

AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF THE
SEX OF THE COMMUNICATOR ON PERCEIVED ETHOS
AND ATTITUDE CHANGE

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
GRETCHEN E. STEFFENS
1967

AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF THE
SEX OF THE COMMUNICATOR ON PERCEIVED
ETHOS AND ATTITUDE CHANGE

By

Gretchen E. Steffens

A THESIS

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

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech

1967

G 45710
8/22/67

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

James C. P. P. P.
Director of Thesis

James C. P. P. P., Chairman

William B. Poshwood

James C. P. P. P.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis would not have been realized without the assistance and encouragement of many people.

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. James C. McCroskey for his patience, guidance, motivation, and interest. Without his assistance, I would never have completed my task. To the members of my thesis committee, Dr. Jerry Anderson and Dr. William Lashbrook, I express my appreciation also for their guidance and interest. Second, I extend my gratitude to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Steffens, for their encouragement and support. Finally, I wish to thank the Hope College Department of Speech and Dr. William Bos, chairman, for their cooperation, assistance, and interest in my research.

* * * * *

ABSTRACT

AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF THE SEX OF THE COMMUNICATOR ON PERCEIVED ETHOS AND ATTITUDE CHANGE

by Gretchen E. Steffens

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of the sex of the communicator on perceived ethos and attitude change.

Theoretical justification for the experimental research from which the hypotheses were generated was based on a study by Franklin Knower reported in 1935.

The Knower research indicated that men and women speakers produced attitude changes which were approximately equal but that audiences tended to change their attitudes more when exposed to a speaker of the opposite sex than when exposed to a speaker whose sex was the same as their own.

An experiment was conducted May 16-18, 1967, at Hope College, Holland, Michigan. Subjects used in the experiment were enrolled in the basic speech course. Six graduate students in speech at Michigan State University, three male and three female, were selected to record the speeches used in the experiment. Two experimental topics were used, the first opposing Capital Punishment, and the second favoring Federal

Control of Education. Subjects were administered a pre-test on attitude and a post test on attitude and perceived ethos. The number of subjects involved in the experiment was 193.

Results of the study indicated the following:

1. Female speakers were perceived to be more dynamic but not more authoritative or of higher character than male speakers.
2. Female speakers produced greater attitude change on Federal Control of Education and male speakers produced greater attitude change on Capital Punishment. These results indicate that sex of speaker is not a significant factor influencing attitude change except as it interacts with the speech topic.
3. No consistent relationship was found between the sex of the speaker and the sex of the audience across the experimental topics.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
General Introduction of the Problem	1
Review of the Literature	3
Statement of the Problem	9
Hypotheses	11
II. PROCEDURES	13
General Procedure	13
Research Design	14
The Experimental Speeches	16
Selection of Speakers	19
Ethos Measures	20
Attitude Measures	21
Ethos Inductions	22
Administration of the Experiment	22
Analysis of the Data	23
III. RESULTS	25
The Boomerang Effect	26
Basic Results	28
Capital Punishment Topic Results	29
Federal Control of Education Topic Results	33
Interpretation	35
Factor Analysis of the Dimensions of Ethos	37
IV. CONCLUSIONS	44
Acceptance or Rejection of Hypotheses . . .	47
Suggestions for Future Research	50
APPENDICES	55
BIBLIOGRAPHY	82

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Results for both topics on attitude change, ethos, and the "speech" resulting from preliminary analysis of variance and analysis of covariance procedures	27
2. Attitude change--Capital Punishment topic . . .	30
3. Authoritativeness dimension--Capital Punishment topic	31
4. Dynamism dimension--Capital Punishment topic .	31
5. Character dimension--Capital Punishment topic .	32
6. Attitude change--Federal Control of Education topic	33
7. Authoritativeness dimension--Federal Control of Education topic	34
8. Dynamism dimension--Federal Control of Education topic	35
9. Character dimension--Federal Control of Education topic	36
10. Capital Punishment topic--three factor solution	39
11. Capital Punishment topic--four factor solution	40
12. Federal Control of Education topic--three factor solution	41
13. Federal Control of Education topic--four factor solution	42

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.	An illustration of the basic research design of the study	15
2.	An illustration of the treatment administered to each section of the experiment	17

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. Measuring Instruments	56
B. Introductions	63
C. Speeches	65
D. Experiment Arrangements	79

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

General Introduction of the Problem

Today, in the field of Speech, an increasing amount of interest is being placed on a complete re-consideration of every facet of the communication process. Obviously, for more effective speaking, we are still interested in "the faculty of discovering in the particular case what are the available means of persuasion."¹ Recent research has illustrated the importance and necessity of many traditional persuasive concepts as well as introducing new areas of emphasis.

One of these new directions provides the purpose for this research study viz. the effect of the sex of the communicator on perceived ethos and attitude change. Most of the past experimental research in Speech has automatically used the male speaker to produce the stimulus. Are we thus developing an empirically based male rhetoric? While traditional figures of persuasive authority in our society remain

¹The Rhetoric of Aristotle, trans. Lane Cooper (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1932), p. 7.

male, the increasing role of women in political, scientific, and educational pursuits emphasizes the importance and necessity of effective public speaking for both sexes.

In addition to the value such information can bring to the "real-world" speaking situation, this study also has meaning to forensic activities, long an integral part of responsible speech programs. The pragmatic application here can answer the long disputed question of whether men and women speakers can compete equally in the same division or whether forensic events should be divided by sexes. Divisions by sexes have been based on the assumption that women would be disadvantaged if placed in direct competition with men in such contests.

What is at issue here, therefore, is the dichotomy between questions of fact and questions of value. What we are attempting to determine in this study relates to the first type of question. As Miller explains,

the scientific scholar should concern himself primarily with the factual questions of speech communication (the previously discussed behavioral dimension of purpose), and that the humanist should direct his attention to the value questions of the area (the previously discussed value dimension of purpose). In the second area, the scientific method does not claim to provide conclusive answers.¹

¹Gerald R. Miller, Speech Communication: A Behavioral Approach (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1966), pp. 25-27.

This precisely states our distinction in this study. For what we are attempting to determine is the actual effect of the sex of the communicator. We will then draw conclusions and make recommendations based on the results of this effort. Although the general area of ethos and attitude change have been problems for previous research, this is the first study in which the prime area of emphasis is to study the effect of the sex of the communicator.

Review of the Literature

A review of thesis titles in Speech Monographs reveals no reported study devoted to determining the effect of the sex of the communicator on either ethos or attitude change. Nor did a review of Psychology Abstracts reveal such a study. However, there are two related references which are highly important to our discussion and are worthy of examination. In addition, these studies form the basis for the theoretical background upon which the hypotheses are based. The first reference is the Knower studies.¹ The second reference is a group of studies which were reported by Scheidel.²

¹Franklin H. Knower, "Experimental Studies in Changes of Attitude," Journal of Social Psychology, VI (August, 1935).

²Thomas M. Scheidel, "Sex and Persuasibility," Speech Monographs, XXX (November, 1963).

The Knower studies examined the effect of oral argument on changes of attitude. His primary focus was to determine to what extent attitudes can be changed or modified by oral argument. In addition to gathering data on this central problem, an attempt was made to gather supplementary data on other factors. One of these "other factors" was the effect of an argument on the change of an attitude in persons of different sex.¹

In his study, run in 1931 and early 1932, Knower used both men and women speakers in an actual speaking situation; the speakers presented their messages "live" as this was before the days of the tape recorder. He used these speakers in both a "together" and an "alone" situation with one-half of the speeches in favor of maintaining prohibition, the other half opposing prohibition.²

The most consistent of any of the results in this study are those concerning the effects of oral argument on persons of different sex. For the "dry" groups the mean change for women was almost twice as great as for men, and the percentage of the members of the groups which made a significant change was exactly twice as great for women as for men. In the "wet" groups the change for men was only two-thirds of the amount of change for women. About one-third of the women in the two groups on the average actually

¹Knower, op. cit., p. 317.

²Ibid.

made a statistically significant change in the direction of the argument, where as the number of men who changed to this extent represented less than one-fifth of the total group. Certainly, in this experimental situation, the women were much more responsive to argumentative appeals than were the men.¹

The last of the major comparisons which Knower made was one in which the effect of the use of arguments by women speakers was compared with the use of the same arguments by men speakers. As Knower points out, "It is sometimes contended that women speakers are not as effective as men speakers." However, his results indicate relatively little difference in the effects produced by men and women speakers, when all situations are equated.²

Knower's experimental conditions allowed for separation of the audience by sex when analyzing the data. In addition, by using speakers of both sexes, he was attempting to determine how male subjects responded to female speakers and how female subjects responded to male speakers.³ Analysis of the results indicated that there were greater changes in groups of men who heard a woman speaker, and there were greater changes in groups of women who heard a man speaker.⁴

¹Ibid., p. 335.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 323.

⁴Ibid., pp. 343-344.

In summary from Knower's research, we can state two conclusions important to the topic under consideration in this study. (1) Men and women speakers produced attitude changes which were approximately equal. (2) There were greater changes in groups of men who heard a woman speaker and there were greater changes in groups of women who heard a man speaker.¹

In addition to this study, those by Scheidel on "Sex and Persuasibility" should be noted. A portion of Schneidel's research dealt with the relation of the sex variable to attitude change and to speech retention. Questions under consideration include (1) is there a difference between the sexes with respect to the attitude shift which a short persuasive speech produces? (2) Is there a difference between the sexes with respect to the extent to which they generalize persuasive appeal beyond the specific topic which the appeal covers? (3) Is there a difference between the sexes with respect to the amount of speech content which they retain?²

Results of the three major questions under consideration showed that (1) women were significantly more persuasive than men, (2) women transferred the persuasive appeal

¹Ibid.

²Scheidel, op. cit., p. 354.

significantly more than did men, (3) women retained significantly less of the speech content than did men.¹

A brief review of research on ethos is also of relevance to the topic under consideration. Research on ethos has reinforced the Aristotelian emphasis placed on this aspect of persuasion.

In an early ethos study, Haiman presented a tape-recorded speech to three groups, attributing it to Thomas Parran, Surgeon General of the United States; to Eugene Dennis, Secretary of the Communist Party in America; and to a "Northwestern University Sophomore." The experimental subjects found the "Parran" speech to be more competent than the other two; and, this speech was also significantly more effective in producing attitude change. No significant differences were found between the other two versions.²

In a similar study, Paulson attributed a taped speech to a political science professor and to a student. Results that there was no significant difference in opinion change produced by the "two" speakers for female members of the audience. However, male subjects shifted significantly

¹Ibid., p. 356.

²Franklyn Haiman, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Ethos in Public Speaking" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Speech, Northwestern University, 1951).

in favor of the speech attributed to the political science professor.¹

In both of these studies, and several similar ones, the experimenters found that initially high ethos sources produced greater favorable attitude change than sources with lower ethos. Kelman and Hovland found that immediately after their experiment, there was a greater shift of opinion for the high ethos source, but that data obtained three weeks later indicated this difference no longer existed.² An excellent summary of the ethos research has been reported by Andersen and Clevenger.³

McCroskey and Dunham have found ethos to be a confounding element in communication research.⁴ Holtzman has confirmed this confounding element and concludes that all

¹S. F. Paulson, "An Experimental Study of Spoken Communication: The Effects of Prestige of the Speaker and Acknowledgment of Opposing Arguments on Audience Retention and Shift of Opinion" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1952).

²H. C. Kelman and C. I. Hovland, "Reinstatement of the Communicator in Delayed Measurement of Opinion Change," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1953), 327-355.

³Kenneth Andersen and Theodore Clevenger, Jr., "A Summary of Experimental Research in Ethos," Speech Monographs, XXX (June, 1963), 59-78.

⁴James C. McCroskey and Robert E. Dunham, "Ethos: A Confounding Element in Communication Research," Speech Monographs, XXXIII (1966), 456-463.

experimental designs should account for ethos effects, including those of perceived sponsorship.¹

Statement of the Problem

After a review of the available literature pertinent to the topic under investigation, the writer can express several theoretic hypotheses. These are generated from previous experimental results combined with predictions that are unique to the problem being discussed.

For the purposes of this study perceived ethos was defined as the image of the communicator in the minds of the receiver. We can be assured that ethos is an important factor in producing attitude change on the part of the audience. We can further expect that high ethos sources will produce greater attitude change with a persuasive message than will a low ethos source with the same message. Indeed, our knowledge of the effects of ethos can allow us to consider it the most potent force in persuasive communication.

A review of the ethos literature indicates that in no case was ethos allowed to interact with the sex of the communicator. Therefore, our first hypothesis was that a high ethos source (either male or female) will produce greater attitude change than will a low ethos source either male or female.

¹Paul H. Holtzman, "Confirmation of Ethos as a Confounding Element in Communication Research," Speech Monographs, XXXIII (1966), 364-366.

The results of Knower's research allow us to make certain observations specifically related to the effect of the sex of the communicator. Knower found when studying the effect of the use of argument by women as compared with the use of the same arguments by men speakers that there is "little difference in the effects produced by men and women speakers, when all situations are equated."¹ This finding suggests that the sex of the communicator has no overall effect on attitude change of audiences.

Therefore, one objective of this study was to test to see if, under similar conditions, there is any significant difference produced by male or female speakers.

Knower also drew another meaningful conclusion. He found that there were greater attitude changes in groups of men who heard a woman speaker and vice versa, there were greater attitude changes in groups of women who heard a man speaker than in groups who heard a woman speaker.

This result led us to hypothesize that a male speakers' ethos will be perceived higher with female audiences than with male audiences and, vice versa, that a female speakers' ethos will be perceived higher with male audiences than with female audiences. This hypothesis suggests a significant interaction between sex of audience and sex of speaker.

¹Knower, op. cit., p. 335.

Based on the previous research and the observations the writer has made in conjunction with the available results, the following hypotheses were formulated.

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference in terminal ethos of male and female speakers with identical introductions.

2. A source with initially high ethos induced by an introduction has significantly higher terminal ethos than a source with initially low ethos also induced by an introduction.

3. There is no significant difference in attitude change produced by male and female speakers with identical introductions.

4. A source with initially high ethos induced by an introduction produces significantly more attitude change than a source with low ethos also induced by an introduction.

5. Terminal ethos of males is significantly higher for audiences composed of females than for audiences composed of males.

6. Terminal ethos of females is significantly higher for audiences composed of males than for audiences composed of females.

7. Female audiences change their attitudes significantly more when exposed to male speakers than when exposed to female speakers.

8. Male audiences significantly change their attitudes more when exposed to female speakers than when exposed to male speakers.

With the stating of these hypotheses, it is necessary to direct the attention of this report to the procedures used to test the hypotheses. Relevant procedures and the research design employed in this study are discussed in Chapter II.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURES

General Procedure

An experiment was conducted in order to test the hypotheses generated in Chapter I. The primary independent variable which was controlled was the sex of the communicator. The ethos level of the speaker was manipulated by means of an introduction presented by the researcher to the subjects. In addition, the variable of audience sex was controlled and analyzed in the study. The dependent variables measured in the experiment were attitude change and ethos.

Subjects used in the experiment were students in the basic speech course (Speech 11--Fundamentals of Speech) at Hope College, Holland, Michigan.¹

The use of Hope College students as experimental subjects was judged advisable since most of the students had not previously served as subjects in an experiment and thus could be considered "uncontaminated." In addition, when

¹Arrangements to use these students were made between Dr. William Bos, chairman of the Hope College Department of Speech, and the researcher.

studying the variable of sex, college students were considered appropriate because of their consciousness at this age of persons of the opposite sex. The experiment using these subjects was conducted May 16-18, 1967. Students in the experimental sections were given a pre-test on attitude administered by their individual instructors during the first week in May, approximately two weeks before the experiment was conducted.¹

Research Design

The design of the study for the experiment included thirteen classes; twelve experimental classes and one section forming the control group. Each class numbered approximately eighteen students. Other elements basic to the research design employed in this study included the development of the experimental speeches, the preparation of introductions to manipulate the initial ethos of the speaker, the use of three male and three female speakers to deliver the speeches, and the consideration of the variables of audience sex in analyzing the effectiveness of the various speakers.

The basic design employed in this study is illustrated by Figure 1. This design, as the figure indicates, provided for eight experimental cells plus one control group (not shown).

¹See Appendix A for a copy of the pre-test administered to the experimental and control subjects previous to the experiment.

High Ethos		Low Ethos	
Male Audience	Female Audience	Male Audience	Female Audience
Male Speaker	Female Speaker	Male Speaker	Female Speaker
Male 1	Female 1	Male 1	Female 1
Male 2	Female 2	Male 2	Female 2
Male 3	Female 3	Male 3	Female 3

Figure 1. An illustration of the basic design of the study.

Figure 2 indicates the treatment which each experimental class received during the experiment. Included in this breakdown are indications of the ethos introductions given each section, the sex of the speaker, a number illustrating the randomization of speakers with each ethos condition, and a listing of the measures administered before and after the experiment.

The Experimental Speeches

The speeches used in the experiment were similar to those used in the McCroskey experiments.¹ Two separate speeches were used, one opposing Capital Punishment and the other favoring Federal Control of Education. Using two topics as opposed to one permitted a built-in replication of the experiment. By running the experiment "twice," allowance has been made for two considerations.

First, such a replication permits greater generalization and extension of results because such discussion can be based on the information gained from simultaneous experiments. Second, and of particular importance because of results which will be discussed in the following chapter, replication allows for the occurrence of a strange, unusual, boomerang, or other artifact of experimental research without

¹James C. McCroskey, "Experimental Studies of the Effects of Ethos and Evidence in Persuasive Communication" (unpublished D.Ed. dissertation, Department of Speech, Pennsylvania State University, 1966).

Section Number	Treatment			Measures Administered			
	CP Topic	Treatment		FC Topic	Pre-test Attitude	Post Ethos	Post Attitude
1	High Ethos Male	1	Low	Ethos Female	1	x	x
2	High Ethos Female	2	Low	Ethos Male	3	x	x
3	Low Ethos Male	1	High	Ethos Female	1	x	x
4	Low Ethos Female	2	High	Ethos Male	3	x	x
5	High Ethos Male	2	High	Ethos Female	3	x	x
6	High Ethos Female	1	High	Ethos Male	1	x	x
7	Low Ethos Male	2	Low	Ethos Female	3	x	x
8	Low Ethos Female	1	Low	Ethos Male	1	x	x
9	High Ethos Male	3	High	Ethos Male	2	x	x
10	Low Ethos Male	3	Low	Ethos Male	2	x	x
11	High Ethos Female	3	High	Ethos Female	2	x	x
12	Low Ethos Female	3	Low	Ethos Female	2	x	x
13	Control				x		x

Figure 1. An illustration of the treatment administered to each section of the experiment.

the cancellation of consideration of related results of the experiment.

The first speech opposed capital punishment. McCroskey developed his speech on this topic from the one used in the Cathcart evidence studies.¹ However, it was not used in its original form as it was determined necessary to revise and update the speech. The speeches were also strengthened in order to induce greater audience attitude shift. The version chosen for use in this study was the "no-evidence" model as the evidence version had been found to interact with the sex of the audience. In addition, the "no-evidence" speech had already been found to obtain significant attitude change.

The second topic used in this experiment favored federal control of education. McCroskey developed this topic because a student survey had indicated that few students held strong opinions on the topic. In addition, the speech was designed to favor such control because most attitudes existing on this topic were moderately unfavorable. Although there are differences in the population between Hope students and students at Penn State, it was assumed that attitudes on the experimental topics of these two groups would be similar. Furthermore, it was assumed that

¹R. S. Cathcart, "An Experimental Study of the Relative Effectiveness of Four Methods of Presenting Evidence," Speech Monographs, XXII (1955), 227-233.

the attitudes of Hope students would be similar to those at Pennsylvania State University since both groups are composed of a population of undergraduate college students. Subsequent data from the pre-tests confirmed this assumption. Again, the no-evidence version of the speech was used in the present study.¹ All evidence of a statistical nature and all factual examples plus all references to sources were removed from this version of the speech.²

Selection of Speakers

All speeches used in the experiment were delivered by tape recording in order to reduce potentially confounding elements in the study such as physical appearance. In addition, tape recording provides more exact consistency in presentation in each treatment of the experiment.

Six graduate students in speech at Michigan State University, three males and three females, were selected to record the speeches. The use of three female and three male speakers helped to control differences in the oral presentations which could contaminate the experiment if only a single speaker of each sex were employed. Each speaker recorded both of the experimental speeches.

¹McCroskey, "Experimental Studies of the Effects of Ethos and Evidence in Persuasive Communication," op. cit., pp. 20-21.

²Copies of these speeches are included in Appendix C.

Ethos Measures

Ethos measures employed in this study were based on the dimensions of ethos which have been identified by factor analysis. The dimensions of ethos are suggested by traditional rhetorical theory. Aristotle identified them as "intelligence," "character," and "good will."¹ More recently, Hovland, Janis, and Kelley identified these dimensions in a theoretical discussion as "expertness," "trustworthiness," and "intention" toward the receiver.²

Using factor analytic procedure, Berlo and Lemert identified three dimensions for ethos which they labelled as "competence," "trustworthiness," and "dynamism." The first two of these are the same as the "intelligence" and "character" dimensions of Aristotle and the "expertness" and "trustworthiness" identified by Hovland, Janis, and Kelley. The new factor is "dynamism" which is concerned with the perceived activity of the source.³

Later, in several factor analytic studies, McCroskey found two dimensions which he labelled "authoritativeness"

¹Cooper, op. cit., p. 92.

²C. I. Hovland, I. L. Janis, and H. H. Kelley, Communication and Persuasion (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953).

³D. K. Berlo and J. B. Lemert, "A Factor Analytic Study of the Dimensions of Source Credibility," Paper presented at the 1961 convention of the Speech Association of America, New York.

and "character" to consistently appear. These two dimensions are similar to the first two dimensions labelled by Aristotle, Hovland, Janis, and Kelley, and Berlo and Lemert.¹

To measure ethos in this study, semantic differential measures for each dimension were selected. Semantic differentials developed by McCroskey for the "authoritativeness" and the "character" dimensions were employed.² The "dynamism" dimension of ethos was measured by the semantic differential developed by Berlo and Lemert.³

Attitude Measures

The methods used to assess attitude and attitude change toward the concepts of capital punishment and federal control of education were also developed and validated by McCroskey.⁴ These measures were six-scale semantic differentials.⁵ Semantic differentials were also used to evaluate content and delivery.

¹James C. McCroskey, "Scales for the Measurement of Ethos," Speech Monographs, XXXIII (1966), 65-72.

²Ibid.

³See Appendix A for copies of these measures. Support for the semantic differentials employed can be seen in C. E. Osgood, G. J. Suci, P. N. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning (Urbana: The University of Illinois, 1957).

⁴McCroskey, "Experimental Studies of the Effects of Ethos and Evidence in Persuasive Communication," op. cit.

⁵See Appendix A for copies of these measures.

Ethos Inductions

The researcher developed two introductions for each experimental topic. The purpose of these introductions was to manipulate the initial ethos level of the speaker. Introductions were written which were applicable to either a male or a female communicator and applied to the topic under consideration.¹ There was no opportunity to pre-test these introductions on Hope College students. However, they were similar to introductions used with the same speeches at Pennsylvania State University. It was assumed that the similarity between undergraduate populations would be sufficient to allow for successful ethos inductions.

Administration of the Experiment

Subjects used in this experiment were not informed that they were part of an experiment. Instead, the experimenter explained at the start of the experiment that Michigan State University, where she was a student, was interested in improving the evaluation forms that it used in its basic speech course, similar to the basic course that the students at Hope were taking. They were told that tapes such as the students were to hear were being played at various colleges and universities throughout the country in an

¹See Appendix B for copies of these introductions. Differences involved the substitutions of the pronouns he or she, and the use of names appropriate to male or female speakers.

attempt to improve the forms. Following the administration of this cover, the researcher delivered the introductions for the tape that was about to be played. At the conclusion of the tape, students completed the post-tests. This procedure was then duplicated on the second topic, using a different speech and a different introduction. Similar forms were then filled out by the students. The week following the experiment the students were informed as to the actual reasons for the presentation.

Analysis of the Data

After the experiment was concluded, the experimenter organized the collected data and transferred the data to punched cards. The number of subjects involved in the experiment was 193. All statistical analyses were computed with the assistance of the Michigan State University Computer Center. Computer programs employed were developed by the Agricultural Experimental Station and the computer institute for social science research. Special computer programs were prepared for scoring the data.¹

Analysis of variance of terminal ethos and analysis of covariance of terminal attitudes comprised the primary

¹The programs employed were Factor A: Principal Components and Orthogonal Rotations (written by Anthony Williams), and Analysis of Covariance and Analysis of Variance with Unequal Frequencies Permitted in the Cells (LS Routine).

statistical analysis. The co-variate was the appropriate pre-test attitude score.

Main effects for which hypotheses were generated in Chapter I were tested by the F statistic generated by the analysis of variance. The criterion level for significance was set at the conventional .05 level. In addition, t-tests were computed when necessary to test hypotheses not relating to main effects. T-tests employed analysis of variance error term.

With these relevant procedures in mind, it is possible to examine and evaluate the results which were obtained from the administration of this procedure. Chapter III presents these results.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Employment of the statistical procedures discussed in the previous chapter such as factor analysis, analysis of variance, and analysis of covariance allows us to consider various results concerning the problem under discussion viz. the effect of the sex of the communicator on ethos and attitude change.

In Chapter II of this study, reference was made to the fact that by using two separate topics for this experiment, i.e., Capital Punishment and Federal Control of Education simultaneous replication was permitted. Part of the rationale for this procedure was to allow for "the occurrence of a strange, unusual, boomerang, or other artifact of experimental research without the cancellation of consideration of related results of the experiment."

In the study under consideration, such an artifact of experimentation did occur. Because of the use of two experimental topics, however, we are still able to indicate important results from this study and draw meaningful conclusions.

The Boomerang Effect

As can be seen from the table of results on the Federal Control of Education Topic which follows, one experimental cell, composed of male subjects in three classes of Speech 11 students at Hope College, shifted negatively in response to the Federal Control of Education speech. The negative shift of 4.5 scale units occurred only on this topic, only with male speakers, only under the high ethos conditions, and only to male receivers of the persuasive communication. Such a response, or "boomerang," occurring under these conditions can only be considered an artifact of the experiment. No logical explanations can be offered for the negative shift since it did not occur with female audience members under the same conditions at the same time, nor did it occur for male subjects on the capital punishment topic.

Despite the lack of explanation, however, the researcher was interested in observing whether this effect would occur again under similar experimental conditions.

Since it was no longer possible to use Hope College students during the summer months, Michigan State University summer term students enrolled in Discussion and Persuasion courses were used as an alternative for the partial replication of the experiment. Several days prior to the experiment, these students were given a pre-test on attitude on

Table 1. Results for both topics on attitude change, ethos, and the "speech" resulting from preliminary analysis of variance and analysis of covariance procedures

Federal Control of Education Topic							
	High Ethos			Low Ethos			
	Male Speaker		Female Speaker	Male Speaker		Female Speaker	
	M. Aud.	F. Aud.	M. Aud. F. Aud.	M. Aud. F. Aud.	M. Aud. F. Aud.	M. Aud. F. Aud.	
Pre	27.9	24.6	29.9	24.1	26.3	24.2	26.5
Difference	-4.5	3.0	1.9	6.6	3.0	4.4	1.9
Post	22.9	28.1	30.6	31.4	29.4	29.3	28.4
Authoritativeness	31.9	33.1	32.3	33.7	31.3	28.9	29.4
Dynamism	28.4	28.9	32.8	36.1	29.6	33.0	33.2
Character	25.1	27.5	25.8	25.7	27.3	25.9	25.8
Delivery	5.1	4.6	4.1	4.6	4.9	5.1	4.7
Content	5.1	5.2	4.7	5.4	5.5	5.4	5.0
Capital Punishment Topic							
Pre	29.9	22.1	28.0	24.9	26.4	29.2	34.0
Difference	3.0	8.3	3.1	3.2	5.4	2.2	1.2
Post	31.5	33.4	30.8	29.6	32.4	30.4	31.6
Authoritativeness	36.4	36.4	34.8	34.3	32.8	32.5	34.7
Dynamism	28.6	27.8	29.6	33.1	31.1	33.5	36.1
Character	28.5	30.2	27.8	26.3	28.6	28.1	28.2
Delivery	5.9	5.2	5.2	4.3	5.7	5.3	5.2
Content	6.4	6.0	6.1	5.4	5.7	6.4	6.5

the Federal Control of Education topic. On July 7, 1967, the experiment was administered to these students. Conditions were the same as had previously resulted in the boomerang effect--that is, high ethos introductions and male speakers on the federal control topic.

Results from this replication indicated a +.5 attitude shift for men and a +.81 attitude shift for women. These results followed the predictable pattern and indicate that the previous "boomerang" can only be termed an artifact of the experiment.

However, approximately one-half of the male subjects in this study did boomerang. The number of negative shifts again raises doubts as to what is actually occurring. Perhaps the answer can be termed a question of semantics. More likely, however, there is an undefined weakness in the Federal Control speech. More speculation in this regard will be made in Chapter IV.

Basic Results

It must be mentioned initially that analysis of the data has indicated that the ethos induction did not "take" as intended. This means that experimental subjects did not perceive the low ethos induction as significantly lower than the high ethos introduction. Both of the introductions allowed for the speakers to be perceived as high ethos sources. A discussion of the possible defects in the introductions is made in Chapter IV.

Because this factor could be determined after introductory statistical analysis, later statistical procedures combined the two ethos levels into one high ethos level. Thus all hypotheses were tested only at the high ethos level. These combined or "pooled" results are what is reported in this chapter.

In addition, due to the fact that the ethos inductions were not effective, the hypotheses related to these inductions are determined to be not testable in this study. This refers to Hypothesis 2--"A source with initially high ethos induced by an introduction has higher terminal ethos than a source with low ethos also induced by an introduction"; and hypothesis 4--"A source with initially high ethos induced by an introduction produces more attitude change than a source with low ethos also induced by an introduction."

It should be added that results obtained from the measures for content and delivery obtained no significant results.

Capital Punishment Topic Results

In terms of overall attitude change, speaker sex made a significant difference. However, it is necessary to break down all results and look at them point by point for their meaning to become evident.

Table 2 concerning attitude change on the Capital Punishment topic indicates that male speakers were more

Table 2. Attitude change--Capital Punishment topic

	Male Speaker	Female Speaker	Mean Difference	t-tests
Male Audience	4.3	2.5	1.8	1.6
Female Audience	5.6	3.0	2.6	2.4*
Mean Difference	1.3	0.5		
t-tests	1.2	0.5		

*Significant at the .05 level.

persuasive with both male and female audiences though only significantly so with female audiences. Male speakers also produced greater attitude change with female audiences than with male audiences.

On the first of the dimensions of ethos to be considered in this study--authoritativeness--it can be seen from Table 3 that there exists no significant difference for authoritativeness of the speaker's ethos, regardless of sex on the Capital Punishment topic. This result, of course, considers the "pooled" or high level of ethos.

On the next dimension of ethos to be considered, dynamism, significance was observed for the speaker sex variable. These results, indicated by Table 4, illustrate that female speakers were perceived to be much more dynamic than male speakers. In addition, there was an interaction

Table 3. Authoritativeness dimension Capital Punishment topic

	Male Speaker	Female Speaker	Mean Difference	t-tests
Male Audience	34.6	33.4	1.2	1.1
Female Audience	34.1	34.6	0.5	0.5
Mean Difference	0.5	1.2		
t-tests	0.5	1.1		

significant at the .07 level working in an inverse or opposite direction to the attitude change which occurred. Whereas a main effect has been observed for males in producing attitude change, as indicated by Table 2; on the Capital Punishment topic, females were perceived as more dynamic significantly so with female audiences. However, this perception did not allow for greater attitude change.

Table 4. Dynamism dimension--Capital Punishment topic

	Male Speaker	Female Speaker	Mean Difference	t-tests
Male Audience	29.9	31.9	2.0	1.7
Female Audience	28.7	33.8	5.1	4.2*
Mean Difference	1.2	1.9		
t-tests	1.2	1.9		

*Significant at .05 level.

On the last dimension of ethos to be considered on the capital punishment topic, character, Table 5 indicates some significant results. Under the condition of this experiment, male speakers were perceived to be of higher character than the female speakers by the female members of the audience. We have previously determined by the discussion of results relevant to Table 4 that female speakers were more dynamic. Yet male speakers produced greater attitude change. Therefore, it appears from these results that on this topic--Capital Punishment--character and not dynamism was related to the amount of attitude change the speakers produced.

Table 5. Character dimension--Capital Punishment topic

	Male Speaker	Female Speaker	Mean Difference	t-tests
Male Audience	28.6	28.0	0.6	0.6
Female Audience	29.6	27.4	2.2	2.2*
Mean Difference	1.0	0.6		
t-tests	1.0	0.6		

*Significant at .05 level.

Federal Control of Education Topic Results

We have now seen the results pertaining to the capital punishment topic. With these in mind, our attention can be turned to those results related to the second topic, that of Federal Control of Education.

The previously mentioned "boomerang" effect is indicated by Table 6. This effect does not permit unequivocal interpretation of the results on attitude change relevant to this topic.

Table 6. Attitude change--Federal Control of Education topic

	Male Speaker	Female Speaker	Mean Difference	t-tests
Male Audience	x ^a	2.8	...	...
Female Audience	2.0	3.6	1.6	1.8
Mean Difference	...	0.8		
t-tests	...	0.4		

^aIndicates boomerang effect.

Table 7 illustrates the authoritativeness dimension of ethos for the Federal Control of Education topic. It can be seen that no significant differences can be reported on this dimension on this topic. It is meaningful to note that this same situation existed on the Capital Punishment topic

Table 7. Authoritativeness dimension--Federal Control of Education topic

	Male Speaker	Female Speaker	Mean Difference	t-tests
Male Audience	31.5	31.0	0.5	0.4
Female Audience	31.5	31.5	0.0	0.0
Mean Difference	0.0	0.5		
t-tests	0.0	0.4		

as illustrated by Table 3. Apparently, in this experiment, authoritativeness bore no relationship to attitude change. It could be concluded therefore, that under these experimental conditions, a speaker's authoritativeness makes no significant difference as related to attitude change.

Table 8 illustrates the dynamism dimension of the speaker's ethos for the Federal Control of Education topic. On this topic, it can be seen that females are perceived to be significantly more dynamic than males. This same situation existed on the Capital Punishment topic. However, on this second topic, dynamism results are not related inversely to attitude change. Indeed, on the Federal Control topic, there seems to be more harmony between dynamism and attitude change. Furthermore, in both topics of this experiment, the dynamism of female speakers obtained significant results.

Table 8. Dynamism dimension--Federal Control of Education topic

	Male Speaker	Female Speaker	Difference	t-tests
Male Audience	29.1	32.9	3.8	2.9*
Female Audience	29.3	33.4	4.1	3.2*
Mean Difference	0.2	0.5		
t-tests	0.2	0.4		

*Significant at .05 level.

The last dimension of ethos to be noted on the Federal Control topic is illustrated by Table 9. This dimension is the character dimension which on the second experimental topic obtained no significant difference. On the Capital Punishment topic, male speakers were perceived to be of higher character than the female speakers by the female members of the audience. However, for the Federal Control of Education topic there exists no significant differences on the character dimension of source credibility.

Interpretation

The results previously indicated by the discussion and the tables in this chapter allow for the following statements to be made concerning the interpretation and application of these results to the topic under investigation.

Table 9. Character dimension--Federal Control of Education topic

	Male Speaker	Female Speaker	Mean Difference	t-tests
Male Audience	26.4	25.8	0.6	0.6
Female Audience	26.7	26.0	0.7	0.7
Mean Difference	0.3	0.2		
t-tests	0.3	0.2		

(1) The females in this experiment under these experimental condition were perceived to be more dynamic.

(2) Female speakers produced greater attitude change on one topic--Federal Control of Education, and male speakers produced greater attitude change on the other topic--Capital Punishment. These results indicate that sex of the speaker is related to the topic in producing attitude change. Therefore, it can be stated that there does not exist a sex variable in producing attitude change except as it interacts with a topic. On what topics this interaction occurs can not be determined from this study. Rather what can be determined is that sex interacts with the topic.]

(3) Sex makes no difference on the perceived authoritativeness of the speaker on either topic. On the character dimension, male speakers were perceived to be of higher character on the Capital Punishment topic when perceived by female audiences. Results on the Federal Control

of Education topic were similar. Although the difference was not significant on the Federal Control topic, the trend was in the same direction as that observed on the Capital Punishment topic.

(4) Another non-significant trend suggests that male audiences perceive the male speaker to be of higher character than do the female audiences.

(5) The perceived dynamism of male speakers in both cases was significantly less than that of the female speakers. Yet the same "undynamic" males were capable of producing greater attitude change on the Capital Punishment topic.

Results on the persuasibility factor on the Capital Punishment topic in this study indicate that males shifted 3.4 scale units and females shifted 4.3 scale units. Therefore, this illustrates a trend in the frequently observed direction that females are more persuasible than males. This difference, however, was not statistically significant.

Factor Analysis of the Dimensions of Ethos

Another aspect of importance related to this study is the results of the factor analysis of the ethos measures.

The ethos scales were factor analyzed and the following dimensions were identified. Both the three factor solutions and the four factor solutions can be termed "acceptable"

solutions for the purposes of this study.¹ The three factor solution loaded as was expected with the dimensions of authoritativeness, dynamism, and character. However, the four factor solution divided the character dimension of ethos into two parts. The split indicated two new dimensions of character--which could be labeled as character and personality. The scales unselfish--selfish, awful--nice, and friendly--unfriendly can be labeled personality characteristics. The remaining three scales, dishonest--honest, pleasant--unpleasant, and sinful--virtuous, can be considered as character traits.

Since this study did not hypothesize any new dimensions of ethos, the four factor solution is of particular interest because of its uniqueness. This is particularly so because the results were almost identical for the two separate topics. The loading for both the three-factor and the four-factor solutions for both the Capital Punishment and the Federal Control of Education topics are indicated by the following four tables.

¹Criterion used included a factor must account for the highest loadings for at least three items, the Eigenvalue must be at least 1.0, and an additional factor must account for a substantial increase in accountable variance.

Table 10. Capital Punishment topic three factor solution

Proportions of Variance			
	1. 0.1849	2. 0.2267	3. 0.1760
Rotated Factor Loadings			
	1	2	3
1.	70	28	18
2.	71	02	03
3.	76	06	24
4.	63	23	39
5.	65	19	23
6.	70	20	19
7.	05	80	10
8.	18	79	05
9.	06	86	02
10.	07	85	00
11.	03	81	15
12.	10	75	30
13.	12	01	66
14.	26	05	76
15.	14	05	80
16.	48	07	51
17.	23	05	70
18.	15	00	56

Table 11. Capital Punishment topic four factor solution

Proportions of Variance				
	1. 0.1863	2. 0.2255	3. 0.1266	4. 0.1102
Rotated Factor Loadings				
	1	2	3	4
1.	70	04	17	06
2.	70	02	04	09
3.	75	06	06	31
4.	65	21	41	10
5.	66	19	18	14
6.	71	20	21	03
7.	04	81	17	06
8.	18	78	04	02
9.	06	86	01	04
10.	07	85	01	03
11.	04	81	17	03
12.	08	74	34	07
13.	10	00	27	72
14.	26	04	61	46
15.	16	02	84	23
16.	46	08	15	62
17.	26	02	81	10
18.	12	02	07	81

Table 12. Federal Control of Education three factor solution

Proportions of Variance			
	1. 0.2031	2. 0.2569	3. 0.2013
Rotated Factor Loadings			
	1	2	3
1.	23	06	78
2.	17	08	77
3.	29	02	74
4.	47	25	61
5.	25	37	66
6.	18	19	84
7.	05	85	14
8.	14	86	13
9.	06	90	17
10.	06	89	12
11.	27	76	09
12.	22	81	11
13.	65	11	22
14.	77	17	21
15.	70	04	18
16.	69	12	28
17.	78	07	23
18.	67	19	10

Table 13. Federal Control of Education four factor solution

Proportion of Variance				
	1. 0.2066	2. 0.2577	3. 0.1270	4. 0.1184
Rotated Factor Loadings				
	1	2	3	4
1.	79	07	15	14
2.	78	09	05	15
3.	75	01	09	30
4.	62	26	37	26
5.	66	39	29	02
6.	84	20	16	06
7.	13	85	05	02
8.	13	85	03	23
9.	17	90	00	10
10.	11	89	03	05
11.	09	76	20	18
12.	10	82	24	06
13.	24	10	37	54
14.	23	18	71	36
15.	19	02	85	09
16.	30	10	24	75
17.	25	07	68	41
18.	13	17	15	82

The results presented in this chapter indicated there does not exist a sex variable in producing attitude change except as it interacts with a topic. The sex of the speaker is related to the topic in producing attitude change.

Following this analysis of results, the relevant conclusions and their implications for future research are discussed in Chapter IV of this study.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

The completion of the analysis of the results of this experiment now permits the researcher to suggest several conclusions that can be drawn from the effort. In addition to such conclusions, the results of the experiment and the theoretical observations on which it is based, challenge our thoughts to formulate new observations upon which future research can possibly be generated. Answers, or at least theories, for some of the problems faced in this study will also be submitted in hopes that research can build upon these and make pragmatic application of them. Finally, specific suggestions for future research will be made.

It probably is best to begin by referring back to one of the initial statements made by the researcher in this study. That statement read, "While traditional figures of persuasive authority in our society remain male, the increasing role of women in political, scientific, and educational pursuits emphasizes the importance and necessity of effective public speaking for both sexes."

It is not the purpose of the present research to illustrate numerous statistics citing where women are

assuming new positions. But it is clear that during World War II, an emancipation of women working began that has continued throughout this decade. This emancipation may indeed have been partially responsible for the results of this study concerning the effect of the sex of the communicator. In this study, sex made no difference except as it interacted with the topic. In relation to attitude change, the influence of the sex of the speaker depends on the topic. We could conclude, therefore, that the male speaker is not dominant alone on the basis of his sex--at least this is true according to the conditions which existed in this experiment. The sex factor appears to be advantageous on specific topics, but not, according to the results of this research, on all topics.)

In addition, this research can have application to forensic activities. It would seem from the results of this study that it is not appropriate to separate contest activities into men's and women's divisions on the grounds that women would be disadvantaged if placed in direct competition with men. Indeed, the disadvantage may lie with the topic the speaker of either sex chooses to speak on. If, in the contest situation the topic interacts with the sex of the speaker as it has in this study, then indeed the worry of the orator should be with the topic he or she selects rather than with whether or not there exists a men's and women's division in the speech contest.

The Knower research which is reported in the review of the literature in this study found that there was relatively little difference in the effect produced by men and women speakers when all situations are equated.¹ This result is supported by the present study where it was found that there existed little difference in the attitude change effected by male or female speakers under similar conditions.

However, Knower also found that there were greater changes in groups of men who heard a woman speaker and vice versa, there was a greater change in groups of women who heard a man speaker than in groups who heard a woman speaker.² This result from the Knower study was not observed in the present study.

It can be speculated that part of the reason for this difference may lie in the fact that Knower used live speakers. Live speakers may increase sexual attraction which could induce attitude change. It certainly would be reasonable to assume that it did increase interest, if not attitude change. However, in the research under consideration in this study, tape recordings were used to reduce potentially non-verbal confounding elements in the study. Certainly, it would seem that sexual attraction is reduced

¹Knower, op. cit., p. 335.

²Ibid., pp. 343-344.

with tapes. Perhaps, if this research was replicated using live speakers, it would be possible to find results similar to those which Knower obtained.¹

The appearance of the source has been found to affect initial ethos in communication. According to an experiment by Mills and Aronson, an attractive girl modifies audience attitudes more than an unattractive girl does. Actually, in the experimental situation both girls were the same girl made up differently. In both cases the audience was composed of male college students.¹

Perhaps, if a live "attractive" girl and a live "attractive" male were placed in an experimental situation as speakers, audience attitudes would be greatly modified when analyzed by opposite sex reactions. Under this situation, it may be possible to replicate Knower's results.

Acceptance or Rejection of Hypotheses

The results of this study concerning the effect of the sex of the communicator on perceived ethos and attitude change allow us to make the following judgments concerning the hypotheses which were generated in Chapter I.

(1) There is no significant difference in terminal ethos of male and female speakers with identical introductions.¹

¹J. Mills and E. Aronson, "Opinion Change as a Function of the Communicator's Attractiveness and Desire to Influence," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, I (1965), 173-177.

This hypotheses can not be rejected. From the results of this experiment concerning terminal ethos, it can be seen that it is not possible to reject this hypothesis of no difference.

(2) A source with initially high ethos induced by an introduction has higher significantly terminal ethos than a source with low ethos also induced by an introduction. This hypothesis is not testable due to the fact that the ethos inductions were not successful as reported in Chapter III.

(3) There is no significant difference in attitude change produced by male and female speakers with identical introductions. This hypothesis can not be rejected because a significant speaker sex effect on attitude change did not occur in this study. As has been previously illustrated, male speakers were more persuasive on the Capital Punishment topic--female speakers on the Federal Control of Education topic, indicating that the sex of the speaker is related to the topic in producing attitude change. Therefore, it can be concluded that in this experiment, under these conditions there existed no difference in attitude change produced by a male or a female speaker with an identical introduction.

(4) A source with initially high ethos induced by an introduction produces significantly more attitude change than a source with low ethos also induced by an introduction. This hypothesis is also not testable in this study. This is

due to the fact that the ethos inductions attempting to manipulate high and low ethos obtained only a high ethos condition as indicated by preliminary statistical analysis.

(5) Terminal ethos of males is significantly higher for audiences composed of females than for audiences composed of males. This hypothesis can be rejected with reservations. Sex made no difference on the perceived authoritativeness of the speaker on either topic. On the character dimension male speakers were perceived to be of higher character on the Capital Punishment topic when perceived by female audiences. The same was true on the other experimental topic, although the difference was not significant. Females were perceived to be more dynamic in all conditions.

(6) Terminal ethos of females is significantly higher for audiences composed of males than for audiences composed of females. This hypothesis can be rejected. It is significant to note in this direction that in all conditions the perceived dynamism of females was significantly more than that of the male speakers. Sex of audience made no significant difference on the perceived authoritativeness or the character of the female speakers on either topic.

(7) Female audiences change their attitudes significantly more when exposed to male speakers than when exposed to female speakers. This hypothesis can be rejected. The results of this study permit us to conclude that there is

no significant difference in attitude change with female audiences when exposed to male or female speakers.

(8) Male audiences change their attitudes significantly more when exposed to female speakers than when exposed to male speakers. This hypothesis can be rejected. The results of this study indicated no difference in male audiences' attitude change when hearing female or male speakers.

Suggestions for Future Research

The first suggestion for future research has previously been alluded to. That is to conduct an experiment similar to this one using live speakers instead of tape recorded speakers. Perhaps, in our days of "sophistication," the use of electric machines has indeed resulted in an obliteration of the human element vital to not only the research situation but to the realistic situation as well. Although the use of live speakers may present complications as to obtaining persons available to present the speeches and to achieving exactness in oral presentations, the difficulties may be worth the effort. Indeed when the human element is reintroduced we may again find that males are persuaded more by females and females more by males.

Previous mention has been made of the boomerang effect on the Federal Control of Education topic in this experiment. It is difficult as has been previously noted

to ascertain the exact causes of this condition. It is possible to suggest that subjects misinterpreted the meaning of Federal Control of Education on the pre-test and were only made aware of the ramifications of such a program after hearing the experimental speech. Thus their original strong feelings of opposition were brought to the surface and they reacted by shifting negatively to the speech. It is possible that there does exist an inherent weakness in the Federal Control topic which could have caused such a reaction. Perhaps, though what really occurred in this case was truly an artifact of experimental research and no logical explanation offered can ever be adequate.

It may be helpful for future research to attempt to gain information on the wiseness of using certain topics in experimental studies. Such "topical" research could be of increased value as experimental study continues. Although such research may seem rudimentary, it is often such elementary questions which can contaminate a valuable study. We have not yet reached the level of sophistication in experimental research in Speech, where we can ignore the basic questions which permit our experiment to operate. It is futile to destroy a valuable study because of the belief that a question was of too small or too simple a nature to merit our attention.

Another problem faced in the present research involved the obtaining of a low ethos introduction for experimental purposes. Although the researcher was of the opinion that her low ethos introduction was low enough--as it had proven to be in the past--it became apparent from the initial analysis of results that both the high and low ethos introductions were perceived by the subjects as introductions for high credibility sources.

Again, we are faced with a rudimentary and basic question. With the changing attitudes and morals of today's generation, perhaps characteristics which appear to indicate low credibility, in actuality do not.

For the meaningful manipulation of ethos introductions as variables in research studies, we must determine the standards by which these introductions are perceived. Certainly the lack of success of the ethos inductions in this study reminds the researcher that meanings are indeed in the minds of the receivers and that ethos is the attitude held by that receiver. Perhaps future research could attempt to determine the conditions which permit credibility to be successfully manipulated in the minds of those receivers.

One significant by-product of this study was the information gained on the factor analysis of the dimensions of ethos. The previously discussed four factor solution should encourage more research on the dimensions of ethos.

Perhaps, we have gained meaningful new knowledge through this analysis concerning the character dimensions. Certainly these results pertaining to the four factor solution are indication of an area for future research.

Probably the most important implication for future research suggested by the results of this study is that we should no longer assume that sex of source or audience differentially affects attitude change except as it interacts with the topic. If we can extend the results of this study far enough to relate to future research, we can see that what we have determined here is a question that is basic to future research studies. The sex variable has appeared to be a potentially contaminating factor in experimental research. However, the results of this research suggest that this contamination is related to topic variability and can thus be controlled by carefully considering this problem during the topic selection.

Future research should be more concerned about whether sex is interacting with the experimental topic than about the basic effect of the sex of the communicator or the audience. Experimental studies in Speech must be applied to other studies to be of value. By building on past research, we can create present studies and indicate new directions for the future. If this is consistently

accomplished, we can build a body of research which permits us new insights into every facet of the process of communication.

Indeed, we must never lose sight of our goal that we are attempting to determine, "the faculty of discovering in the particular case what are the available means of persuasion."¹

¹The Rhetoric of Aristotle, op. cit., p. 7.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MEASURING INSTRUMENTS

Name _____ Section _____ Instructor _____

Student Number _____ Sex _____ Age _____

The following is a series of semantic differentials, a type of attitude scale. You are asked to evaluate the concept at the top in terms of the six bipolar adjectives below the concept. For example, if you were to evaluate the concept "President Johnson" in terms of his attractiveness, and you think he is very attractive, you would mark an X as below:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Beautiful : X : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Ugly

If you feel that he is quite unattractive, of course, your X would be placed nearer the "ugly" pole.

The middle space should be considered "neutral." Check this space if you feel that neither adjective applies to the concept, or if you feel both adjectives apply equally to the concept.

DRAFT DEFERMENTS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

Harmful : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Beneficial

Good : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Bad

Wrong : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Right

Fair : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Unfair

Negative : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Positive

Wise : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Foolish

FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

Harmful : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Beneficial

Good : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Bad

Wrong : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Right

Fair : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Unfair

Negative : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Positive

Wise : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Foolish

U.S. Viet Nam Policy

Harmful	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Beneficial
Good	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Bad
Wrong	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Right
Fair	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Unfair
Negative	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Positive
Wise	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Foolish

STATE INCOME TAX

Harmful	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Beneficial
Good	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Bad
Wrong	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Right
Fair	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Unfair
Negative	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Positive
Wise	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Foolish

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Harmful	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Beneficial
Good	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Bad
Wrong	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Right
Fair	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Unfair
Negative	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Positive
Wise	:__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :	Foolish

Name _____ Section _____ Instructor _____

Student Number _____ Sex _____ Age _____

The following is a series of semantic differentials, a type of attitude scale. You are asked to evaluate the concept at the top in terms of the bipolar adjectives below the concept. For example, if you were to evaluate the concept "President Johnson" in terms of his attractiveness, and you think he is very attractive, you would mark an X as below:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Beautiful : X : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Ugly

If you feel that he is quite unattractive, of course, your X would be placed nearer to the "ugly" pole.

The middle space should be considered "neutral." Check this space if you feel that neither adjective applies to the concept, or if you feel both adjectives apply equally to the concept.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Harmful : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Beneficial

Good : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Bad

Wrong : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Right

Fair : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Unfair

Negative : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Positive

Wise : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Foolish

THE SPEECH

Good Delivery : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Bad Delivery

Bad Content : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Good Content

THE SPEAKER

Informed	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Uninformed
Unqualified	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Qualified
Reliable	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Unreliable
Worthless	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Valuable
Intelligent	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Unintelligent
Inexpert	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Expert
Aggressive	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Meek
Hesitant	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Emphatic
Forceful	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Forceless
Timid	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Bold
Active	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Passive
Tired	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Energetic
Unselfish	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Selfish
Awful	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Nice
Friendly	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Unfriendly
Dishonest	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Honest
Pleasant	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Unpleasant
Sinful	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Virtuous

Name _____ Section _____ Instructor _____

Student Number _____ Sex _____ Age _____

The following is a series of semantic differentials, a type of attitude scale. You are asked to evaluate the concept at the top in terms of the bipolar adjectives below the concept. For example, if you were to evaluate the concept "President Johnson" in terms of his attractiveness, and you think he is very attractive, you would make an X as below:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Beautiful : X : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Ugly

If you feel that he is quite unattractive, of course, your X would be placed nearer to the "ugly" pole.

The middle space should be considered "neutral." Check this space if you feel that neither adjective applies to the concept, or if you feel both adjectives apply equally to the concept.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

Harmful : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Beneficial

Good : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Bad

Wrong : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Right

Fair : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Unfair

Negative : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Positive

Wise : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Foolish

THE SPEECH

Good Delivery : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Bad Delivery

Bad Content : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : Good Content

THE SPEAKER

Informed	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Uninformed
Unqualified	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Qualified
Reliable	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Unreliable
Worthless	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Valuable
Intelligent	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Unintelligent
Inexpert	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Expert
Aggressive	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Meek
Hesitant	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Emphatic
Forceful	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Forceless
Timid	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Bold
Active	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Passive
Tired	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Energetic
Unselfish	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Selfish
Awful	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Nice
Friendly	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Unfriendly
Dishonest	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Honest
Pleasant	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Unpleasant
Sinful	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	Virtuous

APPENDIX B

INTRODUCTIONS

INTRODUCTIONS

I. FEDERAL CONTROL

LOW: Our speaker is Alexander (Alice) Kolaski. Mr. Kolaski is an active member of the Michigan Socialist Labor Party and presently on its board of directors. He is a native of Detroit and attended primary and secondary schools there. He was "supoened" to testify before the H.U.A.C. in 1957 but refused to testify on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

HIGH: Our speaker is Thomas A. (Karen L.) Johnson. Dr. Johnson received his De.D. degree from the University of Chicago and has served special appointments for the U.S. Office of Education as well as being a research director for elementary education for the Rockefeller Foundation. He has recently published a book on the role of the Federal Government in Public Education entitled "What Type of Socialism?"

II. CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

LOW: Our speaker is Mr. John (Jane) Williamston. Mr. Williamston is a native of California and studied at the University of California at Berkeley for two years. Later he served a one year sentence for extortion in the California State Prison at Chico. He is currently under investigation by the California Organized Crime Commission for his activities in connection with gambling in the San Francisco Bay Area.

HIGH: Our speaker is Warren T. (Mark K.) Anderson. Dr. Anderson received his Ph.D. degree from Columbia University in criminology and has since served as a special investigator for the Treasury Department. He has recently completed national lecture tour on the subject of organized crime and correctional institutions.

APPENDIX C

SPEECHES

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT SPEECH

A controversy over capital punishment has raged in this country for the past century. Nearly every week there is at least one article or editorial in the newspapers concerning this method of punishing criminals. State legislatures are constantly confronted by bills which would either abolish or limit the use of the death penalty.

It is no wonder, then that nearly everyone has an opinion on the question. What is surprising is that the American public is nearly evenly divided in their opinions. It is difficult to understand how a people who pride themselves on judging the desirability of a policy in light of cold, hard facts can be so divided. It seems to me that only two things could explain this division: Either the American people are irrational or the important facts on this question have not been made available to them. In my opinion the latter is more likely the case. Thus, it will be my purpose in this talk to discuss the pertinent facts concerning capital punishment in this country.

To begin with, let's answer the question, "How frequently is the death penalty being imposed on criminals?" The trend is clear and that trend is downward. The past thirty years there have been gradually fewer people executed. While our population and crime rate are both increasing sharply, our execution rate has dropped to only a fraction of what it was just a few years ago. In short, although society has retained this form of punishment on our law books, we have chosen to enforce it in only a small and steadily decreasing fraction of the cases in which it could be applied.

But this doesn't tell us whether we should enforce the death penalty more frequently or abolish it. There are those who will argue forcefully for either of these positions. Lets look at the arguments for both sides and the pertinent facts which apply to those arguments.

The most frequent argument for capital punishment is that the threat of the death penalty deters potential criminals from committing crimes. It supposedly helps reduce the crime rate for those offenses against society to which it applies. That this is a strong argument for retaining the death penalty is attested to by the fact that a majority of the American public believe that it is true.

Those opposed to capital punishment, however, say that the deterrence argument is absurd. They analyze the deterrence argument something like this. We are supposed to fear death more than anything else, therefore, if we know that we will be put to death for committing a crime, we shall not commit it. However, this assumes a rational choice on the part of the potential criminal. For this theory to work the criminal would have to be consciously aware of the possibility of being executed when he is making his decision whether to commit a crime or not. Needless to say, this is not in accord with modern psychological research which has found human behavior to be largely unplanned and habitual, rather than carefully calculated and completely rational.

Which view of deterrence is right? Well let's look at the facts. Studies of convicted murderers indicate that very few of them thought of the possible consequences before they committed their crime. Many say that even if they had thought of the consequences they would have committed the crime anyway.

Now to some this represents positive proof that the death penalty is not a deterrent. But if we think about it for a moment we will realize that these reactions of convicted murderers tell us nothing that we didn't already know. It is obvious that they weren't deterred by the death penalty or they wouldn't have been convicted murderers.

It is obvious that facts of this sort will not provide an answer to the question of the value of the death penalty as a deterrent. Fortunately, there is another body of fact that is reliable. Before we look at these facts let's take just a moment to examine the theory of deterrence a bit more closely. This theory says that by threatening potential criminals with the death penalty we will reduce the crime rate. The converse of this, of course, is that if we remove the threat of the death penalty the crime rate will increase. Clearly the best way to test this theory is to look at the crime rates where the death penalty is legal and where it is not legal to see if there is a significant difference.

The figures for murder, the most common crime to which the death penalty applies, show that the homicide rates are lower for states which have abolished capital punishment than for those that still retain it. In fact if we compare individual non-capital punishment states with neighboring capital punishment states, we find that wherever meaningful comparisons can be made the non-capital punishment states have lower homicide rates than their neighbors.

What do these facts indicate? They indicate that homicide rate comparisons are exactly opposite of what they should be if the theory of deterrence were correct. In short, there is absolutely no factual support for the theory of deterrence whatsoever. If we are to justify retaining capital punishment on the law books we must find some other justification.

Supporters of capital punishment, of course, believe there are other reasons for retaining this law. Many will argue that it is essential to eliminate those particularly viscious criminals who have already proven that they are a menace to society so that society will not be threatened by them again. This certainly makes sense. If we run over a nail and get a flat tire, we certainly want to remove that nail so that it won't give us more flat tires in the future. Only a fool would leave the nail where it was.

Opponents of capital punishment readily agree that society must be protected from such criminals, but they suggest that capital punishment is not necessary to accomplish that end. Let's look at the facts to see which side has the better of this dispute.

First, as we all know, there is more than adequate space in our prisons to keep all capital offenders securely restrained from molesting the rest of society. There are only a few hundred persons who are convicted of capital crimes each year in this country. This averages out to only a handful of individuals for each state. Certainly this small group of criminals can be retained in prison without overburdening our prison system.

Secondly, and I think much more importantly, very few persons are actually executed each year. To suggest that executing this small group of criminals significantly protects society is absurd. Obviously, keeping a man in prison is just as effective a method of protecting society as killing him.

Of course many people are legitimately concerned that if a man is not executed he may be parolled and thus be free to commit more capital crimes. This, of course, is true. But the answer to this problem is to toughen the requirements for parole of capital offenders. One excellent suggestion has been made in this regard. That is to give juries the option of life imprisonment without the possibility of parole as an alternative to capital punishment.

On the basis of these facts it is apparent that capital punishment is not necessary to protect society from even the most dangerous of capital offenders. In short, protection of society does not justify retaining capital punishment on the law books.

One more argument is frequently advanced in support of capital punishment. This is the age-old and persistent concept that says a criminal ought to die because he has committed a horrible crime and society must have its retribution. Opponents of capital punishment say that such a philosophy is nothing but the law of the jungle and is beneath the dignity of civilized man. Both sides quote the Bible to support their argument. I will not pose as an authority on normality. However, the facts on this question are known by almost everyone. Every major religion in the world has denounced this position as immoral. As far as I have been able to determine, only the Russian and Chinese Communists and a few primitive tribes in Africa and Asia hold this philosophy as a basic tenant of their lives.

It is apparent then that the three basic arguments of the advocates of capital punishment are not supported by the facts. Crime is not deterred by this penalty, society is not better protected by this penalty, and the ethical basis of this penalty has been renounced by every major religion in the world. But let's not automatically conclude that capital punishment should be abolished. Let's look at the arguments advanced by the opponents of capital punishment to see if they are supported by the facts any better than those of the people favoring it.

The first major argument advanced by those advocating the abolition of capital punishment is that it is inherently discriminatory in its enforcement. They suggest that it is discriminatory on three grounds--on the basis of chance, on the basis of race, and on the basis of sex. Let's look at the facts.

First, discrimination by chance. One fact that we have already mentioned is relevant here. Only a handful of those people convicted of capital crimes each year are actually executed. Why are these few executed and the others not? That question can be answered by referring to chance. Certainly different juries and judges may have chosen a different group to die. This is a most uncomfortable answer to most people. We like to think of our system of justice as being perfect and consistent. Of course we know that no system devised by man is perfect and that mistakes and injustices do occur in our administration of laws permitting

capital punishment. But the opponents of capital punishment suggest that discrimination on the bases of race and sex is much more important than chance in determining who shall be executed and who shall be imprisoned. Again, let's look at the facts.

First, racial discrimination. In some southern states practically the only persons ever executed are Negroes. Certain laws, most notably the law making rape a capital crime, are enforced only against Negroes in some states. Whites who commit the same crime receive a lesser penalty. Over the nation as a whole more Negroes than whites are executed annually--even though the Negro constitutes only a small minority of our population.

As clearly as the facts support the contention that Negroes are discriminated against in the administration of capital punishment, the facts concerning discrimination based on sex are even more lopsided. Women are almost never executed, no matter what their crime. All but a handful of the hundreds of people executed since World War II have been males. Actually a man has about a hundred times greater chance of being executed than a woman for the same crime.

It is readily apparent from these facts that chance, race, and sex, are very important factors in determining whether a criminal will be executed for a capital crime. The discrimination argument of those who would abolish capital punishment is strongly supported.

The final argument expounded by opponents of capital punishment suggests that with all of the executions that take place certainly some completely innocent men have been put to death. There are very few facts on this question. Although it is impossible to estimate how many completely innocent men have been executed, there have been cases in nearly every capital punishment state where the real murderer has confessed the crime on his deathbed years after a totally innocent person has been executed.

It is interesting to note that after recent publication of a case of this type two states have abolished capital punishment and crime commissions in three others have recommended to their state legislatures that it be abolished in these states also.

We must remember that when we invoke the death penalty we preclude any possibility of rectifying mistakes that might have been made. We may think that it could never happen to us. That's what other innocent men have thought. But it did happen to them. The only way we can be absolutely

certain that innocent men are not executed is to avoid executing anyone at all.

Well, I don't believe I need to belabor the issue any further. We have examined the facts and seen that capital punishment does not deter crime, we have seen that society can be protected from criminals without killing them, we have seen that the alleged moral basis for capital punishment has been renounced by every major religion in the world, we have seen that discrimination based on race and sex flourishes in the administration of the death penalty, and finally, we have noted that innocent men have been executed and that the only way to prevent this from happening again is to eliminate the death penalty altogether.

I have decided what I think should be done about the laws that permit capital punishment. I would guess that you have also.

EDUCATION SPEECH

Almost two hundred years ago Thomas Jefferson told the American people that if we expected to remain both ignorant and free we were expecting what never was and never will be. If it was true that man could not remain ignorant and free in the 18th century, it is truer today. Thus it is not surprising that almost every American will tell you that he is "all for the best educational system possible." With this historical support and apparently favorable modern attitude we could be led to the assumption that the United States has the best possible public educational system already in operation. Before we accept this assumption as fact we should determine just what are the criteria for the best possible educational system for the 20th century and how well our present system measures up to this ideal. It will be my purpose this evening to do just that.

While there may be some disagreement on the order of importance, most people concerned with our educational system would suggest four criteria for a first class program. First, the quality of the instruction must be high. Second, there must be adequate finances available to provide for all legitimate educational needs. Third, the school system must provide equal opportunity for all children in the nation. Finally, qualified people must control the operation of the system. Let's look at these criteria of the ideal school system to see what they really mean and how our present school system in the United States meets or fails to meet them.

Probably the most difficult thing to define in relation to education is quality. But I think we can assume that whatever quality is, it will be present if students take the right courses from well trained teachers. The important thing in assessing the quality of an educational system is whether or not individual students, whatever school they must attend, are able to study the courses that are right for them. Unfortunately in many of our nation's schools students are not able to take the right courses-- simply because they aren't even offered. Many of our schools do not offer such essential college preparatory subjects as chemistry or physics, and others don't offer even one foreign language. Only a small fraction of our public schools offer a broad program of vocational education. From this we must conclude that many of our students are not obtaining the quality education we desire.

But, for a moment, let us assume that every student in the United States has the opportunity to take the right courses. We still will be forced to conclude that the quality of American education is not acceptable because of that second characteristic of a quality educational system that I mentioned a few moments ago--well trained teachers. I'm sure I don't have to tell anyone about the tremendous shortage of adequately trained teachers. Almost every state is presently forced to accept substandard teachers. Across the nation we are short more than 100,000 teachers just to meet minimum standards. We can only guess what the figure would be if we tried to eliminate all of the incompetent teachers in the classrooms today and replace them with thoroughly trained and qualified individuals. I would suggest 500,000 as a very conservative starting figure. But, whatever the figure is, since many needed courses are not even offered students in many of our schools, and we face a serious shortage of competent teachers, we must conclude that our present educational system falls far short of our ideal of a quality educational system.

Now let us turn our attention to the criterion of finance. However, we can say that if our schools have enough money to provide educationally acceptable physical plants, to pay professional salaries to our teachers, and to cover costs of operating expenses and equipment, that could be called adequate finance.

Let us look first at physical plants. A very large percentage of the classrooms presently in use are obsolete and unacceptable for public schools because of such things as extreme fire hazards. Over three hundred thousand of our present classrooms are unacceptable. This means that upwards of nine million American children are forced to attend substandard schools, some of which are so bad that they can only be classed as fire hazards. But one may ask, "Isn't this problem being overcome?" Unfortunately it isn't in many areas. I needn't point out that most schools are built by finances derived by selling municipal bonds. These bond issues must be voted on by the people in the communities involved. If the bonds are voted down, the new school facilities are not built. Almost one-fourth of these bond issues have been voted down in elections over the past few years, and the number is increasing. It is apparent from these facts that not only are there numerous school buildings in completely unacceptable condition, but even in those communities where an attempt is made to remedy the problem, over a fourth of the attempts are unsuccessful.

And how about adequate financing to provide for professional salaries for our teachers? Probably many of us

have enough information already to draw a conclusion about the adequacy of financing in some of our states. We know that the average teacher's salary in some states is only half of that of teachers in other states. But let's get away from state and national "averages" and look at teachers' salaries from another prospective. Most of us know that the generally accepted income level under which people are considered to be living in abject poverty is \$3,000. Certainly a professional educator should be expected to earn far more than that. However, in some states many teachers receive salaries below that level.

Now, don't misunderstand me. In some states teachers make a fairly good income. But very few teachers receive salaries comparable to other college graduates.

Thus, while some schools in some areas have excellent financing, other schools in other areas are fire hazards staffed by teachers receiving salaries which force them to live in what our government calls "abject poverty."

But, we can not complete our evaluation of the present school system in the United States without considering the criterion of equality of opportunity for all of our children. There are several things that we must consider in determining whether equality of opportunity is present, some of which I have already mentioned. For a national educational system that offers equal opportunity to all of its children, course offerings must be somewhat similar across the country. We have already seen that this isn't the case in American education. Also for equality of opportunity to exist, the teachers should be reasonably comparable from one area to another. But it would be stretching the imagination pretty far to suggest that Mississippi can get as high a quality of teachers for \$3,000 as California can for \$8,000. Finally, we must mention that many of our children are still prohibited from achieving equality of opportunity in education because of race. Governor Johnson of Mississippi during the last election bragged that no school in the state of Mississippi was integrated. There has been some improvement since then. Now only a little over 99% are segregated.

This brings us to the last criterion for an ideal public educational system that I posited early in this talk, that qualified people must be in control of the system. Well, what is a qualified person? I would suggest that three characteristics are essential. Such a person should, among other things, be well educated, he should understand the process of curriculum building, and he should have a thorough understanding of modern teaching procedures. Let's

look at who is actually in control of our schools. As we all know, the local school board is in charge of our schools so we need to determine whether these people are capable of properly running an educational system.

First we can consider what the requirements are for a person to become a school board member. The picture is not encouraging. No state requires that a school board member know everything about education. In most states the only requirement is that the person be a qualified voter. Some have additional residence requirements. Others require an eighth grade education. A few require that the board member be a taxpayer or parent. In some areas there are no requirements at all.

From this we might suspect that our boards are made up of people totally unqualified to run an educational system. Such a suspicion is born out in fact. Many of the school boards in the United States include members who are not even high school graduates.

Of course, some school board members have finished high school, so let's look at the occupations of school board members in general. Many of them are business owners, officials, and managers. Some are in the professional and technical services--doctors, lawyers, and engineers. Some are farmers. A few are laborers, craftsmen, housewives and clerks. Did you notice one group missing from that list? I did. Educators! There are so few qualified educators that are members of local school boards that they don't even constitute a reportable category.

I think it says something significant about our nation's attitude toward education that we let just anyone serve on our school boards. I think it is time that we make some drastic revisions in our American educational system. The place to begin is right at the heart of the present system, with the people who are controlling the schools, the ones who are responsible for the present deplorable state of American education. These problems can not be overcome by merely increasing federal aid to education as some people suggest. Turning money over to states like Mississippi and Alabama won't solve anything. Neither will it be of any help to turn over federal money to local school districts run by school boards composed of school dropouts.

More specifically, I suggest that it is time for the Federal Government to assume ultimate control of the educational system of the United States. This is not to suggest that we turn the schools over to the federal politicians,

rather it is to take them away from the local politicians and turn them over to the educators. The specific proposal that I recommend has three major points:

First, it should be established by law that 10% of all future Federal budgets be devoted to American public school education. Along with this law, provision should be made for establishing an absolute priority for education before all other expenditures of the government. California now has such a provision and leads the nation in almost every area of education.

Second, the Federal Government should assume all present debts of public schools. This would equalize the program so that communities that have gone into debt to build present schools would not be penalized for that action.

Finally, a national council on education should be formed composed of members to the National Education Association and the Education Associations of the fifty states. This council would serve as advisors to the U.S. Office of Education which would be exclusively empowered to dispense all funds for education in the United States. This would not only guarantee standardization of the educational system across the United States but would also guarantee that the special needs of the state and locality would be served by that state's education association representatives. In short, the ultimate control of education would be in the hands of the Federal Government, but the operation of the schools would be left to professional educators hired on the state and local level.

What would be the effect of this program? Well, let's return to the criteria for an ideal school system that I mentioned a while ago to see how well this program would stand up. First, we said that the quality of education must be high. Since under the program I have recommended our schools would all be part of one standardized system, each student would have the opportunity to take the courses most suited to his needs, wherever he lives. Since there would be no shortage of funds, top flight people would be drawn into the teaching profession by truly adequate professional salaries. Second, we said that a school system should have adequate finances available to provide for all legitimate educational needs. If the budget and priority for education that I have recommended is adopted, no educational decisions will be dependent on financial considerations. The only important thing will be "Is it needed?" If salaries are too low, they will be increased. If a classroom building is a fire hazard, it will be replaced. If a teacher needs a slide projector or a tape recorder for her class, it will be provided.

It is important to note one more thing in this regard. Today, in most communities when the school budget is increased the property owners are forced to pay most of the bill through property taxes. Under the program I have suggested this oppressive form of taxation would not be needed and so could be abolished. All funds for education would come from Federal taxes which are based on a person's ability to pay, not on where he lives or what he owns.

Thus, under this system, the financial needs of education would be met and at the same time an oppressive tax would be removed and replaced by the most democratic type of tax system. Certainly under such a program, we can say that the criterion of "adequate" financing will be met.

Our third criterion was that the school system must provide equal opportunity for all children in the nation. Under the program I have suggested the facilities would be equal, the teachers would be relatively equal, and the course offerings would be equal. But most significantly, only under a program such as I offer can we ever hope to have racial equality in education in many parts of the nation. It should be abundantly clear to anyone who is concerned enough to look at the situation in the South that under state and local control of education, Negro children will never be truly equal.

Finally we said that our school system should be controlled by qualified individuals. The only people who have these characteristics are professional educators, precisely those people who would be administering our public school system under my program.

But what are the possible objections to this new program for American education that I have suggested? The most obvious objection is that it costs a lot of money. It certainly does. To make up for the neglect of our schools over the past fifty years is bound to be expensive. Buy any country that can afford \$40 billion to put a man on the moon can certainly afford to educate its children.

Of course, the other objection is that this program is socialistic. It certainly is. Public schools by definition are socialistic institutions. The only question is whether we want this socialistic institution, controlled at the local level by high school dropouts, the state level by men like Governors Wallace of Alabama and Johnson of Mississippi, or at the national level by professional educators.

To me that choice is simple. I think it is to most thinking Americans, no matter what their political persuasion.

In the final determination we have to decide whether we, the richest nation on the face of the Earth, wish to have an educational system capable of meeting the needs of our youth, or whether we are going to continue to sacrifice our children's future on the Altar of Irresponsibility.

APPENDIX D

EXPERIMENT ARRANGEMENTS

HOPE COLLEGE
The Department of Speech
Holland, Michigan
April 26, 1967

Miss Gretchen Steffens
1320 E. Grand River, Apt. 2
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Dear Gretchen:

We had a departmental meeting yesterday, during which your pre-tests were distributed. When completed, they will be returned to me, and I'll see that your father gets them.

Enclosed is the schedule I've set up for your testing of the classes. I trust it is clear to you; if not, let me know. We'll be looking for you in our classes on May 16, 17 and 18.

Sincerely,

William H. Bos
Chairman

WHB:db

Enclosure

GRETCHEN STEFFENS RESEARCH PROJECT

Schedule for Speech 11 Sections

A	.	.	.	Th	.	.	.	5/18	.	.	.	VR 303	.	.	.	8:30	.	.	.	Schrier
B	.	.	.	Tu	.	.	.	5/16	.	.	.	SC 402	.	.	.	9:30	.	.	.	Bos
C	.	.	.	Th	.	.	.	5/18	.	.	.	VR 303	.	.	.	9:30	.	.	.	Schrier
D	.	.	.	Tu	.	.	.	5/16	.	.	.	SC 402	.	.	.	9:30	.	.	.	Bos
E	.	.	.	Tu	.	.	.	5/16	.	.	.	SC 402	.	.	.	10:30	.	.	.	Bos
F	.	.	.	Th	.	.	.	5/18	.	.	.	PM 205	.	.	.	10:30	.	.	.	Mikle
G	.	.	.	Tu	.	.	.	5/16	.	.	.	SC 402	.	.	.	11:30	.	.	.	Ozinga
H	.	.	.	Tu	.	.	.	5/16	.	.	.	SC 402	.	.	.	1:00	.	.	.	Ozinga
I	.	.	.	Th	.	.	.	5/18	.	.	.	VR 303	.	.	.	2:00	.	.	.	Schrier
J	.	.	.	Tu	.	.	.	5/16	.	.	.	SC 402	.	.	.	3:00	.	.	.	Ozinga
K	.	.	.	W	.	.	.	5/17	.	.	.	SC 402	.	.	.	8:30	.	.	.	Bos
L	.	.	.	W	.	.	.	5/17	.	.	.	VR 303	.	.	.	9:30	.	.	.	Schrier
N	.	.	.	W	.	.	.	5/17	.	.	.	VR 303	.	.	.	11:30	.	.	.	Schrier

(Section M was dropped)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Cohen, Arthur. Attitude Change and Social Influence. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1964.
- Cooper, Lane. The Rhetoric of Aristotle. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1932.
- Hovland, C. I., Janis, L. I., and Kelley, H. H. Communication and Persuasion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Miller, Gerald R. Speech Communication: A Behavioral Approach. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1966.
- Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., and Tannenbaum, P. N. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Articles

- Andersen, Kenneth, and Clevenger, Theodore Jr. "A Summary of Experimental Research in Ethos," Speech Monographs, XXX (June, 1963), 59-78.
- Cathcart, R. S. "An Experimental Study of the Relative Effectiveness of Four Methods of Presenting Evidence," Speech Monographs, XXII (1955), 227-233.
- Holtzman, Paul H. "Confirmation of Ethos as a Confounding Element in Communication Research," Speech Monographs, XXXIII (1966), 364-366.
- Kelman, H. C., and Hovland, C. I. "Reinstatement of the Communicator in Delayed Measurement of Opinion Change," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVII (1953), 327-355.

- Knower, Franklin H. "Experimental Studies in Changes of Attitude," Journal of Social Psychology, VI (August, 1935), 315-345.
- Manis, Melvin. "Assessing Communication with the Semantic Differential," American Journal of Psychology (1959), 111-113.
- McCroskey, James C. "Scales for the Measurement of Ethos," Speech Monographs, XXXIII (1966), 65-72.
- McCroskey, James C., and Dunham, Robert E. "Ethos: A Confounding Element in Communication Research," Speech Monographs, XXXIII (1966), 456-463.
- Mills, J., and Aronson, E. "Opinion Change as a Function of the Communicator's Attractiveness and Desire to Influence," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, I (1965), 173-177.
- Scheidel, Thomas M. "Sex and Persuasibility," Speech Monographs, XXX (November, 1963).

Unpublished Material

- Berlo, D. K., and Lemert, J. B. "A Factor Analytic Study of the Dimensions of Source Credibility." Paper presented at the 1961 convention of the Speech Association of America, New York.
- Haiman, Franklyn. "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Ethos in Public Speaking." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1951.
- McCroskey, James C. "Experimental Studies of the Effects of Ethos and Evidence in Persuasive Communication." Unpublished D.Ed. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1966.
- Paulson, S. F. "An Experimental Study of Spoken Communication: The Effects of Prestige of the Speaker and Acknowledgment of Opposing Arguments on Audience Retention and Shift of Opinion." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1952.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293010620775