

This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received 67-14,139

MOFFETT, Frank Lee, 1938-
EFFECTS OF NEED FOR SOCIAL APPROVAL ON
JUDGMENTS OF STATEMENTS ABOUT A CENTRAL
ISSUE.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1967
Psychology, experimental

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

EFFECTS OF NEED FOR SOCIAL APPROVAL ON JUDGMENTS
OF STATEMENTS ABOUT A CENTRAL ISSUE

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY


FRANK LEE MOFFETT

Norman, Oklahoma

1967

EFFECTS OF NEED FOR SOCIAL APPROVAL ON JUDGMENTS
OF STATEMENTS ABOUT A CENTRAL ISSUE

APPROVED BY



William R. Hood

M. H. Tomada

E. W. Berenda

Vernon L. Disney

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to express his indebtedness to the members of the dissertation committee. Professors Dahlke, Berenda, Hood, Sisney and Trousdale have provided an invaluable amount of encouragement, cooperation, and understanding in the arduous completion of this research. Appreciation is also extended to their professional knowledge and skills which, over the years, have contributed immensely to the knowledge and professional growth of the author.

A special debt of gratitude is extended to Dr. Dahlke who has provided a continuous reality reference so necessary in the completion of this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF APPENDIXES	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM	1
II. METHOD	15
Issue	15
Subjects	15
Materials	16
Procedure	19
III. RESULTS	23
IV. DISCUSSION	41
V. SUMMARY	46
REFERENCES	50
APPENDIXES	53

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Results of Questionnaire for High and Low Approval-Motivated Subjects	25
2. Number of High and Low Approval-Motivated Subjects Who Remain Non-Committal on Zero or One or More Statements for the First Attitude Scale Administration	26
3. Results of the Second Administration of the Attitude Scale for Low and High Approval-Motivated Subjects in the Treatment and Control Groups with Respect to the Region of Non-Commitment	28
4. Number of Control and Treatment High Approval-Motivated Subjects Who Decreased, Increased or Remained the Same on Their Region of Non-Commitment on the Second Administration of the Attitude Scale	30
5. Number of Control and Treatment Low Approval-Motivated Subjects Who Decreased, Increased or Remained the Same on Their Region of Non-Commitment on the Second Administration of the Attitude Scale	32
6. Number of Treatment High and Low Approval-Motivated Subjects Who Changed or Did Not Change Their Region of Non-Commitment	33
7. Number of High and Low Approval-Motivated Individuals Who Shifted and the Direction of Shift of Their Most Acceptable Position on the Second Administration of the Attitude Scale	36

LIST OF APPENDIXES

Appendix	Page
A. Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale	54
B. Frequency Distributions of Sortment of Attitude Statements into Nine Categories by Judges	57
C. Sample Questionnaire Administered to Subjects Following Completion of Attitude Scale	67
D. Number of Most Acceptable, Most Objectionable, Acceptable, Objectionable, and Non-Commitment Statements on First Administration of Attitude Scale for All Subjects	69
E. Number of Non-Commitment Statements for Treatment and Control Subjects on Attitude Scale for Both Administrations and Change in Region of Non-Commitment	71
F. Most Acceptable Position for Treatment and Control Subjects on Attitude Scale for Both Administrations and Direction of Shift of Most Acceptable Position	77
G. Number of Statements Rejected by High and Low Approval- Motivated Subjects on First Administration of Attitude Scale	83

EFFECTS OF NEED FOR SOCIAL APPROVAL ON JUDGMENTS
OF STATEMENTS ABOUT A CENTRAL ISSUE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM

The tendency of subjects taking a personality inventory to try (consciously or unconsciously) to give a favorable picture of themselves has become a matter of increasing importance to personality assessors. Wiggins and Rumrill (1959) numerate three types of approaches that have been applied to this problem:

The first approach was by Meehl and Hathaway (1946) which drew attention to the increasing problem of socially desirable responses. The K scale of the MMPI was specifically developed as an attempt to determine the extent of this test-taking attitude in a given subject and to numerically "correct" the other scales of the MMPI which seemed most vulnerable to this type of distortion.

A second avenue of approach that converges on the same problem has been the generalization of Cronbach's concept of "response set" (Cronbach, 1946, 1950), to include aberrant or statistically deviant response sets by Berg (1955, 1957) and the subsequent implementation of this notion by Barnes (1956a, 1956b) with the MMPI.

A third approach is represented by the concept of item "social desirability" and has been the focus of a great amount of recent research by Edwards (1957) and his followers. Although there would appear to be little that would conceptually distinguish this notion from the general "fake good" dimension that Meehl and Hathaway had in mind, there does seem to be an emphasis on item content that is not present in other studies (Berg, 1955, 1957; Barnes, 1956a, 1956b). Edwards (1957) taps the social desirability dimension by having judges rate the "social desirability" of inventory items. Social desirability, thus has been used by Edwards to refer to a characteristic of test items, i.e., their scale position on a social desirability scale.

In summarizing these three approaches the focus of interest falls into two categories: (a) the test behavior of the subjects as exemplified in the approaches taken by Meehl and Hathaway (1946) and Cronbach (1946, 1950); (b) the social desirability properties of test items as exemplified by Edwards (1957).

There is still another more recent approach to the problem of social desirability which has been taken by Crowne and Marlowe (1960). They contend that the three approaches of Meehl and Hathaway, Cronbach, and Edwards toward the control and conceptualization of the social desirability effect are inadequate. First of all, Crowne and Marlowe (1960) point out that underlying the three above approaches is the concept of statistical deviance.

Whether the test behavior of Ss of the social desirability properties of items are the focus of interest, however, it now seems clear that underlying both these approaches is the concept of statistical deviance (Crowne & Marlowe, p. 394).

Crowne and Marlowe state that there are unfortunate consequences which follow from the use of a statistical deviance model in the development of social desirability scales. For instance, when using items drawn from the MMPI, it is apparent that in addition to their scalability for social desirability the items may also be characterized by their content, which in a general sense has pathological implications. Therefore, when a social desirability scale constructed according to this procedure is then applied to a college student population, the meaning of high social desirability scores is not at all clear. For instance, when subjects are given the Edwards Social Desirability Scale (SDS), a scale which contains pathological items, it cannot be determined whether these responses are attributable to social desirability or to a genuine absence of such symptoms.

It was on the basis of these arguments that Crowne and Marlowe (1960) developed a new scale of social desirability, the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C SDS), which is free from the ambiguities of the statistical deviance approach and free from pathological items.

This new scale differs from others in that it defines social desirability as a personality characteristic such that individuals scoring high on the M-C SDS are characterized as individuals who seek social approval.

Social desirability, as presently defined, refers to a need for social approval and acceptance and the belief that this can be attained by means of culturally acceptable and appropriate behaviors. In a psychometric situation, a high need for social approval would be inferred from a person's attribution of culturally approved statements to himself and the denial of culturally unacceptable traits. . . . A low need for social approval implies a degree of independence of cultural definitions of acceptable

behavior. The person less motivated by a need for social approval might, in a testing situation, acknowledge certain symptoms, reject them as personally irrelevant, or present other test responses depending on such factors as the strength of his present needs, the kinds of responses required, and the nature of the test stimuli. The present need construct clearly implies that "social desirability" has considerable generality beyond self-evaluative or test situations (Marlowe & Crowne, 1961, pp. 109-110).

The M-C SDS thus assumes that an individual brings to the test situation a habitual pattern or style of evaluating himself and that items appropriate to self-evaluation will tend to call forth responses reflecting the individual's particular style. From the individual approach to the test situation a closely interwoven motivational structure is inferred centering around dependence on the favorable evaluations of others and vulnerable self-conception.

There have been a number of studies which have made use of the M-C SDS and they may be divided into two general categories. First of all, there are those studies which have been concerned primarily with the validity of the M-C SDS, i.e., does the scale measure the need for social approval. Secondly, there are those studies which are more concerned with using the scores on the M-C SDS as an independent variable for predicting responses on some dependent measure. These studies will be discussed in respective order.

The study by Crowne and Marlowe (1960) was the first to describe the development and preliminary validation of the M-C SDS. Test items for the M-C SDS were drawn from a population of culturally acceptable and approved behaviors, which were, at the same time, relatively unlikely to occur. These items were also free from pathological implications and as such are different from the Edwards SDS items.

The M-C SDS scale was then correlated with 17 MMPI validity, clinical, and derived scales and the results were then compared with the correlations of the Edwards SDS with the same MMPI scales. Very high correlations were obtained between the MMPI scales and the Edwards SDS which was interpreted by the authors as casting doubt on the validity of the Edwards SDS as a measure of the influence of social approval on test responses. The correlations of the M-C SDS and the MMPI scales were much lower and this was interpreted as being more in accord with a definition of social desirability in terms of the need of subjects to respond in culturally approved ways.

In a study by Stollak (1965) the Edwards Personality Preference Scale and the M-C SDS were administered to 72 male subjects. A correlation was computed between each subject's EPPS profile and (1) the mean need scores of Edwards' college male norms and (2) the mean need scores of Stollak's SD male norms (compiled in a previous study by administering the EPPS under social desirability instructions). These correlations were considered the subject's CN and SD scores, respectively, and two further correlations were computed between each of these scores and the M-C scale scores. The CN-M-C correlation was $-.05$ but the SD-M-C correlation was a significant $.44$. The results provided support for the validity of Stollak's SD and M-C scale scores as indicators of need for social approval.

In a study by Marlowe and Crowne (1961) an attempt was made to assess the usefulness of defining the construct of social desirability in motivational terms. The M-C SDS scale scores of 57 college students were divided into high and low SD categories. The subjects then

performed a boring task for 25 minutes and attitudes toward the experiment were then taken. The investigators predicted that high-need-for-approval subjects would express significantly more favorable attitudes towards the experiment than low-need-for-approval subjects. The results confirmed the predictions.

The major purpose of the study was to assess the utility of treating the construct of social desirability as a motivational variable applicable over a range of situations. The findings of this study provide clear support for a theoretical rationale which views social desirability in motivational terms, regarding it as a need for social approval accompanied by a belief or expectancy that this need can be satisfied by engaging in culturally and situationally sanctioned behaviors.

Crowne and Strickland (1961) argue that while socially desirable personality test responses and compliance with the obvious wishes of the experimenter are neatly explicable by the concept of need for approval, no evidence directly supporting need for approval is found in the above studies, i.e., the goal-oriented character of the behavior of persons described as approval motivated requires a more critical demonstration.

It was the basis of this argument that lead Crowne and Strickland (1961), Marlowe (1962), and Marlowe, Beecher, Cook, and Doob (1964) to investigate high and low need for approval effects on verbal conditioning, an experimental paradigm which they felt to be a more critical demonstration of approval-motivated individuals. They reasoned that the stronger a given need, the more effective will be reinforcement

appropriate to that need. Therefore, if approving social reinforcement is given in a learning task, acquisition of the behavior to be learned should be enhanced for approval-motivated individuals. The studies and their results will be discussed in respective order.

In the verbal operant conditioning experiment by Crowne and Strickland (1961), Greenspoon's classic "plural nouns" procedure was followed. It was predicted that when critical responses (plural nouns) were immediately followed by social reward from the experimenter high-need-for-approval subjects would show a significant increase in response rate as compared to low-need-for-approval subjects. A further prediction was that under negative reinforcement conditions high-need-for-approval subjects would show a significantly greater decrease to punished responses as compared to low-need-for-approval subjects. Both predictions were confirmed, however, the effect of verbal "punishment" was not as consistent in producing between group differences as the effect of approval.

Marlowe (1962) sought to condition meaningful verbal behavior (positive self-references) in an interview situation and further test the need-for-approval conditioning hypothesis. The experimental task was a 15-minute interview conducted immediately after completion of the M-C scale. Every positive self-reference was reinforced by the experimenter's "Mm'hmm" for those subjects in the experimental group. In the control group no reinforcement was given. High- and low-need-for-approval subjects were present in both groups. It was predicted that high-need-for-approval subjects would produce more reinforced responses (positive self-references) under positive reinforcement conditions than low-need-for-approval subjects. The prediction was confirmed, and the

results indicate that differences in conditionability are attributable to individual differences in the need for approval, and they support the results of Crowne and Strickland (1961).

In another verbal conditioning experiment Marlowe, Beecher, Cook, and Doob (1964) were concerned with the effect of vicarious reinforcement and its relationship to high- and low-need-for-approval subjects. In the two previous studies verbal behavior was directly reinforced, however, in vicarious reinforcement a subject observes while another person who is responding is reinforced by the experimenter. The authors predicted that high- as compared to low-need-for-approval subjects would be more responsive to vicarious reinforcement and would show a significant conditioning effect following the observation phase. The results were in the predicted direction.

Other experiments using the M-C SDS as an independent variable have been concerned with social conformity (Crowne & Liverant, 1963; Crowne & Marlowe, 1964; Strickland & Crowne, 1962), attitude change (Buckhout, 1965a, 1965b; Salnan, 1962), perceptual defense (Barthel & Crowne, 1962) and aggression (Conn & Crowne, 1964). Only those studies which have particular relevance to the present research will be discussed.

Strickland and Crowne (1962) used an Asch-type (Asch, 1951) design in their study on conformity and need for approval. High- and low-need-for-approval subjects were exposed to auditory stimuli which could be readily and accurately perceived. Following each auditory stimuli series three confederates announced their judgments of the number of stimuli presented. The confederates never disagreed in their judgments and they gave inaccurate judgments on 12 critical trials out of a total

of 18. After the confederates had verbalized their judgments, the naive subject was asked to verbalize his judgment on the number of stimuli presented. It was predicted that high-need-for-approval subjects would show more conformity as compared to low-need-for-approval subjects. The results were in the predicted direction.

In another "Asch-type" perceptual discrimination study Crowne and Marlowe (1964) required high- and low-need-for-approval subjects to identify the larger of two clusters of dots. Four confederates were present on each discrimination trial and they gave 10 incorrect answers on 16 critical trials. The results indicated that high-need-for-approval subjects were significantly more conforming than low-need-for-approval subjects.

Need for approval has also been a variable of interest in studies concerned with attitude change. In a study by Buckhout (1965a) high- and low-need-for-approval subjects, as measured by the M-C SDS, were brought together in diads in a 2 x 2 design. One subject played the roll of communicator attempting to persuade another subject (a receiver) to change his mind. High-need-for-approval receivers showed more attitude change than low-need-for-approval subjects. High-need-for-approval communicators produced more conformity to immediate situational demands. Low-need-for-approval communicators produced more of a change in affect towards the attitude object.

In another study by Buckhout (1965b) it was predicted that high-need-for-approval subjects would exhibit more attitude change than low-need-for-approval subjects. Attitudes toward television programming were obtained on high- and low-need-for-approval subjects as measured

by the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. The subjects were given 44 cards containing two classes of paired statements about television programming. Twenty-eight cards contained a pair of anti-television statements, and 16 cards (test items) contained one pro- and one anti-television statement. The subjects were asked to verbalize the one statement on each of the 44 cards which was closer to their attitude. The experimenter gave positive verbal reinforcement ("Good") to all anti-television statements, but the experimenter said nothing if the subject chose pro-television statements. All high- and low-need-for-approval subjects were pro-television in their initial attitudes before the experimental task. Thus subjects were forced to verbalize, publicly, inconsistent attitudinal statements under positive verbal reinforcement conditions. The results were in the predicted direction that is, low-need-for-approval subjects chose significantly fewer counter attitudinal television statements than did high-need-for-approval subjects. The results were reconfirmed in a 30-day follow-up retest.

Salman (1962) predicted that persons dependent on approval who engage in role playing in the presentation of a persuasive appeal will demonstrate greater change in their attitudes. This prediction was based on the assumption that approval-motivated individuals will experience greater inconsistency or conflict over their public avowal of a belief they do not privately hold. Because of their desire to be favorably evaluated, high-need-for-approval subjects should be more constrained in an experimental situation and should be less likely to rationalize their behavior or to dismiss the experimental procedure

as personally irrelevant. Thus, alternate means of resolving the discrepancy between a publicly avowed position and their private beliefs are less accessible to them. They should be then compelled to be consistent with the public image they have created.

The experimental design that Saloman used provided for three degrees of personal involvement or commitment in order to assess the roles of personal commitment and improvisation in attitude change. This was accomplished by the following role assignments: (1) "communicators," or active participants, who were required to improvise and to deliver an impromptu argument; (2) "receivers," who were passive recipients of the communication and whose assigned task was to evaluate the communicator's "leadership ability"; and (3) "observers," who performed the same evaluative role but who, in addition, were separated from the other subjects by a one-way vision mirror. It was predicted that the greatest attitude change would occur among high-need-for-approval subjects given the role of communicator. Less change was predicted for approval motivated receivers and little or no change among high-need-for-approval observers. Significant alteration of attitudes was not expected among low-need-for-approval subjects. In order to test these hypotheses, M-C scale scores were obtained on the subjects and an ABA attitude change design was used. Attitudes toward personal revelation were obtained before and after the experimental task. The results are as follows: high-need-for-approval communicators and observers significantly altered their attitudes in the direction they were required to advocate and observe; high-need-for-approval receivers and low-need-for-approval subjects in all three

positions failed to demonstrate evidence of attitude change.

In a study on normatively anchored social behavior Barthel (1963) found that high-need-for-approval subjects are more influenced by cultural standards of goal and among approval-dependent individuals, level of aspiration is, as a result, more restricted and cautious.

It may be concluded from the preceding reported studies that: (1) the M-C SDS validly taps the need for individuals to respond in culturally approved ways; (2) the need-for-approval variable has proved to be a significant personality characteristic accounting for differences in verbal conditioning, conformity, attitude change, and goal setting.

The previous review of some of the pertinent literature on need for approval provides a general orientation, background and application of the need-for-approval variable as measured by the M-C SDS. The purpose of the present research has been to extend the range of application of this variable to an attitude judgmental process to determine if there are systematic differences in judgments and "shifts" in those judgments by high- and low-need-for-approval individuals as measured by the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale.

Previous research on need-for-approval effects has found that high approval-motivated individuals, as compared to low approval-motivated individuals, are more conforming to peer and experimenter expectations, are more restricted and cautious in goal setting or levels of aspiration, and are more susceptible to attitude change when confronted with discrepant attitudinal information (Buckhout, 1965a, 1965b; Crowne & Liverant, 1963; Salman, 1962; Strickland & Crowne, 1962).

Also, research in the area of stimulus situations where the individual has response freedom has indicated that high approval-motivated individuals respond in particular kinds of ways: by being very constricted and guarded in their number of responses and by responding to the obvious stimulus-anchored characteristics of the tests (Barthel & Crowne, 1962; Tutko, 1962). The above kinds of responses have been interpreted as the way in which approval-motivated individuals can avoid criticism, protect themselves, and defend their self-image.

Therefore, it was expected that high approval-motivated individuals taking an attitude assessment scale on a controversial issue which would allow for response freedom would respond in a like manner, i.e., to be constricted and guarded in their number of responses. It was therefore predicted that more high approval-motivated subjects, as compared to low approval-motivated subjects, would be more non-committal on the statements of an attitude assessment scale.

Previous research has indicated that while high approval-motivated individuals are guarded, cautious, and restricted in their responses to unknown social parameter stimulus situations, they are also highly influenced by peer evaluations and expectations. It is therefore reasonable to expect that high approval-motivated individuals would become less restricted and guarded in their responses to stimulus situations when they are made aware of their peers' evaluations to these stimulus situations. It was therefore predicted that high approval-motivated individuals, as compared to low approval-motivated individuals, would decrease their non-committal responses to an attitude assessment scale on its readministration, if the high

approval-motivated individuals are informed as to the majority of peer evaluations on the first administration of the attitude; low approval-motivated individuals should show no change with respect to these treatment effects.

Previous research has indicated that high approval-motivated individuals are concerned with the evaluations of others and with conforming to peer judgments. At the risk of not conforming to peer judgments and being disfavorably evaluated by "wrong" responses, a guarded and self-protective approach could be achieved by shifting one's attitude to conform to the majority of peers' attitude. It was therefore predicted that high approval-motivated individuals would change their acceptable attitudinal statement on a readministration of the attitude scale after being confronted with a fictitious attitudinal statement that the majority of their peers had supposedly chosen; low approval-motivated individuals would not be affected by these treatment effects, that the shifts of most acceptable position by the treatment subjects would be toward choosing a position which was more congruent with the fictitious treatment statement.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Issue: The research problem required that a controversial issue be elected, that subjects be selected which were high and low on the need for approval motive, and that subjects' response on the controversial issue be ascertained before and after the administration of treatment effects.

The issue chosen was the controversy over the Viet Nam war. This issue had been a central one on a college campus in which a large number of students had debated the efficacy of the Viet Nam war.

Subjects: The subjects consisted of 287 college students enrolled in introductory psychology classes. High- and low-need-for-approval subjects were selected through administration of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. A copy of this scale is found in Appendix A. Subjects who made a raw score from 1 to 13 inclusive were designated as low-approval-motivated subjects. Subjects who made a raw score from 15 to 33 inclusive were designated as high approval-motivated subjects. This dicotomy was made on the basis of a median split for all subjects taking the MC-SDS. The research objectives also required that high- and low-need-for-approval subjects be matched for their responses to the controversial issue before and after prescribed

treatment effects. This was accomplished by administering an attitude assessment scale on the controversial issue. This scale is described in the Materials section below.

Materials: Ninety-four representative statements made during the most recent months on the Viet Nam issue were drawn from the newspapers, and from leading magazine articles. Those statements were presented to 29 judges in order to secure clearly differentiated stands on the Viet Nam issue. This sorting included nine judges who were actively for U. S. participation in the Viet Nam war, ten judges who were actively against U. S. participation in the Viet Nam war, and ten judges who had made no public stand or statement with respect to their position on the Viet Nam controversy. The following instructions were read and handed out to each judge together with a packet of the 94 statements on the Viet Nam issue and nine 3 x 5 cards on which were printed the Roman numerals I through IX:

You have been given a number of statements expressing opinions in regard to the Viet Nam war. These statements are to be sorted into different piles.

You will find it easier to sort them if you look over a number of statements, chosen at random before you begin to sort.

You have also been given nine cards with Roman numerals on them: I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX. Please arrange these before you in regular order. Under Card I, put those statements which are most against U. S. participation in the Viet Nam war. Under Card II, put those statements which are most for U. S. participation in the Viet Nam war. Under each of the other seven cards, between I and II, put those statements which correspond to that step in the nine piles.

This means that when you are through sorting you will have nine piles of statements arranged in order from I, the most against, to IX, the most for.

Use your judgment as to where each statement should be placed in the nine piles. Do not be concerned about the number of statements in each pile.

When you are through sorting, please put a rubber band around each of the nine piles of statements, placing the numbered card on top of each pile.

Frequency tabulations were made for each of the 94 statements with respect to the nine categories that each statement was sorted into by the judges. The 94 statements and their frequency distributions are presented in Appendix B. Statements of highest frequency tabulation in each of the nine categories were withdrawn resulting in a total of 22 statements. These were further reduced to nine statements representing each of the nine categories by applying the following procedures: (1) discarding some of the statements found in the same category which were very similar in their content as well as their frequency tabulations; (2) by discarding some of the statements found in the same category which did not lend themselves to the construction of a more or less symmetrical nine-point attitude scale ranging from strong advocacy against U. S. participation in the Viet Nam war to strong advocacy for U. S. participation in the Viet Nam war; (3) by discarding some of the statements found in the same category which had almost identical scale values as determined by the Thurstone and Chave (1929) technique.

As a result of the above analysis a representative sample of nine statements was chosen on the prevailing stands ranging from strong advocacy against U. S. participation in the Viet Nam war to strong advocacy for U. S. participation in the Viet Nam war. Scale values for each of these nine statements were determined by the Thurstone and Chave technique and these scale values did not result in equal intervals for the nine statements, therefore no assumptions were made

about the size of intervals between the positions of the nine statements in the analysis of the data. A copy of this nine-point attitude scale is as follows:

1. There is no conceivable justification for U. S. participation in the Viet Nam war, and the U. S. should withdraw at once and remain neutral.
2. The U. S. participation in the Viet Nam war is an unnecessary waste of human life, and it resolves no international problems.
3. The war in Viet Nam should be stopped, but not if it will cause the U. S. the loss of prestige.
4. Military action is necessary to defeat the enemy in Viet Nam, however, the prime issues are political.
5. A categorical rejection of the Viet Nam war is a difficult decision to make.
6. The desirable results of U. S. participation in the Viet Nam war have not received the attention they deserve.
7. In supporting the long range cold war efforts the Viet Nam war represents an important resistance.
8. The war in Viet Nam is a satisfactory way to solve the present international difficulties.
9. The Viet Nam war should be escalated to the point where the U. S. forces Red China into an all out nuclear war.

A questionnaire was devised as a secondary check on the subjects' stands. It requested the subjects to: (1) list in order of importance the three most important issues facing the U. S. today; (2) indicate their stand on the Viet Nam issue by marking the appropriate position on a nine-centimeter line, 0.0 being the most for and 9.0 being most against the Viet Nam war; (3) write a one-sentence statement of their stand. Subjects' responses to the questionnaire are presented in the Results chapter.

Procedure: The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale was administered to 287 introductory psychology students. A number of "buffer tests" were subsequently administered during the three to four week interval before the attitude scale was given. This was done to insure that no associations were made between the M-C SDS and the attitude scale. These "buffer tests" consisted of reaction time, brightness discrimination, and grammaticality "tests." The subjects were then administered the nine-point attitude scale on the Viet Nam issue, and the questionnaire. The complete set of nine statements was copied on sheets with instructions and given to the subjects. The instructions were read to the subjects and are as follows:

Below are some statements recently made concerning the Viet Nam issue.

Please read all of the statements carefully first before making any marks on this page.

1. Now that you have carefully read all the statements, underline the one statement that comes closest to your own point of view on the topic.

2. There may be other statement or statements which you find not objectionable from your point of view. Put a circle around the letter in front of such a statement or statements which are not objectionable to you.

3. Now cross out that one statement which is most objectionable from your point of view.

4. There may be other statement or statements which you find objectionable from your point of view. Cross out the letter in front of such a statement or statements which are objectionable to you.

It will be recognized that these instructions are very similar to those used by Hovland, Harvey, and Sherif (1957). They direct the subject to respond maximally to only two statements, i.e., to choose that one statement which they agree with the most, and to choose that one statement which they disagree with the most. The remainder of the instructions gives the subject considerable latitude as to

whether the subject will choose to accept, reject, or remain non-committal on the other statements.

After the subjects had completed the attitude scale they were given the questionnaire. The instructions on the questionnaire read as follows:

Some additional information will be needed to aid in determining the results of this study. Your cooperation in filling out the form below will be appreciated.

The above instructions were also read aloud to the subjects before they filled it out. A copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix C. After the questionnaires had been completed they were gathered up and the regular class procedure was carried out.

The attitude scale was subsequently readministered to the subjects two days later. Before the readministration of the attitude scale an analysis of the first attitude scale had been completed. The purpose of this analysis was to determine the modal frequency(s) with respect to which statements on the attitude scale were most acceptable for the subjects. It was found that statement 4 was chosen as the most acceptable position by 24.7% of the subjects; statement 2 was chosen as the most acceptable position by 17.7% of the subjects; statement 7 was chosen as the most acceptable position by 17.0% of the subjects. The data from which these results were drawn is found in Appendix D. Treatment applications were applied to three groups of subjects; a fourth group of subjects received no treatment applications and served as the control group. These groups consisted of subjects who were in four different introductory psychology classes. The treatment applications consisted of the following:

To one experimental group of subjects ($N = 46$) the following announcement was made before the readministration of the attitude scale:

You will remember that during the last class period you participated in a study concerned with the Viet Nam issue. Unfortunately it will be necessary to perform this study again as the computer chewed up many of the IBM cards on which your answers had been transcribed. However, you may be interested in knowing that before the computer broke down one result had been obtained. The largest majority of you checked statement 4 as being the most acceptable statement. (This digit was written on the blackboard.) Also most of you had written similar statements expressing your stand on the Viet Nam issue. For example, some of these statements were: (four student statements were related to the class; these statements were drawn from the questionnaires for four students who had checked position 4 as the most acceptable position on the first administration of the attitude scale; the attitude scale was handed out and the directions were read again to the students.)

To another experimental group of subjects ($N = 63$) the same announcement was made before the readministration of the attitude scale, except that they were told, "the largest majority of you checked statement 2 as being the most acceptable statement." Also four written statements which were congruent with statement 2 were stated to those subjects.

To another experimental group of subjects ($N = 77$) the same announcement was made before the readministration of the attitude scale, except they were told, "the largest majority of you checked statement 7 as being the most acceptable statement." Also four written statements which were congruent with statement 7 were stated to these subjects.

To the control group of subjects ($N = 101$) the same announcement was made except that nothing was said concerning which statement was

the most popular. They were only told that the study would have to be done again since the computer had "chewed up" the IBM cards.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Analyses of the results of this experiment have involved the use of nonparametric statistics, due mainly to the discrete nature of the data. The comparisons to be made consist of three types: either between experimental and control groups, or between high- and low-need-for-approval subjects in the experimental and control groups, or between different measures on the same group.

The subjects for this experiment were drawn from a population of 526 introductory psychology students. They were administered the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, and the results are as follows. The range of raw scores on this scale was from 1 to 28, with a median value of 14.450, a mean value of 14.256, and a standard deviation value of 4.830. Of those 526 subjects, 287 completed all of the remaining experimental tasks. The results of this experiment were compiled from these 287 subjects. The range of raw scores for these subjects on the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale was from 1 to 28, with a median value of 13.763, a mean value of 13.898, and a standard deviation value of 5.724. These values were obtained after discarding the subjects who had a raw score of 14, in accordance with the method put forth in Chapter II for dividing the total subjects into

two groups, high and low.

The 101 control group subjects consisted of 50 low approval-motivated subjects, i.e., a raw score on the M-C SDS from 1 to 13; and 51 high approval-motivated subjects, i.e., a raw score on the M-C SDS from 15 to 33. The range of raw scores on the control group was from 2 to 26, with a median value of 15.250, a mean value of 14.138, and a standard deviation value of 5.604.

The 186 subjects in the experimental groups consisted of 99 low approval-motivated subjects, and 87 high approval-motivated subjects. The range of raw scores for the experimental was from 1 to 28, with a median value of 13.625, a mean value of 13.768, and a standard deviation value of 5.784.

Table 1 presents in summary form the information derived from the questionnaire administered to each subject following the first administration of the attitude scale. It shows the similarity between high and low approval-motivated subjects in areas of potential importance which were not studied directly, such as age, sex, and education. For example, 72% of the low approval-motivated subjects rated the Viet Nam issue as the most important facing the United States, and 82% of the high approval-motivated subjects rated the Viet Nam issue as first in importance.

The predictions discussed in Chapter I and their statistical tests will be dealt with here in respective order.

1. High approval-motivated subjects remain non-committal on more statements on the first administration of the attitude scale than low approval-motivated subjects.

Table 1

Results of Questionnaire for High and Low Approval-
Motivated Subjects

Items	High approval	Low approval
I. Listed position on Viet Nam war (%)		
First	82	72
Second	16	21
Third	2	7
II. Sex (%)		
Male	37	43
Female	64	57
III. Mean age (years)	18.43	18.54
IV. Mean years of schooling	13.81	13.76
V. Mean scale value (cm)	5.01	4.14

A chi-square test was performed on the number of statements neither accepted nor rejected on the first administration of the attitude scale by the high and low approval-motivated subjects. This was performed by separating the number of unlabeled statements into two groups, subjects remaining non-committal on zero statements and subjects remaining non-committal on one or more statements, then casting the frequencies into a 2 x 2 contingency table to be compared against the high and low approval-motivated subjects. Table 2 presents the results of this test, while the raw data from which it was derived are presented in Appendix E.

Table 2

Number of High and Low Approval-Motivated Subjects Who Remain
Non-Committal on Zero or One or More Statements for the
First Attitude Scale Administration

Number of statements	High approval	Low approval	<u>N</u>
Zero	51	90	141
1 or more	87	59	146
<u>N</u>	138	149	287

$$\chi^2 = 14.802$$

$$p < .001$$

The chi-square value resulting from this test shows that the differences are significant at beyond the .001 level for 1 df, indicating that a significantly greater number of high approval-motivated subjects are non-committal on one or more statements, while a significantly greater number of low approval-motivated subjects are non-committal on zero statements, in support of the prediction.

Chi-square 2 x 2 contingency tests were also performed on the number of statements neither accepted nor rejected on the first administration of the attitude scale for high and low approval-motivated control and experimental subjects. These tests were performed by separating the number of unlabeled statements into two groups, subjects remaining non-committal on zero statements and subjects remaining non-committal on one or more statements, then casting the frequencies

into a 2 x 2 contingency table to be compared against the high and low approval-motivated subjects. This was done for the control and the experimental subjects.

The chi-square value resulting from the test for the control subjects was 7.228 which is significant at beyond the .01 level for 1 df. These results indicate that a significantly greater number of control high approval-motivated subjects are non-committal on one or more statements, while a significantly greater number of control low approval-motivated subjects are non-committal on zero statements, again in support of the prediction.

The chi-square value resulting from the test for the experimental subjects was 6.900 which is significant at beyond the .01 level for 1 df. These results indicate that a significantly greater number of experimental high approval-motivated subjects are non-committal on one or more statements, while a significantly greater number of experimental low approval-motivated subjects are non-committal on zero statements, again in support of the prediction.

2. High approval-motivated treatment subjects, as compared to low approval-motivated treatment subjects and high approval-motivated control subjects, will significantly decrease their regions of non-commitment on the second administration of the attitude scale; there will be no differences in the regions of non-commitment for the low approval-motivated subjects in the treatment and control groups.

Table 3 presents the results of the second administration of the attitude scale with respect to whether the subjects increased, decreased,

Table 3

Results of the Second Administration of the Attitude Scale for
Low and High Approval-Motivated Subjects in the Treatment
and Control Groups with Respect to the
Region of Non-Commitment

	Decrease	Increase	Change	No change	<u>N</u>
Control					
Low	8 (16.0%)	8 (16.0%)	16 (32.0%)	34 (68.0%)	50
High	10 (19.6%)	11 (21.5%)	21 (41.1%)	30 (58.8%)	51
<u>N</u>	18 (17.8%)	19 (18.8%)	37 (36.6%)	64 (63.3%)	101
Treatment					
Low	17 (17.1%)	13 (13.1%)	30 (30.3%)	69 (69.6%)	99
High	24 (27.5%)	16 (18.4%)	40 (45.9%)	47 (54.0%)	87
<u>N</u>	41 (22.0%)	29 (15.6%)	70 (37.6%)	116 (62.3%)	186

or remained the same in their regions of non-commitment. The raw data from which these results were derived are presented in Appendix E.

The analysis of these results were of two types. First of all, the results were analyzed with respect to a decrease in the region of non-commitment. Secondly, the results were analyzed with respect to a change in the region of non-commitment, irrespective of the direction. These results will be discussed in respective order.

With reference to table 3 it is noticed that 27.5% of the treatment

high approval-motivated subjects decreased their region of non-commitment as compared to 17.1% of the treatment low approval-motivated subjects, 19.6% of the control high approval-motivated subjects, and 16.0% of the control low approval-motivated subjects.

It was predicted that more high approval-motivated treatment subjects would decrease their regions of non-commitment as compared to the low approval-motivated treatment subjects. With reference to table 3 it will be observed that 27.5% of the treatment high approval-motivated subjects decreased their region of non-commitment while only 17.1% of the treatment low approval-motivated subjects decreased their region of non-commitment. A chi-square test was performed between the low and high approval-motivated treatment subjects with respect to the number of individuals who decreased their region of non-commitment. This was performed by separating the treatment subjects into two groups, subjects who decreased their regions of non-commitment and subjects who increased or remained the same on their region of non-commitment. These frequencies were then cast into a 2 x 2 contingency table to be compared against the high and low approval-motivated dimension. The chi-square value resulting from this test was 2.348 which is between the .10 and .05 levels of confidence for 1 df for a 1-tail test. This level of confidence is not acceptable and the prediction is not supported, however, the result trend is certainly in the predicted direction.

It was also predicted that more high approval-motivated treatment subjects would decrease their regions of non-commitment as compared to high approval-motivated control subjects. With reference to table 3

it will be observed the 27.3% of the treatment high approval-motivated subjects decreased their region of non-commitment while only 19.6% of the control high approval-motivated subjects decreased their region of non-commitment. A chi-square test was performed between the treatment and control high approval-motivated subjects with respect to the number of subjects who decreased their region of non-commitment. This was performed by separating the high approval-motivated subjects into two groups, subjects who decreased their regions of non-commitment and subjects who increased or remained the same on their region of non-commitment. These frequencies were then cast into a 2 x 2 contingency table to be compared against the treatment and control dimension. Table 4 presents the results of this test.

Table 4

Number of Control and Treatment High Approval-Motivated
Subjects Who Decreased, Increased or Remained the
Same on Their Region of Non-Commitment on
the Second Administration of the
Attitude Scale

High-approval subjects	Decrease	Other	<u>N</u>
Control	10	41	51
Treatment	24	63	87
<u>N</u>	34	99	186
$\chi^2 = 0.714$			
$p > .05$			

The chi-square value resulting from this test was 0.714 which is not significant at the .05 level of confidence for 1 df, indicating that the treatment high approval-motivated subjects do not significantly decrease their region of non-commitment when compared to the control high approval-motivated subjects; this result is non-supportive of the prediction.

It was also predicted that there would be no significant decrease in the region of non-commitment for the treatment low approval-motivated subjects as compared to the control low approval-motivated subjects. Table 3 shows that 17.1% of the treatment low approval-motivated subjects decreased their region of non-commitment as compared to 16.0% of the control low approval-motivated subjects.

A chi-square test was performed between the treatment and control low approval-motivated subjects with respect to the number of subjects who decreased their region of non-commitment. This was performed by separating the high approval-motivated subjects into two groups, subjects who decreased their regions of non-commitment and subjects who increased or remained the same on their region of non-commitment. These frequencies were then cast into a 2 x 2 contingency table to be compared against the treatment and control dimension. Table 5 presents the results of this test.

The chi-square value resulting from this test was .002 which is not significant at the .05 level of confidence for 1 df, indicating that the treatment low approval-motivated subjects do not significantly decrease their region of non-commitment when compared to the control low approval-motivated subjects, in support of the prediction.

Table 5

Number of Control and Treatment Low Approval-Motivated Subjects
Who Decreased, Increased or Remained the Same on Their
Region of Non-Commitment on the Second Administration
of the Attitude Scale

Low approval subjects	Decrease	Other	<u>N</u>
Control	8	42	50
Treatment	17	82	99
<u>N</u>	25	124	149

$$\chi^2 = 0.002$$

$$p > .05$$

The results in table 3 were next analyzed with respect to a change in the region of non-commitment irrespective of direction. These results are as follows:

A chi-square test was performed between the treatment high and low approval-motivated subjects with respect to the number of individuals who changed their region of non-commitment. This was performed by separating the treatment subjects into two groups, subjects changing their region of non-commitment and subjects not changing their region of non-commitment, then casting the frequencies into a 2 x 2 contingency table to be compared against the high and low approval-motivated dimension. Table 6 presents the results of this test.

Table 6

Number of Treatment High and Low Approval-Motivated Subjects Who
Changed or Did Not Change Their Region of Non-Commitment

Region of non-commitment	High approval	Low approval	<u>N</u>
No change	47	69	116
Change	40	30	70
<u>N</u>	87	99	186
$\chi^2 = 4.20$			
$p < .05$			

The chi-square value resulting from this test was 4.20 which is significant at the .05 level of confidence for 1 df, indicating that more treatment high approval-motivated subjects changed their region of non-commitment than treatment low approval-motivated subjects. Reference to table 3 shows that 45.9% of the treatment high approval-motivated subjects changed their region of non-commitment as compared to 30.3% of the treatment low approval-motivated subjects. Caution, however, needs to be used in the interpretation of this result as other results need to be taken into consideration.

For instance, table 3 shows that while 45.9% of the treatment high approval-motivated subjects changed their region of non-commitment, 41.1% of the control high approval-motivated subjects also changed their region of non-commitment. A chi-square 2 x 2 contingency test was performed between these two groups of subjects with respect to

a change or no change in the region of non-commitment and a value of 0.137 was obtained which is not significant at the .05 level of confidence for 1 df. This result was interpreted as indicating that the treatment applications had no significant effect on the treatment high approval-motivated subjects as compared to the control high approval-motivated subjects with respect to a change in the region of non-commitment irrespective of direction.

Further reference to table 3 also shows that 32% of the control low approval-motivated subjects changed their region of non-commitment as compared to 41.1% of the control high approval-motivated subjects. A chi-square 2 x 2 contingency test was performed between these two groups and a value of .563 was found which is not significant at the .05 level of confidence for 1 df, indicating that there was no difference between the control high and low approval-motivated subjects with respect to a change in the region of non-commitment. Table 3 also shows that there is no difference between the control and treatment low approval-motivated subjects with respect to a change in the region of non-commitment, i.e., 32.0% of the control low approval-motivated subjects changed their region of non-commitment and 30.3% of the treatment low approval-motivated subjects changed their region of non-commitment.

When all the above results were taken into consideration it was interpreted that the treatment application had the effect of causing fewer treatment low approval-motivated subjects (30.3%) to change their region of non-commitment as compared to 32.0% of the control low approval-motivated subjects, and of causing more treatment high

approval-motivated subjects (45.9%) to change their region of non-commitment as compared to 41.1% of the control high approval-motivated subjects. In other words, the treatment applications appeared to operate on both the treatment low and high approval-motivated subjects to result in a significant difference between these two groups with respect to a change in the region of non-commitment, however, there was no significant treatment effect on the treatment high approval-motivated subjects as compared to the control high approval-motivated subjects.

3. High approval-motivated treatment subjects will have more shifts on their most acceptable position as compared to high approval-motivated control subjects and low approval-motivated treatment subjects; there will be no difference in shift of the most acceptable position between control and treatment low approval-motivated subjects; the direction of shift for treatment subjects will be toward choosing a statement more congruent with the treatment applications.

Table 7 presents the results of the second administration of the attitude scale with respect to whether the subjects shifted their most acceptable position, the direction of this shift, and whether subjects did not shift their most acceptable position. The raw data from which these results were derived are presented in Appendix F.

It was predicted that treatment high approval-motivated subjects would shift their most acceptable position more than control high approval-motivated subjects. Table 7 shows that 36.7% of the treatment high approval-motivated subjects shifted their most acceptable position as compared to 21.5% of the control high approval-motivated subjects.

Table 7

Number of High and Low Approval-Motivated Individuals Who Shifted
and the Direction of Shift of Their Most Acceptable Position
on the Second Administration of the Attitude Scale

	Shift	(Toward)	(Away)	No shift	<u>N</u>
Treatment					
Low	38 (38.3%)	26 (68.4%)	12 (31.5%)	61 (61.6%)	99
High	32 (36.7%)	26 (81.2%)	6 (18.7%)	55 (63.2%)	87
<u>N</u>	70 (37.6%)	52 (74.2%)	18 (25.7%)	116 (62.3%)	186
Control					
Low	15 (30.0%)			35 (70.0%)	50
High	11 (21.5%)			40 (78.4%)	51
<u>N</u>	26 (25.7%)			75 (74.2%)	101

A chi-square 2 x 2 contingency test was performed between the treatment and control high approval-motivated subjects with respect to a shift or no shift in their most acceptable position. A chi-square value of 2.796 was obtained which is significant at the .05 level of confidence for 1 df for a 1-tail test, indicating that more treatment high approval-motivated subjects shifted their most acceptable position as compared to the control high approval-motivated subjects. This result indicates that high approval-motivated treatment subjects were effected by the treatment applications.

It was predicted that more high approval-motivated treatment subjects would shift their most acceptable position as compared to the low approval-motivated treatment subjects. Table 7 shows that only 36.7% of the treatment high approval-motivated subjects shifted their most acceptable position as compared to 38.3% of the treatment low approval-motivated subjects. The prediction was therefore not supported and the negative result was due to the unexpected shift by low approval-motivated subjects. However, this shift of most acceptable position in the treatment low approval-motivated subjects was not the result of treatment effects as is revealed by the following comparison.

It was predicted that low approval-motivated treatment subjects would not shift their most acceptable position as a result of treatment effects. With reference to table 7 it is noticed that 38.3% of the treatment low approval-activated subjects shifted their most acceptable position as compared to 30.0% of the control low approval-motivated subjects. A chi-square 2 x 2 contingency test was performed between the treatment and control low approval-motivated subjects with respect to a shift or no shift in the most acceptable position. A chi-square value of 0.685 was obtained which is not significant at the .05 level of confidence for 1 df, indicating that there is no difference between the treatment and control low approval-motivated subjects with respect to a shift in most acceptable position. This result supports the prediction that low approval-motivated subjects were not effected by the treatment applications.

It was predicted that the direction of shift of the most acceptable position for the treatment subjects would be toward choosing a statement

more congruent with the treatment applications. Each treatment group, 2, 4, and 7, was therefore analyzed with respect to the direction of shift of most acceptable position and compared against the control subjects. For each treatment group, the control group subjects' shifts were analyzed with respect to whether they were toward or away from the respective scale position reinforced in the treatment groups. The shifts, toward or away, in the control group were transformed into percentages and subsequently used as the expected frequencies to be compared against the observed frequencies in each of the experimental groups.

For treatment group 2, 35 subjects shifted their most acceptable position, 24 shifted toward the treatment effect and 11 shifted away from the treatment effect. When the control subjects, who shifted their most acceptable position, were analyzed with respect to this treatment, 50% shifted toward and 50% shifted away. The expected frequencies for this treatment group were therefore 17.5 and 17.5. A chi-square analysis results in a value of 4.828 and is significant at the .05 level of confidence for 1 df, indicating that more subjects in treatment 2 shift toward the treatment applications than shift away from the treatment applications, in support of the prediction.

For treatment group 4, 14 subjects shifted their most acceptable position, 11 shifted toward the treatment effect and 3 shifted away from the treatment effect. When the control subjects, who shifted their most acceptable position, were analyzed with respect to this treatment, 46.1% shifted toward and 53.8% shifted away. The expected frequencies for this treatment group were therefore 6.45 and 7.53. A

chi-square analysis results in a value of 5.92 and is significant at the .02 level of confidence for 1 df, indicating that more subjects in treatment 4 shift toward the treatment applications than shift away from the treatment applications, in support of the prediction.

For treatment group 7, 21 subjects shifted their most acceptable position, 17 shifted toward the treatment effect and 4 shifted away from the treatment effect. When the control subjects, who shifted their most acceptable position, were analyzed with respect to this treatment, 46.1% shifted toward and 53.8% shifted away. The expected frequencies for this treatment group were therefore 9.68 and 11.29. A chi-square analysis results in a value of 10.23 and is significant at the .01 level of confidence for 1 df, indicating that more subjects in treatment 7 shift toward the treatment application than shift away from the treatment applications, in support of the prediction.

An analysis of the number of statements rejected on the first administration of the attitude scale was also performed between the high and low approval-motivated subjects. The purpose of this analysis was to determine if there was a significant difference between high and low approval-motivated subjects with respect to the region of rejection. The analysis was accomplished by tabulating the frequencies of high and low approval-motivated subjects who rejected 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 statements on the initial attitude scale and applying a 2 x 6 chi-square test. The raw data from which this analysis was derived is found in Appendix G. The chi-square value resulting from this test was 9.413 which is significant between the .10 and .05 level of confidence for 5 df. Although this level of confidence is not

acceptable the trend of the data is in the direction of low approval-motivated individuals rejecting more statements than high approval-motivated individuals.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The results of this experiment are revealing as to the kinds of differential responses that high approval-motivated individuals have in attitude assessment situations as compared to low approval-motivated individuals.

With respect to the first hypothesis it was found that high approval-motivated individuals are more non-committal on an attitude assessment scale employing response freedom as compared to low approval-motivated individuals. High approval-motivated individuals could thus be regarded as being non-committal in attitude assessment situations which allow for response freedom and wherein the attitude in question is a highly controversial issue in which normative social answers or attitudes are in a state of flux. This non-committal behavior could be interpreted as a manner in which high approval-motivated individuals protect themselves and defend their self-image by being cautious, restricted, and guarded in their number of responses to unknown social parameter situations. This result gives further support to the findings of Barthel and Crowne (1962) and Tutko (1962).

The attitude response behavior of high approval-motivated individuals possibly has some interrelationship with the findings of studies

that have been concerned with using the region of rejection as a dependent measure of attitudinal ego-involvement. Previous research has indicated that individuals, who are highly ego-involved, behaviorally, on a specific attitudinal issue, respond to attitude assessment tests on that issue by having large regions of rejection. In comparison, low ego-involved individuals have smaller regions of rejection (Reich, 1963; Sherif, Sherif, & Nebergall, 1965).

In this study it was found that high approval-motivated subjects rejected less attitude statements than did low approval-motivated subjects. Although this difference was not significant, the trend was in this direction (p between .10 and .05). This data would tend to lend support to the hypothesis that high approval-motivated individuals, as compared to low approval-motivated individuals, have somewhat less of a propensity to become highly ego involved on controversial issues.

With respect to the second hypothesis it was found that treatment high approval-motivated individuals did not significantly decrease their region of non-commitment as compared to the control high approval-motivated subjects and as compared to the treatment low approval-motivated subjects. These results were interpreted as indicating that the treatment applications were not effective in producing a reduction in the region of non-commitment for the high approval-motivated subjects. One possible explanation as to why the treatment applications did not result in a reduction of the non-commitment region for the high approval-motivated subjects is that not enough information was given in the treatment applications as to the peers' evaluation of all nine statements on the attitude scale.

That is, the treatment applications consisted of relating to the treatment subjects the majority of peer acceptance of only one statement on the first administration of the attitude scale. However, no information was related to the subjects concerning peer evaluation of the remaining eight statements. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that if high approval-motivated individuals are appropriately characterized as remaining guarded, restrictive and non-committal in stimulus situations in which social normative attitudes are unknown, they would continue to remain non-committal in such stimulus situations until informed about the parameters on all of the attitude statements.

This interpretation is further supported by the results of the third hypothesis in which it was found that high approval-motivated individuals significantly shifted their most acceptable attitude position to conform with the treatment applications. Low approval-motivated individuals did not significantly shift their most acceptable position. In other words, high approval-motivated individuals conformed to the stated peer evaluation; perhaps their region of non-commitment would have significantly decreased on the remaining attitude statements had treatment applications incorporated them. The conformity behavior exhibited in this experiment by high approval-motivated individuals is congruent with other studies concerned with conformity behavior and the need-for-approval dimension (Buckhout, 1965a, 1965b; Crowne & Liverant, 1963; Salzman, 1962; Strickland & Crowne, 1962). This finding raises the interesting question as to the validity of previous attitude research on issues of a highly controversial nature. That is, if the sample populations for previous attitude studies have consisted of large

numbers of high approval-motivated individuals then inferences made about the population attitude at large are possibly in error.

The conformity behavior evidenced in the shifts of most acceptable position by high approval-motivated individuals could also be viewed in terms of cognitive dissonance theory (Brehm & Cohen, 1962; Festinger, 1957). That is, high approval-motivated individuals could be regarded as experiencing cognitive dissonance when confronted with discrepant peer attitudinal information, and the reduction of this dissonance is achieved through acceptance of counter-attitudinal positions, rather than by other various alternatives proposed by dissonance theory, because of the greater need of high approval-motivated individuals to conform to peer norms; whereas, low approval-motivated individuals could be regarded as reducing their cognitive dissonance when confronted with discrepant peer attitudinal information by remaining further entrenched in their original attitudinal position, i.e., the "boomerang" effect.

The results of this experiment are also informative as to the behavior of low approval-motivated individuals. As predicted, low approval-motivated individuals did not significantly shift their most acceptable attitude position when confronted with discrepant attitudinal information. Although there were proportionately as many low approval-motivated treatment subjects as high approval-motivated treatment subjects who changed their most acceptable position there was a high degree of shift in the low approval-motivated control subjects as compared to the high approval-motivated control subjects. Possibly low approval-motivated subjects are freer to shift their most acceptable position because of their relative independence from effects of peer

evaluation, whereas high approval-motivated subjects shift their attitudinal position because of their susceptibility to peer evaluations, that is, their need to conform to peer norms.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The present research was concerned with investigating whether individuals characterized in terms of the need-for-approval motive respond in a systematic fashion to a fixed category attitude scale. More specifically, this experiment was concerned with investigating whether individuals, who were high and low in need for social approval as measured by the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, respond differentially but in a predictable fashion to a fixed category, attitude scale with respect to the regions of acceptance, non-commitment, and subsequent shifts in these variables after the application of treatment effects.

To accomplish this task 287 introductory psychology students were administered the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. These subjects were subsequently administered, a few weeks later, a questionnaire and a nine-point attitude scale on the Viet Nam issue with statements ranging from strong advocacy for U. S. participation in the Viet Nam war to strong advocacy against U. S. participation in the Viet Nam war. Subjects' responses to the attitude scale were evaluated with respect to the frequencies of acceptance, and non-commitment for each of the nine positions. The subjects were then readministered the

attitude scale following the application of treatment effects to three of four groups. The fourth group received no treatment application and served as a control. The treatment effects consisted of relating to the subjects the fictitious statement that the largest majority of them had chosen a particular position as most acceptable on the first administration of the attitude scale. A different fictitious position was related to each of three treatment groups of subjects.

It was predicted that high approval-motivated subjects, as compared to low approval-motivated subjects, would have larger regions of non-commitment on the initial attitude scale; that the region of non-commitment would significantly decrease for the high approval-motivated subjects on the second administration of the attitude scale for the treatment groups; that the region of non-commitment for the low approval-motivated subjects would remain the same for both administrations of the attitude scale; that there would be more shifts of the most acceptable position by the treatment high approval-motivated subjects as compared to the control high and treatment low approval-motivated subjects; that the shifts of most acceptable position by the treatment subjects would be toward choosing a position which was congruent with the fictitious treatment statement.

The results of this experiment were both supportive and non-supportive of the predictions, but generally were in accordance with the results of other attitude change studies concerned with the approval-motivated variable as measured by the MC-SDS. It was found that high approval-motivated subjects tended to use larger regions of non-commitment than low approval-motivated subjects; that low approval-motivated

subjects did not decrease their regions of non-commitment; that high approval-motivated subjects did not decrease their regions of non-commitment. Although this latter result was not in accordance with the prediction, it was felt that this result was due to the paucity of treatment application information given to the high approval-motivated subjects, that is, they did not have enough peer evaluation information on eight of the attitude statements to facilitate a change from non-committal positions on these statements to an acceptance or rejection position.

It was also found, as predicted, that treatment high approval-motivated subjects shifted their most acceptable position as compared to control high approval-motivated subjects; that there was no change in the most acceptable position for the treatment low approval-motivated subjects as compared to the control low approval-motivated subjects; that treatment subjects who shifted their most acceptable position did so by choosing a position congruent with the treatment applications. It was predicted that high approval-motivated treatment subjects would have more shifts in their most acceptable position as compared to low approval-motivated treatment subjects. This prediction was not supported due to the unexpected shifting by the low approval-motivated individuals. This result was interpreted as indicating that high approval-motivated subjects tend to shift their most acceptable position when confronted with discrepant peer evaluation information, whereas low approval-motivated subjects shift their most acceptable position irrespective of peer evaluation information.

It was concluded that this experiment provided further corroborating

evidence as to the conformity, attitude change, and guarded, restrictive behavior of high approval-motivated individuals. It was also suggested that a fruitful area of further research would be to investigate the effects of differential amounts of peer evaluation information concerning attitude statements as a possible factor in influencing a decrease in regions of non-commitment by high approval-motivated individuals.

REFERENCES

- Asch, S. D. Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgments. In H. Guetzkow (Ed.), Groups, leadership and men. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Press, 1951.
- Barnes, E. H. Response bias and the MMPI. J. consult. Psychol., 1956, 20, 371-374. (a)
- Barnes, E. H. Factors, response bias and the MMPI. J. consult. Psychol., 1956, 20, 419-421. (b)
- Barthel, C. E. The effects of the approval motive, generalized expectancy, and situational cues upon goal setting and social defensiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State Univer., 1963.
- Barthel, C. E., & Crowne, D. P. The need for approval, task categorization, and perceptual defense. J. consult. Psychol., 1962, 26, 547-555.
- Berg, I. A. Response bias and personality: The deviation hypothesis. J. Psychol., 1955, 40, 61-72.
- Berg, I. A. Deviant responses and deviant people: The formulation of the deviation hypothesis. J. counsel. Psychol., 1957, 4, 154-161.
- Brehm, J. W., & Cohen, A. R. Explorations in cognitive dissonance. New York: Wiley, 1962.
- Buckhout, R. Need for social approval and attitude change. J. Psychol., 1965, 60, 123-128. (a)
- Buckhout, R. Need for social approval and dyadic verbal behavior. Psychol. Rep., 1965, 16, 1013-1016. (b)
- Conn, L. K., & Crowne, D. P. Instigation to aggression, emotional arousal, and defensive emulation. J. Pers., 1964, 32, 163-179.
- Cronback, L. J. Response sets and test validity. Educ. psychol. Measmt., 1946, 6, 475-494.
- Cronback, L. J. Further evidence on response sets and test design. Educ. psychol. Measmt., 1950, 10, 3-31.

- Crowne, D. P., & Liverant, S. Conformity under varying conditions of personal commitment. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1963, 66, 547-555.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. J. consult. Psychol., 1960, 24, 349-354.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. The approval motive. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Crowne, D. P., & Strickland, Bonnie R. The conditioning of verbal behavior as a function of the need for social approval. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1961, 63, 395-401.
- Edwards, A. L. The social desirability variable in personality assessment and research. New York: Dryden, 1957.
- Festinger, L. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1957.
- Hovland, C. I., Harvey, O. J., & Sherif, M. Assimilation and contrast effects in reactions to communications and attitude change. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1957, 55, 242-252.
- Marlowe, D. Need for social approval and the operant conditioning of meaningful verbal behavior. J. consult. Psychol., 1962, 26, 79-83.
- Marlowe, D., Beecher, R. S., Cook, J. B., & Doob, A. N. The approval motive, vicarious reinforcement and verbal conditioning. Paper read at Eastern Psychol. Assoc., Philadelphia, Penna., 1964. In D. P. Crowne, and D. Marlowe, The approval motive. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Marlowe, D., & Crowne, D. P. Social desirability and response to perceived situational demands. J. consult. Psychol., 1961, 25, 109-115.
- Meehl, P. E., & Hathaway, S. R. The K factor as a suppressor variable in the MMPI. J. appl. Psychol., 1946, 30, 525-564.
- Reich, J. Ego-involvement as a factor in attitude assessment by the own categories technique. Unpublished master's thesis, Univer. of Oklahoma, 1963.
- Salman, A. R. The need for approval, improvisation, and attitude change. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State Univer., 1962. In D. P. Crowne and D. Marlowe, The approval motive. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Sherif, Carolyn W., Sherif, M., & Nebergall, R. E. Attitude and attitude change: The social judgment-involvement approach.

Philadelphia: Saunders, 1965.

Stollak, G. E. Relationship between EPPS and Marlowe-Crowne SD scale. Psychol. Rep., 1965, 16, 731-732.

Strickland, Bonnie R., & Crowne, D. P. Conformity under conditions of simulated group pressure as a function of the need for social approval. J. soc. Psychol., 1962, 58, 171-181.

Thurstone, L. L., & Chave, E. J. The measurement of attitude. University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Tutko, T. A. Need for social approval and its effect on responses to projective tests. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern Univer., 1962.

Wiggins, J. S., & Rumrill, C. Social desirability in the MMPI and Welsh's factor scales A and R. J. consult. Psychol., 1959, 23, 100-106.

APPENDIX A

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally. Mark your answer on the attached answer sheet by blacking out the letter.

1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.
2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.
3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
4. I have never intensely disliked anyone.
5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.
6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
7. I am always careful about my manner of dress.
8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.
9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it.
10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
11. I like to gossip at times.
12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.
14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.
15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
17. I always try to practice what I preach.
18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people.
19. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.

21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.
23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.
25. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.
28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.
32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.
33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

APPENDIX B

**Frequency Distributions of Sortment of Attitude Statements
into Nine Categories by Judges**

Statement	Categories								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. The U. S. is in need of a reconciliation with North Viet Nam.	5	1	6	1	5	2	2	3	4
2. The only effective method for settling international difficulties is force.	3	1	1	1	2	0	4	4	13
3. The Viet Nam war has to be fought in order to obtain peace.	6	3	3	4	0	5	2	2	4
4. It is necessary that the U. S. make a stand in Asia and Viet Nam is the best place.	6	5	4	1	5	0	3	1	4
5. The U. S. should not be fighting in Viet Nam.	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	9
6. In war time other countries need to accept our stands or become our enemy.	3	1	0	0	7	3	4	3	8
7. American policy in Viet Nam is an abortive and needless waste of human suffering.	2	3	1	3	3	2	4	3	8
8. Wars often have to be fought in order to obtain peace.	15	5	4	2	0	1	0	1	1
9. The Viet Nam war stimulates men to their noblest efforts.	3	1	2	1	3	4	3	4	8
10. It is absolutely essential from all angles in our country's interests not to be involved in the war in Viet Nam.	1	1	1	3	1	1	5	4	12
11. It is absolutely essential from all angles in our country's interests to be involved in the war in Viet Nam.	4	2	2	2	1	5	3	1	9
12. The U. S. should ask for more international help in the Viet Nam war.	0	2	1	4	6	4	6	3	3
13. The war in Viet Nam should be restricted to the use of conventional weapons.	2	5	2	3	6	3	2	2	4

Statement	Categories								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14. The Viet Nam War brings out the best qualities in men.	2	0	1	2	2	2	4	4	12
15. The United States participation in the Viet Nam war is primarily for upholding the economy.	0	0	1	3	5	5	2	4	9
16. Under the present conditions the war in Viet Nam is necessary to maintain justice.	5	3	2	1	6	2	3	5	2
17. Without the Viet Nam war communism will continue to spread throughout the world and will eventually encompass everything and everybody.	4	3	2	5	2	3	3	3	4
18. We must use force in other countries before it is used on us.	3	3	2	1	5	1	2	3	9
19. The U. S. should be less concerned with international politics and should try to win the war.	5	2	2	4	3	0	3	4	6
20. There are some arguments in favor of the war in Viet Nam.	12	5	3	5	2	0	0	2	0
21. From the point of view of our country's interests, it is hard to decide whether or not we should be involved in the war in Viet Nam.	1	2	3	0	7	1	3	5	7
22. The Viet Nam war represents a necessary evil in our current fencing with Red China, but it is in itself a ridiculous conflict which we can never win.	1	1	1	3	5	4	4	1	9
23. It is necessary for the U. S. to keep Viet Nam free, but not at the expense of sending soldiers there to get slaughtered.	3	0	4	6	3	3	2	2	6
24. The cause we are fighting for in Viet Nam is important.	13	5	3	4	2	1	0	1	0

Statement	Categories								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
25. The Viet Nam war is necessary for the preservation of freedom in the East and in the United States.	12	2	1	3	6	1	2	0	2
26. It is important that the U. S. is supporting the Viet Nam war.	0	3	2	5	4	5	5	3	2
27. U. S. participation in the Viet Nam war is necessary in order to support the rights of all mankind.	10	4	2	1	0	2	5	1	4
28. We want no more Viet Nam war if it can be avoided without dishonor.	1	3	3	3	5	5	3	2	4
29. The U. S. should be in Viet Nam, but the U. S. should not be dragging the war out for such a long length of time.	7	4	5	5	1	3	1	1	2
30. It is difficult to know if the U. S. is doing any good in the Viet Nam war.	4	5	4	1	4	3	3	2	3
31. Human destruction in Viet Nam must be avoided at any cost.	3	5	1	4	5	2	1	2	6
32. Right or wrong, a citizen must support his country in times of war.	13	4	1	1	1	2	2	2	3
33. War is wrong at any time.	4	2	4	0	3	1	4	2	9
34. The war in Viet Nam is an imperialist attempt to suppress a popular revolt of the South Viet Nam people.	0	1	1	2	5	0	2	4	14
35. There are times when war cannot be avoided.	8	6	4	4	3	0	1	1	2
36. Although it is hard to decide, it is probable that our country's interests will be better served if we were not involved in the war in Viet Nam.	1	2	3	1	6	2	4	2	8

[illegible]

Statement	Categories								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
interests will be better served by our involvement in the war in Viet Nam.	4	3	2	6	5	2	3	2	2
49. The U. S. has an obligation to intervene in the Viet Nam struggle.	5	4	1	4	5	4	2	2	2
50. Increased military involvement in the Viet Nam war aids the Communist cause.	1	1	1	4	3	3	7	3	6
51. The Viet Nam war cannot be decided by military means.	2	0	3	4	2	7	3	3	5
52. The Viet Nam war is necessary but has few qualities of justice or nobility which if present would make the war justifiable.	3	1	2	3	2	2	4	7	5
53. An alternative to war or surrender can be found if man would only compromise.	7	5	2	6	2	0	2	1	4
54. We must use force in Viet Nam before it is used on us.	4	6	3	1	1	3	2	2	7
55. The U. S. has been dealing fairly with the Vietnamese people under the circumstances.	7	3	3	6	3	3	2	0	2
56. The Viet Nam war represents a necessary evil in U. S. fencing with Red China, but it is in itself a ridiculous conflict which the U. S. can never win.	1	1	2	1	4	1	6	3	10
57. It is good judgment to sacrifice certain rights in order to prevent an acceleration of the war in Viet Nam.	2	3	1	1	2	0	5	7	8
58. The aim of U. S. policy must be to avoid getting more deeply involved in the Viet Nam war.	2	4	1	2	5	4	3	3	5
59. The war in Viet Nam is an unfortunate error on the part of the U. S.	2	0	0	0	4	2	4	7	10

Statement	Categories								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
60. It seems that our country's interests would be better served by our involvement in the war in Viet Nam.	3	0	2	2	5	4	4	6	3
61. The U. S. is involved in the Viet Nam war for reasons that are not valid.	1	2	3	3	3	0	4	4	9
62. Essentially the interests of our country will be served best if we were not involved in the war in Viet Nam.	2	0	1	5	2	2	2	6	9
63. Essentially the interests of our country will be served best by our involvement in the war in Viet Nam.	3	2	4	3	4	1	1	4	7
64. The North Vietnamese would overrun South Viet Nam and introduce Communism if it weren't for American war efforts.	11	2	7	1	2	2	2	1	1
65. A defensive type of war in Viet Nam is justified but any other type of war is not.	1	0	2	2	4	2	4	6	8
66. Since the U. S. has committed its men, finance, and resources to the Viet Nam war it should stay and win.	9	4	3	1	6	1	2	3	0
67. All measures should be taken to settle the dispute in Viet Nam at once without further loss of life.	11	1	2	1	5	4	0	1	4
68. An immediate cease fire under any circumstance must be attained in Viet Nam.	1	1	2	4	2	1	8	2	8
69. The Viet Nam war has some benefits, but it's a big price to pay for them.	4	3	6	5	2	3	2	2	2
70. The more nations spend for defense the less real security their people have.	2	8	1	5	3	2	3	0	5

Statement	Categories								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
71. The U. S. is failing to achieve international objectives in the war in Viet Nam.	2	5	2	3	5	2	4	2	4
72. The highest duty of a U. S. citizen is to fight for the power and glory of his nation by serving in the armed forces in Viet Nam.	5	3	0	1	2	2	3	5	8
*73. Perhaps we should consider stopping bombing raids on North Viet Nam if they are willing to cooperate in a peace conference.	2	3	9	5	3	2	3	1	1
*74. It is necessary for the United States to stop the progression of communism in Viet Nam, but this cannot be done by military intervention alone.	7	4	7	8	1	0	1	1	0
*75. It seems that our country's interests would be better served if we were not involved in the war in Viet Nam.	2	2	2	1	8	1	4	2	7
*76. Continued U. S. involvement in the Viet Nam war hurts the American image.	1	1	4	1	8	5	2	4	3
*77. The U. S. should act more resolutely and effectively to check the North Vietnamese.	2	1	2	4	1	6	7	5	1
*78. Neutral nations are actually cowardly.	1	0	1	1	2	1	1	6	16
*79. The U. S. should use the Viet Nam war as a "springboard" in the invasion of China.	3	0	1	0	0	3	0	1	21
*80. The Viet Nam issue should be settled as quickly as possible.	14	5	1	3	1	0	1	0	4
*81. The U. S. should try to work out plans for peace in Viet Nam.	20	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	0
*82. Peaceful settlement of the Viet Nam war at the earliest time would be ideal.	18	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	3

Statement	Categories								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
*83. The Viet Nam war should be settled as quickly as possible.	15	3	2	2	1	2	0	1	3
*84. Perhaps we should consider stopping bombing raids on North Viet Nam if they are willing to cooperate in a peace conference.	3	7	6	2	3	2	1	0	5
*85. The Viet Nam war is an unnecessary waste of human life.	12	2	4	7	0	0	3	1	0
**86. There is no conceivable justification for U. S. participation in the Viet Nam war, and the U. S. should withdraw at once and remain neutral.	21	3	0	2	1	1	0	1	0
**87. The U. S. participation in the Viet Nam war is an unnecessary waste of human life, and it resolves no international problems.	4	10	6	3	2	2	1	1	0
**88. The war in Viet Nam should be stopped, but not if it will cause the U. S. a loss of prestige.	7	4	11	4	1	0	1	0	1
**89. Military action is necessary to defeat the enemy in Viet Nam, however, the prime issues are political.	1	7	5	11	2	2	0	1	0
**90. A categorical rejection of the Viet Nam war is a difficult decision to make.	1	1	3	5	11	7	0	1	0
**91. The desirable results of the Viet Nam war have not received the attention they deserve.	0	1	0	5	8	12	2	1	0
**92. In supporting the long range cold war efforts Viet Nam represents an important resistance.	1	2	0	1	2	5	9	4	4
**93. The war in Viet Nam is a satisfactory way to solve the present international difficulties.	0	2	1	0	3	2	1	6	14

Statement	Categories								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
**94. The Viet Nam war should be escalated to the point where the U. S. forces Red China into an all out nuclear war.	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	23

Note.-- *Thirteen of 22 items first selected. **Final items
selected for attitude scale.

APPENDIX C

Sample Questionnaire Administered to Subjects Following
Completion of Attitude Scale

Name _____ Classification _____ Age _____ Sex _____

Some additional information will be needed to aid in determining the results of this study. Your cooperation in filling out the form below will be appreciated.

- I. Please list in order of importance 3 issues which appear to you to be the most important facing the United States today.

1.

2.

3.

- II. Please write a one-sentence statement expressing your stand on the Viet Nam issue.

- III. Below is a horizontal line, representing the entire range of opinions on the Viet Nam issue. Please indicate your position on the issue by drawing a vertical line across the horizontal line at that place which represents your stand on the issue.

Extremely
against the
Viet Nam war

Extremely
for the
Viet Nam war

APPENDIX D

Number of Most Acceptable, Most Objectionable, Acceptable,
Objectionable, and Non-Commitment Statements on First
Administration of Attitude Scale for All Subjects

Responses to first attitude scale for all subjects

Position	Attitude scale statements								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Most acceptable position	9	51	23	71	55	19	49	3	9
Most objectionable position	58	7	5	0	0	0	1	14	193
Acceptable	32	47	66	138	159	139	105	19	7
Objectionable	151	138	126	28	18	58	58	214	72
Non-commitment	37	44	67	50	55	71	74	37	10

APPENDIX E

Number of Non-Commitment Statements for Treatment and Control
Subjects on Attitude Scale for Both Administrations
and Change in Region of Non-Commitment

Treatment 2

Low approval subjects	First attitude scale	Second attitude scale	Change	High approval subjects	First attitude scale	Second attitude scale	Change
1	0	1	+1	1	2	5	+3
2	0	0	0	2	3	2	-1
3	4	0	-4	3	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	4	3	3	0
5	5	4	-1	5	0	0	0
6	2	3	+1	6	0	0	0
7	1	2	+1	7	3	3	0
8	0	5	+5	8	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	9	2	1	-1
10	1	1	0	10	4	1	-3
11	0	0	0	11	5	1	-4
12	0	0	0	12	1	0	-1
13	0	0	0	13	2	3	+1
14	3	4	+1	14	5	5	0
15	0	0	0	15	1	3	+2
16	0	0	0	16	0	0	0
17	0	0	0	17	5	5	0
18	2	0	-2	18	4	0	-4
19	0	0	0	19	3	2	-1
20	0	3	+3	20	0	0	0
21	0	0	0	21	1	0	-1
22	0	0	0	22	0	0	0
23	0	0	0	23	3	5	+2
24	0	0	0	24	2	5	+3
25	0	0	0	25	0	0	0
26	0	0	0	26	0	0	0
27	2	1	-1	27	4	5	+1
28	0	0	0	28	4	3	-1
29	5	5	0	29	0	0	0
30	0	0	0				
31	0	0	0				
32	0	0	0				
33	0	0	0				
34	2	4	+2				

Treatment 4

Low approval subjects	First attitude scale	Second attitude scale	Change	High approval subjects	First attitude scale	Second attitude scale	Change
1	3	3	0	1	2	0	-2
2	3	3	0	2	4	5	+1
3	0	0	0	3	5	4	-1
4	0	0	0	4	5	3	-2
5	4	4	0	5	5	3	-2
6	0	0	0	6	6	7	+1
7	4	4	0	7	7	7	0
8	3	3	0	8	5	5	0
9	5	3	-2	9	0	0	0
10	1	2	+1	10	3	2	-1
11	0	0	0	11	2	0	-2
12	0	0	0	12	5	3	-2
13	3	2	-1	13	3	3	0
14	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
15	1	0	-1	15	3	0	-3
16	1	0	-1	16	0	0	0
17	0	0	0	17	0	0	0
18	4	4	0	18	4	4	0
19	5	5	0	19	3	2	-1
20	0	0	0	20	3	3	0
21	1	1	0				
22	3	3	0				
23	0	0	0				
24	3	2	-1				
25	3	4	+1				
26	0	2	+2				

Treatment 7

Low approval subjects	First attitude scale	Second attitude scale	Change	High approval subjects	First attitude scale	Second attitude scale	Change
1	3	2	-1	1	1	0	-1
2	0	0	0	2	4	4	0
3	0	0	0	3	2	2	0
4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
6	4	3	-1	6	0	0	0
7	2	3	+1	7	2	5	+3
8	0	0	0	8	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	9	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	10	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	11	0	6	+6
12	0	0	0	12	0	0	0
13	3	3	0	13	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	14	0	0	0
15	0	0	0	15	3	5	+2
16	0	0	0	16	1	0	-1
17	0	0	0	17	2	1	-1
18	0	0	0	18	0	0	0
19	6	5	-1	19	0	0	0
20	0	0	0	20	0	0	0
21	2	4	+2	21	4	3	-1
22	0	0	0	22	4	4	0
23	0	0	0	23	5	5	0
24	3	5	+2	24	2	0	-2
25	2	1	-1	25	0	2	+2
26	3	2	-1	26	0	0	0
27	0	0	0	27	4	4	0
28	0	0	0	28	3	4	+1
29	0	0	0	29	1	3	+2
30	0	0	0	30	2	0	-2
31	3	1	-2	31	0	0	0
32	0	0	0	32	0	0	0
33	4	4	0	33	0	0	0
34	0	0	0	34	0	0	0
35	0	0	0	35	3	5	+2
36	2	0	-2	36	0	0	0
37	4	0	-4	37	0	0	0
38	0	0	0	38	4	5	+1
39	0	0	0				

Control

Low approval subjects	First attitude scale	Second attitude scale	Change	High approval subjects	First attitude scale	Second attitude scale	Change
1	0	0	0	1	3	3	0
2	3	4	+1	2	1	2	+1
3	0	0	0	3	2	0	-2
4	0	0	0	4	3	3	0
5	3	1	-2	5	2	4	+2
6	3	3	0	6	3	3	0
7	1	3	+2	7	4	1	-3
8	4	4	0	8	2	3	+1
9	3	0	-3	9	2	2	0
10	0	0	0	10	4	4	0
11	0	2	+2	11	0	0	0
12	4	4	0	12	3	1	-2
13	4	5	+1	13	6	0	-6
14	3	3	0	14	2	4	+2
15	0	0	0	15	3	3	0
16	0	0	0	16	1	1	0
17	0	0	0	17	0	0	0
18	0	0	0	18	4	4	0
19	4	4	0	19	6	4	-2
20	0	0	0	20	4	4	0
21	3	5	+2	21	0	0	0
22	0	2	+2	22	3	4	+1
23	2	3	+1	23	2	3	+1
24	0	0	0	24	0	0	0
25	0	0	0	25	1	0	-1
26	0	0	0	26	0	0	0
27	0	0	0	27	0	0	0
28	2	2	0	28	2	3	+1
29	0	0	0	29	3	3	0
30	0	0	0	30	0	0	0
31	2	2	0	31	1	1	0
32	5	1	-4	32	3	1	-2
33	3	2	-1	33	3	3	0
34	0	0	0	34	2	2	0
35	0	0	0	35	3	3	0
36	0	0	0	36	0	0	0
37	0	0	0	37	0	0	0
38	0	0	0	38	1	3	+2
39	5	4	-1	39	0	0	0
40	4	3	-1	40	3	2	-1
41	0	0	0	41	4	2	-2
42	0	0	0	42	3	6	+3

(Control continued on next page.)

Low approval subjects	First attitude scale	Second attitude scale	Change	High approval subjects	First attitude scale	Second attitude scale	Change
43	0	0	0	43	0	0	0
44	0	0	0	44	0	0	0
45	3	1	-2	45	3	5	+2
46	0	0	0	46	0	0	0
47	0	0	0	47	3	4	+1
48	3	2	-1	48	2	1	-1
49	0	2	+2	49	0	0	0
50	0	0	0	50	0	0	0
				51	0	0	0

APPENDIX F

Most Acceptable Position for Treatment and Control Subjects
on Attitude Scale for Both Administrations and Direction
of Shift of Most Acceptable Position

Treatment 2

Low approval subjects	First attitude scale	Shift toward or away	Second attitude scale	High approval subjects	First attitude scale	Shift toward or away	Second attitude scale
1	2	0	2	1	5	+3	2
2	5	0	5	2	2	0	2
3	2	-2	4	3	3	-4	7
4	7	+2	5	4	7	0	7
5	4	0	4	5	7	0	7
6	5	+3	2	6	7	0	7
7	2	0	2	7	5	0	5
8	2	0	2	8	4	0	4
9	7	+3	4	9	1	+1	2
10	4	-5	9	10	2	0	2
11	2	0	2	11	6	+1	5
12	7	+5	2	12	5	0	5
13	7	+4	3	13	7	+5	2
14	3	+1	2	14	5	+1	4
15	5	+3	2	15	5	+1	4
16	9	+3	6	16	4	0	4
17	7	+3	4	17	5	+3	2
18	4	-1	5	18	7	+3	4
19	1	0	1	19	4	0	4
20	7	+2	5	20	2	0	2
21	4	0	4	21	6	0	6
22	3	-2	5	22	3	-3	6
23	4	-3	7	23	7	0	7
24	5	+3	2	24	3	-1	4
25	5	+3	2	25	6	+2	4
26	2	0	2	26	3	0	3
27	8	+4	4	27	4	0	4
28	3	0	3	28	6	+2	4
29	1	-4	5	29	6	0	6
30	2	0	2				
31	7	+2	5				
32	7	0	7				
33	4	-2	6				
34	3	-4	7				

Treatment 4

Low approval subjects	First attitude scale	Shift toward or away	Second attitude scale	High approval subjects	First attitude scale	Shift toward or away	Second attitude scale
1	8	+5	3	1	4	0	4
2	2	+2	4	2	2	0	2
3	5	0	5	3	7	-1	8
4	3	+1	4	4	4	0	4
5	9	+2	7	5	3	0	3
6	4	0	4	6	7	0	7
7	3	+1	4	7	5	0	5
8	4	0	4	8	2	+2	4
9	4	0	4	9	4	0	4
10	4	0	4	10	4	0	4
11	5	0	5	11	7	+3	4
12	4	0	4	12	1	0	1
13	2	0	2	13	4	0	4
14	5	0	5	14	4	0	4
15	3	-2	5	15	2	0	2
16	4	-3	7	16	5	0	5
17	4	0	4	17	4	0	4
18	2	0	2	18	4	0	4
19	3	+1	4	19	5	+1	4
20	5	0	5	20	4	0	4
21	4	0	4				
22	1	+1	2				
23	2	0	2				
24	2	0	2				
25	3	+1	4				
26	4	0	4				

Treatment 7

Low approval subjects	First attitude scale	Shift toward or away	Second attitude scale	High approval subjects	First attitude scale	Shift toward or away	Second attitude scale
1	7	0	7	1	5	0	5
2	4	0	4	2	5	0	5
3	7	0	7	3	7	0	7
4	4	0	4	4	3	0	3
5	4	0	4	5	4	0	4
6	4	0	4	6	4	0	4
7	7	0	7	7	4	0	4
8	6	0	6	8	2	0	2
9	5	0	5	9	2	0	2
10	7	0	7	10	5	0	5
11	4	0	4	11	5	+2	7
12	4	0	4	12	6	+1	7
13	2	0	2	13	2	0	2
14	7	0	7	14	5	+2	7
15	4	0	4	15	2	+1	3
16	7	0	7	16	1	+1	2
17	4	0	4	17	7	0	7
18	6	0	6	18	5	0	5
19	4	0	4	19	7	0	7
20	5	0	5	20	6	+1	7
21	5	0	5	21	4	+3	7
22	4	0	4	22	4	+3	7
23	7	0	7	23	5	-3	2
24	4	+3	7	24	6	0	6
25	4	0	4	25	7	0	7
26	5	0	5	26	7	0	7
27	4	0	4	27	6	0	6
28	1	+4	5	28	4	+3	7
29	1	0	1	29	7	0	7
30	4	+3	7	30	7	-1	6
31	7	0	7	31	3	0	3
32	4	0	4	32	4	+3	7
33	7	0	7	33	3	0	3
34	7	0	7	34	4	+3	7
35	2	-1	1	35	2	0	2
36	2	-1	1	36	7	-2	9
37	4	+3	7	37	4	+3	7
38	5	0	5	38	2	0	2
39	2	0	2				

Control

Low approval subjects	First attitude scale	Shift toward or away	Second attitude scale	High approval subjects	First attitude scale	Shift toward or away	Second attitude scale
1	5	0	5	1	6	0	6
2	5	0	5	2	4	0	4
3	3	1	4	3	9	2	7
4	5	0	5	4	5	0	5
5	4	5	9	5	4	2	2
6	5	2	7	6	7	0	7
7	2	0	2	7	7	0	7
8	7	0	7	8	2	0	2
9	2	0	2	9	3	0	3
10	7	0	7	10	9	0	9
11	5	3	2	11	4	0	4
12	2	0	2	12	5	0	5
13	2	0	2	13	6	4	2
14	7	0	7	14	5	0	5
15	5	1	4	15	5	0	5
16	5	0	5	16	4	1	5
17	4	0	4	17	3	0	3
18	5	0	5	18	7	1	8
19	5	0	5	19	2	0	2
20	2	0	2	20	9	0	9
21	5	0	5	21	4	0	4
22	7	0	7	22	6	1	7
23	5	0	5	23	6	0	6
24	5	0	5	24	4	0	4
25	2	0	2	25	2	0	2
26	7	0	7	26	3	0	3
27	7	4	3	27	2	0	2
28	4	0	4	28	4	3	7
29	5	0	5	29	5	0	5
30	2	0	2	30	7	0	7
31	5	0	5	31	6	0	6
32	4	0	4	32	9	0	9
33	4	2	2	33	2	0	2
34	6	5	1	34	7	0	7
35	7	0	7	35	2	0	2
36	2	0	2	36	8	0	8
37	2	0	2	37	2	0	2
38	5	0	5	38	5	0	5
39	5	0	5	39	2	0	2
40	7	2	5	40	9	0	9
41	5	0	5	41	4	0	4
42	3	1	2	42	5	1	4

(Control continued on next page.)

Low approval subjects	First attitude scale	Shift toward or away	Second attitude scale	High approval subjects	First attitude scale	Shift toward or away	Second attitude scale
43	4	0	4	43	6	0	6
44	6	1	7	44	2	0	2
45	2	2	4	45	3	4	7
46	7	2	5	46	4	3	1
47	2	1	1	47	2	3	5
48	2	1	3	48	4	0	4
49	4	0	4	49	4	0	4
50	2	0	2	50	1	0	1
				51	5	0	5

APPENDIX G

Number of Statements Rejected by High and Low Approval-Motivated
Subjects on First Administration of Attitude Scale

Treatment 2

Low approval subjects	First atti- tude scale	High approval subjects	First atti- tude scale	Low approval subjects	First atti- tude scale	High approval subjects	First atti- tude scale
1	5	1	4	18	4	18	3
2	4	2	4	19	6	19	4
3	2	3	5	20	5	20	7
4	4	4	3	21	6	21	3
5	2	5	6	22	5	22	6
6	3	6	4	23	5	23	3
7	6	7	3	24	4	24	3
8	5	8	6	25	5	25	5
9	4	9	4	26	4	26	4
10	5	10	4	27	4	27	3
11	5	11	2	28	5	28	4
12	4	12	5	29	2	29	4
13	4	13	4	30	5		
14	2	14	2	31	6		
15	5	15	4	32	6		
16	4	16	4	33	3		
17	5	17	3	34	3		

Treatment 4

Low approval subjects	First atti- tude scale	High approval subjects	First atti- tude scale	Low approval subjects	First atti- tude scale	High approval subjects	First atti- tude scale
1	4	1	4	14	4	14	4
2	3	2	3	15	4	15	3
3	5	3	2	16	6	16	5
4	4	4	3	17	6	17	3
5	3	5	2	18	3	18	3
6	4	6	2	19	2	19	4
7	3	7	1	20	5	20	4
8	3	8	2	21	4		
9	2	9	5	22	3		
10	5	10	3	23	8		
11	5	11	3	24	3		
12	4	12	1	25	2		
13	2	13	3	26	5		

Treatment 7

Low approval subjects	First atti- tude scale	High approval subjects	First atti- tude scale	Low approval subjects	First atti- tude scale	High approval subjects	First atti- tude scale
1	5	1	3	21	4	21	2
2	4	2	2	22	5	22	3
3	5	3	4	23	4	23	2
4	5	4	5	24	3	24	4
5	5	5	5	25	4	25	4
6	2	6	5	26	4	26	4
7	3	7	4	27	5	27	3
8	4	8	4	28	4	28	3
9	5	9	5	29	7	29	3
10	4	10	5	30	6	30	3
11	4	11	4	31	4	31	6
12	4	12	5	32	4	32	6
13	4	13	4	33	3	33	5
14	4	14	6	34	4	34	5
15	5	15	4	35	6	35	2
16	4	16	5	36	4	36	7
17	4	17	3	37	4	37	5
18	3	18	4	38	5	38	3
19	2	19	5	39	6		
20	5	20	5				

Control

Low approval subjects	First atti- tude scale	High approval subjects	First atti- tude scale	Low approval subjects	First atti- tude scale	High approval subjects	First atti- tude scale
1	4	1	4	27	3	27	4
2	4	2	3	28	4	28	3
3	4	3	4	29	5	29	3
4	5	4	3	30	4	30	6
5	3	5	4	31	3	31	6
6	4	6	2	32	2	32	4
7	3	7	3	33	5	33	4
8	3	8	5	34	5	34	3
9	3	9	2	35	5	35	3
10	5	10	2	36	5	36	5
11	6	11	5	37	3	37	6
12	3	12	5	38	6	38	4
13	3	13	1	39	2	39	6
14	3	14	3	40	3	40	3
15	4	15	1	41	5	41	2
16	4	16	5	42	6	42	4
17	4	17	3	43	5	43	5
18	6	18	3	44	5	44	4
19	3	19	2	45	3	45	2
20	6	20	3	46	5	46	5
21	3	21	4	47	6	47	4
22	5	22	3	48	3	48	2
23	5	23	3	49	6	49	4
24	4	24	4	50	6	50	7
25	4	25	6			51	4
26	3	26	4				