sets were no longer operating (Hypothesis C,1) but that the High and Low Rigid groups would not (Hypothesis C,2). Accordingly, the writer does not expect either the High and Low Dogmatic groups or the High and Low Rigid groups to differ significantly from each other on time taken to solve the problem after the first set was overcome. For integration implies at the very least the presence of two elements to be interrelated. Cne must look to the second and third measures, namely (1) time taken to solve the problem after the second set was overcome and (2) time taken to solve the problem after the third set was overcome, to provide one with a measure of integration of new sets.

Turning now to the first measure shown in Table 4 (time taken to solve the problem after the first set was overcome) one finds that the mean times taken were not significantly different either between the High and Low Dogmatic groups or between the High and Low Rigid groups. This is as expected.

However, on the time taken to solve the problem after the second set was overcome, the High and Low Dog-matic groups are significantly different from each other

and the High and Low Rigid groups are not. The High Dog-matic group took a mean time of 7.68 minutes while the Low Dogmatic group took only a mean time of 6.08 minutes. This difference is significant at the five percent level of confidence. In contrast, the High and Low Rigid groups took mean times of 7.20 minutes and 6.57 minutes respectively. This difference is not significant.

Turning finally to the third measure (the time taken to solve the problem after the third set was cvercome) no significant differences either between the High and Low Dogmatic groups or between the High and Low Rigid groups was found.

The American Council of Education test total scores were correlated with time taken to overcome the first set, number of sets overcome in the first fifteen minutes, total time taken to solve the problem after the second set was overcome and total time taken to solve the problem. The Pearsonian correlations were -.23, -.24, -.21 and plus .36 respectively. Only the last correlation between total time taken to solve the problem and total American Council of Education test scores was significant. With such low correlations, intelligence was not considered to be a significant variable affecting the results, especially since the correlation between American Council of Education test scores and speed of overcoming sets or between American Council of Education test scores and speed of integrating sets overcome were not significant.

DISCUSSION

In general the findings are regarded as having substantiated the hypotheses presented. Both the High and Low Dogmatic groups and the High and Low Rigid groups were found to differ significantly on the total time taken to solve the Denny Doodlebug Problem. these findings were not necessarily due to the operation of similar thought processes was demonstrated by the further findings regarding time taken to overcome sets and time taken to solve the problem after the various sets were overcome. As will be recalled, the High and Low Rigid groups did and the High and Low Dogmatic groups did not differ significantly from each other on the time taken to overcome the first set, time taken to overcome the second set. time taken to overcome the third set and the number of sets overcome within the first fifteen minutes. Furthermore, the High and Low Dogmatic groups did and the High and Low Rigid groups did not differ significantly on the time taken to solve the problem after the second set was overcome.

It has already been pointed out why neither the High and Low Dogmatic groups nor the High and Low Rigid groups differed significantly on the time taken to solve the problem after the first set was overcome. Namely that

the integration process cannot begin to operate until at least two sets have been overcome. Indeed, the fact that no significant differences were found in this connection lends strong support to the significant differences found on the time taken to solve the problem after the second set was overcome.

If the integration process should make itself evident after the overcoming of two sets surely, it may be argued, it should be even more evident after three sets were overcome. Hence, in accordance with Hypothesis C,1, it should be expected that the High and Low Dogmatic groups should have been found to differ significantly on time taken to solve the problem after the third set was overcome. This was not found to be the case. Neither the High and Low Dogmatic groups nor the High and Low Rigid groups differed significantly on this measure.

Some possible explanations for the positive findings with respect to the second measure (Table 4) and the negative findings with respect to the third measure (Table 4) should be considered.

The subject in the experiment did not know how many sets the Denny Doodlebug Froblem contained. The only basis he had for integration was after the first two sets had been given by the experimenter or overcome by the subject. Hence the measure of the time taken to solve the problem after the first two sets were

overcome is considered to be the best measure of the integration period. By the time the subject had been given the third set or had overcome it by himself, too much time spent in integrating had already expired. In a sense then the third measure provides one only with a measure of the "tail-end" of the integration period rather than the total integration period which began after the overcoming of the second set and ended at the completion of the problem. It is furthermore hardly reasonable to suppose that the integration period began after the third set was overcome.

In line with these considerations, no significant difference between the High and Low Dogmatic groups should have been expected on time taken to solve the problem after the overcoming of the third set.

To be considered next are some of the qualitative findings which distinguished the High Dogmatic from the Low Dogmatic subjects. A record was kept of all the comments made by all of the subjects during the experiment. In line with Rokeach's formulation of dogmatism as involving not only closed systems of thinking and believing but also the rejection of people and alternatives who threaten such closed systems, it is hypothesized that subjects high in dogmatism would more frequently make comments indicative of such rejection than those low in dogmatism.

One person high in dogmatism wrote the following when asked her opinion of the Denny Doodlebug Problem as a test of general intelligence:

"The problem without a doubt was a good one for Einstein but under the circumstances of being nervous and being watched I don't think it was quite fair for a college freshman."

Other subjects known to be high in dogmatism made statements implying rejection of the experiment or the experimenter as follows:

"Stupid bug, he could get there in one jump it seems to me."
"Let him starve to death!"
"There is probably a catch here."
"I don't believe he has to jump four times."
"What if you don't agree with it?"
"That's crazy!"
"That's irrelevant!"

In collaboration with Rokeach, the numerous comments made by the subjects were categorized as dogmatic and non-dogmatic. In making these categorizations the identification of the subject was deleted. A total of fifty comments were categorized as dogmatic. Of these, 33 were made by the High Dogmatic group and 17 by the Low Dogmatic group. By Chi Square, after the application of Yate's Correction, this difference was found to be significant at the five percent level of confidence (Chi Square = 4.50).

These findings do not differentiate between the High and Low Rigid groups for after applying Yate's Correction, a Chi Square of .02 was obtained. This value of Chi Square is not significant.

In spite of the fact that the hypotheses were confirmed, it is believed that there are certain phases of this research which could have been improved. For instance, at the end of thirty minutes the problem was stopped whether or not the subject solved the problem. The writer feels that the methodology colud be improved in future experimentation with the Denny Doodlebug Problem by extending the time limit. Second, while the problem was given under ego-threatening conditions the contents of the problem arreared ludicrous to some of the subjects who consequently remained in relatively good humor throughout the experiment. Minor revisions in the wording of the problem would overcome this. Third, the time was gauged by a standard wrist watch. It is believed that a stop watch would have given more exact data and would have discriminated better the differences between the groups investigated.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The primary aim of this study was to investigate certain cognitive aspects of dogmatism and to distinguish such aspects from rigidity. Dogmatism was defined as "(1) a closed cognitive system of thinking and believing about reality, (2) organized around a set of authoritarian beliefs and (3) providing a frame of reference for attitudes of intolerance and qualified tolerance toward people in general." (8, p. 3) It is a higher level of resistance to change than rigidity. Rigidity was defined as "... the inability to change one's set when the objective conditions demand it..." (5)

In the study the following hypotheses were tested:

- A. Concerning total time taken to solve the problem which involves both the overcoming of sets and their integration:
 - 1. Persons high in rigidity should take more time to complete the problem than persons low in rigidity.
 - 2. Persons high in dogmatism should take more time to complete the problem than persons low in dogmatism.
- B. Concerning the overcoming of specific sets:
 - 1. Persons known to be high in rigidity should take more time in the overcoming of the sets than persons low in rigidity.
 - 2. Persons high in dogmatism should take no more time in overcoming the sets than persons low in dogmatism.
- C. Concerning the integration of sets already overcome:
 - 1. Persons high in dogmatism should take more time in integrating the sets already overcome than persons low in dogmatism.

2. Persons high in rigidity should take no more time in integrating the sets already overcome than persons low in rigidity.

In order to test these hypotheses, the subjects were confronted with a cognitive task, The Denny Doodlebug Problem.

The problem contained three separate sets which had to be overcome and then integrated by the subject before the correct solution could be reached. By the use of the problem, three types of measurements could be obtained: (1) total time taken to solve the problem, (2) time taken to overcome the specific sets and (3) time taken to solve the problem after the sets were overcome.

Che hundred and nine subjects were given a battery of tests including The California Psychological Inventory Rigidity Scale and the Dogmatism Scale. From this group sixty subjects were chosen on the basis of their scores on the dogmatism and rigidity tests. Thirty of the subjects were high in dogmatism and thirty were low; thirty of the subjects were high in rigidity and thirty were low. These sixty subjects were then given the Denny Doodlebug Problem.

The results indicated that the High and Low Rigid groups did and the High and Low Dogmatic groups did not differ significantly from each other on the time taken to overcome the first set, time taken to overcome the second set, time taken to overcome the to overcome the third set and the number of sets overcome within the first fifteen minutes. Furthermore, the High and Low

Dogmatic groups did and the High and Low Rigid groups did not differ significantly on the time taken to solve the problem after the second set was overcome. The reasons why this measure of integration was considered to be the best possible measure were discussed. The measure of dogmatism was supported by the analysis of qualitative data.

All of the hypotheses were considered to be confirmed and in addition, the following conclusions were reached:

- (1) The research provides experimental confirmation of the theoretical distinctions drawn between dogmatism and rigidity.
- (2) The research provides evidence that personality factors, in this case dogmatism and rigidity, can be demonstrated at the cognitive level.

BIBLICGRAPHY

- (1) Cattell, R. B. and L. Ghose Tiner, "The Varieties of Structural Rigidity", Journal of Personality, 17: 321-341, 1949.
- (2) Festinger, L., "A Statistical Test For Means of Samples From Skew Populations", <u>Psychometrika</u>, 8:205-210, 1943.
- (3) Gough, Harrison G. and Nevitt Sanford, "The California Psychological Inventory Rigidity Scale", An unpublished manuscript.
- (4) Luchins, A. S., "Mechanization In Problem Solving: The Effect of Einstellung", Psycho. Monogr., 54, No. 6, 1942.
- (5) Rokeach, Milton, "Generalized Mental Rigidity As A Factor In Ethnocentrism", <u>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</u>, Vol. 43, No. 3, July, 1948.
- (6) Rokeach, Milton, "Rigidity and Ethnocentrism: A Rejoinder", Journal of Personality, 17:467-474, June, 1949.
- (7) Rokeach, Milton, "Dogmatism and Opinionation On the Left and On the Right", Paper presented at American Psychological Association meetings in September, 1952.
- (8) Rokeach, Milton, "The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism", An unpublished manuscript.

APPENDIX A

THE CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY RIGIDITY SCALE*

by

Dr. Harrison G. Gough and Dr. Nevitt Sanford

- 1. I wish people would be more definite about things.
- 2. I don't like to work on a problem unless there is the possibility of coming out with a clear-cut and unambiguous answer.
- 3. I am in favor of a very strict enforcement of all laws, no matter what the consequences.
- 4. For most questions there is just one right answer once a person is able to get all the facts.
- 5. The trouble with many people is that they don't take things seriously enough.
- 6. It bothers me when something unexpected interrupts my daily routine.
- 7. I often start things I never finish.
- 8. I set a high standard for myself and feel others should do the same.
- 9. People who seem unsure and uncertain about things make me feel uncomfortable.
- 10. Most of the arguments or quarrels I get into are over matters of principle.
- 11. I don't like things to be uncertain and unpredictable.
- 12. I think that I am stricter about right and wrong than most people.
- 13. It is annoying to listen to a lecturer who cannot seem to make up his mind as to what he really believes.
- 14. Once I have my mind made up I seldom change it.
- 15. I always see to it that my work is carefully planned and organized.

APFENDIX A (Continued)

- 16. Cur thinking would be a lot better off if we would just forget about words like "probably", "approximately", and "perhaps".
- 17. I like to have a place for everything and everything in its place.
- 18. I never make judgments about people until I am sure of the facts.
- 19. I am known as a hard and steady worker.
- 20. I find that a well-ordered mode of life, with regular hours and an established routine, is congenial to my temperament.
- 21. A strong person will be able to make up his mind even on the most difficult questions.
- 22. It is hard for me to sympathize with a person who is always doubting and unsure about things.

^{*} This is from an unpublished manuscript by Drs. Gough and Sanford.

APPENDIX B

"THE DOGRATISA SCALE"

by

Dr. Milton Rokeach

- 1. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.
- 2. I am afraid of people who want to find out what I'm really like, for fear they'd be disappointed in me.
- 3. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.
- 4. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.
- 5. It is when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that he becomes important.
- 6. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.
- 7. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.
- 8. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.
- 9. It is sometimes necessary to resort to force to advance an ideal one strongly believes in.
- 10. My hardest battles are with myself.
- 11. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.
- 12. To one who really takes the trouble to understand the world he lives in, it's a relatively easy matter to predict future events.
- 13. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own personal happiness.
- 14. At times I think I am no good at all.

APPENDIX B (Continued)

- 15. To achieve the happiness of mankind in the future it is sometimes necessary to put up with injustices in the present.
- 16. Communism and Catholicism have nothing in common.
- 17. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is the future that counts.
- 18. All too many people are failures and it is the system which is responsible for this.
- 19. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble 'all or nothing at all.'
- 20. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.
- 21. If I had to choose between happiness and greatness, I'd choose greatness.
- 22. There is nothing new under the sun.
- 23. It is only natural for a person to have a guilty conscience.
- 24. I have often felt that strangers were looking at me critically.
- 25. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal or our own side.
- 26. If given the chance I would do something that would be of great benefit to the world.
- 27. It is by returning to our forgotten and glorious past that real social progress can be achieved.
- 28. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, I sometimes have the ambition to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.
- 29. I have often felt that people say insulting and vulgar things about me.
- 30. To compromise with our political opponents is to be guilty of appeasement.
- 31. It's all too true that most people just won't practice what they preach.

APPENDIX B (Continued)

- 32. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.
- 33. I am sure I am being talked about.
- 34. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.
- 35. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.
- 36. It is better to be a dead hero than a live coward.

PART I ,

Ple	ase fill in the follow	wing information	. DO NOT SIG	1 YOUR NAME.	
Date	9	Se x	Date of B	irth	
Cit	y and state of birth_		Re	ligion	
Race	e or national extract:	ion		···	
What	t is your year in col	lege?			
	t is your major or pla	•			
	t career are you plan				
What	t is your all-college Note: A=4, B=3, C=2, 1	grade point ave	rage?		
	h what political part;			nolitical ne	arty do you
	h what political part; ty do they favor?				litical
What	t is the approximate	population of yo	ur home town?		
Wha	t is the approximate;	yearly income of	your father?	Circle one	number.
1.	\$1000-2000	6.	\$6000-7000	•	
2.	\$2000-3000	7.	\$700 0- 8000		
3.	\$3000-4000	g.	\$8000-9000		
4.	\$4000-5000	9.	\$9000-10,000		
5.	\$5000-6000	10.	Over \$10,000		

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing with some of the statements, disagreeing with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many other people feel the same way you do.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how you feel in each case. Write in 1 if you disagree with the statement, 2 if you agree with the statement in part, and 3 if you agree with the statement. Please mark every one.

- 1: I DISAGREE WITH THE STATEMENT
- 2: I AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT IN PART
- 3: I AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT

1.	Only a misguided idealist would believe that the United States is an imperialistic war-monger.
2.	

3.	It is perfectly clear to any intelligent person that America's economic program to help backward countries is really the same old imperialism in a new disguise.
4.	Anyone who is really for democracy knows very well that the only way for America to head off revolution and civil war in backward countries is to send economic aid.

5.	There were two kinds of people who fought Truman's Fair Deal program: the selfish and the stupid.
6.	It's the people who have no initiative and no ambition who want a welfare state.

7.	Any person with even normal intelligence can plainly see that the real reason America is rearming is to stop aggression.

8. Make no mistake about it! The real reason America is re-arming is

to head off a depression.

2: I AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT IN PART

3:	Ι	AGREE	WITH	THE	STATEMENT
----	---	-------	------	-----	-----------

		•
	9.	It's the people who foolishly believe everything they read in the papers who are convinced that Russia is pursuing a ruthless policy of imperialistic aggression. It's the fellow travellers and Reds who try to tell us that Russia is interested only in peace.

	11.	Any person with even a brain in his head knows that it would be dangerous to allow the United States to be run by men like General MacArthur.
	12.	It is perfectly clear to all thinking persons that General MacArthur is one of the truly great men of our times.

		A person must be pretty stupid if he still believes in differences between the races.
	14.	It's usually the trouble-makers who keep yelling that all races deserve equal rights in everything.

*********	15.	Anyone who really knows his history knows very well that human freedom and private enterprise go together.
	16.	History clearly shows that it is the private enterprise system which is at the root of depressions and wars.

	17.	It's the reactionaries who try to make us believe that labor has too much power.
	18.	It's the agitators or labor racketeers who yell the loudest about labor's right to strike.

		History will show that Churchill's victory over the Labor Party in 1951 was a step backward for the British people.
	20.	History will show that Churchill's victory over the Labor Party in 1951 was a step forward for the British people.

		It's simply incredible that anyone should believe that socialized medicine will actually help solve our health problems.
	22.	It's the gullible people who have been taken in by the propaganda line of the A.M.A. (American Medical Association) who are against socialized medicine.

	23.	It's perfectly clear to all thinking persons that America's increasing
		friendliness toward Franco Spain has harmed the cause of democracy. Even a person of just average intelligence knows very well that the United States, in order to defend itself against aggression, should welcome all help including Franco Spain.

- 1: I DISAGREE WITH THE STATEMENT
- 2: I AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT IN PART
- 3: I AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT
- 25. You just can't help but feel sorry for the person who believes that the world could exist without a Creator.
 - 26. It's the people who can't stand on their own two feet who have to believe in some supernatural being.

- 27. The plain unadulterated fact is this! Chiang Kai-Shek is and always was a corrupt politician who never really cared about the Chinese people.
 - 26. This much is certaint The only way to defeat tyranny in China is to support Chiang Kai-Shek.

- 29. It is perfectly ridiculous to think that Eisenhower will really try to strengthen American democracy.
 - 30. A person must be pretty ignorant if he thinks that Eisenhower is going to let the "big boys" run this country.

- 31. Anyone who really knows what's going on will have to admit that America's rearmament program is designed to increase profits.
- 32. The American rearmament program is clear and positive proof that the United States is willing to sacrifice to preserve its freedom.

FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS

Mark each of the following statements according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Write in +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case. Please mark every one.

- +1: I AGREE A LITTLE -1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE
- +2: I AGREE PRETTY MUCH -2: I DISAGREE PRETTY MUCH
- +3: I AGREE VERY MUCH -3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH
- 33. Labor unions should become stronger and have more influence generally.
- 34. Even though many atheists become religious when old or dying, this does not constitute proof for God's existence.
- 35. Whether it's alright to manipulate people or not, it is certainly alright when it's for their own good.
- 36. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.
- _____ 37. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.

		+2: I AGREE PRETTY MUCH	-1: I DISACREE A LITTLE -2: I DISACREE PREITY MUCH -3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH
	38.	I work under a great deal of tens	ion.
	39•	I wish people would be more defin	ite about things.
***************************************	40.	A person should be free to believe our country's enemies may believe	
	41.	I am afraid of people who want to for fear they'd be disappointed in	•
	42.	A person who has bad manners, hab expect to get along with decent	
	43.	Most government controls over bus strengthened.	iness should be continued and even
	林.	I have nightmares every few night	8.
	45.	If a man fails to practice what he wrong with what he preaches.	e preaches, there's something
	46.	In certain things Stalin is right	•
	•	My blood boils whenever a person he's wrong.	stubbornly refuses to admit
	4 8 .	If people would talk less and wor better off.	k more, everybody would be
	49.	My sleep is fitful and disturbed.	
	50.	I don't like to work on a problem of coming out with a clear-cut an	unless there is the possibility d unambiguous answer.
	51.	The worst crime a person could c people who believe in the same t	ommit is to attack publicly the hing he does.
	52.	If a man believes that being ques American then, whether he is a con in refusing to testify before Con	mmunist or not, he is justified
*************	53•	Men like Henry Ford or J.P. Morga on the road to success, are model and imitate.	n, who overcame all competition s for all young people to admire
	54.	The business man and the manufact society than the artist and the p	
	55•	The fact that God exists is prove of people believe in him.	n by the fact that so many millions
	56.	It is when a person devotes himse becomes important.	lf to an ideal or cause that he

		+1: I AGREE A LITTLE -1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE 6. +2: I AGREE PRETTY MUCH -2: I DISAGREE PRETTY MUCH +3: I AGREE VERY MUCH -3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH
-	57.	Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
	58.	Whether Russian scientists are free or not, they have advanced our knowledge of nature.
	59•	I frequently notice my hand shakes when I try to do something.
	60.	Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
	61.	Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.
	62.	I frequently find myself worrying about something.
********	63 .	In general, full economic security is bad; most men wouldn't work if they didn't need the money for eating and living.
	64.	Even in war, if a person refuses to testify before a Senate committee on the grounds that it violates his personal integrity, he is to be admired.
	65.	Do unto others as they do unto you.
	66.	I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.
	67.	What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.
	68.	I get anxious and upset when I have to make a short trip away from home.
	69.	I am in favor of a very strict enforcement of all laws, no matter what the consequences.
	70.	Whether you approve of Communism or not, you have to admit that Karl Marx has made an important contribution to our understanding of economics.
	71.	Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.
	72.	I am often afraid of the dark.
	73•	America may not be perfect, but the American Way has brought us about as close as human beings can get to a perfect society.
	74.	For most questions there is just one right answer once a person is

able to get all the facts.

		+2: I AGREE PRETTY MUCH -	1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE 2: I DISAGREE PRETTY MUCH 3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH	7•
	75•	Whether one approves of filibusters for a good cause.	ing or not, it is alright if it's	
-	76.	The US, the Vatican, and Russia have	e a number of things in common.	
	77•	It is sometimes necessary to resort strongly believes in.	to force to advance an ideal one	
	7 8 .	No sane, normal, decent person could friend or relative.	l ever think of hurting a close	
	79.	I have often been frightened in the	e middle of the night.	
	€0.	The trouble with many people is that enough.	t they don't take things seriously	y
	81.	My hardest battles are with myself.		
	82.	I admire the courage of those who re refusing to testify before a Senate being questioned about one's belief	committee on the grounds that	
	83.	Nobody ever learned anything really	important except through suffering	ng.
	64.	Several times a week I feel as if so happen.	emething dreadful is about to	
	85.	The reason we should show consideration is		
	86.	When it comes to differences of opin not to compromise with those who believe.		ul
	87 .	I am a high-strung person.		
	66.	There are, after all, some things at try to imitate.	oout Russia which we might well	
	89.	What the youth needs is strict disc the will to work and fight for family		
	90.	It bothers me when something unexpec	eted interrupts my daily routine.	
	91.	To one who really takes the trouble in, it's a relatively easy matter to		
	92.	An insult to our honor should always	s be punished.	
	93•	I am troubled by discomfort in the por oftener.	oit of my stomach every few days	
	ajr -	I set a high standard for myself and	I I feel others should do the same	8.

+1: I AGREE A LITTLE -1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE +2: I AGREE PRETTY MUCH -2: I DISAGREE PRETTY MUCH -3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH +3: I AGREE VERY MUCH 95. The fallacy in Hitler's theories is shown by the fact that, after all, he lost the war. 96. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own personal happiness. 97. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse. 98. I have periods of such great restlessness that I cannot sit long in a chair. 99. People who seem unsure and uncertain about things make me feel uncomfor-100. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great

love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

Jaf	3
-----	---

Date	Sex		Date of Birth	9.
			Religion	
				•
		PART II	:	
The	following is a study of w	nat the g	general public thinks and feel	ls about
a number	of important social and po	ersonal q	uestions. The best enswer to	each
statement	below is your personal or	pinion.	We have tried to cover many d	ifferent
and oppos	sing points of view; you me	ay find y	yourself agreeing strongly wit	h some
of the st	atements, disagreeing just	t as stro	ongly with others, and perhaps	un-
certain a	bout others; whether you	agree or	disagree with any statement,	you can
be sure t	that many other people fee	1 the sam	ne way you do.	
Mark	each statement in the le	eft margi	n according to how much you s	gree
or disagn	ee with it. Please mark	every one	. Write in +1, +2, +3, or -1	1, -2, -3
depending	on how you feel in each	case.		
+1:	I AGREE A LITTLE	-1:	I DISAGREE A LITTLE	
+2:	I AGREE PREITY MUCH	-2:	I DISAGREE PRETTY MUCH	
+3:	I AGREE VERY MUCH	-3:	I DISAGREE VERY MUCH	
101	L. At times I think I am no	o good at	all.	
102	2. Most of our social problem rid of the immoral, cross		d be solved if we could some! feebleminded people.	low get
103	6. I am easily embarrassed.	•		
104	. Most of the arguments or principle.	: quarrel	s I get into are over matters	of
105	 Appreciation of others is way to have them appreciated 		thy attitude, since it is the	only
106	. To achieve the happiness necessary to put up with		ind in the future it is somet ces in the present.	imes
107	. Homosexuals are hardly be severely punished.	etter th	an criminals and ought to be	ŀ

108. I feel anxiety about something or someone almost all the time.

		+2: I AGREE PREITY MUCH	-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE -2: I DISAGREE PRETTY MUCH -3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH	10
-	109.	When a person has a problem or think about it, but to keep busy	~ ·	
	110.	Zootsuiters prove that when peopmoney and freedom, they just tal		
	111.	Communism and Catholicism have a	nothing in common.	
	112.	Every person should have complete whose decisions he obeys without	te faith in some supernatural power question.	er
	113.	The future is too uncertain for	a person to make serious plans.	
	114.	I think that I am stricter about	t right and wrong than most people	₽.
	115.	What is wrong with socialization results in severe rationing.	n, as seen in England, is that it	
	116.		It is best to keep them in their covent too much contact with Whites	
	117.	The present is all too often ful that counts.	ll of unhappiness. It is the futu	ıre
-	118.	Some people are born with an urg	ge to jump from high places.	
	119.	I must admit that I have at time something that really did not me	es been worried beyond reason over	r
	120.	It is annoying to listen to a le his mind as to what he really be	ecturer who cannot seem to make uppelieves.	Ď
	121.	All too many people are failured responsible for this.	s and it is the system which is	
	122.		s men is that they stick together aving a fair chance in competition	
	123.	People can be divided into two distrong.	listinct classes: the weak and the	Э
	124.	I sometimes feel that I am about	t to go to pieces.	
	125.	The reason you should not critic around and criticize you.	cize others is that they will turn	n
	126.	If a man is to accomplish his man necessary to gamble 'all or not		
	127.	I am easily awakened by noise.		
	128.	The worst danger to real America come from foreign ideas and agis	anism during the last 50 years has	s

-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE

-2: I DISAGREE PRETTY MUCH

+3: I AGREE VERY MUCH -3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH 129. I often start things I never finish. 130. There seems to be a lump in my throat much of the time. 131. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt. 132. Some day it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things. 133. I have diarrhea once a month or more. 134. Once I have my mind made up I seldom change it. 135. It's better not to talk about people behind their back, because sooner or later it gets back to them, and you get a reputation as a gossip. 136. I can hardly imagine myself marrying a Jew. 137. If I had to choose between happiness and greatness. I'd choose greatness. 138. Wars and social troubles may someday be ended by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world. 139. I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job. 140. I always see to it that my work is carefully planned and organized. 141. There is nothing new under the sun. 142. It would be a mistake ever to have Negroes for foremen and leaders over Whites. 143. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power. 144. I am worried about sex matters. 145. Radio and TV programs should employ only loyal Americans, so as not to lose their audiences. 146. It is only natural for a person to have a guilty conscience. 147. Sometimes, when embarrassed, I break out in a sweat which annoys me greatly. 146. There may be a few exceptions, but in general, Jews are pretty much alike. 149. It is best to use some prewar authorities in Germany to keep order

+1: I AGREE A LITTLE

and prevent chaos.

+2: I AGREE PRETTY MUCH

	+1: I AGREE A 1 +2: I AGREE PRI +3: I AGREE VE	ETTY MUCH	-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE -2: I DISAGREE PRETTY MU -3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH	
15			er off if we would just it commately!, and !perhaps	
15	1. I have often felt	that strangers	were looking at me criti	ically.
15	2. Most people don't plots hatched in a		h our lives are controll	led by
1	3. Life is a strain i	for me much of t	he time.	
1!	4. I like to have a p	place for everyt	hing and everything in i	lts place.
1	The trouble with Onever worked.	Communism is the	t, in all of human histo	ory, it has
1	6. If Negroes live polazy, ignorant and	* *	ly because they are naturentrol.	ırally
15	7. To compromise with usually leads to	_	opponents is dangerous to our own side.	Decause it
1	g. Human nature being	what it is, th	ere will always be war a	and conflict
1	9. I cannot keep my n	nind on one thi	ng.	
10	O. Taxation without people rebel.	representation i	s wrong, because sooner	or later
16	l. If given the chance benefit to the wor		mething that would be o	of great
10	2. The trouble with I gradually give it		o a nice neighborhood is the atmosphere.	s that they
16	3. Almost every day a	something happen	s to frighten me.	
16	4. It is by returning social progress ca	-	en and glorious past the	at real
16	Generosity is a he upon the waters sh		fe, because he who casts urned ten-fold.	s his bread
10			even to myself, I sometion, like Einstein, or Bee	
16	7. I feel uneasy indo	ors.		
16			is set up, America must indence and complete powe	
16	9. I am known as a ha	ard and steady w	orker.	

	+1: I AGREE A LITTLE -1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE 13. +2: I AGREE PRETTY MUCH -2: I DISAGREE PRETTY MUCH +3: I AGREE VERY MUCH -3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH
 170.	The American economic and political system is preferable to the Russian, because the Soviet system means long hours at poor wages.
 171.	I have often felt that people say insulting and vulgar things about me.
 172.	Familiarity breeds contempt.
173.	I worry quite a bit over possible misfortunes.
 174.	I find that a well-ordered mode of life, with regular hours and an established routine, is congenial to my temperament.
 175.	The reason that criticism is a poor policy is that it prevents you from making and keeping friends.
 176.	To compromise with our political opponents is to be guilty of appeasement.
 177.	Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around and mix together so much, a person has to protect himself especially carefully against catching an infection or disease from them.
 178.	It makes me nervous to have to wait.
 179.	A strong person will be able to make up his mind even on the most difficult questions.
 180.	I am afraid of finding myself in a closet or a small closed place.
 181.	It's all too true that most people just won't practice what they preach.
 182.	Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
 183.	It is hard for me to sympathize with a person who is always doubting and unsure about things.
 184.	Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.
 185.	Negroes deserve equal treatment, because there is as yet no scientific evidence showing that there is any real difference in body odors.
 186.	I am sure I am being talked about.
 187.	The wild sex-life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.
 188.	I never make judgments about people until I am sure of the facts.
 189.	The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.

+2: I AGREE PRETTY MUCH
+3: I AGREE VERY MUCH
-3: I DISAGREE PRETTY MUCH
190. The reason it's better to let people make up their own minds is because they won't follow your advice anyway.

191. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.

192. I don't like things to be uncertain and unpredictable.

193. It is better to be a dead hero than a live coward.

194. You should only criticize others when you are above reproach yourself.

-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE

+1: I AGREE A LITTLE



14.

. POSTI USE GNLY

WIR-LIPSARY LOAN

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES
31293105394104