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ABSTRACT

This research examines relationships between support for public censorship, the tendency to self-censor, demographics, political ideology, and personality. Censorship is a prevalent issue in contemporary society. Time and again throughout history censorship has been used as a force of oppression. According to political theorists, freedom of expression is viewed as the normatively positive alternative to censorship. Freedom of expression is both the individual's right and responsibility in a democratic society. As such, the decisions that the public makes about which opinions may be expressed and which opinions will be censored are important.

The research presented here uses a social scientific approach to assess the concepts of interest. A questionnaire was constructed and distributed to a sample from the university community (n = 169) in order to assess relationships between individuals' tendencies to support public censorship and self-censor, demographic and political ideological characteristics, and personality.

The results indicate that individuals who are more supportive of public censorship also tend to self-censor more. Despite the fact that support for public censorship and the tendency to self-censor have some common predictors, support for public censorship is better predicted by demographic and political traits whereas self-censorship is better predicted by personality traits. These findings raise many new questions and thus present several opportunities for future research. Better communication theory with regard to
censorship is called for. The study's broader implications as well as some general policy recommendations are also discussed.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Informal Prologue: The Current State of Affairs

Issues of freedom of expression are prominent in today’s society, and examples are plentiful in the public record. Soon after recording artist Janet Jackson’s breast was exposed during the halftime entertainment for the Super Bowl in 2004, Federal Communications Commission (FCC) inquiries and congressional hearings were launched (Levinson, 2004). The results included an FCC fine of over half a million dollars to CBS (Fabrikant, 2004), broadcaster of the halftime show, and congressional attempts to increase the amount of money that the FCC can fine stations for broadcasting material that it deems indecent (Aherns, 2004). At about the same time radio “shock jocks” were also facing the scrutiny of the FCC. Programs hosted by Howard Stern and Todd Clem were dropped from stations owned by Clear Channel Radio in an effort to reduce content of questionable decency after the FCC fined the chain $755,000 for several of Clem’s broadcasts (Montgomery & Aherns, 2004). Though Stern was still broadcasting to approximately 12 million listeners through another syndication agreement with Viacom’s Infinity Broadcasting, soon after being dropped by Clear Channel he announced that in 2006 he will move his program to Sirius Satellite Radio, which remains unregulated by the FCC, in order to avoid what he describes as censorship (Carter & Leeds, 2004). When the American Broadcasting Company (ABC) scheduled an unedited showing of
the film *Saving Private Ryan* for Veteran’s Day, 2004, several companies that owned ABC affiliates refused to run the program, citing concerns about FCC fines due to the graphic nature of the film, even though many of the same stations had run the unedited film prior to the Jackson incident (De Moraes, 2004). It seems that public outcry and subsequent punishment for media presentations that had not met the FCC’s decency standards led producers and purveyors to seriously examine the risks entailed in presenting certain content, and in some cases led to decisions to change the broadcast venue or cancel the presentation completely.

These issues are not limited to the entertainment media; freedom of political expression has also been called into question. In December of 2003 the Supreme Court of the United States issued a ruling that upheld even the most stringent clauses of the McCain-Feingold campaign finance law regarding political advertising, including a multitude of regulations that advertisements paid for by private groups must face if they so much as mention a candidate running for public office (Von Drehle, 2003). During the 2004 Democratic and Republican national conventions individuals who wished to protest the parties were relegated to “free speech zones,” fenced off areas that in most instances could not be seen or heard from the convention sites (Lithwick, 2004). In September of 2004 an Alabama woman was allegedly fired from her job for refusing to remove a sticker promoting John Kerry’s campaign for president from her automobile (“Election 2004,” 2004).

Once the campaigning is over, elected officials make and enforce laws. Legislative and administrative action related to national security has also involved freedom of expression issues in recent years. Following the events of September 11,
2001 the government has sought to enhance security within the United States. In some cases measures taken to this end have come into conflict with civil liberties, including freedom of expression. The Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT) Act was signed into law in October of 2001 with the primary intent of enhancing the ability of U.S. law enforcement agencies to prevent terrorist attacks. One provision of the act allows U.S. law enforcement officials, under the jurisdiction of a secret court, to request any library and bookstore records that they consider relevant to investigations involving national security. The officials are not required to show that the individuals whom the records are associated with are in any way suspected of any crime. Nor are they required to explain why the individuals are being investigated. It has been suggested that this provision could discourage many innocent individuals from obtaining information from libraries and bookstores that government officials might associate with controversial or dangerous topics. This may, in turn, discourage individuals from forming, and thus expressing, informed ideas about any issue that they think the government might view with concern (Airoldi, 2005). While the war on terror has brought about security measures that may conflict with freedom of expression, so too has the war in Iraq.

In March of 2003, just before the U.S. invasion of Iraq, the Pentagon issued a directive reinforcing an existing policy that forbade direct journalistic coverage of the processing and transport of the remains of U.S. military personnel at air bases. Although the administration of President George W. Bush has stated that the policy is in place to protect the privacy of families of the dead, some have charged that the true purpose of the policy is to limit the public’s knowledge of the human costs of the war by prohibiting,
and effectively censoring, coverage of those costs (Hayes & Reineke, 2005; Stolberg, 2004). In April of 2005, in response to a lawsuit, the Pentagon did release to the public hundreds of images of honor guard ceremonies that it had previously denied requests for (National Security Archive, 2005). As these examples show, in worldwide venues such as the mass media, global and national politics, and defense, freedom of expression is often a contested value.

Academia has also recently faced its share of crises involving freedom of expression. A survey of over 100,000 of the nation’s high school students conducted by The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation found that three quarters of the students surveyed thought, wrongly, that flag-burning was illegal, half thought, wrongly, that the government could censor the Internet, and more than a third thought that the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States went too far in the rights that it guarantees (“Survey Finds,” 2005). The recent “academic freedom” movement has sought to limit what instructors at public educational institutions may discuss in classes, especially when it comes to political material that may be seen as controversial or construed to be partisan. Proponents of “academic freedom” have met with receptive ears in several state legislatures, and even the beginnings of actual legislation in a few states (MacDonald, 2005). Ward Churchill, a professor of ethnic studies at the University of Colorado, has faced death threats and cancelled speaking engagements while state politicians have called for his firing due to the controversial nature of some of his opinions and writings (Smallwood, 2005). Debate continues over what role religiously oriented expression, such as prayer, support for creationism, and restricted sex education, should play in public schools (Paley, 2004).
All of the cases mentioned thus far deal with classic forms of public censorship: the restriction of expression that is in some way controversial by an outside authority. Though these examples of institutionally, or outwardly sourced forms of expression restriction are commonly associated with censorship, another form of expression restriction, though recognizable, is not typically conceptualized in the same way. In these cases, the restriction of expression comes from within.

A presidential commission assigned to look into the intelligence failures during the lead-up to the war in Iraq found that an over-reliance on consensus, coupled with a lack of expression when it came to dissenting opinions, were among the main factors in the intelligence community’s acceptance of faulty information on issues such as Iraq’s alleged possession of weapons of mass destruction (Pincus & Baker, 2005; see also Janis, 1983). Most people experience similar situations in their own lives. In the boardroom a businessperson may decide not to express her or his opinion about a particular topic for fear of contradicting the boss (e.g. Wyatt, Katz, Levinsohn, & Al-Haj, 1996), or presenting an idea that would be considered too controversial relative to the organization’s corporate culture. Many times educators struggle to elicit responses from seemingly uncooperative classes when undoubtedly individual students have insightful ideas or opinions that would benefit the class if shared, but do not express them for fear of being wrong or being singled out as different from their cohort in a way that might lead to ostracism. In the current political climate, individuals who find themselves in the midst of others who are not politically like-minded when the topic turns to politics may be inclined to “hold their tongues” (Noelle-Neumann, 1974, 1993). These too are examples of a kind of censorship, censorship where the authority that forbids
communication of controversial information is one’s self: self-censorship. While there are certainly other examples of situations where similar issues exist, all of these illustrations provide a rudimentary impression of the social world, as it pertains to freedom of expression and censorship, which serves as a backdrop to this work.

1.2 Why is Free Expression Important?

Belief in the importance of free expression dates back the very foundations of western civilization (Hargreaves, 2002; Kostyu, 2004). In the 4th century B.C., Greek philosopher Plato wrote two dialogues on censorship, Apology and Crito. In Apology, Plato’s teacher, Socrates, is on trial for his life because, in the judgment of the authorities of Athens, he has denied the gods and corrupted the youth with his teachings. His judges tell Socrates that they will spare his life if he stops his teaching or substantively changes it. Socrates refuses, though he denies that he is an atheist and that his teaching is corruptive; he argues that even if the charges were true, as Athens is a free and democratic city, no official has authority to tell him what he may or may not think, say, or teach. The court finds Socrates guilty and sentences him to death. In Crito, Socrates explores the possibility that though the state cannot prevent him from expressing himself, it may be within its rights to put him to death for doing so. Socrates concludes that as the conviction and sentence were reached lawfully he will willingly comply, despite opportunities to recant or escape, because he wishes to be a good and responsible citizen of Athens (Emery, 1996; Hargreaves, 2002).

Plato makes an important distinction about the relationship between the autonomous individual and the government in self-governing societies: if the government attempts to limit an individual’s expression, she or he may, indeed must, disobey out of
duty to the principles of the society, but if the government, through reasonable legal means decides to take the individual’s property, or even her or his life, she or he must comply, and willingly so, also out of duty to the principles of the society (Meiklejohn, 1948). According to Socrates and Plato, despite any law made to the contrary, or any consequence, expression is an individual’s right and obligation to society.

In the Roman Empire, from the rule of Nero until the conversion of Constantine, the policy of *Christiani non sint* prohibited the profession of Christianity. This included prohibition of refusals to recant Christianity or refusals to acknowledge the existence of the gods recognized by the empire. Though factual numbers are difficult if not impossible to determine, histories of the time offer a multitude of accounts of individuals who in one way or another defied this policy and were subsequently martyred. As martyrdom came to be understood as an unencumbered and direct means of entry into Heaven, some believers openly sought death at the hands of the empire by way of proclaiming their Christianity. If the accounts of the day are at all believable, it seems that many felt, in tandem, beliefs and expression were well worth dying for. The empire was not faced with the same contradictions, trials, and tribulations that Athens had faced as a democratic society in the time of Socrates. Despite the tolls inflicted, Christianity survived and grew, beyond even the end of the Roman Empire. Ironically, as Christianity became a dominant force in the western world, it too sought to quash expression that contradicted its dogma; this was one of the factors that perpetuated the dark ages and the loss of the ideal of free expression for over a thousand years (Hargreaves, 2002).

Gutenberg’s invention of the printing press in the mid-fifteenth century was the beginning of a new era in human communication (McLuhan, 1962). The development of
the press marked the nascent beginnings of the mass media as we conceptualize them today, and so media censorship soon followed. Luther’s publication of the ninety-five theses and his repeated refusals to recant were catalysts for his excommunication and ultimately the Reformation. At around the same time across Europe various authorities banned the publication and possession of Bibles that had been translated into languages other than Latin. Such texts were burned and possession was often punishable by death. At the Council of Trent in the mid-sixteenth century the Catholic Church began the Tridentine Index, or the Index of Forbidden Books. During the Renaissance, Galileo’s publication of support for and evidence of a Copernican model of the universe was condemned by the Catholic Church and, while he avoided formal punishment, he was ordered to cease and desist any such belief or expression in the future. Galileo disobeyed this order with the publication of *Dialogue*, but this time the Inquisition acted, and he was forced to formally recant and swear allegiance to the dogma of the Church as a seventy year-old man under threat of torture (Hargreaves, 2002).

The Catholic Church was certainly not responsible for all acts of censorship. Similar to a policy originally enforced by the Catholic Church, the British monarchy, beginning in the late sixteenth century, tightly controlled printing in the United Kingdom. Any material to be published had to first be licensed by specified deputies of either the archbishop of Canterbury or the bishop of London. Thus the monarchy, like the Church before it, enforced a policy of pre-publication censorship; anything that the monarchy found disagreeable was unlicensed and therefore illegal to print, sell, or possess. Only authorized printers were allowed to own or operate presses. However, such policies ultimately failed, as it was nearly impossible for authorities to stop the importation or
construction of illegal presses and thus the printing and ultimately the distribution of unlicensed material. It was in this climate during the mid-seventeenth century that one of the best-known statements on freedom of expression, Milton's *Areopagitica*, was published (without license). The passage that is perhaps the best known and most often referenced lies near the end and reads:

> And though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple; who ever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter? (Hargreaves, 2002, p. 100; Kostyu, 2004, p. 27)

Though an eloquent and enduring statement on the value and necessity of free expression, *Areopagitica* had almost no discernable effect on the English authorities at the time of its publication. When Parliament finally prevailed over the monarchy at the end of the English civil wars, rather than remove regulation from the press, it simply assumed control of said regulation. By the end of the seventeenth century, however, with the help of academic and statesman John Locke, the licensing laws were allowed to lapse. While the press moved towards greater freedom as a result, it was hardly the end of strict regulation of expression in England – or her American colonies (Hargreaves, 2002).

The Stamp Act of 1712 imposed a tax on all printed papers, pamphlets and advertisements with the intent of discouraging distribution of media critical of the British government. The act was largely successful and profitable in England, but when, some years later, a similar tax was imposed in the American colonies it met with a violent reaction and had to be repealed within a year. Today it is seen as one of the primary antecedents of the American Revolution, but it was also the culmination of a long line of
attempts by England to control expression in the colonies. Aside from licensing, taxes, and restrictions on who was authorized to print, indictments on charges of seditious libel, or criticism of the government, were also used to censor the press. When colonist William Zenger printed papers critical of New York’s colonial governor in 1734 he was jailed under charges of seditious libel. Zenger’s attorney, Andrew Hamilton, made the bold move of admitting that indeed Zenger had broken the law of seditious libel, but argued that Zenger could not be found guilty and imprisoned for publishing information that could not be proven false or malicious. Despite a direct order from the judge that Zenger must be found guilty, the jury returned a verdict of not guilty. The case put free expression on the agenda of those among the colonist who were at the time considered radicals and would later become revolutionaries. It also facilitated the publication of Gordon and Trenchard’s *On Freedom of Speech*, and later Paine’s *Common Sense*, both of which served as further catalysts for the American Revolution (Hargreaves, 2002; Kostyu, 2004).

The formal legal framework for freedom of expression began with the English jurist William Blackstone’s *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, which was published in 1767. Blackstone’s position was essentially that prior restraint of expression was unacceptable in a free state, but subsequent punishment for the communication of objectionable material was acceptable. This notion was the preeminent understanding of free expression on both sides of the Atlantic through the American Revolution and until the writing and ratification of the United States’ Bill of Rights (Hargreaves, 2002; Kostyu, 2004).
Initially the founders saw no need for a codification of the rights of individuals. After all, the Constitution expressly states that only the powers enumerated therein were the purview of the federal government; all others belonged to the states and the people. However, during the debate over ratification, it became clear that many of the states felt that issues as important as basic civil liberties (and states’ rights) should not be left to inference alone. Madison saw the need for concession of the issue to the states if the Constitution were to be ratified and so he drafted appropriate amendments. The First Amendment was not the first amendment. In fact, the House of Representatives sent seventeen of the amendments originally proposed by Madison to the Senate, which eventually approved twelve. Ultimately the last ten were ratified by the states (the first two out of the Senate were not); today’s First Amendment reads as follows:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. (Kostyu, 2004, p. 29)

Although the First Amendment signified another step forward for the cause of free expression, only through time and challenge has it come to the power and prominence that it holds today (Hargreaves, 2002; Kostyu, 2004).

In the late eighteenth century Adams’s Federalist government passed the Sedition Act in an attempt to seize control of the American press for his party. This act, in a clear breach of the Bill of Rights, made it illegal to criticize the government. However, soon after Jefferson and his Democratic-Republicans took power in 1801 the act was nullified. The debate over the meaning of the First Amendment has been legally revisited for
almost every generation since, especially in times of war. The declaration of martial law, suspension of *habeas corpus*, and other executive measures were used during the American Civil War to discourage and punish expression of opinions contrary to the war or the Union’s ideals. The United States’ entry into World War I was accompanied by the Espionage Acts of 1917 and 1918, amended with a Senate rider that later came to be known as the Sedition Act, which again “would stamp out the printing, writing, or utterance of statements deemed disloyal, profane, scurrilous or abusive of the government of the United States, its constitution, flag or military uniforms,” (Hargreaves, 2002, p. 257). In a series of opinions on cases brought before the United States Supreme Court regarding the Sedition Act that began with wary support for the act, then became dissents, and would eventually sway the court against the act, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes formulated the clear and present danger test, which held that in order to warrant censorship, expression must directly and unequivocally present a high probability of harm. The classic example is yelling, “fire!” in a crowded theater. Today, American courts use the clear and present danger test in cases with circumstances tightly limited to the administration of the government or the judiciary, and the test has largely been replaced by a method of judicial review known a strict scrutiny. Strict scrutiny assumes that freedom of expression is one of the most important values of American society. In order for the government to curtail expression, it must present an extremely compelling reason to do so, and fashion the method of censorship in such a manner that it may only effect the expression in question (Hargreaves, 2002; Emerson, 1970; Kostyu, 2004; Hopkins, 2004).
The government and courts, or politics in action, are not the only source of ideas on freedom of expression. Mill’s (2002) *On Liberty*, originally published in 1859, is perhaps the most important and influential of political theory works that considers freedom of expression. In it Mill lays out the argument that liberty, especially liberty of the individual (of which the right to free expression is an integral part), should be society’s most important value. Mill believed, like Milton, that even false expression should be protected, as in the end truth would overcome falsehood and be made clearer by the comparison. Even in a hypothetical absolute democracy, where the government was one with the people, Mill argued, the government had no right to silence any individual’s expression or expunge it from the record, lest future peoples might lose a truth that had been unpopular in its time, or the clarity in truth gained by its comparison to falsehood. While Mill seems most concerned with the individual’s expression rights, he also notes that a free press is a similarly important tool when used by a democratic society to monitor its elected officials and consider competing ideas (Hargreaves, 2002; Mill, 2002).

In the mid-twentieth century, Meiklejohn (1948) came to quite similar conclusions, though from a different perspective and for different reasons. While Mill’s emphasis was on the individual, Meiklejohn’s was on collective society. To put it another way, Mill felt, first and foremost, that freedom of expression is of paramount importance because it is a civil liberty of the individual; its value to society is value-added. Meiklejohn felt that freedom of expression is an individual’s right, but its more important role is in the individual’s obligation to express himself or herself so that democratic society can make informed decisions. Meiklejohn argued that to silence
expression is to damage the democratic process; not only does it deny the right of the individual, it makes self-government impossible and thus gives rise to other, less-desirable, alternatives for the society. Both Mill and Meiklejohn reference Plato’s Apology and Crito. Mill feels that the conviction of Socrates was unjust because such a great individual was deprived of his life by the state for expressing reasoned and truthful opinions. Meiklejohn’s position suggests that the judges failed in their democratic duty by convicting Socrates – not only did they deny him an inalienable right and unjustly take his life, but they also deprived society of a powerful and important voice and perspective in the process of reasoned discourse and, ultimately, self-government (Meiklejohn, 1948; Mill, 2002).

Emerson (1966, 1970) summed up the reasons for freedom of expression in four premises. The first is a rationale similar to Mill’s, that freedom of expression is necessary as a civil liberty for the individual. The second is basically that freedom of expression is essential to the optimal function of the “marketplace of ideas;” freedom of expression is requisite to the search for truth and the advancement of knowledge. Third, freedom of expression aids democracy in that it is conducive to greater individual participation. Finally, Emerson presents and argument similar to Meiklejohn’s, that freedom of expression is an important factor in promoting a healthy, informed, and effective community. Through these four premises, Emerson (1966, 1970) lays out a summative rationale for the values inherent to freedom of expression.

In recent years political theory has continued to define the role of free expression in society and explore new areas and applications. Sunstein’s (2003) delivers a compelling treatise on the important role of dissent in society, for example.
Vaidhyanathan's (2001) work is also a recent example of continued consideration of what censorship is and means, as it conceptualizes modern copyright law essentially as censorship bought and paid for by wealthy, corporate interests. Indeed, there is no reason to believe that discussion of censorship and freedom expression in either the popular or scholar literature will cease any time soon.

So, in sum, what does this history have to say that informs the research presented here? How does it answer the question that begins this section, on the importance of freedom of expression? Perhaps most central to this research is the value of freedom of expression in terms of the individual and society. According to the sources mentioned previously, expression is not just the individual’s right - it is also the individual’s duty to society. Censorship from without and censorship from within both damage the individual and society. Both deprive the individual (or in the case of media censorship, the media entity) of participation, the ability to advance his or her interests in the democratic forum, and self-fulfillment. Both also deny the community information that it needs to make informed and effective decisions in a self-governing society. Based on the normative position that these are undesirable consequences, it is necessary to understand the roots of censorship in order to prevent it. The historical examples recounted above relate time and again stories of groups of people who are oppressed, through means that include censorship, who after being relieved of that oppression and themselves coming to power in one way or another, institute policies of censorship on others. The only exceptions are modern societies in progress, including, despite the occasional setback, the United States. In a democratic republic such as the United States, only through the people can censorship be employed and freedom of expression denied as a matter of lasting policy.
Thus, if one is to address the potential problem of censorship, one must understand how the people think about censorship. The approach advocated by this paper involves the examination of both public censorship and self-censorship tendencies as well as what type(s) of people, conceptualized primarily in terms of personality, exhibit these tendencies to greater or lesser extents. These issues will be examined using a social scientific approach. As such, a review of the relevant social scientific literature is appropriate.

1.3 Statement of Purpose and The Social Scientific Perspective

The purpose of this research is to discover if there is a relationship between individuals’ support for public censorship, their tendency to censor themselves, and their personalities. Despite the conceptual differences between support for public censorship and self-censorship, both are examples of the intentional prevention of communication. The fundamental assumption is that there is a common conceptual core for both traits, that some individuals exhibit a greater propensity to intentionally prevent expression that they perceive as controversial, whether the expression is their own or that of others. It is not enough to merely identify a relationship, a researcher should also ask “why?” Thus, as well as being compared to each other, support for public censorship and the tendency to self-censor will also be examined in terms of one of the most fundamental concepts regarding individual differences in the social sciences – personality.
1.3.1 Support for Public Censorship

Weaver's (1977) findings on social and governmental associates of public censorship may be the best bridge between the history, and political theory discussed previously and the social scientific findings to date discussed here. Weaver analyzed data collected on 137 countries at four separate points in time during the 20th century (1950, 1960, 1965 and 1966) found associations between greater government restriction of the press and a number of other normatively undesirable societal characteristics including less media development, less accountability of governors, less resources, less economic productivity, and greater stress on a country's political system (Weaver, 1977). While Andsanger, Wyatt, and Martin (2004) conducted a similarly global analysis, their focus was on individual opinions, rather than societal characteristics, in a purposive selection of four cultures (American, Russian, Hong Kong Chinese, Arab and Israeli). Their results indicate that, generally speaking, around the world, within and across cultures, men, the more educated, those with higher incomes, and those who are younger tend to convey greater support for expression rights (Andsanger, Wyatt, & Martin, 2004). These facts indicate that those who are more secure among the peoples of the world, financially or socially speaking, tend to be more supportive of expression rights. These results are quite similar to the general findings of a long line of American research regarding individual opinions on public censorship.

It seems that much of this public censorship opinion research, and hence the associated findings, is focused on the examination of relationships between support for public censorship and demographics. Andsanger, Wyatt, and Martin's (2004) summative conclusions are extensively replicated in this body of work. Women tend to support
public censorship more than men (e.g. Stouffer, 1955; Nunn, Crockett & Williams, 1978; Gunther 1995; Hense & Wright, 1992; Rojas, Shah, & Faber, 1996; Lambe, 2002, 2004; Reineke, 2004). Education tends to be negatively associated with support for public censorship (e.g. Stouffer, 1955; McClosky & Brill, 1983; Wyatt, 1991; McLeod, Sotirovic, Voakes, Guo & Huang, 1998; Lambe, 2002, 2004) whereas age is positively related to such support (e.g. Stouffer, 1955; McClosky & Brill, 1983; Wyatt, 1991; Lambe 2002). The more politically conservative an individual is, the more likely she or he is to support public censorship (e.g. McLeod et al., 1998; Lambe, 2002, 2004; Rojas et al., 1996), though this finding is contested in some examples of the literature (e.g. Hense & Wright, 1992; Suedfeld, Steel, & Schmidt, 1994). Many of the studies that make up this research tradition conclude that, generally speaking, while Americans tend to strongly support the broad, abstract concept of freedom of expression, they also demonstrate unequivocal support for censorship in many specific, concrete situations – especially when an entity they disagree with expresses itself in a controversial manner (e.g. McClosky & Brill, 1983; Wyatt, 1991; Demac, 1997; Erskine, 1970; Lambe, 2002, 2004). For example, a survey researcher would be quite justified in expecting an overwhelmingly positive response from a representative sample of the U.S. population to the questions, “Do you support freedom of speech?” and “Do you support freedom of the press?” and “Do you support the right of groups of people to peaceably assemble?” But the same researcher would also be quite justified in expecting an overwhelmingly positive response, from the same sample, to the question “Do you believe that the courts and/or police should prohibit the Ku Klux Klan from holding a demonstration in your neighborhood?”
All of these findings may seem to suggest rather diffuse motivations underlying support for censorship and resulting in an inconsistent hodgepodge of decisions made on the basis of the situation, the individuals involved, and rationalization. But, given the great, negative, normative perception of the general idea of censorship, and its demonstrable negative associations throughout history, why should there be any desire to see any policy of censorship implemented? Communication research's answer to this question is found in the realm of communication effects. More specifically, it involves perceptions of communication effects. The third-person effect hypothesis states that individuals tend to overestimate the effect that persuasive communication will have on society in general, while at the same time denying that the same communication has any effect on themselves or their cohorts (Davison, 1983; Perloff, 1993). To put it another way, the third-person effect is the belief that a persuasive message will not affect you or me, but it will affect them (Davison, 1983). Counter to Milton's assertion in *Areopagitica* that in the end what is right and true will win out if the people are allowed to witness and judge the contest of ideas, the relatively pessimistic assumption of an individual's third-person perception, as implemented in the form of public censorship, is that the message must be censored, lest the poor fools who make up the general public begin to mindlessly follow the whims and assertions of those whom the individual disagrees with (Lambe, 2002). According to the theory, this belief will result in a call for action in the form of greater support for public censorship (Davison, 1983). The suitability of this application of the third-person effect hypothesis has been demonstrated repeatedly (e.g. Gunther, 1995; Chia, Kerr-Hsin, & McLeod, 2004; Lo & Wei, 2002; Hoffner & Buchanan, 2002). One might point out that the use of the third person effect
hypothesis by researchers to describe the actions of the general public could easily be
construed to be a third person perception in and of itself, thus adding to the general sense
of cynicism arguably inherent to the theory. A similar quality of cynicism is implied by
the idea that humanity is weak in the face of disagreement, even with regard to the most
deeply held beliefs. This idea is the basic conclusion of self-censorship’s primary
theoretical framework: spiral of silence theory.

1.3.2 Self-Censorship

While there are other conceptualizations of the decision not to communicate at the
individual level, such as self-monitoring (e.g. Snyder, 1974, 1979; Lenox & Wolfe,
1984), communication apprehension (e.g. Beatty, McCroskey, & Heisel, 1998), and
reticence (e.g. Burgoon & Kooper, 1984), the most appropriate framework for the
examination of self-censorship in the broader context of public opinion and the
implications of censorship for democracy is Noelle-Neumann’s (1974, 1993) spiral of
assess public opinion through the use of a “quasi-statistical sense,” and that the more this
sense indicates a difference between the individual’s opinion and public opinion, the less
likely the individual is to express his or her opinion. This, in turn, contributes to a greater
sense of difference and fear of potential ostracism among other members of the perceived
minority opinion group, leading to a greater likelihood that they, too, will cease
expression. Iteratively, this process leads to less and less expression of perceived
minority opinions until the perceived majority opinion is virtually and relatively
ubiquitous and the perceived minority opinion is virtually and relatively non-existent –
despite the possibility that a significant number of people may still hold the perceived
minority opinion or may even compose a silent majority (Noelle-Neumann, 1974, 1993). At the individual level, one may be more likely to decide not to express a controversial opinion when he or she perceives the majority of those who make up his or her opinion climate to be hostile toward that opinion. This decision constitutes self-censorship, the second form of intentional prevention of controversial expression by some authority (the assumption being that one has authority over one’s self) examined by this research.

Hayes, Glynn, & Shanahan (2005) define self-censorship succinctly as “...the withholding of one’s true opinion from an audience perceived to disagree with that opinion.” The concept has been explicated and advanced through meta-analysis of the extant body of work on spiral of silence theory (Glynn, Hayes, & Shanahan, 1997), development and thorough refinement of a scale of measurement (Hayes et al., 2005, in press), and examination of individual differences in terms of propensity to self-censor (e.g. Hayes et al., in press; Hayes, Glynn, Shanahan, Uldall, 2003). Females tend to self-censor more than males (e.g. Hayes et al., 2005; Wyatt, Kim, & Katz, 2000). The less education an individual has, the more likely he or she is to self-censor (e.g. Hayes et al., 2003; Willnat, 1996, Wyatt et al., 2000). Age is positively associated with self-censorship (e.g. Hayes et al., 2003; Willnat, 1996; Wyatt, et al., 2000). And some evidence suggests that conservatives tend to self-censor more than liberals (e.g. Hayes et al., 2003). At this point, one may note the similarity between the demographic correlates of self-censorship and those mentioned previously in the discussion of support for public censorship. Indeed, in their massive surveys of public opinion on a multitude of civil liberties issues both Stouffer (1955) and Wyatt (1991) found similar tendencies in terms of demographics for both support for public censorship and what they conceptualize,
roughly, as feeling free to speak. However, this is just the beginning of why it is reasonable to expect that support for public censorship and the tendency to self-censor are related, an argument to be examined in depth later.

So there is reason to believe that there may be some other individual attributes that connect, or at least are common to, support for public censorship and the tendency to self-censor. But what does social science have to offer in terms of beginning to explain this relationship in a more sophisticated sense? Personality may account for some of the relationship between these phenomena.

1.3.3 The Five-Factor Model (FFM)

Personality can be described as the sum of an individual’s emotional, interpersonal, experiential, attitudinal, and motivational styles (McCrae & John, 1992). Although there are many ways of describing the “structure” of personality, the five-factor model (FFM) is a popular conceptualization of personality derived from over 60 years of research (Daly, 2002; Goldberg, 1993; John & Srivastava, 1999; McCrae & John, 1992). Some have argued that the FFM offers effectively comprehensive coverage and rarely requires additions that can’t be derived from combinations of the five factors to describe personality (McCrae & John, 1992; Saucier & Goldberg, 1998), while others have contended that it lacks important components (Paunonen & Jackson, 2000). Furthermore, debate continues as to whether the FFM works as taxonomy alone or approaches the status of a theory of personality (e.g. McCrae & Costa, 1999, 2003; Paunonen & Jackson, 2000; Saucier & Goldberg, 1996).

The five factors are commonly referred to as openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism (e.g. Benet-Martinez & John, 1998;
Borkenau & Ostendorf, 1990; Costa & McCrae, 1989; John & Srivastava, 1999; McCrae & John, 1992). The definition of openness is contentious, but it is essentially described as consciousness, imagination, intellect, aesthetic awareness, sensitivity, and willingness to try and think about new things (McCrae & Costa, 2003; McCrae & John, 1992; John & Srivastava, 1999). Conscientiousness is the tendency to be thorough, neat, well organized, diligent, competent, achievement-oriented, and self-disciplined (e.g. McCrae & Costa, 2003; McCrae & John, 1992). Extraversion is a broadly defined factor often described in terms of venturesomeness, warmth, gregariousness, energy, ambition, ascendancy, affective positivism, and assertiveness (e.g. McCrae & Costa, 2003; McCrae & John, 1992). Agreeableness involves altruism, nurturance, caring, trust, modesty, compliance and straightforwardness (e.g. Digman, 1990; McCrae & John, 1992). Finally, neuroticism is the propensity to experience distress, especially in terms of nervous tension, worrying, depression, frustration, guilt, self-consciousness, and low self-esteem in addition to being associated with impulsiveness and vulnerability (e.g. McCrae & Costa, 1987; McCrae & Costa, 2003; McCrae & John, 1992).

Recently, personality researchers have begun to study personality types based on the FFM (e.g. Asendorpf, Borkenau, Ostendorf, & Van Aken, 2001; De Fruyt, Mervielde, & Van Leeuwen, 2002; Costa, Herbst, McCrae, Samuels, & Ozer, 2002). Using cluster analysis to examine individuals in terms of how they group in a 5-dimensional space (with each axis being one of the five factors), generally speaking, across studies involving large, heterogeneous samples, three types appear to be fairly stable and replicable. These types can be explained in terms of differences in selected traits relative to each other and are referred to as resilienters, overcontrollers, and undercontrollers (e.g.
Asendorpf, 2002; Asendorpf et al., 2001; Robins, John, Caspi, Miffitt, & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1996). This terminology is derived from the theoretical work of Block and Block (1980), which deals with ego-control and ego-resilience. These two dimensions refer to the individual's tendency to respond flexibly or rigidly to changing, stressful, situational demands and the individual's tendency to contain or express her or his impulses, respectively (e.g. Block & Block, 1980; Asendorpf et al., 2001; Caspi, 1998). Resilients exhibit a preponderance of socially desirable personality traits (above average openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and agreeableness; below average neuroticism); they are typically the largest group and are generally well adjusted both socially and cognitively. Undercontrollers are characterized by below average agreeableness and below average conscientiousness; they externalize and tend to be relatively more anti-social and less accepted by their peers. Finally, overcontrollers' responses are consistent with below average extraversion and above average neuroticism; they tend to internalize and may often exhibit more shyness, loneliness, and lower social self-esteem (e.g. Asendorpf et al., 2001; Robins et al., 1996; Caspi, 1998). However, these types are not always replicated in all samples or sub-samples. Nevertheless, the clustering process, which is typically carried out by first using Ward's hierarchical clustering and then an iterative, confirmatory k-means analysis, is an accepted method of examining personality more holistically, as opposed to scrutinizing each factor in a piecemeal fashion (e.g. Asendorpf, 2002; Asendorpf et al. 2001; De Fruyt et al., 2002; Costa et al., 2002). This research will examine personality with respect to support for public censorship and tendency to self-censor from both individual trait and cluster group perspectives.
1.3.4 Rationale and Hypotheses

The primary concern of this research is the proposed relationship between support for public censorship and the individual's tendency to self-censor, and to search for potential explanations for such an association. But why should the researcher expect to find such a relationship at all? First, the results of the pilot study for the research presented here (Reineke 2004) suggested a positive relationship. However, this research was conducted with a quite small, homogenous sample, and little was done in the way of analysis. Nevertheless, Reineke's (2004) significant and directly relevant findings were the impetus for this research.

Second, extant literature suggests a negative relationship between an individual's support for public censorship and his or her feeling of freedom to speak (e.g. Stouffer, 1955; Wyatt, 1991). Though an individual's perception of freedom to speak and whether the individual is actually likely to do so are two different things, these findings seem to suggest that there may also be a positive relationship between support for public censorship and the tendency to self-censor (which is conceptually similar, though not the same as, the feeling of freedom to speak). Furthermore, Lambe (2002) mentions studies on self-censorship as a related part of the literature on public censorship opinions, implying a conceptual similarity as well.

Third, public opinion research has suggested that the theoretical roots of support for public censorship and self-censorship, the third-person effect and spiral of silence, respectively, are related. For example, Mutz (1989) and Willnat (1996) both found support for Davison's (1983) original speculation regarding a mingling of the two theories. Third-person perceptions regarding the amount of influence that a particular
media message is presumed to exert on society in general may throw off the individual's "quasi-statistical sense" in such a way that he or she may in turn re-assess his or her willingness to publicly speak out (Davison, 1983; Mutz, 1989; Willnat, 1996). While this process-oriented interpretation of the relationship between how the two theories may play out in practice is not directly applicable to the corollary, "common cause" relationship proposed here, it does hold that the theories are, at a fundamental level, related and the idea that where one process is present the other can be expected to exist as well, and to a similar degree.

Fourth, the concepts have been linked in a more abstract sense in qualitative literature (e.g. Boyer, 2003; Pudal, 2001; Skidmore, 2001). Rather than assessing attitudes about censorship, these studies attempt to describe the phenomenon itself during various instances in history. They typically find that when censorship has been employed, it is a complex system involving overt public censorship, framing, education, deception, and self-censorship (e.g. Boyer, 2003; Pudal, 2001; Skidmore, 2001).

Finally, as noted previously, certain common demographic characteristics have been found to relate to support for public censorship and self-censorship in similar ways. These characteristics include sex, age, education and political ideology. This suggests that support for public censorship and the tendency to self-censor may at least be related through demographic variables. Thus:

\textit{Hypothesis 1:} There will be a positive relationship between support for public censorship and the tendency to self-censor.

The following hypotheses are all, at least partially, contingent upon the first in that, given a positive relationship between support for public censorship and the tendency
to self-censor, it is reasonable to also expect that they would tend to have similar relationships (relative to each other) with other, or third, variables – namely demographic and personality variables.

As mentioned previously, females have been identified by several studies as a generally more supportive of public censorship (e.g. Stouffer, 1955; Nunn, Crockett & Williams, 1978; Gunther 1995; Hense & Wright, 1992; Rojas, Shah, & Faber, 1996; Lambe, 2002, 2004; Reineke, 2004). Women may also be expected to tend to self-censor more (e.g. Hayes et al., 2003; Wyatt, Kim, & Katz, 2000).

*Hypothesis 2a:* Females will tend to exhibit greater support for public censorship than males.

*Hypothesis 2b:* Females will tend to exhibit a greater tendency to self-censor than males.

Age may be expected to positively predict both support for public censorship (e.g. Stouffer, 1955; McClosky & Brill, 1983; Wyatt, 1991; Lambe 2002) and the tendency to self-censors (e.g. Hayes et al., 2003; Willnat, 1996; Wyatt, et al., 2000).

*Hypothesis 3a:* There will be a positive relationship between age and support for public censorship.

*Hypothesis 3b:* There will be a positive relationship between age and the tendency to self-censor.

Education tends to be negatively associated with both support for public censorship (e.g. Stouffer, 1955; McClosky & Brill, 1983; Wyatt, 1991; McLeod, Sotirovic, Voakes, Guo & Huang, 1998; Lambe, 2002, 2004) and the tendency to self-censor (e.g. Hayes et al., 2003; Willnat, 1996, Wyatt et al., 2000).
Hypothesis 4a: There will be a negative relationship between education and support for public censorship.

Hypothesis 4b: There will be a negative relationship between education and the tendency to self-censor.

Those with conservative political ideologies have been found more likely to both support public censorship (e.g. McLeod et al., 1998; Lambe, 2002, 2004; Rojas et al., 1996) and self-censor (e.g. Hayes et al., 2003) than their more liberal counterparts.

Hypothesis 5a: There will be a positive relationship between more conservative political ideology and support for public censorship.

Hypothesis 5b: There will be a positive relationship between more conservative political ideology and the tendency to self-censor.

Lambe (2004) examined the relationship between support for public censorship and three of the five factors in the FFM: neuroticism, extraversion, and openness (NEO). As such, some hypotheses may be made with that research as a guide. However, there are no other known studies that have sought personality descriptions based on the traits that compose the FFM in terms of either support for censorship or the tendency to self-censor.

Lambe (2004) found that openness was negatively correlated with support for public censorship. This makes sense if openness is thought of as willingness to be exposed to new, controversial, or perhaps even offensive ideas.

Hypothesis 6a: There will be a negative relationship between openness and support for public censorship.
Hypothesis 6b: There will be a negative relationship between openness and the tendency to self-censor.

Conscientiousness was not examined by Lambe (2004). On the surface, there doesn’t seem to be a patent connection between the neat, orderly, thorough, disciplined nature of conscientiousness and either support for public censorship of the tendency to self-censor.

Research Question 1a: Is there a relationship between conscientiousness and support for public censorship?

Research Question 1b: Is there a relationship between conscientiousness and the tendency to self-censor?

Lambe (2004) found no relationship between extraversion and support for public censorship. However, it seems reasonable to expect a connection between this personality trait, of which “talkative” and “outgoing” are fundamental descriptions, and the tendency to self-censor. So in terms of this personality trait, support for public censorship and the tendency to self-censor are actually expected to differ.

Hypothesis 7a: There will not be a relationship between extraversion and support for public censorship.

Hypothesis 7b: There will be a negative relationship between extraversion and self-censorship.

Like conscientiousness, Lambe (2004) did not address agreeableness. Also like conscientiousness, it is difficult to speculate as to what relationship might exist between this trait and either support for public censorship or the tendency to self-censor. On one hand, the non-confrontational, “go along to get along” nature of the trait might suggest a
disposition toward eliminating any communication, whether its source is internal or external, that might cause controversy or disagreement. On the other hand, the friendly nature of the trait might also lead to greater willingness to let others express themselves, and perhaps an expectation of understanding.

Research Question 2a: Is there a relationship between agreeableness and support for public censorship?

Research Question 2b: Is there a relationship between agreeableness and the tendency to self-censor?

Lambe (2004) found a positive relationship between neuroticism and support for public censorship. One who worries more in general seems to be a likely candidate to worry about the adverse effects of controversial expression on others, and would then in turn be more likely to support public censorship. These individuals might reasonably also be expect to censor themselves more, due to fears of ostracism and the other potential, negative outcomes that may be associated with expressing a controversial opinion.

Hypothesis 8a: There will be a positive relationship between neuroticism and support for public censorship.

Hypothesis 8b: There will be a positive relationship between neuroticism and the tendency to self-censor.

What of personality types? Though no known research has been previously conducted with the purpose of searching for or examining any potential relationships between the three types and censorship, it seems reasonable to extrapolate hypotheses
based on the nature of the types and the rationale for the previous hypotheses regarding individual personality traits from the FFM.

Resilients may be expected to exhibit less support for public censorship and less self-censorship than the other two types, given their emphasis on openness and extraversion, as well as their tendency to not exhibit neuroticism.

_Hypothesis 9a_: Resilients will exhibit less support for public censorship than undercontrollers and overcontrollers.

_Hypothesis 9b_: Resilients will exhibit less self-censorship than undercontrollers and overcontrollers.

As undercontrollers are defined primarily by the two traits that have not been examined previously in terms of support for censorship or self-censorship, their censorship tendencies are, at this point, unpredictable.

_Research Question 3a_: How are undercontrollers described, relative to resilients and overcontrollers, in terms of support for public censorship?

_Research Question 3b_: How are undercontrollers described, relative to resilients and overcontrollers, in terms of self-censorship?

Overcontrollers, on the other hand, with their below average extraversion and their above average neuroticism would seem to demonstrate a likely disposition toward greater support for public censorship and greater self-censorship than the other two types.

_Hypothesis 10a_: Overcontrollers will exhibit greater support for public censorship than resilients or undercontrollers.

_Hypothesis 10b_: Overcontrollers will exhibit greater self-censorship than resilients or undercontrollers.
As the relationship between support for public censorship and self-censorship is the focal point of this research, and personality type is also of central concern, the nature of the correlation between support for public censorship and self-censorship in terms of each personality type is also sought.

*Research Question 4:* How, if at all, are support for public censorship and self-censorship correlated among resilient, undercontrollers, and overcontrollers, respectively.
CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1 Operationalization

The research presented here was conducted using a questionnaire approach. Fortunately, survey tools designed specifically to examine individuals’ support for public censorship, the tendency to self-censor, and the personality traits that comprise the FFM had been produced by scholars through prior research.

2.1.1 The Willingness to Censor Scale

Lambe’s (2002) Willingness to Censor (WTC) scale was constructed by crossing seven expression content areas (pornography, hate expression, expression that raises privacy issues, political expression, abortion expression, defamatory expression and commercial expression) with seven medium types ("pure" speech, demonstration, newspaper, magazine, television, cable and Internet) to form forty-nine items. Both the content and media distinctions were based on U.S. Supreme Court jurisprudence regarding public freedom of expression. As stated previously, support for censorship in concrete, realistic circumstances is often determined in significant part by the individual’s feelings about the entities involved and other situational factors. Given this, the lengthy WTC scale is a reasonable means of obtaining an accurate measure of the individual’s support for public censorship through responses to the sort of varying expression rights
concepts and questions that jurists, legislators, executives and concerned private citizens often consider.

To further enhance the ecological validity of the WTC scale, Lambe (2002) constructed the individual items and their response options with U.S. Supreme Court case law as a guide. In order to present each combination of expression content type and medium type in a realistic manner, each item recounts a specific, imaginary situation for the participant to respond to by way of indicating how she or he thinks that an authoritative entity should address the circumstances. Each item has five possible response options that are specifically worded for that item. The response options reflect the five basic distinctions made by the U.S. Supreme Court regarding possible decisions on public censorship (prior restraint; subsequent punishment; time, place, or manner restrictions; no restrictive action taken; and active protection). For example, the item that crosses hate expression content and the demonstration medium is:

The Ku Klux Klan has filed for a permit to hold a march through your town.

I think the city permit office should:

- refuse to give them a permit
- hold them responsible for any physical or personal damage that occurs as a result of the march
- require them to hold the march in a sparsely populated area of town
- issue a permit for the march
- issue a permit, and provide police escorts to make sure their right to march is protected

The full text of the WTC scale is included as Appendix A.
Each response was numerically coded depending on the option chosen by the respondent with the prior restraint option as a 5, the subsequent punishment option as a 4, time, place, or manner restrictions as a 3, no restrictive action taken as a 2, and active protection as a 1. If less than five WTC items were unanswered, the WTC items that the participant responded to were averaged to obtain the participant’s WTC score, which could fall between 1 and 5, inclusive, with higher scores indicating greater general WTC and hence greater support for public censorship ($\alpha = .920$). Six cases (3.6% of the total number of cases) were excluded from aggregation and analyses involving WTC because in those cases five or more WTC items were unanswered.

2.1.2 The Willingness to Self-Censor Scale

Hayes et al.’s (2005) Willingness to Self-Censor (WTSC) scale measures an individual’s tendency to self-censor. This tool includes six directly worded Likert-type items that assess how reluctant to express an opinion in a perceived hostile opinion climate the respondent claims to be (e.g. “It is difficult for me to express my opinion if I think others won’t agree with what I say.”). The WTSC scale also includes two items that are reverse worded, and so approach self-censorship by assessing the respondent’s perception of her or his own ability to express an opinion in a hostile climate (e.g. “It is easy for me to express my opinion around others who I think will disagree with me.”). Each item has five possible response options: strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, and strongly agree. The full text of the WTSC scale is included as Appendix B.

Each response was numerically coded depending on the option chosen by the participant. For the six directly worded items, strongly agree responses were coded as 5,
agree as 4, neither agree nor disagree as 3, disagree as 2, and strongly disagree responses were coded as 1. For the two reverse worded items, strongly agree responses were coded as 1, agree as 2, neither agree nor disagree as 3, disagree as 4, and strongly disagree responses were coded as 5. For cases where at least seven of the eight WTSC items were answered, the items that the participant responded to were averaged to create the individual’s WTSC score. Thus, WTSC scores could fall between 1 and 5, inclusive, with higher scores indicating a greater tendency to self-censor ($\alpha = .833$). Three cases (1.78% of the total number of cases) were excluded from aggregation and analyses involving WTSC because more than one WTSC item was unanswered in those cases.

2.1.3 The Big Five Inventory

The Big Five Inventory (BFI) consists of 44 Likert-type items composed by John, Donahue, and Kentle (1991) to measure the traits of the FFM, a.k.a. the “big five.” John and Srivastava (1999) tested the measure and cross-validated it with some of the other best-known measures of the FFM, such as the NEO five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI) and trait descriptive adjectives (TDA). Furthermore, the measure has also been tested and validated across languages and cultures (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998).

The BFI consists of five subscales, one for each of the five factors. The openness subscale includes ten items, eight of which are directly worded (e.g. “I see myself as someone who is original, comes up with new ideas.”) and two of which are reverse worded (e.g. “I see myself as someone who has few artistic interests.”). The conscientiousness subscale is made up of nine items, five of which are directly worded (e.g. “I see myself as someone who does a thorough job.”) and four of which are reverse worded (e.g. “I see myself as someone who can be somewhat careless.”). The
extraversion subscale consists of eight items, five directly worded (e.g. “I see myself as someone who is talkative.”) and three reverse worded (e.g. “I see myself as someone who is reserved.”). Agreeableness is measured with a subscale composed of nine items, five directly worded (e.g. “I see myself as someone who is helpful and unselfish with others.”) and four reverse worded (e.g. “I see myself as someone who tends to find fault with others.”). Finally, the neuroticism subscale has eight items, five directly worded (e.g. “I see myself as someone who can be tense.”) and three reverse worded (e.g. “I see myself as someone who is relaxed, handles stress well.”). The full text of the BFI is included as Appendix C.

All BFI items have five response options ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. For directly worded items, strongly disagree was coded as 1, disagree as 2, neither agree nor disagree as 3, agree as 4, and strongly agree as 5. Reverse worded items were coded in the opposite order, with strongly disagree as 5, disagree as 4, neither agree nor disagree as 3, agree as 2, and strongly agree as 1.

For each participant, for all subscales wherein less than two items were unanswered, responses were averaged to form separate openness (α = .790), conscientiousness (α = .778), extraversion (α = .890), agreeableness (α = .755), and neuroticism (α = .824) scores. Scores could fall between 1 and 5, inclusive, with higher scores reflecting a greater tendency to exhibit the given trait. Three cases each (1.78% of the total number of cases) were excluded from aggregation and analyses involving openness, conscientiousness, or agreeableness because the participants in those cases did not respond to two or more items from those subscales. Two cases each (1.20% of the total number of cases) were excluded from aggregation and analyses with respect to
extraversion or neuroticism because the participants did not respond to two or more items from those subscales.

2.1.4 Personality Type

Personality types were derived using a cluster analysis procedure consisting first of a Ward’s method analysis followed by a confirmatory k-means procedure (e.g. Asendorpf et al., 2001; Caspi & Silva, 1995). A five-dimensional space was constructed, with possible BFI scores for each FFM trait as a dimension. In this space, each case was plotted as a point based on the observed BFI scores for each trait. The Ward’s method clustering procedure was then used, with the squared Euclidean equation of distance, to determine cluster homogeneity among these points. Based on previous research (e.g. Asendorpf et al., 2001), the three-cluster Ward’s method solution was determined to be the best description of the data. In order to confirm the obtained clusters, a k-means analysis was conducted using the cluster centers obtained through the Ward’s method analysis as the starting points for three clusters. A cross tabulation of cluster membership from the Ward’s method results and the k-means results was conducted to confirm that cluster membership was largely unchanged between methods. The k-means results were accepted as the “true” cluster membership solution, and a new variable was created in which each case was assigned the number of the k-means cluster (possible values were 1, 2, and 3) to which it belonged. Three cases were excluded from clustering procedures because they were missing BFI scores for one or more trait(s).

2.1.5 Demographics

Participants were presented with several items designed to assess the demographic differences hypothesized in this study to be related to support for public censorship and
the tendency to self-censor. Each participant was asked to indicate whether she or he was a female (coded as a 1) or a male (coded as a 0), what her or his age was at the time the survey was conducted in terms of number of years, and how much formal education she or he had, also in terms of number of years. Finally, each participant was asked to indicate her or his political ideology on as seven point scale. Very Liberal responses were scored as 1, Liberal as 2, slightly Liberal as 3, middle of the road as 4, slightly Conservative as 5, Conservative as 6, and very Conservative responses were scored as 7. The full text of these demographic items is included as Appendix D.

2.1.6 Questionnaire Construction

All questionnaires began with general instructions and notification of informed consent. The institutional review board waived formal consent forms as consent is implied by voluntary return of the questionnaire. A copy of instructions and notification is included as Appendix E.

The questionnaire was presented to participants in three parts. Part 1 consisted of the WTC scale. Relevant to the research presented here, part 2 consisted of the BFI and WTSC scale. Part 3 included the demographics items mentioned above.

2.2 Participants

All participants were members of the community that forms the large, Midwestern university where this research was conducted. The participants can be classified into sub-samples: undergraduate students and faculty/staff.

2.2.1 The Student Sub-Sample

The student sub-sample was composed of 119 undergraduate student enrolled in a communication research methods course during the winter quarter of 2005. In exchange
for returning the questionnaire, the students were awarded extra credit in the course and allowed access to the data for their final projects. Participation was voluntary in that involvement was not a course requirement and was anonymous in that the only identifying information provided by the students was codenames that the researcher had no means of linking to their identities. The student sub-sample was 69.49% female with a mean age of 22.263 years (S.D. = 2.189, Min. = 20, Max. = 37).

2.2.2 The Faculty/Staff Sub-Sample

The university faculty/staff sub-sample was obtained through the use of the university’s 2004/2005 Faculty/Staff Directory book. Listings of faculty and staff were cataloged therein in alphabetical order by surname on 247 pages running from page 89 through page 336. The Website http://www.random.org was used to generate 25 random numbers (approximately 10% of 247) between 89 and 336. The numbers of faculty and staff listings on each of the pages corresponding to the 25 random numbers were tallied. These tallies were used to estimate an average of listings per page in the listings section of the directory (108.48). An estimate of the total number of listings (26,795) was obtained by multiplying the estimated average number of listings per page (108.48) by the number of listing pages (247). The desired sample frame was approximately 4,500 contacts. This number was chosen because an optimistic questionnaire return rate of 2.5% would provide a sample of over 100 participants. Thus, the estimate of total listings was divided by the desired sample frame size to obtain a skip number (5.95, which was rounded to 6). The Website http://www.random.org was again consulted, this time for a random, initial skip number between 1 and 108 (the approximate estimated average number of entries on one page) and provided the number 64. Starting with the first entry
in the top, leftmost of the four columns on page 89, each entry down that column was counted off, with the count continuing at the top of the next column to the right and so on to the sixty-fourth listing in the directory, which was the first entry in an electronic spreadsheet that was used to construct the sample frame.

Thereafter every sixth listing, moving down each column and across the page to the right and then on to the following page, as described above, was entered into the sample frame spreadsheet. Each listing in the directory includes the employee’s last name, first name, middle initial (when extant), campus phone number, job title, university department, and typically a campus address and university e-mail address. Each entry in the sample frame spreadsheet was composed of the faculty or staff member’s last name, first name, e-mail address, job title, and department as reported in the directory. Upon employment, every university employee is issued an identification code consisting of her or his last name and a number. If the employee activates her or his university e-mail address, it consists of this identification code followed by “@osu.edu.” For example, if John Doe were the first Doe hired by the university, his identification code would be doe.1, and his university e-mail address would be doe.1@osu.edu. In cases where the selected directory listing did not include an e-mail address, the university’s online faculty, student, and staff search page (http://www.osu.edu/findpeople.php) was used to obtain either the individual’s university e-mail address or, if an e-mail addressed was not published there either, the individual’s identification code, which was then appended with the “@osu.edu” suffix and entered in the sample frame spreadsheet’s e-mail address cell for that individual in the hope that an address either existed and was not listed, or might be activated by the time a recruitment e-mail was sent.
This process resulted in a sample frame composed of 4,398 entries. Once the sample frame was completed, the researcher again consulted http://www.random.com, this time requesting a random-order sequence of whole numbers from 1 to 4398. This sequence was then applied to the sample frame, so that each entry was assigned a random order number. The entries were then sorted so that their order number corresponded with their place in the list. This was done to eliminate any relationship that may have existed between alphabetical order of last names, recruitment, or data collection time.

Beginning on April 19, 2005, recruitment e-mails were sent to the faculty and staff whose information composed the sample frame at a rate of approximately 1,100 per day for 4 days. The text of this recruitment e-mail is included as Appendix F. As detailed in the e-mail, faculty or staff members who were interested in participating in this research replied to the researcher indicating a participation session or sessions that they would be willing and able to attend. The researcher would then schedule each participant depending first on her or his requested session or sessions and second on session availability in terms of how many individuals had already been scheduled for a given session and the size of the room that the session was scheduled to take place in. Once the individual was scheduled, a confirmation e-mail (Appendix G) was sent to her or him. Then, twenty-four to forty-eight hours before the session that an individual was scheduled in took place, a reminder e-mail (Appendix H) was sent to her or him.

Of the initial 4,398 e-mails sent, 831 were returned as undeliverable. One-hundred-and-twenty-six people responded to this first round of e-mails, and of these individuals, 59 indicated that they were willing to participate. The following week, on Monday through Wednesday (the 25th through 27th of April, 2005), the 3,508 individuals
who were contacted, but had not responded, were re-contacted with another e-mail (Appendix I) inviting them to participate in the study’s Friday, April 29th session. Thirty-six individuals responded to this round of e-mails, 11 of them indicating that they were willing to participate in the study. Thus a total of 70 individuals agreed to participate in the study out of the 4398 e-mails sent.

There were three data collections sessions for the faculty/staff sample, which took place at 12:00 noon on April 27, 28, and 29 of 2005. Sessions were conducted at three different locations around campus so as to give potential participants an opportunity to come to a session within a relatively short distance from their workplace. At each session, the participants were given a free lunch consisting of pizza, bottled water, single-serving bag of potato chips, applesauce, and peppermint candy. A questionnaire packet was distributed to each participant after she or he had a chance to get food. The packet consisted of part 1 of the questionnaire, in answer-sheet form, parts 2 and 3 of the questionnaire as a separate document, a pen, and an envelope pre-addressed for use in the university’s campus mail system.

During the data collection session, the researcher presented each of the WTC items (part 1 of the questionnaire), one at a time, via a plain, black text on white background, PowerPoint presentation. Response options were bulleted “A” (prior restraint option) through “E” (active protection option), with each participant indicating the response she or he favored by writing the letter of that choice by the appropriate item number on her or his answer sheet. Once participants had a chance to respond to all of the WTC items, the researcher collected the part 1 answer sheet, which included a code number in the bottom right corner of each page. Participants were then told that they
were finished with the first portion of the study. These initial data collection sessions
each took between 30 and 45 minutes to complete. Participants were excused, and told
that they could return the rest of the questionnaire (consisting of parts 2 and 3), which
included a code number that matched that on the part 1 answer sheet, in one of two ways.
Participants could either put the remaining portion of the questionnaire in the envelope
provided and send to the researcher via campus mail, or come to an additional session on
May 6, 2005 between 11:00 AM and 1:00 PM, where they would receive another,
similar, free lunch and also be enter into a prize-drawing contest for university gift cards
charged with five, ten or twenty dollars. Individual’s who won the prize-drawing contest
were notified via a website that posted numbers matching those on tickets that the
winning participants had been given. It was the winners’ responsibility to arrange for
pickup or delivery of their respective prizes.

Fifty individuals saw the process through and returned parts 2 and 3 of the survey.
Fifteen individuals returned the remainder of the questionnaire via campus mail before
the return session. After a return session reminder e-mail (Appendix J) was sent, 23
individuals returned the remainder of the questionnaire at the session. Finally, with the
encouragement of one last reminder e-mail, 12 more individuals returned the remainder
of the questionnaire through campus mail in the two weeks following the return session.
The code numbers from each portion of the questionnaire were used to match up
responses.

The resulting faculty staff sample was 59% female, and in mid-adulthood in terms
of age (M = 43.398, S.D. = 12.903, Min. = 23, Max. = 75). On the whole, they were well
educated (M = 18.750, S.D. = 5.728, Min. = 9, Max. = 45).
2.2.3 The Sample Overall

The final, total sample was composed of 169 individuals, 119 (70.41%) from the student sub-sample, and 50 (28.46%) from the faculty/staff sub-sample. Participants were 66.47% female with an average age of 28.46 (S.D. = 12.029, Min. = 20, Max. = 75).
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

3.1 Analysis

Each participant’s responses to the questionnaire were entered into an SPSS data file using the coding schemes for each scale or individual item. The data were then aggregated into scale scores using an SPSS syntax program written to average the variables that composed each scale into single variables, and record a missing score for cases with too many unanswered items according to the exclusion criteria for each scale. For a detailed description of coding, scale aggregations, and how missing data were dealt with, see the method section.

First, descriptive statistics and Pearson’s correlations for the variables of interest were calculated. Second, two hierarchical regression models were constructed. The first used WTC scale score as the dependent variable with demographic (sex, age, education) and political (liberal/conservative self-rating) responses entered as the first block, BFI subscale (openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism) scores entered as the second block, and WTSC scale score entered as the third and final block. The second model used WTSC as the outcome variable, with demographic and political responses entered as the first block, BFI subscale scores entered as the second block, and WTC scale score entered as the third block. A cluster analysis was conducted to categorize participants into personality types.
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3.2 Support for Hypotheses

The main analytical focus of this research was to determine if there is a relationship between WTC and WTSC. Further, it was also designed to determine if common demographic, political, and personality traits predict both WTC and WTSC. Finally, this research was intended to describe individual differences in WTC and WTSC in terms of said demographic, political, and personality variables.

For quick reference, quantitative results are presented in tabular format. Table 1 recounts descriptive statistics for the variables of interest to this study. Table 2 presents the Pearson’s correlations between WTC, WTSC, demographics, and political ideology. Table 3 shows the Pearson’s correlations between WTC, WTSC, and BFI subscale scores, and Table 4 depicts the Pearson’s correlations between demographics, political ideology, and BFI subscale scores. Table 5 Presents the Pearson’s correlations between the personality variables.

Table 6 and Table 7 present regression equations predicting WTC and WTSC, respectively. Block 1 of each equation is composed of the demographic (sex, age, and education) and political ideology variables. Block 2 is, in both equations, made up of BFI subscale (openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism) scores. For each equation block three consists only of the other censorship variable, so for the equation predicting WTC, WTSC is bloc 3, and for the equation predicting WTSC, WTC is block 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTC</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2.742</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td>3.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTSC</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>4.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>28.464</td>
<td>12.029</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>75.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>16.499</td>
<td>3.285</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>45.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal / Conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3.665</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>4.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3.808</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.492</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3.785</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>4.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>2.769</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>WTC</th>
<th>WTSC</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTSC</td>
<td>.242***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.167*</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>-.167*</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.385****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal/</td>
<td>.182*</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

*Pearson's Correlations Between WTC, WTSC, Demographics, and Political Ideology.*

Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.005, ****p<.001*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Variable</th>
<th>WTC</th>
<th>WTSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-.254***</td>
<td>-.370****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.421****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.177*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

*Pearson’s Correlations Between WTC, WTSC and Personality Variables*

Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.005, ****p<.001*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Agreeableness</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.167*</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.168*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.305****</td>
<td>.160*</td>
<td>-.153*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.227**</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal/</td>
<td>-.344****</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

*Pearson's Correlations Between Demographic, Political, and Personality Variables*

Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.005, ****p<.001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Agreeableness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.208**</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.208**</td>
<td>.175*</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.205***</td>
<td>-.392****</td>
<td>-.187*</td>
<td>-.383****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

*Pearson’s Correlations Between Personality Variables*

Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.005, ****p<.001*
In tables 6 and 7, the "β₁" column presents the variable's regression coefficient before subsequent blocks were entered into the model; thus the influence of other variables introduced in later steps is not controlled out of these coefficients. The "s.e. (β₁)" column presents the standard error for this initial regression coefficient. The "β₂" column shows the final regression coefficient for each variable, after all other variables have been introduced into the model and thus controlled for, and the "s.e. (β₂)" column shows the standard errors of these coefficients. The "Setwise ΔR²" column describes the additional variability in the dependent (WTC or WTSC) accounted for as each block of variables is introduced into the model. The "Model Partial r" column describes the partial correlation between each independent variable and the dependent, or the correlations between the dependent and independent when the influence of the other independents has been controlled out of both. Finally the "Unique ΔR²" column in each table presents the squared semi-partial correlation between the independent variable, or block of independent variables, and the dependent variable (either WTC or WTSC), or in other words the variability in the dependent uniquely attributable to that independent variable or block of variables.

Table 8 shows the results of the cluster analysis. Cluster centers, which were determined in terms of the five BFI subscale scores are shown, as are cluster means for WTC and WTSC scores. T-tests were used to determine if each type was different from each other type in terms of personality variables, WTC, and WTSC. Correlations between WTC and WTSC within each type are also presented. The statistical significance of the differences between groups on these variables is depicted using a symbolic systems described in the table’s notes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\beta_1$ (s.e.)</th>
<th>$\beta_2$ (s.e.)</th>
<th>Setwise $\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>Model Partial $r$</th>
<th>Unique $\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.761**** (.229)</td>
<td>3.268**** (.746)</td>
<td>.099**</td>
<td>.086*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.189* (.083)</td>
<td>.207* (.088)</td>
<td>.208*</td>
<td>.035*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.006 (.004)</td>
<td>-.011** (.004)</td>
<td>-.233**</td>
<td>.045**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.012 (.013)</td>
<td>.002 (.013)</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal/Conservative</td>
<td>.051* (.025)</td>
<td>.035 (.026)</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-.209* (.083)</td>
<td>-.157 (.083)</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.091 (.083)</td>
<td>-.060 (.082)</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.076 (.057)</td>
<td>-.026 (.059)</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.106 (.080)</td>
<td>.077 (.079)</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.133 (.073)</td>
<td>-.146* (.071)</td>
<td>-.182*</td>
<td>.026*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTSC</td>
<td>.176** (.066)</td>
<td>.176** (.066)</td>
<td>.232**</td>
<td>.044**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Model $R^2$: .227

Table 6

WTC Hierarchical Regression.

Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.005, ****p<.001

$\beta_1 = $ raw score regression weight from model without subsequent step(s)

$\beta_2 = $ raw score regression weight from model including all variables

Setwise $\Delta R^2 = $ change in the $R^2$ of WTC when blocks ordered as indicated

Model Partial $r = $ Partial correlation between variable and WTC in the model including all variables

Unique $\Delta R^2 = $ change in the $R^2$ of WTC when the block is introduced into the model last, or the squared semipartial correlation between the variable and WTC in the model including variables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\beta_1$</th>
<th>s.e. ($\beta_1$)</th>
<th>$\beta_2$</th>
<th>s.e. ($\beta_2$)</th>
<th>Setwise $\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>Model Partial r</th>
<th>Unique $\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.823****</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>3.455****</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>.082*</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.014*</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.048*</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal/Conservative</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>-.296**</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.232*</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.188*</td>
<td>.024*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.288****</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.265****</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.309****</td>
<td>.070****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC</td>
<td>.306**</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.306**</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Model $R^2$: .338

Table 7

**WTSC Hierarchical Regression.**

*Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.005, ****p<.001*

$\beta_1$ = raw score regression weight from model without subsequent step(s)

$\beta_2$ = raw score regression weight from model including all variables

*Setwise $\Delta R^2$* = change in the $R^2$ of WTSC when blocks ordered as indicated

*Model Partial r* = Partial correlation between variable and WTSC in the model including all variables

*Unique $\Delta R^2$* = change in the $R^2$ of WTSC when the block is introduced into the model last, or the squared semipartial correlation between the variable and WTSC in the model including variables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Attribute</th>
<th>Resilients (n = 63)</th>
<th>Undercontrollers (n = 50)</th>
<th>Overcontrollers (n = 53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cluster Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>3.810&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.497&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.653&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>3.981&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.462&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.929&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverted</td>
<td>4.224&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.238&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.854&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeable</td>
<td>3.963&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.423&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.914&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurotic</td>
<td>2.488&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.448&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.469&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cluster Means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWTC</td>
<td>2.718&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.820&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.691&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWTSC</td>
<td>2.331&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.742&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.785&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC/WTSC Pearson’s r&lt;sup&gt;+&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.446&lt;sup&gt;***&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

*Personality Type Attributes*

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .005, ****p < .001

Cluster centers and means with the same superscript are not statistically different from each other.

† There was not a significant difference between personality types in terms of the correlation between WTC and WTSC (χ² = 3.073; df = 2; p = not significant)
Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be a relationship between support for public censorship and support for self-censorship. This assertion was supported by every analysis conducted. Individuals who exhibit more support for public censorship also tend to report a greater tendency to self-censor. The Pearson's correlation between the two variables was .242 (p < .005). After controlling for demographic, political, and personality variables, WTSC was still a significant predictor ($\beta_2 = .176$, $p < .01$) of WTC and, of course, WTC was still a significant predictor ($\beta_2 = .306$, $p < .01$) of WTSC when the same variables were controlled. In terms of personality type, overcontrollers exhibited a positive correlation between WTC and WTSC ($r = .446$, $p < .005$). However, there was not a significant difference between personality types in terms of the strength of the relationship between WTC and WTSC ($\chi^2 = 3.073; df = 2; p = not significant$).

Hypotheses 2a and 2b asserted that females would tend to be more supportive of public censorship than men and would also tend to self-censor more than men, respectively. Hypotheses 2a was fully supported by the data, and hypothesis 2b was partially so. With respect to hypothesis 2a, women ($M = 2.794$, $SD = .472$) tended to claim more support for public censorship than men ($M = 2.623$, $SD = .495$), in terms of both simple relationship ($r = .167$, $p < .05$) and with all other examined predictors controlled ($\beta_2 = .207$, $p < .05$). Regarding hypothesis 2b, women did tend to self-censor more than men ($r = .167$, $p < .05$).

The data did not support the contention that age would be positively associated with support for public censorship (hypothesis 3a), but partially supported the claim that age would be positively correlated with tendency to self-censor (hypothesis 3b). Older people were actually less likely to support public censorship than younger people...
(β₁ = .014, p < .05). But older individuals did, when only demographic and political predictors were examined, tend to report greater self-censorship (β₂ = -.011, p < .01).

The data failed to confirm the negative relationship between education and support for public censorship proposed by hypothesis 4a, but some support was found for hypothesis 4b, which stated that education would be negatively associated with WTSC. More educated individuals were no less likely to support public censorship than their younger counterparts according to any analyses conducted. However, the simple relationship (r = -.167, p < .05) did suggest that more educated individuals were less likely to self-censor, as did the negative relationship between education and WTSC when only demographic and political predictors were examined (β₁ = -.048, p < .05).

The negative relationships between conservatism and support for public censorship forecasted by hypothesis 5a was partially supported, but the negative association between conservatism and WTSC proposed in hypothesis 5b was not supported. More conservative individuals were more likely to support public censorship than their more liberal counterparts in terms of the simple relationship (r = .182, p < .05). Furthermore, conservatism was also a positive predictor of WTC when only demographic predictors were controlled (β₁ = .051, p < .05). No analyses indicated a relationship between conservatism and WTSC.

After demographics and political ideology, personality was examined in terms of individual traits and their relationships with support for public censorship and the tendency to self-censor. Hypothesis 6a predicted a negative relationship between openness and support for public censorship. This hypothesis was partially supported. Both the simple relationship (r = -.254, p < .005), and the coefficient when demographic,
political, and the other personality variables were controlled ($\beta_1 = -0.209, p < .05$) suggested that more open individuals were less supportive of public censorship.

Hypothesis 6b stated that there would be a negative association between openness and self-censorship. Hypothesis 6b was supported. The more open a participant was, the less likely she or he was to self-censor ($\beta_2 = -0.232, p < .05$).

The study’s first research question, 1a, asked if there was a relationship between conscientiousness and support for public censorship and the second, 1b, asked if there was a relationship between conscientiousness and the tendency to self-censor. The evidence did not suggest association in either case.

Based on the findings of previous research, hypothesis 7a presented the expectation that support for public censorship would not be related to extraversion. Indeed, no significant association was found. On the other hand, hypothesis 7b contended that there would be a negative association between extraversion and self-censorship. The results suggested that this hypothesis was also correct. More extraverted individuals were less likely to self-censor than their less extraverted counterparts ($\beta_2 = -0.265, p < .001$).

Research questions 2a and 2b asked if there was a relationship between agreeableness and support for public censorship or the tendency to self-censor, respectively. The results indicate that the answer to both questions is “no.” None of the analyses conducted suggested significant association between agreeableness and WTC or agreeableness and WTSC.

Results were mixed regarding hypotheses 8a and 8b. Hypothesis 8a stated that there would be a positive correlation between WTC and neuroticism. Actually, instead of
greater WTC occurring in cases with greater neuroticism, greater neuroticism tended to be reported by individuals who exhibited less WTC, after controlling for all of the other variables in the model \( \beta_2 = -0.146, p < .05 \). Hypothesis 8b, which asserted that more neurotic people would tend to self-censor more, was supported by the simple relationship between the two variables \( r = .177, p < .05 \).

The last set of analyses involved an examination of the similarities and differences in support for public censorship and self-censorship among the respondents in terms of personality type. There were no significant differences when it came to WTC, so hypotheses 9a, that resilient would be significantly less supportive of public censorship than the other two types, and hypothesis 10a, that overcontrollers would tend to support public censorship more than the other two types, were not substantiated by the data. Research question 4a asked if undercontrollers were different from the other two groups in terms of WTC, and the results indicated that they were not. Analyses did, however, reveal variation in WTSC between types. Hypotheses 9b said that resilient would tend to be less likely to self-censor than the other two types. Indeed, resilient did report less self-censorship than undercontrollers \( t = -3.334, d.f. = 106.165, p < .005 \) and overcontrollers \( t = -3.946, d.f. = 113.728, p < .001 \). Research questions 3b asked how undercontrollers differed from the other two types in terms of self-censorship. As previously mentioned, undercontrollers were more likely to self-censor than resilient, but their WTSC scores were statistically indistinguishable from those of overcontrollers. As these findings make apparent, hypothesis 10b, which stated that overcontrollers would tend to self-censor more than the other two groups, was partially supported, in that they
tended to report higher WTSC than resilient, but were not statistically different from undercontrolllers in this respect.

Research question 4 asked how support for public censorship and self-censorship were correlated in each personality type. WTC and WTSC were not significantly correlated for either resilient or undercontrollers but, as stated above, overcontrollers who were more supportive of public censorship also tended to self-censor more ($r = .446$, $p < .005$).
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research was to determine if there is a relationship between support for public censorship and self-censorship. It was also designed to assess whether there were commonalities between these two traits in terms of demographic, political and personality predictors. While the results suggested that individuals who are more supportive of public censorship indeed do tend to self-censor more, on the whole the two traits had dissimilar predictors. This chapter will discuss possible interpretations of these findings and the opportunities that they present for future research, the study's limitations, and implications for policy.

4.1 Findings and Future Opportunities

What do the data tell us about censorship and the individual? First and foremost, the results of this study provide evidence that individuals who report greater support for public censorship also tend to self-censor more. Openness may play a role in this relationship, as the evidence suggest that those who are more open tend to be less supportive of public censorship and less likely to self-censor. Recall that openness, though widely defined, is in part an individual's willingness to try and think about new things. Openness could also be thought of as willingness to be exposed to opinions and information that one may disagree with. Since individuals tend to be more likely to support public censorship in cases when they disagree with the content of the message,
and self-censorship is conceptualized in terms of one's willingness to express one's self in an opinion climate that is perceived to disagree, the relationship between the three variables makes sense. Essentially, those who are more open to differing opinions, and thus tolerant of the resulting controversy, are less likely to support the censorship of those who disagree, and would also be less likely to censor themselves to avoid disagreement or controversy. So this interpretation suggests the idea that perceived controversy is a pre-requisite of both support for censorship and self-censorship, insomuch as those who are more open to disagreement and controversy are both less likely to support censorship and less likely to self-censor.

Overcontrollers seem to be primarily responsible for the relationship between support for public censorship and self-censorship in the data. They were the only group that exhibited greater support public censorship when they self-censor more, and less support for public censorship when they self-censor less. Recall from Table 8 that extraversion was the only factor for which each type was significantly different from each other type. Also recall from Table 8 and the review of relevant literature in the introduction that neuroticism was the one variable for which the clusters obtained in this study were inconsistent with the descriptions laid out in the literature. Overcontrollers are defined in the literature as less extraverted and more neurotic than the other two types. The "overcontrollers" in this study were indeed much less extraverted than resilient or undercontrollers, but they were also much less neurotic than undercontrollers and statistically indistinguishable from resilient when it came to neuroticism. Neuroticism also yielded unexpected results as an independent variable in regression, where it was actually associated with less support for public censorship (as opposed to
the predicted positive association) and unrelated to self-censorship. So claims about relationships involving neuroticism, and by extension the overcontroller personality type, should take these inconsistencies into consideration.

While ego control is concerned with control over one's self, it might broadly be stated that overcontrollers are more control-oriented than the other types. This suggests the possibility that a desire for control may play a role in the relationship between support for censorship and self-censorship. However, readers should be cautioned against inferring a corollary relationship, the idea that greater desire for control leads to greater support for public censorship and more self-censorship, as the data were not consistent with this interpretation. Rather, it seems as though an overcontrol-orientation may be a pre-requisite to the positive relationship between support for public censorship and self-censorship, as among the less control-oriented groups no significant relationship existed. Within each personality type, no analyses more involved than Pearson's correlations were conducted due to the small size of each group (between 50 and 63 individuals, each). However, future research should attempt to better define and explain the role that personality type, especially in terms of control, plays in the relationship between support for public censorship and self-censorship.

Other aspects of this research's findings also imply that further study is warranted. While, as noted above, there is strong evidence for a relationship between support for censorship and the tendency to self-censor, aside from openness and overcontrol, the evidence provided few clues as to common correlates, much less a central common cause, of support for public censorship and self-censorship.
Support for public censorship was predicted mostly from demographics and political ideology or, more likely with regard to some variables, unmeasured associates of demographics. For example, among other physical characteristics, at the most basic level a Y chromosome makes an individual a male. Are researchers to believe, from the results obtained here, that a Y chromosome, as the fundamental male trait, may make an individual less likely to support censorship? Anything from physical phenomena, such as brain chemistry, to all manner of gender socialization that men typically receive may explain the relationship, but it is unlikely that male sex, in and of it’s self, contributes to support for public censorship, self-censorship, or the relationship between the two. Any independent variable’s influence on the dependent is contributed to, to some extent, by the influence of other, un-modeled variables. But measures of demographics such as sex or age (how many trips around the Sun the Earth has made with the participant on it) are particularly sloppy shortcuts to significance. Worse yet, the results of research based on such broad, “umbrella” variables can contribute to stereotypical and bigoted impressions about groups that may tend to exhibit normatively undesirable traits.

Unfortunately, as discussed earlier in this writing, much of the previous research on support for public censorship has focused on demographic predictors. Similarly, the research presented here found that demographic predictors were, aside from self-censorship, the only significant group of independent variables predicting support for public censorship. Future research should seek not just to further confirm that these demographics predict support for public censorship, but rather ask why these variables predict support for public censorship. For example, what aspects of typical male socializations might contribute to their tendency to report less support for public
censorship, or what typical female socializations might contribute to their greater
tendency to support public censorship? What is it about age that leads it to be a
consistent predictor of support for public censorship; is it some sort of life experience, a
generation gap, or other factors? Asking these questions will help to better describe those
who tend to support public censorship, and may also shed more light on the relationship
between support for public censorship and self-censorship.

Unlike support for public censorship, which was predicted mainly by
demographics, self-censorship was primarily predicted by personality. The relationship
with openness has already been addressed, but what of the other significant associations?
There was some suggestion that more neurotic individuals are more likely to self-censor,
which seems reasonable in that neurotics may be more concerned or worried about
approval and avoidant of conflict and would thus conceal controversial opinions; but
given the abnormal finding regarding neuroticism in other areas, it is difficult to
determine how much weight to give this finding.

There was an especially strong negative relationship between extraversion and
self-censorship. The reason for this is rather obvious; the essence of extraversion is a
tendency to be outgoing, talkative, and socially interactive. This directly opposes the
tendency of self-censors to restrict their own expression. So in terms of personality,
which was significantly predictive of willingness to self-censor, individuals who are less
open to new ideas and experience, less outgoing and talkative, and less emotionally stable
tend to be more likely to self-censor.

When considering self-reports on willingness to self-censor, especially when
comparing these reports to self-reported opinions on controversial subject matter, socially
desirable responses are a concern. Individuals are more likely to self-censor in cases where they perceive that their opinions are unpopular. Could this reluctance to express an opinion “outside of the mainstream” be a factor in questionnaire responses? Even given an expectation of anonymity, self-censors might be uncomfortable recording a response that they perceive to be unpopular. This possibility has specific implications for the research presented here. For example, a self-censor might not see any problem with the Ku Klux Klan holding a rally in her or his neighborhood (a situation proposed in one of the WTC scales items), but, perceiving that many people would find this objectionable and assuming as such that they would support censorship in this case, the self-censor might conceal her or his opinion, even on an anonymous questionnaire, and go along with she or he thinks “most people” would do – support censorship. In this way, self-censor’s WTC scores could be artificially inflated, so there is some concern that the correlation between WTC and WTSC may be as much a result of this process as a true, root adverse reaction to controversial expression common to both traits.

However, there is also a feasible scenario in which self-censors might exhibit decreased support for public censorship as a result of socially desirable response tendencies. Most American schoolchildren learn very early in their civics education that freedom of expression is a highly valued civil liberty in the United States, and this value is reaffirmed for most citizens, at least in the abstract sense, throughout their lives by the broadcast media and popular press, and perhaps in their social interactions as well. Thus, self-censors might believe that most Americans hold the belief that freedom of expression is very important, and that as a result of this belief, most Americans would be averse to the idea of public censorship. From this position, self-censors may experience discomfort
at the idea of reporting support for public censorship (again, if self-censorship is assumed to take place when the individual is responding anonymously to a questionnaire), and therefore be less likely to do so, for fear that their opinion might be "un-American."

Future research should examine whether there is a socially desirable response bias regarding perceived controversial responses to anonymous questionnaires that increases with willingness to self-censor, and if so in what manner the bias relates to support for public censorship. An experimental design in which one experimental group is primed at the outset with a statement like "Remember, Americans value freedom of expression very highly," and another experimental group is primed with a statement such as "Remember, most people do not support the rights of others to express hate speech, purvey pornography, etc.," and a control group is not given a public opinion cue could be used to examine such a possibility.

Other relevant factors should also be examined. The research presented here did not assess respondent's feelings about the groups involved in the WTC scenarios. Given the importance of such affect in public censorship situation assessment (McLeod et al., 1998) such attitudes should be examined. There are other potential correlates, unmeasured in this research, which should also be evaluated. Authoritarianism likely plays in a role in both support for public censorship and self-censorship. Those who are more willing to defer to the power of an authoritarian government would likely also be more supportive of that government censoring controversial, and especially contradictory, expression. In a democratic society, authority lies ultimately with the will of the people, thus the tendency to defer to that authority may also contribute to
willingness to self-censor insomuch as it is another form of pressure exerted to encourage individuals to express conforming opinions, or at least remain silent when they disagree.

A case can also be made for a relationship between need for cognition and censorial tendencies. It could be expected that individuals who have a greater desire to learn and understand would be less supportive of public censorship and less likely to self-censor. Individuals with a higher need for cognition might want to be exposed to opinions about issues to the greatest extent possible, even opinions that take a position that the high need for cognition individual doesn’t agree with, in order to form a better understanding of the issues. Also, these individuals might be expected to be more participatory in discussion and debate, even when they perceive themselves as being in the opinion minority, as a result of a desire for more talk and hence more information.

4.2 Limitations

An effort was made to obtain a sample that was both as varied and as representative of the general population as possible. However, the response process was time-intensive for the participants and the study was constrained both financially speaking and in terms of the potential respondents that the university setting could provide. Thus, it would be difficult to argue that the final sample obtained was very representative of the general population of the United States. Notably, the participants were disproportionately female, young, and well educated. Undergraduate student samples are inherently homogeneous in terms of age and education, and as the student sub-sample was composed of individuals from one communication research methods class, populated almost exclusively by junior and senior communication majors, its uniformity is made that much more exceptional. The fact that this group was such a large
part of the sample (70.4%) compounds problems with generalization of results to larger populations. While the faculty/staff sub-sample broadened the demographic scope of the study somewhat, the fact that university's tend to employ highly educated individuals means that, though to a lesser extent than the student sample, this group is also rather homogenous and differs from the general population.

These differences in the sample from the American population as a whole might explain why some of this study's results differed from the expectations derived from previous research (studies which utilized more representative samples). For example, the insignificance of age as a predictor of WTSC, and its unexpected direction as a predictor of WTC, could be attributable to the demographic homogeneity and idiosyncrasies of the sample. There may not have been enough variability in education for it to significantly predict WTC or WTSC, whereas it may have done so had the sample been more representative of the general population (i.e. more varied in terms of education).

With any study conducted using a one-shot, non-experimental questionnaire, there is no way to assess causality. While it seems rational to assume that demographics, political ideology, and personality give rise to support for public censorship and self-censorship in the manner implied by the format of the hypotheses, analyses, and results presented herein, there is no way to support the claim empirically with the limited evidence obtained through the simple questionnaire. Of greater concern is the question of the causal relationship between support for censorship and self-censorship. Does one produce the other, or is there a third factor that brings about both? Unfortunately, this study's data cannot provide any evidence capable of providing a sufficient answer to this question.
4.3 Broader Implications

So there are some shortcomings with regard to the methods used in this study, and there are ample opportunities for future research suggested by the results presented here and their interpretation. It is also important, however, not to forget that these results and interpretations have value in and of themselves. They provided valuable new information about the relationship between support for public censorship and self-censorship, and the similarities and differences of these two central concepts in terms of associated demographic, political, and personality variables examined. So, keeping in mind the limitations of this research and the need for further study, what broader implications do these findings suggest?

Within the context of the field of communication, censorship research needs more and better theory. While self-censorship is well grounded in spiral of silence theory, public censorship is really only addressed as a tributary of the third-person effect, which is more hypothesis than theory at this point. Perhaps the research presented here provides a few inklings of the direction that such a general theory of censorship might take. As noted earlier in this section, a desire to control and a disposition against controversy seem conceptually important. To these, the idea of power might be added. The WTC scale implicitly asks respondents to imagine that they are in positions that have the power vested in them to carry out censorial action. Indeed, power is required to punish an offending communicator after the fact, to place time, place or manner restrictions on another’s expression, or to provide protection for a controversial expressive event; and an even greater capability is required to enforce a ban on particular expression. It takes
some amount of personal discipline and strength to “hold one’s tongue.” The powerless
can do none of these things. Thinking in these terms of control-orientation, controversy,
and power, researchers may be able to begin thinking about what a general theory of
censorship might look like.

As explained early in the introduction, the general normative position is that
censorship is undesirable and that free expression is necessary both as an individual’s
right and her or his responsibility in a democratic society. A brief, superficial application
of this belief to the research presented here might be that society should identify
individuals who are more likely to support public censorship or to self-censor and in
some way compel them to change their position. However, such a strategy would in fact
reduce freedom of expression by attempting to take away the individual’s choice to
express a desire for censorship, or the individual’s right to choose not to speak.
Ironically, part of freedom of expression is the right to openly state opposition to and
disagreement with it. Additionally, as has been previously observed with regard to
communication research, one cannot not communicate (e.g. Clevenger, 1991), and the
decision not to express an opinion, or to self-censor, itself conveys a message. Therefore,
to try to coerce support for free expression, or force individuals who would rather not do
so to express themselves would be just as normatively undesirable as censorship.

Despite this, if expression is a good thing, it should be promoted. Education
seems to present a fair balance of encouragement for free and self-expression and the
freedom to make a different choice. Though not supported by the data in this study,
education is consistently a negative predictor of support for public censorship. So
learning is something, but what difference does this research make? By identifying,
albeit roughly in terms of only a few, select demographics, political ideology, and personality the individuals who are more likely to support public censorship or censor themselves, this research provides a guide to individuals who can be thought of as being at “high risk for censorship.” Thus, educational messages can be better tailored to address the thoughts and feelings that might lead these individuals to be more supportive of public censorship. For example, the positive outcomes of openness to new perspectives and positions could be emphasized in terms of the marketplace of ideas and democracy’s attempt to reach truth through free, wide-ranging discourse, both of which require that individuals be exposed to and at least consider ideas that may be new to them, and that they may disagree with.

Further, this research has shown that if individuals tend to hold pro-censorship opinions, since they are also more likely to be self-censors, if they perceive the opinions as unpopular their chances of expressing themselves with regard to public censorship are reduced. It is difficult for an instructor to address misconceptions that a student may have if the student in no way brings the misunderstandings to the instructor’s attention. Thus, instructors in communication, social psychology, sociology, law, and other fields where freedom of expression is a relevant topic should be cautioned against discouraging pro-censorship opinions as invalid, or allowing students who express such opinions to be ridiculed or ostracized. The results of this research suggest that rather than allowing conditions like these, where a spiral of silence is likely to occur, educators should treat the opinions respectfully and respond in such a way that the virtues of free expression are supported, with the knowledge that, in the spirit of Milton, the righteousness of the position for free expression will win out over censorship in the end.
LIST OF REFERENCES


76


APPENDIX A

THE WILLINGNESS TO CENSOR SCALE
Student Sub-Sample Instructions:

In Part 1 you will be presented with situations in which freedom of speech comes into conflict with other important social and individual values. There are five possible responses listed for each situation. Please put a check or an X in the box next to the one response out of the five that you think is best. Please select no more than one response to each question. Don’t spend too much time on any question. Simply record your first impression.

Please mark the one answer that you feel to be most appropriate.

Faculty/Staff Sub-Sample Instructions:

In Part 1 you will be presented with situations in which freedom of speech comes into conflict with other important social and individual values. There are five possible responses listed for each situation. Please write the letter of the response that you think is best on the line next to the item number. Please select no more than one response to each question. Don’t spend too much time on any item. Simply record your first impression.

Please write the letter of the one answer that you feel to be most appropriate.
1. A company promoting a rock musical, which contains scenes where the actors are naked, wants to lease a municipal auditorium to present their production.

I think city officials should:

- refuse to allow them to lease the auditorium for this production
- grant the lease for the production, but sue the producers if they leave the scenes with nudity in the show
- grant the lease for the production, but require that audience members be 18 or older, or accompanied by an adult
- grant the lease with no conditions
- grant the lease, and provide police officers to insure the security of the performers

2. The Aryan Nation, a white-supremacist group, is publishing and distributing a newspaper in your state.

I think state officials should:

- close down the newspaper
- levy a tax on special interest newspapers, like this one
- not allow the publisher to send the newspaper through the mail
- allow the newspaper to be distributed
- protect the publisher’s right to print and distribute the newspaper
3. A television news photographer takes video of a famous person entering a house of prostitution. The celebrity seeks a court order to stop the TV station from using the footage.

I think the judge and/or jury should:

- order the TV station not to air the video
- fine the TV station to compensate the celebrity
- order the TV station to alter the video so the celebrity can’t be identified
- take no action, thereby allowing the TV station to air the video as is
- issue a ruling protecting the right of the TV station to use the video


I think the government should:

- confiscate their computer equipment so they can’t have a site on the WWW
- bring criminal charges against the militia’s members
- require them to take the bomb information off their web site
- take no action against the militia group
- protect their right to publish on the WWW
5. A group of protesters is picketing outside an abortion clinic, sometimes
obstructing the paths of patients who are entering the clinic.

I think city officials should:

- forbid the protesters from picketing outside the clinic
- arrest the protesters for disturbing the peace
- require the protesters to stay at least 15 feet away from the clinic
- allow the protest to continue without restriction
- protect the right of the protesters to express their beliefs

6. During a campaign, the current mayor was speaking at a civic group’s meeting.

Discussing his opponent, he commented that she had the same name as a missing
Nazi war criminal and asked “Is this the same Ilse Koch? Who knows?” Koch
sued the mayor for trying to destroy her reputation.

I think the judge and/or jury hearing the case should:

- order the mayor not to talk about his opponent in public anymore
- fine the mayor to compensate Koch
- require the mayor to make a public apology
- not take any action against the mayor
- issue a ruling upholding the mayor’s right to speak
7. A local pharmacist places an ad, which includes price information for prescription medication, in a magazine targeted at the elderly.

I think the government should:

- □ forbid the pharmacist from advertising prices for prescription medication
- □ fine the pharmacist for advertising price information
- □ require the pharmacist to list the price information in small print
- □ take no action against the pharmacist
- □ protect the right of the pharmacist to advertise price information

8. As you are surfing the World Wide Web, you accidentally come across a site that contains graphic sexual images.

I think the U.S. government should:

- □ confiscate the computer equipment of the site’s producers
- □ fine the producers of the site
- □ require the site’s producers to install a blocking mechanism so that it can’t be accessed accidentally
- □ let the site’s producers decide what to do
- □ protect the right of the producers to choose what to include in their site
9. A newspaper publishes a story that reveals that a certain community member is gay. He had not wanted to reveal this fact publicly, and he sues the newspaper for invading his privacy.

I think the judge and/or jury hearing the case should:

- order the newspaper not to publish such information again
- fine the newspaper to compensate the man
- require the newspaper to issue a public apology
- take no action against the newspaper
- issue a ruling supporting the right of the newspaper to publish such information

10. A group protesting the U.S. government's foreign policy in Iran burns the flag on a street corner outside a government building.

I think the government should:

- make it illegal to burn the flag
- arrest the protesters for disturbing the peace
- require the protesters to hold their demonstration in a less crowded area
- take no action against the protesters
- protect the protesters right to demonstrate
11. The first of a three part TV mini-series just aired on your local NBC affiliate. It included two characters who frequently make racist remarks against African-Americans and Mexicans.

I think the Federal Communications Commission, which grants the station’s license, should:

- forbid the station from airing the last two parts of the mini-series
- revoke the station’s license to broadcast if it airs the last two parts of the mini-series
- require that the last two parts of the mini-series be aired after 9:00 p.m.
- let the local station decide whether or not to air the last two parts of the series
- make sure that the last two parts of the series air as scheduled

12. A newspaper editor publishes an editorial on election day endorsing a particular candidate.

I think state officials should:

- make it illegal to solicit votes on election day
- fine the editor for his partisanship
- require the editor to issue a special edition with a statement supporting the other candidate
- take no action against the editor
- protect the editor’s right to express his views on the election
13. An arts and entertainment program on your cable system included a negative review of a local restaurant. The critic said that the restaurant owners “are rude and vulgar people” and are “pigs.” The owners sued the critic for ruining their reputations.

I think the judge and/or jury hearing the case should:

- forbid the critic from doing any more negative reviews
- fine the critic to compensate the restaurant owners
- require the critic to issue a public apology
- not take any action against the critic
- issue a ruling defending the critic’s right to express his opinion

14. The chamber of commerce issues a yearly magazine that profiles the various civic organizations in your community. A chamber staff member, who is the head of a local pro-life group, plans to include a feature on his group in the next issue.

I think the city officials who oversee the chamber of commerce should:

- refuse to allow an article on the group to be included in the magazine
- fire the staff member if he insists on publishing the article about his group
- require the staff member to include an article about pro-choice groups,
  also
- let the staff member decide what to do
- protect the right of the staff member to include the article in the magazine
15. An online company provides its subscribers access to "photo libraries," where they can pay to download pictures. In the "California Girls" section, the images are of women hoping to become fashion models. They didn’t give permission to use their pictures, and have sued the company for invasion of privacy.

I think the judge and/or jury hearing the case should:

- issue an injunction prohibiting further publication of the photographs
- fine the company to compensate the women
- require the company to put a caption on the photos explaining they are included without permission
- take no action against the company
- issue a ruling protecting the right of the company to include the photographs

16. A new certified public accountant (CPA) is going door-to-door soliciting business.

I think the government should:

- not allow CPA’s to solicit clients in this way
- fine the CPA for violating people’s privacy
- only allow the CPA to solicit to people who have expressed an interest in receiving such information
- take no action against the CPA
- protect the right of the CPA to solicit clients door-to-door
17. A cable channel is promoting an upcoming series about the assassination of
President John F. Kennedy. The promotion names several authors that it claims
are "guilty of misleading the American public" about the assassination. One of the
authors sues the cable channel for portraying him in a false light.

I think the judge and/or jury hearing the case should:

- order the cable channel not to air the series
- fine the cable channel to compensate the author
- require the cable channel to include an interview with this author in their
  series, so he can state his point of view
- take no action against the cable channel
- issue a ruling protecting the right of the cable channel to air the series

18. An alternative newspaper in your community runs a singles column each week
which sometimes includes graphic descriptions of sexual encounters.

I think city officials should:

- force the paper to stop running that column
- fine the paper each time the column includes graphic descriptions of sex
- require the paper to run a warning on the front page of any issue that
  contains graphic sexual descriptions
- let the paper decide what to do
- protect the paper's right to publish the column
19. A magazine article about on-duty drunkenness by certain police officers mistakenly included a picture of an officer who was not involved. The officer sued the magazine for damaging his reputation:

I think the judge and/or jury hearing the case should:

- ☐ not allow the magazine to publish any more articles about police behavior
- ☐ fine the magazine to compensate the officer
- ☐ require the magazine to make a public apology
- ☐ not take any action against the magazine
- ☐ issue a ruling protecting the magazine’s right to publish, even when they’ve made a mistake

20. The names and home phone numbers of an abortion clinic’s medical staff and board of directors are provided by an anti-abortion activist on the Internet.

I think the government should:

- ☐ confiscate the activist’s computer equipment so she can’t publish such information on the Internet
- ☐ press charges against the activist for endangering the lives of the clinic’s staff and directors
- ☐ order the activist to remove the phone numbers from her Internet site
- ☐ take no action against the activist
- ☐ protect the right of the activist to provide the information on the Internet
21. In a meeting at a public hall, a speaker is preaching hatred against gays and
lesbians.

I think the police officers on the scene should:

- arrest the speaker to stop him from finishing the presentation
- fine the speaker for disturbing the peace
- require the speaker to apologize for the offensive language
- take no action, thus allowing the speaker to continue
- protect the speaker’s right to say whatever he thinks

22. A television station which broadcasts into two states accepts advertising for a
lottery in one of the states. The other state prohibits lotteries.

I think the Federal Communications Commission, which grants the station’s
license, should:

- forbid the TV station from broadcasting any lottery advertising
- fine the TV station for accepting the lottery advertising
- require the TV station also to run public service announcements about the
dangers of gambling
- take no action against the TV station
- protect the right of the TV station to accept the lottery advertising
23. A pro-life corporation published a special edition of its quarterly newspaper the week before national elections, urging people to vote for anti-abortion candidates.

I think the Federal Election Commission should:

☐ make it illegal for corporations to spend money in support of particular candidates

☐ fine the corporation for publishing a special “election edition” of its newspaper

☐ require the organization to provide space in its newspaper for candidates to respond

☐ take no action against the organization

☐ protect the right of the organization to express its views concerning political candidates

24. The local news programming on a TV station in your city always favors one political party over the other.

I think the Federal Communications Commission, which grants the station’s license, should:

☐ not allow the station to cover political stories

☐ fine the station to compensate the other political party

☐ require the station to give an equal amount of favorable coverage to the other political party

☐ take no action against the TV station

☐ issue a ruling supporting the right of the TV station to choose what to include on its news programs
25. A magazine is planning to publish an in-depth article about a 20-year old murder case, involving a son convicted for murdering his parents. The piece discusses family relationships while raising issues of child abuse and rehabilitation. The murderer’s brother sues the publisher for invading his privacy.

I think the judge and/or jury hearing the case should:

- order the magazine not to publish the article
- fine the magazine to compensate the brother
- order the magazine to change the names in the article so that the brother won’t be identified
- take no action against the magazine
- issue an order protecting the magazine’s right to publish the article

26. College students are holding a rally to protest the University’s decision not to allow condoms to be distributed in residence halls. They are carrying signs and banners with sexual language and pictures.

I think University officials should:

- forbid protests on campus
- put the students who participate in the rally on probation
- take the signs and banners from the rally
- allow the rally to continue as is
- supply campus police to provide security for the rally
27. A group of neo-nazis produces a weekly call-in show on the public access channel of your cable system.

I think the city officials who granted the cable company its franchise should:

- demand that the group’s program not appear on your cable system
- fine the group and the cable company each time the program appears
- require that the program only be shown after 9 p.m.
- allow the cable company to handle the situation
- protect the right of the group to produce the program on public access

28. An on-line service provides a forum for information about and discussion of current events. In the forum, allegations were made about the illegal actions of an investment company. The investment company sued the on-line service for damaging its reputation.

I think the judge and/or jury hearing the case should:

- force the on-line service to close down its forum for discussion of current events
- fine the on-line service to compensate the investment company
- require the on-line service to make a public apology
- take no action against the on-line service
- issue a ruling protecting the right of the on-line service to provide a forum for discussion
29. A personal injury lawyer is running an ad on your cable system, soliciting business from people who had suffered injuries as a result of using a certain product.

I think the government should:

- □ forbid the lawyer from soliciting clients through advertising
- □ fine the lawyer for soliciting business in this manner
- □ require the lawyer to mention his fees for service in his ad
- □ not take any action against the lawyer
- □ protect the lawyer’s right to solicit clients through advertising

30. A newspaper ran editorials and cartoons stating that anti-nuclear protesters are “bums,” “deluded,” and “insane,” and that signs they have been carrying are “gibberish,” “un-American,” and “trash.” The protesters have sued the newspaper for attacking their reputations.

I think the judge and/or jury hearing the case should:

- □ stop the paper from printing any more editorial commentary on the protesters
- □ levy a fine against the newspaper to compensate the protesters
- □ require the newspaper to run guest editorials from the protesters point-of-view
- □ not take any action against the newspaper
- □ issue a ruling protecting the newspaper’s right to express its editorial position
31. One of the new prime-time television series this year on the ABC affiliate in your city regularly includes explicit nudity.

I think the Federal Communications Commission, which grants the station's license, should:

- require the station to stop airing any episode with explicit nudity
- fine the station each time an episode with explicit nudity airs
- require the station to air the series after 9:00 p.m.
- let the station decide the appropriate action to take
- protect the right of the station to air the series

32. A magazine for U.S. members of the socialist party regularly publishes articles in support of foreign governments and against the U.S. government.

I think the government should:

- close down the magazine
- fine the magazine's publishers
- make the publishers include articles explaining the U.S. government point of view
- take no action against the magazine
- protect the right of the magazine's publishers to express their opinions
33. The Ku Klux Klan has filed for a permit to hold a march through your town.

I think the city permit office should:

- refuse to give them a permit
- hold them responsible for any physical or personal damage that occurs as a result of the march
- require them to hold the march in a sparsely populated area of town
- issue a permit for the march
- issue a permit, and provide police escorts to make sure their right to march is protected

34. An individual who is opposed to abortion is shouting his beliefs in front of a doctor's office where abortions are performed. The office is in a residential neighborhood.

I think city officials should:

- forbid him from protesting there in the future
- arrest him for disturbing the peace
- require him to protest with signs instead of by shouting
- allow him to continue to protest
- protect his right to protest
35. A group advocating welfare reform publishes a leaflet with photos and stories about women who are “shamelessly and brazenly violating the law by having children out of wedlock and receiving welfare to support them.” One of the women whose photo is included sues the group for portraying her in a false light.

I think the judge and/or jury hearing the case should:

- order the group to stop distributing the leaflet
- fine the group to compensate the woman
- order the group to take the woman’s photo out of the leaflet
- take no action against the group
- issue a ruling protecting the right of the group to publish their leaflet

36. A bookstore in your city sells magazines featuring pictures of nude and partially-clothed adults in various sexual positions.

I think city officials should:

- force the bookstore to stop selling the magazines
- file charges against the bookstore’s owner for distributing pornographic material
- require the store to place the magazines behind the counter, so customers have to ask for them
- let the store’s owner decide what to do
- protect the right of the bookstore to sell the magazines
37. A radical Jewish organization advocating violence against Muslims has a site on the World Wide Web.

I think the government should:

- confiscate the group’s computer equipment so they can’t have a web site
- fine the group’s leaders for advocating violence
- require the organization to place a warning about the content that appears before their page is accessed
- do nothing, thereby allowing the web site to remain unchanged
- protect the organization’s right to express its beliefs

38. An anti-abortion organization produces a monthly program on the public access channel on your cable system. During the program, they show pictures of local physicians who perform abortions, and label them as “murderers” and “killers.”

I think the city officials who run the public access channel should:

- not allow the organization to air their program on the public access channel
- fine the organization for improper use of a public facility
- require the organization to refrain from identifying any particular physician
- take no action against the organization or its program
- protect the right of the organization to air its program
39. Several students at a public university were protesting the university’s contracts with two businesses known to be anti-union. They were speaking on the library lawn in the center of campus, using bullhorns to amplify their voices.

I think University officials should:

- have campus police remove the protesters
- put the students involved in the protest on probation
- require the students to stop using bullhorns
- allow the protest to continue uninterrupted
- protect the students’ right to speak their opinions

40. A liquor store includes price information in their newspaper ads for alcoholic beverages.

I think the government should:

- issue on a ban on price advertising for alcohol
- fine the liquor store for advertising alcohol prices
- require the liquor store to advertise prices in very small print
- take no action against the liquor store
- issue a ruling supporting the right of the liquor store to advertise price information
41. A TV news program showed unrelated video of a local doctor while the voice-over indicated that some health practitioners use “quack machines, fraudulent tests, and illegal drugs to treat cancer.” The doctor has sued the television station for damaging his reputation.

I think the judge and/or jury hearing the case should:

- not allow the TV station to run these kinds of stories in the future
- fine the TV station to compensate the doctor
- require the TV station to broadcast a story correcting their mistake
- take no action against the TV station
- issue a ruling supporting the TV station’s right to air these kinds of stories

42. A black separatist organization in your city is publishing a “humor” magazine which makes fun of whites, especially Jewish people and Catholics.

I think city officials should:

- close down the magazine
- levy a tax on special interest magazines, like this one
- revoke the special mailing rates for their magazine
- allow the group to continue to publish and distribute the magazine
- protect the right of the group to publish and distribute the magazine
43. In a public speech criticizing the practice of placing mentally ill people in boarding homes, the speaker reveals that Ed Samuels, one of the boarding home operators, had been convicted of certain criminal sexual acts 30 years ago. Samuels sues the speaker for disclosing private facts.

I think the judge and/or jury hearing the case should:

□ forbid the speaker from commenting publicly on the boarding home issue again

□ fine the speaker to compensate Samuels

□ require the speaker to make a public apology

□ take no action against the speaker

□ issue a ruling protecting the right of the speaker to criticize the boarding home operators

44. Volunteers for a political advocacy group set up a table outside the post office to solicit contributions and sell subscriptions to their newspaper.

I think post office officials should:

□ order the group to leave the premises

□ fine the group’s members for soliciting on government property

□ make the group move so they are not blocking the path of post office customers

□ not take any action against the group

□ protect the group’s right to solicit contributions and subscriptions
45. A locally produced, sexually explicit program has begun to air on a public access channel on your cable system.

I think the city officials who granted the cable company its franchise should:

- require the cable company to stop airing the program
- fine the cable company each time the program airs
- require that the program be aired after 9:00 p.m.
- let the cable company decide what to do
- protect the right of the local producers to show their program

46. A pro-life organization has bought time on an independent television station in your city. They want to air a 15 minute program which includes graphic pictures of aborted fetuses.

I think the Federal Communications Commission, which grants the station’s license, should:

- forbid the station to air the program with the graphic footage included
- fine the station if it airs the program as is
- allow the station to show the program with the graphic footage, as long as it is shown after 10 p.m.
- leave the decision of whether or not to air the program up to the station
- require the station to let the program air as scheduled
47. A man with a small business is advertising his products by sending 500,000 unsolicited e-mails each week. Several people who have received the messages have complained to their state attorney general.

I think the attorney general’s office should:

□ confiscate the man’s computer equipment to prevent him from sending unsolicited e-mails

□ fine the man for each unsolicited e-mail he sends

□ require him to stop sending e-mail messages to those individuals who make such a request

□ not take any action against the man

□ protect the right of the man to send e-mail messages to promote his products

48. On a picket line during a strike, one of the union banners says “#1 Scab Jacobsen Sucks.” Jacobsen has sued the union leader, saying that his character was called into question.

I think the judge and/or jury hearing the case should:

□ forbid the union leader from having any signs directed at individual workers

□ fine the union leader to compensate Jacobsen

□ require the union leader to make a public apology

□ not take any action against the union leader

□ issue a ruling protecting the union leader’s right to speak freely
49. A cable channel is planning to air films, produced outside of the U.S., that explore global political issues like acid rain and nuclear power.

I think the U.S. government should:

☐ not allow the cable channel to air the programs

☐ fine the cable channel for airing these programs

☐ require the cable company to label the films as “political propaganda”

☐ let the cable channel decide whether or not to air the programs

☐ protect the cable channel’s right to air the films
APPENDIX B

THE WILLINGNESS TO SELF-CENSOR SCALE
Instructions:

Please check or mark with an “X” only one box per statement that reflects whether you strongly disagree with the statement, disagree with the statement, neither agree nor disagree with the statement, agree with the statement, or strongly agree with the statement. Don’t spend too much time on any question. Simply record your first impression.

Please mark the one answer that best indicates your level of agreement for each statement.

1. It is difficult for me to express my opinion if I think others won’t agree with what I say.

2. There have been many times when I have thought others around me were wrong but I didn’t let them know.

3. When I disagree with others, I’d rather go along with them than argue about it.

4. It is easy for me to express my opinion around others who I think will disagree with me.

5. I’d feel uncomfortable if someone asked my opinion and I knew that he or she wouldn’t agree with me.

6. I tend to speak my opinion only around friends or other people I trust.

7. It is safer to keep quiet than publicly speak an opinion that you know most others don’t share.

8. If I disagree with others, I have no problem letting them know it.
APPENDIX C

THE BIG FIVE INVENTORY
Instructions:

Please check or mark with an “X” only one box per statement that reflects whether you strongly disagree with the statement, disagree with the statement, neither agree nor disagree with the statement, agree with the statement, or strongly agree with the statement. Don't spend too much time on any question. Simply record your first impression.

Please mark the one answer that best indicates your level of agreement for each statement.

1. I see myself as someone who is talkative.

2. I see myself as someone who tends to find fault with others.

3. I see myself as someone who does a thorough job.

4. I see myself as someone who is depressed, blue.

5. I see myself as someone who is original, comes up with new ideas.

6. I see myself as someone who is reserved.

7. I see myself as someone who is helpful and unselfish with others.

8. I see myself as someone who can be somewhat careless.

9. I see myself as someone who is relaxed, handles stress well.

10. I see myself as someone who is curious about many different things.

11. I see myself as someone who is full of energy.

12. I see myself as someone who starts quarrels with others.

13. I see myself as someone who is a reliable worker.

14. I see myself as someone who can be tense.

15. I see myself as someone who is ingenious, a deep thinker.
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16. I see myself as someone who generates a lot of enthusiasm.
17. I see myself as someone who has a forgiving nature.
18. I see myself as someone who tends to be disorganized.
19. I see myself as someone who worries a lot.
20. I see myself as someone who has an active imagination.
21. I see myself as someone who tends to be quiet.
22. I see myself as someone who is generally trusting.
23. I see myself as someone who tends to be lazy.
24. I see myself as someone who is emotionally stable, not easily upset.
25. I see myself as someone who is inventive.
26. I see myself as someone who has an assertive personality.
27. I see myself as someone who can be cold and aloof.
28. I see myself as someone who perseveres until the task is finished.
29. I see myself as someone who can be moody.
30. I see myself as someone who values artistic, aesthetic experiences.
31. I see myself as someone who is sometimes shy, inhibited.
32. I see myself as someone who is considerate and kind to almost everyone.
33. I see myself as someone who does things efficiently.
34. I see myself as someone who remains calm in tense situations.
35. I see myself as someone who prefers work that is routine.
36. I see myself as someone who is outgoing, sociable.
37. I see myself as someone who is sometimes rude to others.
38. I see myself as someone who makes plans and follows through with them.
39. I see myself as someone who gets nervous easily.

40. I see myself as someone who likes to reflect, play with ideas.

41. I see myself as someone who has few artistic interests.

42. I see myself as someone who likes to cooperate with others.

43. I see myself as someone who is easily distracted.

44. I see myself as someone who is sophisticated in art, music, or literature.
APPENDIX D

RELEVANT DEMOGRAPHIC ITEMS
Instructions:

Please mark one answer or fill in the blank for each item about you.

1. What is your sex? _____ Female _____ Male

2. What is your age in years? _____

3. How many years of education have you completed? _____

4. When it comes to politics, how would you describe yourself?
   - Very Liberal
   - Liberal
   - Slightly Liberal
   - Middle of the Road
   - Slightly Conservative
   - Conservative
   - Very Conservative
APPENDIX E

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND INFORMED CONSENT
Instructions

This survey is part of an investigation of general public opinion concerning a variety of social issues. There are no right or wrong answers. You are being asked for your opinion.

There are three sections to the survey. It will take approximately 45 - 60 minutes to complete. At the beginning of each section you will be given instructions specific to that section. Please read them carefully.

Returning this survey indicates that you understand and agree to the following:

- You consent to your participation in research being conducted by Andrew F. Hayes of The Ohio State University and his assistants and associates.
- You know that you can choose not to participate without penalty to you.
- You may skip any items that you do not wish to answer
- If you agree to participate, you can withdraw from the study at any time; there will be no penalty for withdrawal.
- You have had a chance to ask questions and to obtain answers to your questions.
- You can contact the investigator at hayes.338@osu.edu or (614) 688-3027.
- If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you can call the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 614-688-4792.
- You have read this form or have had it read to you.

Thank you for reading the instructions! Don’t forget to return this page with your complete survey. Please begin Part 1 on the next page.
APPENDIX F

RECRUITMENT E-MAIL TEXT
RE: 2 Free Lunches! Help from OSU Staff/Faculty

Dear OSU Staff or Faculty Member,

You have been randomly selected from a list of staff and faculty at OSU to receive this opportunity to assist in research. The School of Communication at The Ohio State University is seeking volunteers to participate in a research study on personality and social attitudes (OSU IRB Protocol Number 2005B0004). This study is being conducted by Dr. Andrew F. Hayes. THE STUDY CONSISTS OF TWO PARTS. The first will take approximately 75 minutes. A free lunch consisting of pizza and sides will be provided during this part of the study. During this session, you will also be issued a take home packet, which you will complete at your convenience. The second part of the study will take place approximately one week after the first part. All that will be required of you for the second part of the study is that you return the take home packet. Another pizza lunch will be provided at this second session and you will have the opportunity to participate in a contest to win a "visitor" BuckID card with $5, $10, or even $20 value! Alternatively, you will be provided with a campus mail envelope that you can use to return part two of the survey if you are unable to attend the return session. Thus, you will receive up to TWO FREE LUNCHES for completing a two-part survey. Participation is limited to the first 200 people who respond to this e-mail.

The study is simple. During part one you, along with others who participate in your session, will individually use a paper response sheet to record your opinions on a series of items about social issues. During part two, you will fill out a paper survey on a variety of questions about yourself. Your responses will be made confidentially and
anonymously. There is no way that anyone else will be able to determine how you personally responded to each question.

Please reply to this email to let me know that you are willing to participate. I can be contacted at reineke.6@osu.edu.

The study will take place at the days, times, and locations listed below. To reserve a space, please reply to this email, indicating the time that you prefer. Please list an alternative time in the event that a space is not available at your chosen time. After you receive a confirmation email from me that a space is available, simply show up at the date and time you have been assigned. An email reminder will be sent to you approximately 24 to 48 hours before your scheduled time. DUE TO THE GROUP NATURE OF PART ONE, SESSIONS WILL START PROMPTLY AT THE TIME LISTED, so you will want to arrive a few minutes early. Choose one of the sessions below to begin the process, and receive up to 2 FREE LUNCHES!

Personality and Social Attitudes Study Part 1

Wednesday, April 27, 12:00 Noon

255 Townshend Hall

Map: http://www.osu.edu/map/building.php?building=townshendhall

Thursday, April 28, 12:00 Noon

115 Mendenhall Labs

Map: http://www.osu.edu/map/building.php?building=mendenhalllaboratory

Friday, April 29, 12:00 Noon

1180 Postle Hall

Map: http://www.osu.edu/map/building.php?building=postlehall
Part 2 of the study will take place on Friday, May 6 between 11:00 AM and 1:00 PM in 1180 Postle Hall.

Thank you for your time and attention. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the email address listed above. I look forward to having lunch with you, twice!

Sincerely,

Jason B. Reineke

Graduate Student in Communication
APPENDIX G

CONFIRMATION E-MAIL TEXT
Dear <NAME>,

Thank you for your interest in our study, I’m glad to hear you’ll be participating!

I have scheduled you for our <DAY>, <TIME> session in <PLACE>, and will send you an e-mail reminder 24-48 hours ahead of time.

Don’t hesitate to let me know if you have any questions. I look forward to meeting with you!

Sincerely,

Jason B. Reineke

Graduate Student in Communication
APPENDIX H

SESSION 1 REMINDER E-MAIL TEXT
RE: Study Participation Reminder

Dear OSU Staff or Faculty Member,

Greetings! This e-mail has been sent to remind you that you have agreed to participate in the School of Communication’s personality and social attitudes study. You are scheduled to participate on <DATE> at <TIME> in <PLACE> (Map: <MAPLINK>).

We will start promptly at noon, so please try not to be late.

I look forward to meeting you. If you have any questions, feel free to e-mail me (reineke.6@osu.edu).

Thank you again!

-Jason Reineke
APPENDIX I

SECOND CONTACT RECRUITING E-MAIL TEXT
RE: LAST CHANCE! 2 Free Lunches! Help from OSU Staff / Faculty

Dear OSU Staff or Faculty Member,

You have been randomly selected from a list of staff and faculty at OSU to receive this opportunity to assist in research. The School of Communication at The Ohio State University is seeking volunteers to participate in a research study on personality and social attitudes (OSU IRB Protocol Number 2005B0004). This study is being conducted by Dr. Andrew F. Hayes. **THE STUDY CONSISTS OF TWO PARTS.** The first will take approximately 75 minutes. A free lunch consisting of pizza and sides will be provided during this part of the study. During this session, you will also be issued a take home packet, which you will complete at your convenience. The second part of the study will take place one week after the first part. All that will be required of you for the second part of the study is that you return the take home packet. Another pizza lunch will be provided at this second session and you will have the opportunity to participate in a contest to win a “visitor” BuckID card with $5, $10, or even $20 value! Alternatively, you will be provided with a campus mail envelope that you can use to return part two of the survey if you are unable to attend the return session. Thus, you will receive up to **TWO FREE LUNCHES** for completing a two-part survey. Participation is limited to the first 200 people who respond to this e-mail.

The study is simple. During part one you, along with others who participate in your session, will individually use a paper response sheet to record your opinions on a series of items about social issues. During part two, you will fill out a paper survey on a variety of questions about yourself. Your responses will be made confidentially and
anonymously. There is no way that anyone else will be able to determine how you personally responded to each question.

Please reply to this email to let me know that you are willing to participate. I can be contacted at reineke.6@osu.edu.

To reserve a space, please reply to this email. After you receive a confirmation email from me that a space is available, simply show up at the session for Part 1. An email reminder will be sent to you approximately 24 hours before your scheduled time. DUE TO THE GROUP NATURE OF PART ONE, THE SESSION WILL START PROMPTLY AT THE TIME LISTED, so you will want to arrive a few minutes early. Reply ASAP to get up to 2 FREE LUNCHES!

Personality and Social Attitudes Study Part 1
Friday, April 29, 12:00 Noon
1180 Postle Hall
Map: http://www.osu.edu/map/building.php?building=postlehall

Part 2 of the study will take place on Friday, May 6 between 11:00AM and 1:00PM in 1180 Postle Hall.

If you have already responded to our previous contact please disregard this e-mail; we make every effort to not re-contact those who have already responded. Thank you for your time and attention. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the email address listed above. I look forward to having lunch with you, twice!

Sincerely,

Jason B. Reineke
Graduate Student in Communication
APPENDIX J

RETURN SESSION REMINDER E-MAIL TEXT
RE: Study Participation Part 2 Reminder

Dear OSU Staff or Faculty Member,

Greetings! I just wanted to send you this e-mail as a reminder that you’ll be turning in Part 2 of the personality and social attitudes survey this FRIDAY, MAY 6 between 11:00 AM and 1:00 PM in 1180 POSTLE HALL (Map: http://www.osu.edu/map/building.php?building=postlehall). We will have ANOTHER FREE LUNCH for you, as well as a contest in which you can win a “visitor” BuckID charged with up to $20! Alternatively, you can send Part 2 to me through campus mail using the envelope I provided.

A few of you have already returned Part 2 through campus mail. Thank you!

It is very important that you complete your part of our agreement by returning Part 2 to me either by coming to the session Friday, or sending it through campus mail. The data collected in Part 1 is of little use without the data from Part 2. If you require another envelope, or it I can facilitate the return of Part 2 in any other way, please let me know.

If you were unable to participate in Part 1, please disregard this e-mail.

I hope to see you FRIDAY, MAY 6, between 11:00 AM and 1:00 PM for ANOTHER FREE LUNCH!

Sincerely,

Jason Reineke