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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Study and Presentation of the Problem

Professional literature in education abounds with assertions of the need within the teaching-learning experience for a process that goes by such names as problem-solving, creative thinking, and reflective thought. This process and its significance to general education have been philosophically defined and logically explained by such monumental works as John Dewey's *How We Think*,\(^1\) Columbia Associates' *An Introduction to Reflective Thinking*,\(^2\) and Hullfish and Smith's *Reflective Thinking: The Method of Education*.\(^3\) Hullfish and Smith describe the process in these terms,

A first condition for education, therefore, consists of confronting individuals with situations

\(^1\)John Dewey has written on the reconstruction of experience. His analysis of the thinking process related to reflection is especially helpful in *How We Think* (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1933).

\(^2\)Columbia Associates in Philosophy, too, has gone into many philosophical aspects related to reflective thought in *An Introduction to Reflective Thinking* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1923).

\(^3\)One of the most recent and readable discussions of reflection and its place in education is H. Gordon Hullfish and Philip G. Smith, *Reflective Thinking: The Method of Education* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1963).
that call into question this basic structure of meanings and beliefs. Emotionally, this is a challenge to the individual as a person. His very existence as a "whole person" depends on successfully overcoming this challenge. His existence as an educated person depends on overcoming the challenge by growing in the ability and courage to test ideas or patterns of belief against the facts that bear upon them. Within this growth new persons are reconstructed from former ones.

The specific goal for the social studies teacher in our democratic society of encouraging reflection has been defined operationally in the following passage by the Educational Policies Commission in its booklet The Central Purpose of American Education:

To be free, a man must be capable of basing his choices and actions on understandings which he himself achieves and on values which he examines for himself. He must be aware of the bases on which he accepts propositions as true. He must understand the values by which he lives, the assumptions on which they rest, and the consequences to which they lead. He must recognize that others may have different values. He must be capable of analyzing the situation in which he finds himself and to perceive and understand the events of his life and the time and the forces that influence and shape those events. He must recognize and accept the practical limitations which time and circumstances place on his choices. The free man, in short, has a rational grasp of himself, his surroundings, and the relation between them.

By bringing to bear the tenets of the inductive and

---

4Ibid., p. 59.

social-evolutionary schools of philosophy, Robinson and Beard among others illustrated the feasibility and utility of reflection for historical explanation. They pointed out the need of bringing man's dynamic human experience to the interpretation of theoretical behavioral knowledge and factual historical events. By attempting to interpret empirically and structure logically the sociological and psychological situational factors related to a historical happening, the learner is able to bring himself into a broader and more meaningful study of human behavior.

Recently this process has been more scientifically elaborated upon by such men as Swift and Hempel. It should be recognized, nevertheless, as reported by Metcalf, that scientifically oriented historical explanation for

---


7 Charles A. Beard points out the cultural influence on social inquiry in the study of the evolution of human behavior, see particularly Chapter I in The Nature of the Social Sciences (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934).


developing the reflective processes is still only sketchily supported by empirical research.

With the philosophical orientation of this study in mind, there remains the operational prerequisites for the preceding educational goal to be functionally obtainable in the school setting. One of these, certainly, is freedom of discussion in the classroom. Of equal importance is the ability and habit of the teacher to practice reflection in those puzzling situations which occur daily, and to recognize and accept the value pattern that it represents. Another prerequisite is familiarity with the skills and techniques for encouraging the reflective process in others. Another is the need to have the type of subject matter that can be structured conceptually in such a manner that it furnishes relevant hypotheses upon which to test experience through scientific investigation and verification. In concluding this partial list it should be noted that the teacher needs to recognize and understand the affective dimension of an individual's cognitive domain when in the process of explaining, evaluating, and predicting human experience. It is the analysis of this last precondition for encouraging reflection in the classroom to which this paper is mainly addressed. The problem has been described aptly by Columbia Associates as follows:

In the last analysis, the final test of the relative worth of values must be experience, just as the final test of any truth must come down to an experienced agreement with fact... Yet it
still remains true that many men would disagree, even after a thorough experience of various values, as to the relative importance to be assigned to each in any ultimate standard of what constituted a good life. . . . But this fact of what constituted perhaps an ultimate disagreement on important preferences, which cannot be settled by an appeal to experience because experience differs from man to man, does lead to the most profound difficulty of all in any consideration of values.\[11\]

This process of reflective thought has been defined also in the language of the cognitive processes in the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives edited by Bloom under the heading of "intellectual abilities and skills." Included under this general heading are the cognitive processes of comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Bloom defines these processes in operational terms when he states,

The most general operational definition of these abilities and skills is that the individual can find appropriate information and techniques in his previous experience to bring to bear on new problems and situations. This requires some analysis or understanding of the new situation; it requires a background of knowledge or methods which can be readily utilized; and it also requires some facility in discerning the appropriate relations between previous experiences and the new situation.\[12\]

This study was interested in noting any significant difference in the cognitive processes of analysis, synthesis,


and evaluation between two groups of high school students while explaining and evaluating historical information. These two groups of students were dichotomized on the personality factors of dogmatism and immaturity in the hope of extending the insights already gained by recent studies of the affective influence of personality on the cognitive processes. As Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey state,

Not only is cognitive change a function of the characteristics of the nature of the pre-existing cognitive system; it is also a function of the characteristics of the person within whom the cognitive system resides—his intellectual abi-

lity, his ability to tolerate cognitive ambiguity and dissonance, his "open-mindedness" or "closed-
mindedness," his typical manner of coping with blocks to want satisfaction.\(^{13}\)

Frequently the defining or critical attributes or cues necessary for a pragmatically adequate or correct recognition and definition of a behavioral problematical situation are difficult to identify and categorize. This difficult condition of viewing as Bruner, Goodnow, and Austin point out, "... leads to categorizing or identification behavior that varies in a systematic way from the behavior prevailing under normal perceptual conditions."\(^{14}\) Due to the

---


complexity of human behavior and the failure of even those empirically verifiable conceptual models within the social sciences accurately to predict human outcomes, this condition of the inadequacy of viewing encourages the accompanying habit of fixating on a number of scientifically insufficient attributes or cues. It is in such a situation that the personality, through its values and needs, has an opportunity to color information.

Social psychology provides a useful conceptual model of the cognitive processes which this study has utilized in attempting to gain further insights into this riddle of how an individual perceives, remembers, and thinks. Eric Fromm, A. H. Maslow, T. W. Adorno, Eric Hoffer and Milton Rokeach among others have contributed significantly to the definition of a personality syndrome or pattern characterized as authoritarian or dogmatic, the full implications of which will be discussed in Chapter II. Such a well defined pattern provides clues worthy of empirical investigation as to how those directive factors function that influence what information is to be achieved, retained, and transformed into those cues and attributes (concepts) which shape the structure or perspective of an individual's phenomenological field. This "field" in turn utilizes these cues or attributes in identifying, categorizing, and judging what additional information has the capacity to arouse, confirm, or infirm a particular hypothesis or system thereof (conceptual model)
to be used in an inference being considered to explain a current puzzling situation. As Bruner points out,

The concept hypothesis is best likened to such terms as determining tendency, set, Aufgabe, cognitive predisposition. It may be regarded as a highly generalized state of readiness to respond selectively to classes of events in the environment. . . . A specific hypothesis is not simply an isolated expectancy about the environment but rather relates to more integrated systems of belief or expectancy.15

Previous studies of dogmatism have indicated that the dogmatic individual was more apt to lack the ability to reconstruct experience utilizing all relevant facts due to his lesser capacity to doubt or consider value-laden alternatives more objectively. To test this assumption operationally in the social studies classroom the writer attempted to investigate the number and type of concept hypotheses aroused by selected historical information containing a minimum of current emotional verbiage that would deal with present-day controversial issues which might have tended to polarize viewpoints prematurely. It was concluded from a pilot study that two slightly paraphrased philosophical statements in political context popular at the time of the writing of the United States Constitution would encourage a more rational treatment of data. The evaluation,

nevertheless, needed to be one that obviously would contain a basic difference in the concept of human nature that justifiably could differ theoretically between that group classified as immature, dogmatic and that group classified as mature, nondogmatic.

In summary the author in this study was concerned with the identification and analysis of the differences in the cognitive processes of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation between two groups of students dichotomized on the personality variable of dogmatism and immaturity. These cognitive processes were analyzed from the students' essay-type responses while explaining and evaluating two divergent philosophical statements in historical context. Differences in attitudes and beliefs as expressed in the evaluative statements hypothesized as supportive generalizations subsequently were judged for their similarity to the cognitive operational criteria utilized in defining the immature, dogmatic--mature, nondogmatic continuum. To investigate the problems enumerated above the following predictions have been hypothesized:¹⁶

¹⁶These hypotheses are stated as predicted outcomes arising from the theoretical perspective of this study rather than all being stated in the null form.
correctly restated, ignored, and misinterpreted for that point of view with which each member did not agree.

2. The immature, dogmatic group will not differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of cues correctly restated, ignored, and misinterpreted for that point of view with which each member agreed.

3. The immature, dogmatic group will differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of cues that were grounded for that point of view with which each member did not agree.

4. The immature, dogmatic group will not differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of cues that were grounded for that point of view with which each member agreed.

5. The immature, dogmatic group will differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of hypotheses that were offered to ground those cues that were utilized to support that point of view with which each member did not agree.

6. The immature, dogmatic group will not differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of hypotheses that were offered to ground those cues that were utilized to support that point of view with which each member agreed.

7. The value-orientation and manner of expression inherent in the generalizations offered as evaluative
hypotheses will separate the immature, dogmatic group from the mature, nondogmatic group.

Importance of the Problem

In discussing the results of his extensive attitude poll of high school students, Remmers made the following remarks on those responses related to citizenship education:

These tragic results seem to confirm beyond much doubt that our traditional freedom is already in danger. Certainly when nearly half of our teenagers feel that the people are incapable of making their own decisions, we have a massive and frightening rejection of the basic theory of democratic government. Social scientists agree that it makes little difference whether adolescents really believe these statements or are simply answering without fully considering all of the implications of their responses. In either case, their attitudes threaten our democratic values. If they have taken into account all the ramifications of their replies, then the results are truly antidemocratic. If they have answered without much thought, what is to prevent them from being misled by harangues of Fascistic leaders? 17

Accepting the findings of Remmers as valid, it becomes apparent that the social studies teacher, who logically should be a major surrogate of America's democratic heritage within the formalized climate of the schoolhouse, has failed to do his job of encouraging reflection. Implicit in this conclusion is the assumption that an individual who had achieved the skill and habit of reflection could not hold such antidemocratic views. Instead, personal achievement

of a more integrated, self-directive, and intellectualized approach to human experience would have given him a pragmatically realistic perspective that would foster more democratic, rational, humane behavior. It is assumed that such an achievement fortifies the individual's hope or faith that others too can attain through the same pragmatic process a perspective on life that will free the individual from his social, cultural, or personal myths that tend to cloud the cognitive processes with undue pessimism or optimism which frequently ends in a socially and psychologically unhealthy escape into fantasy or sterile disillusionment. Hullfish and Smith put this process of maturing in this way,

As the student progressively gains control of the process within which his reconstruction occurs, he may then develop a toughness that will enable him to face increasing challenges to his beliefs without risk of serious personality damage. He may then not only learn to weather situations that require comprehensive reconstructions, but in addition, sharpen his sensitivity to incongruency. His potential for self-education will thus be increased. Again, like the progress of science, the individual's education proceeds through accelerating and accumulative integrations, not by mere additive acts.13

With this affective variable of the immature, dogmatic--mature, nondogmatic continuum more fully analyzed in typical historical content terms, social studies teachers and supervisors should have more specific data related to the functioning of reflection in the context of personality. The

13Hullfish, op. cit., p. 61.
implications of this variable and its relation to other significant variables of the teaching-learning process such as teacher characteristics, creativity, anxiety, and teacher-pupil interaction will be touched upon in Chapter V.

Limitations of the Concepts and Instruments Used

1. This study was limited by its assumption that the reflective thought process as developed by Dewey, Griffin, Hullfish, and others is a valid and necessary means for the discovery of knowledge and truth. It was held, also, that this method is man's best hope for promoting self-actualizing, adequate personalities and for containing the dynamic, pulsating human condition within an understandable and humanitarian world of free men.

2. This study accepted the social psychological concept of the cognitive processes as a means of understanding the interaction of selected achieving (perceiving), retaining (remembering), and transforming (thinking) of information that can be utilized subsequently by an individual in the reflective thought process, or in other words, can become a part of the individual's phenomenological field.

3. This study was limited by the assumption that the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) and Inventory of Beliefs (Form I)\(^\text{19}\) developed by the Cooperative Study of Evaluation

\(^{19}\)Copies of both instruments are located in Appendix A.
in General Education reveals an individual's tendencies toward dogmatic and immature beliefs respectively as a part of the authoritarian personality syndrome.

4. This study was limited by the Likert-type method of construction of the dogmatism scale and the Inventory of Beliefs. Unlike the Thurstone scaling method the manifest content is not related as directly to the attitude being measured since the main criteria of acceptability is its high correlation with the total score and its diagnostic provability. The questions on the two personality scales, therefore, are not as obvious as would be otherwise tending to eliminate the possibility of the examinee faking responses or developing unconsciously a conditioned set that could slant the results of a series of responses. Individual scores are seen as simply relative to the distribution of the scores of the total population, not having an absolute meaning. The minimum and maximum scores have the most relative significance leaving those of the middle position rather meaningless. The actual mid-point is unknown since the total scale of any one instrument may be but a portion of a much broader continuum, the particular segment of which cannot be determined. Another weakness of the mid-point relates to two quite different ways of arriving at the same score which have different psychological meanings. One might either take a neutral position on most or all items or take equally extreme positions on about half of the items.
5. The study is limited in assuming that the method of cue and hypothesis tabulation used to evaluate the student responses to the philosophical statements was able to measure differences in the students' cognitive processes of analysis and synthesis.

6. It is also assumed that the paragraphs were ambiguous enough to elicit alternate hypotheses related to dogmatism and immaturity that furnish valid clues to competent judges in differentiating the written evaluative responses of the two dichotomous personality groups.

7. The analysis of hypotheses or assumptions used to support judgments in evaluating philosophical beliefs in historical perspective is limited to selected statements of two American patriots which made up the Historical Evaluation Test (HET)\textsuperscript{20} prepared by the author. The study assumes that these two statements, one slightly paraphrased from the writings of Alexander Hamilton and the other from the writings of Thomas Jefferson, truly represent points of view on man's basic nature in political context held by these men and were representative of other men who were influential in the founding of the United States.

Limitations of the Population Sample

1. The findings of this study were obtained from a single local study group. For this reason the findings, at

\textsuperscript{20}See Appendix A for a copy of the test.
their best, can be utilized in locating some avenues for further research with a study group at variance with the academic and social climate at this particular suburban, college preparatory four-year high school. The student body of approximately 875 provided a setting which was economically homogeneous, being composed mainly of middle and upper middle class students. The religious orientation was composed of substantial proportions of Protestants and Jews with a lesser number of Catholics.

2. Certainly the score profile of the sample and sub-sample on such areas as beliefs, values and intelligence was no more valid than the degree of concern and sincerity that was displayed generally while taking the tests. The author and the assisting school staff felt that the participation seemed very satisfactory with the exception of approximately 20 per cent who failed to carry out the instructions correctly, invalidating their scores. The writer, having worked in the school system utilized for the study and having known the staff as well as a number of the students in an earlier grade, felt that he had a sounder basis than might be assumed otherwise upon which to base his subjective judgment of student participation.

3. The population for the study was composed of 215 juniors who were completing, when the study began, the first of a two-year sequence in American Civilization covering
American history through the Civil War period. The students had progressed to beginning seniors before the final data had been collected.

Overview

The author identified a group of high school students that logically and empirically could be categorized as immature and dogmatic as displayed by their attitude and belief characteristics on two personality scales. To measure the significance to reflection of the attitude and belief pattern of the immature, dogmatic personality, the cognitive performance of this group was compared with another group displaying attitude and belief characteristics defined as mature and nondogmatic. The cognitive performance was tested by the comparative ability of the two groups to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate two divergent philosophically oriented statements in American historical context. First, this was measured by the amount of relevant information that had been achieved, retained, and transformed into those concepts which subsequently had shaped the cognitive structure or perspective of each student's phenomenological field while dealing with the philosophically oriented statements. Secondly, the cognitive performance was measured by the similarity of the attitude and belief patterns peculiar to the immature, dogmatic personality as revealed by each student's verbal expression and value-
orientation while hypothesizing generalizations used to substantiate and evaluate the philosophical statements.

Chapter II discusses the relevant theoretical or conceptual models upon which this study was based. Chapter III explains the methods and procedures related to collecting the data, utilizing the testing instruments, establishing the sample, and analyzing the data.

Chapter IV presents the findings and conclusions related to each of the hypotheses. Chapter V speculates on the general significance of the findings of the study to encouraging reflective thought in relation to such fields of educational research as teacher characteristics, creativity and learning, anxiety and learning, and teacher-pupil interaction analysis.
CHAPTER II

A SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

Having noted in Chapter I the role of reflective thought in promoting the learning process and its interrelatedness with the functioning of the cognitive processes, this chapter will point out the key theoretical propositions and supportive empirical findings that have influenced the development of the social psychological model of the cognitive processes that were used in this study. The related theory and empirical research have interacted among such fields as cognitive psychology, perception, personality theory, and general education theory.

The Development of the Social Psychological Model of the Cognitive Processes

Bartlett's work in the area of remembering in the late nineteen twenties and early thirties clarified and further defined some previous concepts dealing with the "higher mental processes," especially memory. Consequently he underscored his philosophical affiliation with such men as Wundt and Ebbinghaus who had followed what Allport calls
"the Liebnitzian Tradition." Bartlett offered some speculations growing out of his experiments that have continued to provide the basis for further cognitive research down to the present. He utilized the empirical methodology of experimental psychology without, however, dehumanizing his theoretical and experimental designs. In contrast to the methods and philosophy of the stimulus and response school of psychology, he recognized the reality of individual differences and utilized them in searching for common functional patterns or relationships that might underlie what appeared to be idiosyncratic behavior. He states,

Again the external conditions may vary, and the description of the responses evoked may vary, yet the mode of determination of the responses may remain substantially the same. For example, the sportsman describing a game, the politician giving an account of some current controversy of State, the musician talking about a concert, are all dealing with very diverse material, and no doubt their ways of fulfilling their task would appear very different to the observer. Yet their selection, criticism, arrangement and construction of material may be quite strictly comparable, because they are the work of internal determining factors belonging to the same order.\footnote{In defining the term Gordon W. Allport says, "The Leibnitzian tradition . . . maintains that the person is not a collection of acts, nor simply the locus of acts; the person is the source of acts. And activity itself is not conceived as agitation resulting from pushes by internal or external stimulation. It is purposive. To understand what a person is, it is necessary always to refer to what he may be in the future, for every state of the person is pointed in the direction of future possibilities." For a fuller discussion, see Gordon W. Allport, Becoming (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955), p. 12.}

\footnote{F. C. Bartlett, Remembering (London: Cambridge University Press, 1932), p. 10.}
Bartlett suggested that patterns in internal thought processes may exist that, if discovered, would establish valid generalizations on types of human behavior that previously had appeared to be unique responses or behaviors to a particular stimulus or combination of stimuli.

Bartlett also expanded the concept of "schemata" that he attributed to his colleague, Sir Henry Head, at the Laboratory of Experimental Psychology in the University of Cambridge. Bartlett saw it as a dynamic, everchanging perspective whose similarities to the ongoing reconstruction of experience in the tradition of the instrumentalists' concept of the learning process as defined by Dewey, Griffin, Hullfish, and others can be readily discerned. In discussing the "schemata" concept, Bartlett says,

Determination by schemata is the most fundamental of all the ways in which we can be influenced by reactions and experiences which occurred some time in the past. All incoming impulses of a certain kind, or mode, go together to build up an active, organized setting: visual, auditory, various types of cutaneous impulses, and the like, at a relatively low level; all the experiences connected by a common interest: in sport, in literature, history, art, science, philosophy and so on, on a higher level. There is not the slightest reason, however, to suppose that each set of incoming impulses, each new group of experiences persists as an isolated member of some passive patchwork. They have to be regarded as constituents of living, momentary settings belonging to the organism, or to whatever parts of the organism are concerned in making a response of a given kind, and not as a number of individual events somehow strung together and stored within the organism.3

3Ibid., p. 201.
Bartlett, therefore, along with directing attention to the theoretical benefits of studying what appeared to be idiosyncratic behavior along common functional lines, also prescribed a method of classifying all sensory impulses in a manner that subsequently was to influence Postman and Bruner among others in their concept of what is now more commonly called an individual's cognitive structure to be discussed more fully later in the chapter.

Bartlett also speculated on the significant role of inherent physical determinants versus culturally acquired interests and attitudes within the philosophical traditions of the Gestalt school. He was interested in the evolution of what already has been pointed out as the "schema" that is selectively structured from previously experienced perceptual or conceptual events when an individual deals with a current problematical situation. He suggests,

When any series of events occur which go to build up that sort of organized mass of experiences which Head calls a "schema," what is it that gives to certain of these events, other than the last, a predominant function, and at the same time tends to individualise them in the mass? It is appetite, instinct, interests and ideals, the first two being much the more important in early stages of organic development, and the last two advancing to positions of great, and very likely of chief, importance at the human level. These are all factors which are peculiarly easily transmitted, and so the human infant begins with, or rapidly acquires, certain predisposing tendencies which at once cut across the strict chronological mode of organising past experience.4

Bartlett thus revealed his theoretical predisposition and set the scene for further cognitive theory research when he stated that "Remembering is not a completely independent function, entirely distinct from perceiving, imagining, or even from constructive thinking, but it has intimate relations with them all."5

In keeping with Bartlett's philosophical perspective, though not necessarily with his empirical methodology, was Tolman who drew some tentative findings on cognitive functioning from the study of rats. He demonstrated in one experiment the existence of an aspect of what in popular terms now would be called a "cognitive structure" which he designated "latent learning." He was alluding to that tendency of an organism to learn unobtrusively something without one's behavior indicating the fact until a particular need calls for the behavior. He referred to the development of such a tendency as a "cognitive map" that becomes operational after a puzzling situation has been interpreted by the organism as calling for the "map" as a means to accomplish the need-related goal. In explaining this experiment done by Spence and Lippitt at the University of Iowa, he says,

A simple Y-maze with two goal-boxes was used. Water was at the end of the right arm of the Y and food at the end of the left arm. During the training period the rats were run neither hungry

5Ibid., p. 13.
nor thirsty. They were satiated for both food and water before each day's trials. However, they were willing to run because after each run they were taken out of whichever end box they had got to and put into a living cage with other animals. They were given four trials a day in this fashion for seven days, two trials to the right and two to the left. In the crucial test the animals were divided into two subgroups one made solely hungry and one solely thirsty. It was then found that on the first trial the hungry group went at once to the left, where the food had been, statistically more frequently than to the right, and the thirsty group went to the right, where the water had been, statistically more frequently than to the left. . . . In short, they had acquired a cognitive map to the effect that food was to the left and water to the right, although during the acquisition of this map they had not exhibited any stimulus-response propensities to go more to the side which became later the side of the appropriate goal.6

Tolman's intellectual jump into the realm of human behavior with his theory of narrow cognitive strip maps versus broad cognitive strip maps is relevant to the present study which deals with reactions to selected defining cues or attributes of a group of students designated as immature, dogmatic in contrast with another group designated as mature, nondogmatic. He pointed out that there is much evidence throughout the literature on the variance among individuals to the number of possible cues to which they are able to make adequate responses. He offers these conclusions:

I can merely summarize it by saying that narrow strip maps rather than broad comprehensive maps

seem to be induced: (1) by a damaged brain, (2) by an inadequate array of environmentally presented cues, (3) by an overdoes of repetitions on original trained-on path and (4) by the presence of too strongly motivated or of too strongly frustrating conditions.7

Postman saw the instrumentalist view of the cognitive processes as the grounds upon which theories of personality and social psychology might be articulated. He points out their common intellectual interest:

For those concerned with personality dynamics and with social processes have always been impressed with the highly selective and idiosyncratic interpretations of the environment rooted in deep-seated motivations and in strongly reinforced social and cultural norms.8

It is from this perspective that social psychology continues to develop a science of social behavior through cognitive theory to try to understand how man comes by the ideas about things and people which make up his cognitions or world image. Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey state,

The cognitive component of an attitude consists of the beliefs of the individual about the object. ... The most critical cognitions incorporated in the attitude system are evaluative beliefs which involve the attribute of favorable or unfavorable, desirable or undesirable, "good" or "bad" qualities to the object.9

---

7Ibid., pp. 205, 207.


Some investigators have explored in learning situations various ramifications of this concept. Clark noted the superior recall of high school girls which could not be attributed to the superiority of verbal memory of a prose passage on a male-female conflict, in which the female was represented as superior. The conclusion was that, "In general it may be stated that set (frame of reference) at the time of perception has a significant effect upon the gross quantitative aspects of the recall of the same meaningful prose material."¹⁰

Levine and Murphy¹¹ had a group of five pro-communists and a group of five anti-communists at New York City College study two paragraphs on the Soviet Union, one had a pro-communist bent and the other one was excitedly anti-communist. The difference in retention of the anti-communist material was statistically significant for the two groups throughout, that of the pro-communist paragraph statistically significant during the forgetting period which was the last five weeks of the nine week experiment at which time the paragraph was no longer reviewed.


L later studies include one by Taft\textsuperscript{12} of delinquent white and Negro boys. He showed the superiority of recall of the Negro boys of the favorable and unfavorable items on immediate recall and favorable items on delayed recall of a partially fictitious story of a Negro baseball player who had to go to Brazil to play in the major leagues due to the type of prejudice then existing in the United States. Gustafson\textsuperscript{13} displayed the significance of ethnic group membership, classified as Jewish Americans, Dominant Americans, and Negro Americans, to retention of selected facts pertaining to American history. Fitzgerald and Ausubel\textsuperscript{14} demonstrated the importance to remembering of the existence of the "other side" subsuming ideas to aid in the retention of new negatively perceived controversial material, that is, the importance of a previously acquired cognitive structure to which the negatively biased information can be functionally related.


\textsuperscript{13}Lucille Gustafson, "Relationship between Ethnic Group Membership and the Retention of Selected Facts Pertaining to American History and Culture," \textit{Journal of Educational Sociology}, XXXI (October, 1957).

\textsuperscript{14}Donald Fitzgerald and David P. Ausubel, "Cognitive versus Affective Factors in the Learning and Retention of Controversial Material," A paper based on unpublished Doctorial dissertation, the University of Illinois, Urbana, 1959. (Mimeographed.)
Cognitive theory, in other words, states that the evaluative beliefs are an ongoing directive component of the cognitive processes defined by Bruner, Goodnow and Austin as "... the means whereby organisms achieve [perceive], retain [remember], and transform information [think]." An individual's cognitive map or the way persons and things look to him is in turn a product of what Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey point out as "(1) his physical and social environments, (2) his physiological structure, (3) his wants and goals, (4) his past experiences."

This theoretical perspective overcomes some of the intellectual limitations of such previous theories on human behavior as Gestalt theory, behaviorism, and classical psychoanalysis. As Rokeach mentions,

For them [Gestaltists], the model of man seems to be primarily a rational one. People act primarily in accord with the meaningful structural, configurational requirements of the situation. Action on the basis of irrational motives or arbitrary external reinforcements is de-emphasized.\[17\]

The other extreme has man a prisoner of his own pressures irrelevant to the situation. Behaviorism is predicted on these terms as is classical psychoanalysis. Rokeach states,


"For behaviorism, action is determined by arbitrary reinforcements and arbitrary associations [external factors]; for classical psychoanalysis, action is determined by id and superego strivings [internal factors]."\(^{18}\) As an individual's belief system (cognitive structure) becomes more open to reality these theories become less tenable. Smith, Bruner, and White refer to this same phenomenon when they say, "...we have been impelled to treat the function of an opinion as a resultant or compromise between reality demands, social demands, and inner psychological demands."\(^{19}\)

Therefore, the cognitive theoretical approach in general and Rokeach's belief-disbelief system in particular, to be discussed more fully in the following paragraphs, reconciles the interacting internal and external pressures acted upon functionally by the individual by serving as Rokeach says, "...two powerful and conflicting sets of motives at the same time: the need for a cognitive framework to know and to understand and the need to ward off threatening aspects of reality."\(^{20}\) The degree to which one of these functions dominates determines the individual's over-all inclination toward "openness" or "closedness." Krech, 

\(^{18}\)Ibid., p. 65.


Crutchfield, and Ballachey have the same point in mind when they state,

One main factor that initiates cognitive change is the blockage of want satisfaction. Whether the resultant cognitive change is or is not adaptive depends upon the strength of the want, and the accuracy with which the block to the goal is perceived. Another main factor initiating cognitive change is change in the individual's information. But mere exposure to new information does not guarantee that the individual will pay attention to or accept the new information. Despite new information, his feelings, emotions, and wants may prevent cognitive change.21

A Method of Studying Cognition

Postman developed in conjunction with Bruner a hypothesis-information theory to study cognition. They saw it as a useful avenue to analyze many of the ramifications of the cognitive processes that have been elaborated upon somewhat in the previous paragraphs. Postman states,

To summarize, then, hypothesis is an intervening construct used to account for observed empirical relationships in cognitive behavior. They are conceived as predispositions or expectancies of the organism which organize and transform selectively incoming stimulus information (perception) and continue to transform it after removal of the stimulus (memory). Hypotheses are anchored operationally in discriminable stimulus information on the one hand and various classes of responses (e.g., verbal reactions and motor acts) on the other.22

22Postman, op. cit., p. 250.
Postman suggested that the theory could be utilized to accomplish the following:

The ultimate tasks of the theory are these: (1) to specify the hypotheses which operate in the transformation and organization of information; (2) to describe the conditions which govern the acquisition of hypotheses; (3) to analyze the information on which the hypotheses operate; and (4) to build a model representing the mode of operation of hypotheses.23

These are questions which this study, too, hopes to explore as related to the development of historical concepts in a high school social studies classroom.

Perhaps of most significance to the present study was the adoption of the hypothesis-information-confirmation theory dealing with perception to the hypothesis-trace-confirmation theory related to remembering and its conceptual qualities. Postman states,

Remembering is a clear case of cognitive organization which must take place without opportunity for trial and check against appropriate stimulus information. We would expect, then, that it is in memory, perhaps even more clearly than in perception, that the directive effect of hypotheses and schemata can be demonstrated. . . . Let us consider the remembering situation as one in which the subject is faced with the task of reconstructing a past event, and again let us analyze his behavior in terms of hypotheses and appropriate information. His hypotheses derive from his initial perception of the situation. The appropriate stimulus information in terms of which the initial perceptual hypotheses were checked is, however, no longer present but is, we assume, represented by a system of traces. Paralleling the hypothesis-information-confirmation cycle in perception, we now posit an

23Ibid., p. 250.
hypothesis-trace-confirmation cycle in remembering.\textsuperscript{24}

Postman wrestles a bit with the problem of what information is accepted as data in choosing those hypotheses that are held to be important in describing, analyzing, or predicting social behavior. He points out,

Our theory would require us to specify not only the nature and substance of hypotheses about self, others, and society, but also what information is appropriate to the confirmation of such hypotheses.\textsuperscript{25}

In discussing a possible answer to his dilemma which his colleague, Bruner, clarified in a latter work, Postman says,

What type of stimulus information is appropriate to the verification of such hypotheses? [dealing with interpreting others' feelings, impressions, etc., or one's own feelings, impressions, etc.]

It is unlikely that the appropriate stimulus information can be specified in energy terms but we should be able to specify it in terms of relevant cues.\textsuperscript{26}

It is an aspect of this method that was utilized in the present study in analyzing the hypotheses that were offered to explain the defining attributes or cues that were presented to the students to categorize two philosophical views that were to be evaluated in historical perspective.

Bruner gets at this problem of the relevant cues in hypothesis activation with the concept of perceptual and conceptual categories. He discusses an individual's

\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., pp. 263, 265.
\textsuperscript{25}Ibid., p. 269.
\textsuperscript{26}Ibid., p. 269.
tendencies to categorize objects, feelings, that is, human experience, in equivalence as well as identity classes. He states,

We speak of an equivalence class when an individual responds to a set of discriminable different things as the same kind of thing, or as amounting to the same thing. . . . While there is a striking phenomenological difference between identity and equivalence, both depend upon the acceptance of certain properties of objects as being criterial or relevant. . . and others as being irrelevant.  

Bruner in discussing categories underscores his philosophical nominalism view which he holds in common with the instrumentalists and social evolutionists among others. He explains,

The recognition of the constructive or invented status of categories [versus categories as immutable facts of nature] changes drastically the nature of the equivalence problem as a topic for psychological research. The study of equivalence becomes, essentially, a study of coding and re-coding processes employed by organisms who have past histories and present requirements to be met.  

The selectivity of the coding operation, therefore, becomes dependent on the past history of an individual in biosocial terms as well as the particular present requirements or conditions that need to be met.

The Relation of Personality to Cognition

The element of personality in directing the cognitive operation of an anticipatory and exploratory nature enters

\[27\] Bruner, op. cit., p. 4.

\[28\] Ibid., p. 7.
into the selection of what categories an individual will make to classify an experience. The "flavor" or affective nature of the perceptual or conceptual "field" encourages a "mental set." Bruner states,

Anticipatory categorizing, then provides "lead time" for adjusting one's response to objects with which one must cope. . . . It is not simply that organisms code the events of their environment into equivalence classes, but that they utilize cues for doing so that allow an opportunity for prior adjustment to the event identified.\(^\text{29}\)

The expectancy, a function of the personality, limits what could be possible for the particular individual. It is in Bruner's second specific case of the utility of the "empty category" that the present study has particular relevance. In other words, it was assumed that the study dealt with that aspect of problem-solving that went beyond the range of events one encounters to the sphere of the possible, or beyond the mere regurgitation of facts to a synthesis and an evaluation, for as Bruner says, "Hypotheses in problem-solving often take the form of creating new categories by the combining of potential defining attributes."\(^\text{30}\) The instrument developed for this study to measure the cognitive processes combined those attributes considered criterial for defining two philosophical viewpoints related to man's potentialities in political context that were held by Thomas Jefferson and

\(^{29}\text{Ibid.}, p. 14.\)

\(^{30}\text{Ibid.}, p. 14.\)
Alexander Hamilton. It was, then, the job of the previously identified immature, dogmatic group and the mature, non-dogmatic group to bring what they thought were relevant hypotheses derived from their knowledge (previous perceptions and conceptions considered correct and relevant to substantiate these two dichotomous points of view.

It was assumed, that the type of personality which Combs and Snygg term the adequate or inadequate personality would have a significant bearing on the perspective of the learner while analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating problematical situations. More specifically for this study, the hypothesis was tested that the personality has a bearing on what the individual is able to conceive as possible in establishing those inferences that he feels are relevant and valid. The number and value-orientation of these hypothesized generalizations were thus analyzed.

Arnold, in attempting to study the differences in perspective for action of the successful individual versus the unsuccessful individual, utilized a projective type technique to study motivation. She developed a set of criteria for evaluating the type of human actions enorporated in a sequence of paragraph size stories activated by the TAT pictures. In contrast to the motivational studies of McClelland and others who were involved with the study of McClelland and others, The Achievement Motive (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953).
story themes activated by the TAT pictures, she was concerned with the plot and outcome for establishing an integrated type summary of the person's action potential.

Arnold, in describing her methodology, states,

Each story is condensed into an import that leaves out incidental details but preserves the kernel—the meat of the story. When all the imports are read in sequence, a picture of the individual emerges that does portray his attitudes, his intentions for action. Every story makes a point, expresses a conviction. It describes an action that may be headed for success or failure, may exemplify cooperation or hostility, may be an attempt to cope with adversity or betray spineless acceptance of whatever may come. Or, the story may speak of hopes and dreams rather than actions and depend on fate or luck to make them come true. In every case, emotions may influence the action, but the outcome is primarily an expression of the storyteller's convictions, garnered from experience and reflection. The plot sets a problem, the outcome solves it. Both the type of problem a man sets himself and the kind of outcome he prefers are characteristics for him.\(^{32}\)

In the present study, the Historical Evaluation Test (HET), which is discussed in detail in Chapter III, provided the projective instrument. It set the problem, then allowed the examinee through the value-orientation and verbal expression of his hypothesized generalizations to set the mood, to establish a "plot" for each philosophical viewpoint. These two "plots," in turn, had an effect on what the "outcome" or the evaluation of the two "plots" would be. A study of such generalizations is significant because it controls the

alternatives of action available to the individual. As Parsons and Shils note in their Introduction, "Generalization as a cognitive mechanism orders the object world and thereby defines the structure of alternatives open to the orientation of action."33

The Authoritarian Personality

Combs and Snygg describe adequate personalities as those who "(1) perceive themselves in essentially positive ways, (2) are capable of acceptance of self and others, and (3) perceive themselves as closely identified with others."34 Inadequate personalities in exhibiting contrary characteristics are referred to by Combs and Snygg as

... those who regard themselves as unable to achieve need satisfaction. ... Their experience has taught them that they are more often than not unliked, unwanted, unacceptable, or unworthy. Seeing themselves in these ways, inadequate personalities find living a difficult and hazardous process in which they must constantly be prepared for emergencies. They feel threatened so much of the time that we might well use the term "threatened people" as synonymous with inadequate personalities.35


through his work in psychoanalysis, pieced together a number of personality characteristics from his analysis of patients who wanted to flee from the responsibilities and privileges related to maintaining their freedom. He then theorized on the significance of these human tendencies in the social-cultural evolution of our Western society. His characterization made at the time of the Fascist conquests of the early nineteen forties stimulated further studies. Fromm elaborates on the sadomasochistic tendencies in the normal person which he labels the "authoritarian character."

... the most important feature to be mentioned is its attitude towards power... The feature common to all authoritarian thinking is the conviction that life is determined by forces outside of man's own self, his interest, his wishes... To suffer without complaining is his highest virtue—-not the courage of trying to end suffering or at least to diminish it. Not to change fate, but to submit to it, is the heroism of the authoritarian character. ... He has belief in authority as long as it is strong and commanding. His belief is rooted ultimately in his doubts and constitutes an attempt to compensate them. But he has no faith, if we mean by faith the secure confidence in the realization of what now exists only as a potentiality... Any threat against vital (material and emotional) interests creates anxiety. The threat can be circumscribed in a particular situation by particular persons. In such a case, the destructiveness is aroused towards these persons. It can also be a constant—though not necessarily conscious—-anxiety springing from an equally constant feeling of being threatened by the world outside. This kind of constant anxiety results from the position of the isolated and powerless individual and is one other source of the reservoir of destructiveness that develops in him.36

Maslow building on Fromm's authoritarian character combines many of the attributes mentioned above plus a few more in an over-all rationale called the "world-view." He points out,

This diversity of single characteristics can be understood only, I believe, by understanding the basic philosophy of the authoritarian person. This basic philosophy I shall call the "world view." Like other psychologically insecure people, the authoritarian person lives in a world which may be conceived to be pictured by him as a sort of jungle in which man's hand is necessarily against every other man's, in which the whole world is conceived of as dangerous, threatening, or at least challenging, and in which human beings are conceived of as primarily selfish or evil or stupid.37

Maslow, consequently, had a more cogent rationale to explain the attitudes, values, and behaviors that were beginning to be theoretically and empirically attributed to the authoritarian personality. He thus was able to say,

To carry the analogy further, this jungle is peopled with animals who either eat or are eaten, who are either to be feared or despised. One's safety lies in one's own strength and this strength consists primarily in the power to dominate. If one is not strong enough the only alternative is to find a strong protector. If this protector is strong enough and can be relied upon, then peace of a certain sort is possible to the individual.38

Adorno and his Berkeley colleagues applied some of the typically social psychological empirical techniques such as interviewing, statistical analysis, and sampling in attempting

38Ibid., p. 403.
to test more rigorously various ramifications originating in the earlier writings such as those mentioned above. On the basis of eighty interview cases Adorno reported a highly significant relationship between ethnocentrism and preconceived categorizations inaccessible to new experience which Rokeach confirmed in an independent investigation which grew out of the Berkeley group's work. Though Hyman and Sheatsley were able to locate some empirical and theoretical imperfections in the study, it did clarify some directive factors related to the cognitive processes of the fascist authoritarian personality and suggest some further lines of investigation which Rokeach among others was able to utilize.

The authoritarian personality syndrome evolved from such investigations as have been enumerated within such conceptual frameworks as sado-masochism, "world-view," anti-sematism, ethnocentrism, and the fascist mentality. That is, there was conceived in Maslow's terms

\[ \ldots \text{a structural, organized complex of apparently diverse specificities (behavior, thoughts,} \]

\[ \text{\textit{39}} \text{. W. Adorno et al., The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950).} \]

\[ \text{\textit{40}} \text{. Milton Rokeach, "Generalized Mental Rigidity as a Factor in Ethnocentrism," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLIII (July, 1948).} \]

\[ \text{\textit{41}} \text{. For a criticism on sampling techniques see especially pp. 54-69, or on the analytic scheme see pp. 89-119 of Herbert H. Hyman and Paul B. Sheatsley, "The Authoritarian Personality"--A Methodological Critique, Studies in the Scope and Method of Authoritarian Personality, eds. Richard Christie and Marie Jahoda (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1954), pp. 50-122.} \]
impulses to action, perceptions, etc.) which, however, when studied carefully and validly, are found to have a common unity which may be phrased variously as a similar dynamic "meaning," "flavor," function, purpose or aim.42

Smith, Bruner, and White summarize this personality type as evidencing

Conventionalism; submission to idealized authority figures; hostility toward those violating social norms; dislike of subjectivity: "anti-intraception"; superstitiousness and stereotypy; preoccupation with strength and toughness; destructive cynicism toward human nature; tendency to project unacceptable impulses; and exaggerated concern with sexual "goings on."43

Rokeach, following his initial work on ethnocentrism illustrated through factorial analysis a new personality type related to authoritarianism but distinctly and significantly different. He concludes,

From all the preceding we conclude that dogmatism, as conceived and represented, measures something similar to authoritarianism but independently of the left-right dimension (Factor II). It is also discriminable from rigidity, and ethnocentrism. Finally, it seems to be related to anxiety.44

From this and other investigations Rokeach developed his three dimensional model of open-closed belief systems that

42A. H. Maslow, "Dynamics of Personality Organization I," The Psychological Review, L (September, 1943), 525.

43Smith, op. cit., p. 23.

provided the framework for his dogmatism scale used in this study.45

Rokeach structured these three dimensions on a working definition of an individual's generalized cognitive perspective on authority. As he mentions,

In attempting to formulate the basic defining characteristic of openness-closedness, we could have let the whole matter go by simply saying that the fundamental basis is the extent to which there is reliance on absolute authority.46

It is assumed that all individuals must utilize authority in gaining knowledge and experience in those areas of life in which they have not had the opportunity or do not have the skill to draw their own conclusions. The point is that it has a different meaning for the open versus the closed mind. The open minded person tends to evaluate puzzling situations more "realistically" and to have at his cognitive disposal more relevant and more scientifically honed generalizations to use as hypotheses when drawing inferences. Rokeach explained the difference in these terms:

We assume that, in any situation in which a person must act, there are certain characteristics of the situation that point to the appropriate action to be taken. If the person reacts in terms of such relevant characteristics, his responses should be correct or appropriate. The same situation also contains irrelevant factors, not related to the

45 For a detailed treatment see Milton Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind, Chapter III.

inner structure or requirements of the situation. To the extent that response depends on such irrelevant factors, it should be unintelligent or inappropriate. Every person, then must be able to evaluate adequately both the relevant and irrelevant information he receives from every situation. This leads us to suggest a basic characteristic that defines the extent to which a person's system is open or closed; namely, the extent to which the person can receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic merits, unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside.  

These irrelevant factors that might be related to a particular situation of an internal nature, as suggested by Rokeach, refer to such aspects of the personality as habits, beliefs, perceptual cues, irrational ego motives, power needs, the need for self-aggrandizement and the need to allay anxiety. Those that are irrelevant of an external nature deal with reward and punishment that arise from external authority, which would include parents, peers, reference groups, social and institutional norms, and cultural norms.

The closed-minded by feeling more strongly threatened or anxious is unable to evaluate information independent of source. He feels the need to accept all that an authority figure offers or to reject it all. For the open-minded in a more friendly world, he is more impervious to irrelevant pressures. The power of authority is evident, but his acceptance depends on the authority's cognitive correctness,

---

47 Ibid., p. 57.
accuracy, and consistency with his previously acquired information about the world.

In his famous Doodlebug Problem, Rokeach illustrated that in analyzing a fictitious world with a minature belief system, the open and closed minded did not vary significantly. It was in the following cognitive operation of applying these newly acquired beliefs in a new puzzling situation that the open and closed minded varied significantly. Consequently, it was in the synthesis rather than the analytic phase of the problem-solving that the open-minded excelled the closed-minded. Rokeach states his findings as follows:

The results show that subjects with relatively closed systems, as measured by the Dogmatism Scale, take longer to solve the Doodlebug Problem than do subjects with relatively open systems. This is clearly due to differences in the ability to synthesize, and not in the ability to analyze. These findings become more understandable in the light of additional findings which suggest that relatively closed persons have greater difficulty in remembering the beliefs to be integrated. Greater difficulty in recall, in turn, seems to be related to an unwillingness to play along, or to entertain new belief systems.48

By allowing the closed-minded subject to keep the new beliefs in their perceptual field, memory and the synthesis of the new beliefs into a new system were facilitated which, in

48Ibid., p. 213.
consequence, decreased the total amount of time to solve the fictitious problem. He concludes,

The results found cannot be attributed to differences in intelligence between closed and open subjects, or between subjects under the two experimental conditions. We favor the view that the differences can better be understood as arising from the greater threat to closed persons of the new Doodlebug system. 49

Other studies have attempted to investigate facets of problem-solving as related to the rigid, authoritarian, or dogmatic personality. Solomon, while studying the adeptness of a group of subjects to group ten interrelated concepts into a single whole, found that "The rigid individuals seem to show an inability to go beyond the mere factual information at hand and react on the basis of each individual fact separately. The rigid group does not see a relationship of one piece of factual information to others." 50 Kemp, too, in his study of problem-solving has concluded from his research that the less efficient performance of the high dogmatic was due to the following factors:

1. Difficulty in tolerating ambiguities which leads to a "closure" before full consideration is given to each piece of contributing evidence.
2. A perceptual distortion of facts resulting in a decision which does not encompass all elements of the problem.

49 Ibid., pp. 213-14.
3. Lack of recognition or rejection of significant parts of the whole problem in order to accommodate it into the preformed value pattern, resulting in a poor or incorrect solution.51

This generalized tendency of the dogmatic personality to fail to synthesize suggested to the writer the problem upon which this study is based. The rationale, procedures, and methods of which are to be discussed more fully in Chapters III and IV.

**General Education's Goal of Student Maturity**

Many proponents of general education in the public schools recognized, too, during the early decades of this century the instrumentalist insights on learning as necessitating a reconstruction of the experience of the learner in order to encourage the development of an autonomous, self-directing individual. Certainly such pronouncements as the Seven Cardinal Principles of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education of the National Education Association52 and those of the Educational Policies Commission53 are examples of this widening of the responsibility of the

---


secondary school to meet more effectively the needs of all adolescents of secondary school age. It was recognized that a dynamic, ever-changing world demanded reflective cognitive techniques if the individual was to adjust intelligently to the evolving social and cultural conditions. Therefore, what was defined as intelligent behavior often was dependent upon an individual's concept of authority. One of the basic goals or purposes of general education was the type of personality that has been identified as relatively "open."
The Report of the Committee on the Function of the Social Studies in General Education illustrates this fact quite well. In its opening chapter discussing the role of the school, the report states,

No more significant task faces the school than that of finding effective and acceptable means of doing three related things: first, of strengthening allegiance to those values which are essential for democratic living; second, of helping young people to make their own choices among other competing values in such ways as to result in the progressive integration of their individual personalities; and, third, of helping them develop a tolerance of the choices made by others, an awareness of the virtues of a heterogeneity which is yet unaccompanied by a weakening and distingregating sense of disloyalty and doubt regarding their own standards . . . . Adolescents must be provided with opportunities for making their choices wisely, for gaining the attitudes and skills necessary for coping effectively with heterogeneity and change.54

---
Within the philosophical perspective of these earlier statements on general education is the 1954 Report of the Cooperative Study of Evaluation in General Education of the American Council on Education. In discussing the specifics of an instrument for the evaluation of the product of general education, Dressel and Mayhew, the committee's director and assistant director, respectively, state,

Instruments resulting would be concerned with the differentiation between the mature, independent, reality-minded, flexible, adaptive, secure, and comfortable individual who is seen as the potential base and anticipated outcome of a program of general education in a free society, and the childish, self-centered, threatened, aggressive, rigid, compulsive, insecure, and uncomfortable individual whose concomitant attitudes and values are seen as essentially antidemocratic and in opposition to the objectives of general education.55

The review of the literature related to general education, therefore, supports the fact that the Inventory of Beliefs developed by the Cooperative Study of Evaluation in General Education was structured to filter the immature believer from his more mature fellows was based primarily upon the same rationale as that of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale although no published study to the author's knowledge has attempted to show their high statistical correlation.

To summarize, it has been the purpose of this chapter to elaborate on some of the milestones in the evolution of

the concept of the cognitive processes utilized in the theoretical model of this study. Bartlett by synthesizing the empirical exactness of the English Experimental Psychology School with the Wundtian activistic school provided a scientifically firm and, subsequently proven, fruitful foundation for the cognitive research that followed.

Postman and Bruner, among others, saw the usefulness of Bartlett's "schema" concept which they broadened into their hypothesis-information-confirmation theory utilized in explaining perception and hypothesis-trace-confirmation theory utilized in explaining conceptual traits. Bruner in his work with Smith and White illustrated the interview method for attempting to locate the biosocial determinates of personality and their relevancy to opinions or attitudes. Bruner also has displayed along with his colleagues, Goodnow and Austin, the conceptual utility to the study of the cognitive processes of defining further what is meant by equivalence categories and noting the possible role of attitude in determining these categories.

Rokeach performed the meaningful synthesis of the leading social psychological tenets of cognitive theory and the defining attributes of the authoritarian syndrome contributed to by such scholars as Fromm, Maslow, Adorno, Hoffer, and others. Rokeach employed aspects of the two fields in developing a significantly reliable and verifiable scale for identifying a closed type of personality
that is anxiety ridden and that does not have the capacity to doubt. This failure to be able to doubt, as was discussed at some length in Chapter I, prevents the type of reflective thought that is a prime prerequisite for learning. Dressel and Mayhew evidence this same concern for encouraging reflective thought in their report of the Cooperative Study of Evaluation in General Education. Their attempt to identify the holder of immature beliefs resulted in an instrument based on a similar rationale to that of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale.

This study now will focus on the procedures and methods used by this writer in establishing the members of two dichotomous personality groups who, subsequently, evaluated defining attributes or cues given in two philosophical statements dealing with man's potentialities in political, historical context. Chapter III also will discuss the rationale behind the development of the test that presented these two philosophical positions to which the students were to offer hypotheses supporting each position.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Through this study the author wanted to validate certain hypothesized differences in how the members of a group of high school students previously categorized as immature, dogmatic differed from another group categorized as mature, nondogmatic in their cognitive functioning while dealing with value-laden historical information. The author also wanted to note the similarity of attitude and belief patterns originally measured by the personality scales to those attitudes and beliefs revealed by the hypothesized generalizations used to evaluate the two divergent philosophical statements. The methods and procedures utilized in gathering and analyzing the data related to these concerns now will be discussed in detail.

Data Collection Sequence

To accomplish the two purposes enumerated above, in the spring of the 1963-1964 school year, the author administered the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) and the Inventory of Beliefs (Form I) developed by the Cooperative Study of Evaluation in General Education to 215 high school juniors during one school day in their regular forty-two minute
American Civilization class period. In the third week of the following fall term, the now senior class took the Historical Evaluation Test (HET) under the direction of the author on a single day during most of their regular newly lengthened fifty-five minute American Civilization class period.¹

With such an essay evaluation as the Historical Evaluation Test, it was assumed that verbal reasoning (intelligence) would be an intervening variable if appropriate statistical controls were not followed. For this reason, the Verbal Reasoning section of the Differential Aptitude Test (DAT) was given by the author in mid-October to the population on a single day during a thirty minute span of time within another fifty-five minute American Civilization class period. During this final session, additional information was requested from the population on 3 x 5 cards. Each student was to state his sex, house of worship (if any), age (months and years), type of parental occupation (self-employed, business firm, or government), and resident data (number of occupants, bedrooms, and baths), all of which, it was subsequently decided, would not be utilized in the statistical controls of this study.

¹Copies of all the testing instruments are found in Appendix A.
Testing Instruments Utilized

Rokeach Dogmatism Scale

The Dogmatism Scale was constructed deductively by Rokeach. In accomplishing this, he formulated his three dimensional system introduced in Chapter II in classifying the various defining characteristics of the open and closed mind. From these he constructed statements such as the following that attempted to evaluate these characteristics: "It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes." This statement is to measure the relative degrees of differentiation of the belief and the disbelief systems, a part of Rokeach's first dimension to be discussed (below) in detail. This statement along with the others on the scale offer the examinee the following six choices: to agree a little, on the whole, or very much; or to disagree a little, on the whole, or very much.

It was assumed that each statement in the scale transcended ideological positions if it was actually to reach the formal and structural characteristics of all positions. As Rokeach points out,

A person may espouse a set of beliefs that are democratic in content. He may take a militant stand against segregation; he may advocate permissiveness in parent-child relationships; he may regard McCarthy as a demagogue. Yet adherence to such

beliefs, considered alone, is not necessarily a true guide of an anti-authoritarian outlook. For a person espousing such beliefs may still strike us, from the way he espouses his beliefs as authoritarian, intolerant of those who disagree with him and closed in his mode of thought and belief. The discrepancy we may note between what is said and the way it is said is a discrepancy between content and structure. Our theoretical task, then, is to formulate the formal and structural properties of belief systems apart from specific content, and in such a way that they can be measured. We need some way to think about a person's belief system which will enable us to skirt around the content of the belief system and still reveal, intact, its structure. 

Therefore, anyone adhering dogmatically to any viewpoint, whether it be capitalism or communism, Catholicism or anti-Catholicism, was to score at the same end of the dogmatic-nondogmatic continuum.

The first dimension utilized to overcome content limitations and to classify defining characteristics of the open and closed mind was that of the belief-disbelief system as shown on the following page. This dimension deals with the extent of isolation within and between belief and dis-belief systems; the disbelief systems were noted to involve the remaining beliefs or values that were incompatible with the belief system. As Rokeach states, "Isolation refers to the degree of segregation or lack of intercommunication between neighboring regions or subregions. It is assumed

\[3\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 14-15.}\]
Definition I: The Defining Characteristics of Open-Closed Systems

Open

A. to the extent that, with respect to its organization along belief-disbelief continuum,

1. the magnitude of rejection of disbelief subsystems is relatively low at each point along the continuum;
2. there is communication of parts within and between belief and disbelief systems;
3. there is relatively little discrepancy in the degree of differentiation between belief and disbelief systems;
4. there is relatively high differentiation within the disbelief system;

B. to the extent that, with respect to the organization along the central-peripheral dimension,

1. the specific content of primitive beliefs (central region) is to the effect that the world one lives in, or the situation one is in at a particular moment, is a friendly one;
2. the formal content of beliefs about authority and about people who hold to systems of authority (intermediate region) is to the effect that authority is not absolute and that people are not to be evaluated (if they are to be evaluated at all) according to their agreement or disagreement with such authority;
3. the structure of beliefs and disbeliefs perceived to emanate from authority

Closed

1. the magnitude of rejection of disbelief subsystems is relatively high at each point along the disbelief continuum;
2. there is isolation of parts within and between belief and disbelief systems;
3. there is relatively great discrepancy in the degree of differentiation between belief and disbelief systems;
4. there is relatively little differentiation within the disbelief system;

1. the specific content of primitive beliefs (central region) is to the effect that the world one lives in, or the situation one is in at a particular moment, is a threatening one;
2. the formal content of beliefs about authority and about people who hold to systems of authority (intermediate region) is to the effect that authority is absolute and that people are to be accepted and rejected according to their agreement or disagreement with such authority;
3. the structure of beliefs and disbeliefs perceived to emanate from authority.
(peripheral region) is such that its substructures are in relative communication with each other, and finally:

C. to the extent that, with respect to the time-perspective dimension, there is a

1. relatively broad time perspective.


that the more closed the system the greater the isolation between and within the belief and disbelief systems."\(^4\)

The Central-Peripheral Dimension was conceived first to be made up of a central core of "pre-ideological" primitive beliefs which are usually unverbalized and precede historically the remaining beliefs in the system. These primitive beliefs deal with what Maslow calls "the world view" as discussed in Chapter II. This dimension includes those beliefs dealing with whether the world is a friendly place, what the future has in store for us, and the adequacy of the self, which have been speculatively hypothesized by Fromm and others to vary between the dogmatic and nondogmatic. Rokeach states,

It is assumed that the more closed the system, the more will the content of such beliefs be to the effect that we live alone, isolated and helpless

\[^4\text{Ibid., p. 73.}\]

\[^5\text{See Chapter II of this study under the heading, "The Authoritarian Personality."}\]
in a friendless world; that we live in a world wherein the future is uncertain; that the self is fundamentally unworthy and inadequate to cope alone with this friendless world; and that the way to overcome such feelings is by a self-aggrandizing and self-righteous identification with a cause, a concern with power and status, and by a compulsive self-proselytization about the justness of such a cause. 

Secondly, within the Central-Peripheral Dimension are the Intermediate beliefs which are related to the nature of positive and negative authority and the extent to which people are accepted and rejected according to the positive and negative authorities they line up with. Rokeach points out, "The more closed the belief-disbelief system, the more will authority be seen as absolute and the more will people be accepted and rejected because they agree or disagree with one's belief-disbelief system." Thirdly, the peripheral beliefs are assumed to be highly dependent on the primitive and intermediate sectors. Rokeach states that they control "... not only what will be represented in the peripheral region but also what will not be represented, that is, narrowed out." 

The third dimension involved that of Time-Perspective. Following earlier theoretical and experimental studies of the dogmatic or authoritarian personality, Rokeach states that, "... the more closed the belief-disbelief system, the more

---

6Rokeach, op. cit., p. 75.  
7Ibid., p. 78.  
8Ibid., p. 78.
will its organization be future- or past-oriented, and the more will the present be rejected as important in its own right." The items which were used to measure these three dimensions may be studied on the sample test form in Appendix A of this study or by reference to Chapter III of *The Open and Closed Mind*.

In discussing the reliability factor of the final scale, Form E, used in this study, Rokeach states,

> This final 40-item scale, Form E, was found to have a corrected reliability of .81 for the English Colleges II sample and .78 for the English worker sample. In other samples subsequently tested at Michigan State University, Ohio State University, and at a VA domiciliary, the reliabilities ranged from .68 to .93.

In validating the ability of the Dogmatism Scale to differentiate between high and low dogmatic subjects Rokeach used the Method of Known Groups. When graduate students in his psychology classes selected high and low dogmatic subjects from among their personal friends or acquaintances, those predicted to be high in dogmatism scored significantly higher ($p < .01$) than those thought to be low in dogmatism.

In proving the ability of the Dogmatism Scale to locate general authoritarianism and intolerance relatively unencumbered by rightest or leftest political or religious leanings, Rokeach first compared the correlations of the Dogmatism Scale and the F Scale for seven groups from Michigan.

---

9Ibid., p. 79.  
10Ibid., p. 89.
State University, two colleges in New York City, and two colleges and a worker sample in England. The correlation ranged from .54 to .77. Rokeach states,

People who score relatively high on one test tend to score relatively high on the other. This is even true for the English Communists. Even though their mean dogmatism score is low, we still get a positive correlation between their dogmatism and F scores.12

On the other hand, by comparing two measures of attitudes toward liberalism-conservatism, it was possible to demonstrate a degree of commonness between those two instruments and the Dogmatism and F Scales. The Dogmatism Scale unlike the F Scale seemed to be unrelated to the liberalism-conservatism continuum. As Rokeach concludes,

It will be noticed that the dogmatism scores are related to a negligible extent with scores obtained on the two liberalism-conservatism tests. In other words, these low correlations support the conclusion that the Dogmatism Scale is actually measuring general authoritarianism, since it is found with approximately equal frequency along all positions of the political spectrum.13

It should be noted that the Dogmatism Scale ordinarily has been used with college age groups. In fact, to the author's knowledge, no published studies have established the reliability or validity of the Dogmatism Scale with high

11 For a further description of these groups, see ibid., p. 88.
12 Ibid., p. 121.
13 Ibid., pp. 121-122.
school students. Kemp, however, has conducted such a study to be published in the near future which does demonstrate its usefulness with such groups.

The Inventory of Beliefs

The Inventory of Beliefs (Form I) was the second scale that was used to designate what the Intercollege Committee on Attitudes, Values, and Personal Adjustment refers to as the anti-democratic-democratic continuum. As pointed out by Dressel and Mayhew,

The fundamental assumption underlying such a scale is that the objectives of general education can serve as a base from which may be inferred the model organization characterizing the personalities of those most adaptable to the purposes of general education.15

The Committee, composed of counselors, professional evaluators, and teachers in courses dealing with human relations, defined attitude, as reported by Dressel and Mayhew, as "... an emotionalized tendency to act for or against something."16 The Committee also assumed that attitudes toward individual or specific objects such as particular persons, particular books, or specific events condition


16Ibid., p. 211.
attitudes toward more generic forms of the same objects. As Dressel and Mayhew mentioned, "Thus, attitudes toward Negroes, Jews, Chinese, and white American Protestants condition one's feeling toward human beings generally."\textsuperscript{17}

The Committee established "four levels of personal involvements" which were to be used as the indexes in measuring the type of psychological maturity which was considered significant for general education. These were, as listed by Dressel and Mayhew, "... (1) ideas and intellectual abstractions, (2) social groups and identifications, (3) interpersonal relations, and (4) the self."\textsuperscript{18}

"Ideas and intellectual abstractions" included such content areas as philosophy, religion, arts, sciences, politics, and economics. "Social groups and identifications" covered such cultural Out-groups as the Negro, Jews, other minorities, and foreigners and the In-groups' characteristics which have sometimes been referred to as Americanism. "Interpersonal relations" dealt with relationships to the family; school; church; state; business and consumer relations; and friends, peers, and siblings. "The self" delved into the individual's self-concept and self-evaluation.

Approximately three thousand cliches, pseudo-rational statements or inappropriate generalizations were collected

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid., p. 211.

\textsuperscript{18}Ibid., p. 216.
on the various college campuses participating in the study. Each statement chosen was assumed to reveal one of the four areas mentioned above. As far as possible, each statement was assumed to be capable of being examined factually by recourse to appropriate evidence. As Dressel and Mayhew point out, "On the basis of expert judgment and statistical test performance data, 120 such statements were finally selected for inclusion in a final form of the Inventory of Beliefs." One statement included in Form I of the Inventory was the following: "No world organization should have the right to tell Americans what they can or cannot do." The examinee had the following four choices in judging the statements: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) disagree, and (4) strongly disagree. All items were to be disagreed with by the mature student.

In noting the reliability of Form I, Dressel and Mayhew state,

The Inventory of Beliefs has been subjected to considerable research as to its technical effectiveness. Form I of the inventory has proven to be sufficiently reliable for purposes of group or individual measurement. Some thirty-odd reliability studies have been made resulting in coefficients ranging from .68 to .95 with a median coefficient of .86.

---

19 Ibid., p. 218.
20 See Appendix A for other examples.
21 Dressel, op. cit., p. 222.
In studying the validity of the Inventory of Beliefs, various approaches were taken. The list of statements was corroborated by two groups of faculty members. One group judged on the basis of how the items should be answered by an "ideal" product of general education. The other group judged whether or not experts in the relevant field would be apt to support or to deny the statement. Dressel and Mayhew note,

The results from these two studies reveal that a large majority of the faculty judges could accept 100 out of the 120 items as relevant to the objectives of general education and that three-fourths of the entire list consisted of statements the truth or falsity of which could be established by fact and expert opinion.\(^{22}\)

The hypothesis that the low scorers on the Inventory of Beliefs represented an atypical segment of a college population led to a number of studies between very low and very high scorers. Dressel and Mayhew state, "As a result of such inquiry a considerable body of data has been accumulated which either directly supports, or does not contradict, the conclusion that the inventory does measure certain types of personality structure."\(^{23}\) The following data were gathered from three independent samplings of college students in two institutions. The samplings were

\(^{22}\)Ibid., p. 222.

\(^{23}\)Ibid., p. 224.
drawn from populations of 200 to 500. In summarizing the
data, Dressel and Mayhew state,

Significant differences (level generally, .001 or
less) are found favoring the high scorers with
respect to matriculation in the area of humanities,
social sciences, and English, that is, more high
scorers enter these fields than do low scorers.
In the natural sciences, however, neither group is
distinguishable from the general populations from
which they were drawn. [Achievement data indicated.] Although differences in over-all grade averages are
negligible, significant differences favoring the
high scorers are found in comprehensive examinations
in the areas of the social sciences and humanities.
... Analyses of data [related to interests and
attitudes] from the activities inventory indicates
high scorers seem to prefer activities which reflect
autonomous or independent behavior, abstract and
analytical intellectual interests, and esthetic
experiences. Low scorers reject such activities,
their preferences reflecting orientation toward the
achievement of financial status, security, compulsive
orderliness, and submissive or dependent
behavior.24

As the trial forms were tested, it was demonstrated
that the belief scale was most effective in isolating a
homogeneous group of individuals representing the antithesis
of the mature, adaptive individual desired as a product of
general education.25

Historical Evaluation Test

The third instrument that was utilized in this study
was developed by the author to investigate the availability


25A copy of the Inventory of Beliefs is included in
Appendix A or may be studied in Chapter Eight of Paul L.
Dressell and Lewis B. Mayhew, General Education Explorations
in Evaluation (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Educa-
in the students' conceptual structure of historical information that had been covered as an integral part of the curriculum of their American Civilization classes six to eight months prior to the time of the administration of the HET. This purpose was to be accomplished within the model of the hypotheses-information-confirmation theory that deals with perception and remembering formulated by Postman and Bruner and discussed in detail in Chapter II.

The first requirement in the developing of the Historical Evaluation Test was to find appropriate historical content that all American Civilization sections composing the study's population had covered. Another requirement was to find content that would be expected through previous studies of the attitude or belief pattern of the authoritarian personality to differentiate the immature, dogmatic student from the mature, nondogmatic one. An investigation of the three teachers' final exams indicated that the historical treatment surrounding the writing of the Federal Constitution brought into focus the Hamiltonian and Jeffersonian philosophies of "good" government. A survey of the literature by the author reinforced the assumption that the writings of Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson would provide ready material from which to develop an evaluative type of instrument whose cues would activate the conceptual structures of the students. The instrument, consequently, was made up of four cues from each of the historical figures setting
forth two somewhat divergent philosophical points of view related to man's capabilities in political, historical context that needed to be only slightly paraphrased by the author.

The theme of Jefferson's paragraph emphasized the capabilities of the mass of common men to govern themselves, the need for a forum for public inquiry and debate, and that these common men were basically honest. There was, however, a recognition that the upper classes did tend to be more greedy and unscrupulous. The theme of Hamilton's paragraph emphasized the basic evilness of all men, the need for checks and balances in the Constitution, the exceptional ineptness of the masses to govern, and the more responsible behavior of the wellborn with their good sense and education.

The students did the following in explaining and evaluating each paragraph: (1) summarized the key concepts or cues, (2) offered some reasons that the author might have given to substantiate these concepts or cues, (3) specified which point of view they personally agreed with and why, and (4) stated which philosophical point of view underlay the writing of the Constitution.

The purpose of asking each student to summarize the key cues of each paragraph was to note any differences.

---

See Appendix A for a complete copy of the Historical Evaluation Test.
between the dichotomized groups in their ability to perceive the main concepts of each writer, especially for that point of view with which the student tended to disagree. It was hypothesized that selective perception might prevent the immature, dogmatic student from recognizing those cues that caused "cognitive dissonance," that is, that were incompatible with the individual's value-orientation. The means of tabulating the number of conceptual cues that were subsequently elaborated upon provided a clue to the willingness of the immature, dogmatic group in contrast to the mature, nondogmatic group to ground the cues already recognized, especially for that point of view with which the members did not agree. In noting the difference in the number of hypotheses utilized by each group to support the conceptual cues presented especially for that point of view with which the members did not agree, there was an attempt at testing the quantity of conceptual material that was cognitively available. In asking the students to specify which point of view they personally agreed with and why, the author hoped to note any significant difference in the dichotomized groups in the choices of Hamilton, Jefferson, or a combination view as well as the value-orientations displayed in their statements marshalled to support their personal points of view. Kluckhohn states,

Values are operative when an individual selects one line of thought or action rather than another, insofar as this selection is influenced by gener-
alized codes rather than determined simply by impulse or by purely rational calculus of temporary expediency.27

In noting the choice of the philosophical point of view supporting the writers of the Constitution, the author initially had expected to evaluate the independence of choice and reasoning from that expressed in that section dealing with the individual's personal point of view. It was hypothesized that the mature, nondogmatic members would be less blinded by their own preferences in discussing the historical circumstances and personal preferences of the Founding Fathers. Though this factor was discounted as an independent hypothesis after the pilot study to be discussed below, here again was an opportunity to note the nature of verbal expressions and value-orientations that could be compared with Rokeach's working definition of the open and closed mind (see page 55).

The author gained some valuable assistance in establishing the final form of the Historical Evaluation Test (HET) from his pilot study during the 1964 Summer Quarter at The Ohio State University involving 157 freshmen taking the introductory education course. The findings of the pilot study supported the assumption that students would take sides

in explaining and evaluating the two philosophical views couched in historical perspective. It demonstrated that students would bring their knowledge of the historical circumstances to the problem as well as their own insights on the nature of man. Many students did reveal their value-orientations by the types of hypothesized generalizations they brought to the problem and by the manner in which they expressed themselves. More explicit directions on the final form of the evaluation instrument assisted, subsequently, in getting more responses of this value-laden variety from the final subsample utilized in this study.

Verbal Reasoning Section of the Differential Aptitude Test

The last instrument to be given to the population was the Verbal Reasoning section of the Differential Aptitude Test (DAT) developed by the Psychological Corporation to measure verbal intelligence. One of the preliminary example items in the test booklet is provided as a sample. It states.

Example X(drink) is to water as eat is to (food).\(^{23}\)
1. continue 2. drink 3. foot 4. girl
A. drive B. enemy C. food D. industry

The test has been validated on various high school populations

\(^{23}\) See Appendix A for a copy of the test.
and is recognized as an effective standardized instrument.

Carroll states,

Verbal Reasoning presents a series of verbal analogies items which probably measures a combination of the "verbal ability" and "deductive reasoning" factors. In any event it is a good measure of the student's ability to handle complex logical relationships which can be stated in verbal terms, and in this sense, it is largely a measure of "intelligence" as this is ordinarily conceived. . . . [In speaking of the total DAT battery.] With one or two possible exceptions, the tests are excellent in format, item construction, standardization, validation, and just about every other aspect which is regarded as important in the testing fraternity.29

Frederikson in discussing validity criteria notes,

Validity studies summarized in the manual employ as criteria high school grades (including courses taken up to four years after testing), achievement test scores, college grades, and educational and vocational placement after graduation from high school. All studies reported as predictive validity studies are strictly that; that is, the tests were administered prior to the time when the criterion measures were earned.30

The Sample

The study group from which the sample for this study was taken was composed of about 875 students of a four year, public, coeducational, senior high school in a middle and upper-middle class suburban community in the Midwest.


The community seemed exceptionally attractive for the location of the study. For one reason, it did not have a highly heterogeneous population which would have necessitated more statistical controls and in consequence, a larger study group from which to pick qualified subjects. The students were, relatively, homogeneous economically, racially, and in academic goal orientations; they did vary religiously, a factor which was considered initially in setting up the statistical controls. These controls will be discussed in some detail later in this section.

Another factor encouraging the use of this particular study group was the accessibility and cooperativeness of the faculty and students, at least, partly due to the author's being a part of that community and having worked in the school system a few years earlier. Since the study was to span the summer months, another factor favoring this particular group of students was its comparative residential stability.

The population chosen was the 1963-1964 junior class composed of 215 members who were finishing the first year of a newly instituted two-year American Civilization curriculum when the study began. This age group was considered mature enough to conceptualize generalizations in the abstract in keeping with Piaget's theory of the various developmental stages of the thought processes. The members of the popula-
tion, almost without exception, were between sixteen years, ten months and seventeen years, ten months as disclosed at the end of the data collection period of the study in October, 1964. As Bruner points out,

Somewhere between ten and fourteen years of age the child passes into a third stage, which is called the stage of "formal operations" by the Geneva school. Now the child's intellectual activity seems to be based upon an ability to operate on hypothetical propositions rather than being constrained to what he has experienced or what is before him. The child can now think of possible variables and even deduce potential relationships that can later be verified by experiment or observation. Intellectual operations now appear to be predicted upon the same kinds of logical operations that are the stock in trade of the logician, the scientist, or the abstract thinker.31

Another factor pointing to this particular population was its comparatively large size since the group was a captive of a required social studies course. It also was assumed that juniors would be more adept in handling essay responses than a younger group. The senior class was not considered appropriate, since it was necessary, as already mentioned in another context, that the total population be available the following fall for completion of the study.

In establishing the eligibility of the members of the initial sample to be dichotomized on the maturity and dogmatic continuum, it was necessary to utilize the scores of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the Inventory of Beliefs.

They were correlated to estimate the similarity of the tenets upon which the scales were based. The similarity was great enough to be able to identify approximately forty subjects out of a possible fifty-seven who scored in equivalent brackets on both scales. That is, students within the upper third of the Dogmatism Scale and the lower third of the Inventory of Beliefs were classified as immature, dogmatic. Those students within the lower third of the Dogmatism Scale and the upper third of the Inventory of Beliefs were classified as mature, nondogmatic. Figure 1 shows graphically how this dichotomy of the sample was carried out utilizing the two attitude scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Scores on Dogmatism Scale</th>
<th>Scores on Inventory of Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immature, dogmatic students</td>
<td>Upper Third of Population</td>
<td>Lower Third of Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature, nondogmatic students</td>
<td>Lower Third of Population</td>
<td>Upper Third of Population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1.—Method of dichotomizing initial sample.

Those members of the two dichotomized groups who returned the following fall and had an opportunity to take the verbal intelligence test were subsequently checked statistically for significant differences (DAT Score) by the "t" test and for sex and religious differences by chi square.
Table 1 presents the mean raw score achieved by the members of the initial dichotomized sample on the Verbal Reasoning section of the Differential Aptitude Test (DAT).

**TABLE 1**

COMPARISON OF THE DICHOTOMIZED MEMBERS OF THE INITIAL SAMPLE ON THE MEAN RAW SCORES OF THE VERBAL REASONING SECTION OF THE DIFFERENTIAL APTITUDE TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Raw Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>&quot;t&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35a</td>
<td>Immature, dogmatic students</td>
<td>30.857</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mature, nondogmatic students</td>
<td>36.882</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>3.33b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* One member of the original thirty-six had dropped out of school before the final testing session at which time the Verbal Reasoning section of the Differential Aptitude Test was given.

*b* "t" value must be 2.65 with 70df to be significant at the .01 level of confidence.

The "t" value of 3.33 indicates statistically that a significant difference does exist between the immature, dogmatic and the mature, nondogmatic members of the initial sample.

Table 2 gives the total number of males and females that were members of the initial dichotomized sample.
# TABLE 2

## COMPARISON OF THE DICHOTOMIZED MEMBERS OF THE INITIAL SAMPLE BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35a</td>
<td>Immature, dogmatic students</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.028b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mature, nondogmatic students</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* One member of the original thirty-six had dropped out of school before the final testing session at which time the Verbal Reasoning section of the Differential Aptitude Test was given.

*b* Chi-square value must be 3.841 with 1 df to be significant at .05 level of confidence.

The chi-square figure of .028 shows that there was statistically no significant difference between the two personality groups making up the initial sample in the number of male and female members.

Table 3 gives the total number of Christians and Jews that made up the initial dichotomized sample.

The chi-square value of 3.26 indicates that statistically there was no significant difference between the immature, dogmatic and the mature, nondogmatic members composing the initial sample on the variable of religious affiliation.

Though there was no statistically significant difference in sex or religious affiliation, the statistically
TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF THE DICHOTOMIZED MEMBERS OF THE INITIAL SAMPLE BY RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Chi square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immature, dogmatic students</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.26^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35a</td>
<td>Mature, nondogmatic students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aOne member of the original thirty-six had dropped out of school before the final testing session at which time the Verbal Reasoning section of the Differential Aptitude Test was given.

^bChi-square value must be 3.841 with 1 df to be significant at .05 level of confidence.

^cThis category was used since there were five Catholics with the remaining Protestants in the immature, dogmatic group. All the "Christian" members of the mature, nondogmatic group were Protestants.

significant difference in verbal intelligence required the use of matching pairs technique before further analysis of the data was possible. The final subsample upon which the findings of this study were based, consequently, was made up of equal numbers of immature, dogmatic students and mature, nondogmatic students who were matched by sex and verbal intelligence. The verbal reasoning percentiles varied five percentage points for seven pairs, the higher scores on two pairs favoring the immature, dogmatic group and the higher scores on five pairs favoring the mature, nondogmatic group.
Due to the small size and diversity of the initial sample, it was not possible to include religious affiliation as a basis for matching along with the verbal reasoning score and sex. However, a chi-square subsequently was figured to establish the religious equivalence of the two dichotomous groups making up the final subsample. Table 4 indicates the number of Christians and Jews in each group.

**TABLE 4**

**COMPARISON OF THE TWENTY-THREE PAIRED MEMBERS OF THE SUBSAMPLE ON RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Chi square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Immature, dogmatic students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.788b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mature, nondogmatic students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This category was used since there were two Catholics with the remaining Protestants in the immature, dogmatic group. All the "Christian" members of the mature, nondogmatic group were Protestants.*

*Chi-square value must be 3.841 with 1 df to be significant at .05 level of confidence.*

The chi-square statistic of .788 points out that statistically there was no significant difference on religious affiliation between the dichotomous personality groups making up the subsample.
Analysis of Data

Students taking the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (Form E) were instructed initially to mark the statement +1, +2, or +3 for the degree of agreement and -1, -2, or -3 for the degree of disagreement. The higher the number, the greater the degree of agreement or disagreement. In assigning a score for each member of the population, the following procedure was carried out in establishing the high and low dogmatic groups: (1) tests in which more than four responses were unanswered were eliminated from scoring; (2) every third item was neutral and consequently was canceled before tabulation; (3) four points were added to the remaining forty items actually making up the (Form E) scale; (4) the resulting totals for each answer, now all positive numbers, were totaled for each student.

The author arbitrarily decided that more than four items incomplete could affect the validity of the final score. Only five or six students otherwise eligible missed as many as four items. There were, however, forty-two of the original population of 215 students that failed to satisfactorily complete either the Dogmatism Scale or the Inventory of Beliefs. This factor left 173 eligible students from which the upper and lower dichotomies ultimately were chosen.

The scores on the Dogmatism Scale ranged from 244 points to 92 points with the median score being 164 points. The range of scores for the lower third, classified in this
study as nondogmatics, ranged from 92 to 156 points. The upper third, classified as dogmatics, ranged from 172 to 244 points.

The Inventory of Beliefs was scored by giving one point for each "disagree" or "strongly disagree" response. The scores ranged from 22 points to 105 points with the median score being 63 points. The range of scores for the upper third, classified in this study as mature students was from 70 to 105 points. The range of scores for the lower third, classified as immature students, was from 22 to 57 points.

The Verbal Reasoning section of the Differential Aptitude Test (DAT) was scored by noting the correct matching of words for the fifty items, each correct item receiving one point. The raw score was then to be changed to percentile norms figured on grade level and sex. The median score for the immature, dogmatic group was the 60th percentile and for the mature, nondogmatic group the median score was the 80th percentile. This variance in the verbal intelligence of the dichotomous groups necessitated the matching technique mentioned above to control this variable while analyzing the cognitive variables evaluated by the Historical Evaluation Test.

**Analysis of Historical Evaluation Tests**

**Hypothesis One.** The immature, dogmatic group will differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of cues correctly restated, ignored, and misinterpreted for that point of view with which each member did not agree.
Hypothesis Two. The immature, dogmatic group will not differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of cues correctly restated, ignored, and misinterpreted for that point of view with which each member agreed.

To evaluate the individual restatements of each of the major cues making up the summaries of the two philosophical positions, the following categories were established: (1) **correctly restated**—as displayed by the accuracy of each restatement, (2) **misinterpreted**—as displayed by the inaccuracy of each restatement, or (3) **ignored**—as displayed by the failure to include a restatement of a substantial part of a particular cue or attribute.

The first attribute or cue of Hamilton's point of view was the following: "The passions of greed, ambition, interest govern most individuals and all public bodies." The writer accepted as a correct restatement of this cue an accurate allusion to the basic theme as "Men are motivated by certain passions (i.e., greed, ambition, etc.)." Only if so much was read into the original cue that the essential meaning was changed substantially, or if it was simply misunderstood, as evidenced by the restatement, was the restatement of the cue categorized as "misinterpreted." If no allusion was made to the essential theme, the cue was categorized as "ignored."

Some arbitrary choices on interpretive procedures did have to be made. In Jefferson's first cue, the second sentence was judged a supporting but nonessential one. For
this reason Cue Number 1 was marked "correct" if the elements of the second sentence were left out or stated separately as another cue. Only when the elements of the second sentence were stated in place of the more dominate first sentence was the cue categorized as "misinterpreted."

Any major elements (subject-predicate combinations), or literal facsimiles thereof, were accepted as a "correct" restatement of any one of the other cues or attributes incorporated in the Historical Evaluation Test.

The totals on the three categories or classifications mentioned above were tabulated for the philosophical position with which the members agreed and disagreed within the mature, nondogmatic and the immature, dogmatic groups. The two groups then were analyzed statistically by chi square.

Hypothesis Three, The immature, dogmatic group will differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of cues that were grounded for that point of view with which each member did not agree.

Hypothesis Four, The immature, dogmatic group will not differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of cues that were grounded for that point of view with which each member agreed.

Students also were requested to suggest or hypothesize generalizations from their knowledge of human nature and the historical period that they felt Hamilton and Jefferson logically could have offered to support his particular philosophical position as stated in the Historical Evaluation Test (HET).
A grounding or validating of a cue by a generalization or hypothesis was classified as (1) **sufficient** if it displayed additional relevant insights on human nature or historical situations, (2) a **restatement** if the generalization simply repeated in essence the cue or attribute, or (3) **ignored** if there was a failure to offer a supportive generalization or hypothesis for a particular cue. The accuracy of the generalization was not at issue and only figured into the tabulating to the extent that the grader did have to see some relationship between a particular cue and a particular hypothesized generalization.

In reverting back to Hamilton's first cue, "The passions of greed, ambition, interest govern most individuals and all public bodies," one sufficient generalization offered was the following: "The writer would contain such opinions because at this time most people were poor. Thus to gain money and power, they became corrupt people." Here an opinion or generalization involving "some" knowledge is activated by a particular cue or attribute within the cognitive structure of the student and offered as a hypothesis to substantiate the cue.

The totals on the three classifications related to validating cues mentioned above were tabulated for the philosophical position with which the members agreed and disagreed within the mature, nondogmatic and the immature,
dogmatic groups. Then, the two groups were analyzed statistically by chi square.

Hypothesis Five, The immature, dogmatic group will differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of hypotheses that were offered to group those cues that were utilized to support that point of view with which each member did not agree.

Hypothesis Six, The immature, dogmatic group will not differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of hypotheses that were offered to ground cues that were utilized to support that point of view with which each member agreed.

In counting the hypotheses or assumptions offered to ground or validate the respective four cues or attributes of the two philosophical positions, all those hypotheses that had been classified as "sufficient" were counted except for those that were restated for another cue within the same position. Another difference in some members' totals of hypotheses utilized in this tabulation and those acceptable for supporting those cues grounded or validated entered when more than one "sufficient" hypothesis or assumption was offered to validate a single cue.

The total number of hypotheses proposed for the philosophical position with which the members of each dichotomous group agreed and disagreed were compared statistically for significance by the "t" test.

Hypothesis Seven, The value-orientation and manner of expression inherent in the generalizations offered as evaluative hypotheses will separate the immature, dogmatic group from the mature, nondogmatic group.
As pointed out in Chapter I, a basic assumption of this study was that an evaluation of value-laden data by an individual allows the expression of the insights that an individual feels are valid and relevant to a particular problem. It is also assumed that these insights are not random and idiosyncratic, but form a pattern related to an immature, dogmatic versus a mature, nondogmatic personality. A possible pattern of outlook for these personality dichotomies was operationally defined by Rokeach within the three dimensions of his theory discussed earlier in this chapter when outlining the rationale of the Dogmatism Scale. The interpretation and evaluation sections of the Historical Evaluation Test (HET) were developed with the goal of assessing these factors which are listed on pp. 55-56.

In the beginning stage of surveying the responses of the HET, the author attempted to differentiate those tests done by the thirty-six immature, dogmatic students from those done by the thirty-four mature, nondogmatic students making up the initial sample that had returned for their senior year and were present the day the HET was administered.

The statistically significant findings confirmed the probability that a pattern along the criterial lines of Rokeach's working definition of the open and closed mind was revealed by the student's verbal expression and value-orientation. It occurred to the author that this was another
means of distinguishing between the cognitive performance of the two dichotomous groups while evaluating value-laden historical information.

Somewhat along the lines of Arnold's story sequence analysis, the author subsequently summarized on separate 5 x 8 cards the key quotes that were considered relevant to Rokeach's working definition from each member of the twenty-three paired subsample. The evaluation section of the HET, where personal impressions of the two philosophical positions were requested, was the most fruitful source. However, evaluative-type statements from the interpretation section of each philosophical viewpoint also were included to illustrate the type of reaction to that position with which the individual agreed as well as to that position which was incongruent with his value-orientation. Two judges familiar with the tenets of the open and closed mind then were asked to separate the summary cards in equal piles of twenty-three as to whether the student, as indicated by his statements, was an immature, dogmatic personality or a mature, nondogmatic personality.

The Historical Evaluation Test (HET), utilized in attempting to locate the value-orientation and manner of expression along the lines of Arnold, becomes a form of

---

For a detailed treatment of her rationale and methodology see Magda B. Arnold, Story Sequence Analysis (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962).
projective instrument categorized by Vinacke as disguised, nonstructured. That is, the subject is presented with ambiguous, or incomplete material and required to supply it with meaning. Projective techniques have been shown to be useful tools to reveal conceptual perspectives as well as variations in attitudes. Vinacke points out,

One possible procedure would be to adapt projective techniques to the investigation of concepts. In relatively unstructured tasks of that kind, the subject may be expected to reveal important modes of interpreting the world and his relation to it; in short, it should be possible to infer a great deal about the concept systems which determine the subject's responses.

In summary, this chapter first outlined the data collection sequence of the study. The various testing instruments utilized then were explained in some detail. The actual procedures of analyzing the data subsequently were described under the relevant hypothesis. The findings of the study along with some pertinent conclusions will now be presented in Chapter IV.

---


As discussed in Chapter I, the author conducted this study to note the effect of the attitude and belief pattern typical of the immature and dogmatic personality syndrome on reflection while treating historical information. This was accomplished, first of all, by comparing the cognitive processes of analysis and synthesis of a group of students categorized as immature and dogmatic with another group displaying the attitude and belief structure characteristic of the mature and nondogmatic individual. Secondly, the evaluation dimension of the cognitive processes was investigated by noting the evidence of the predicted attitude and belief structure of the immature, dogmatic group as revealed in the essay-type responses to two divergent philosophical statements.

Hypotheses One and Two deal specifically with that aspect of the cognitive processes referred to as analysis. The comparative ability of the two dichotomized groups to analyze the data was measured by tabulating the number of cues of each philosophical statement that were correctly restated, ignored, or misinterpreted by the members of each
group. The hypotheses took special note of any differences in the cognitive processing of the cues for that point of view with which each member of the two groups tended to disagree or to agree.

Hypothesis One, The immature, dogmatic group will differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of cues correctly restated, ignored, and misinterpreted for that point of view with which each member did not agree.

Table 5 shows the extent to which the cues were perceived by the thirty-six members of the subsample who expressed a preference for one of the philosophical positions, specifically for that position with which they did not agree.

**TABLE 5**

**COMPARISON OF THIRTY-SIX HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS ON THEIR ABILITY TO PERCEIVE PHILOSOPHICAL CUES FOR THAT POINT OF VIEW WITH WHICH EACH DID NOT AGREE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Correctly Restated</th>
<th>Ignored</th>
<th>Misinterpreted</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>Immature, dogmatic students</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.54b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>Mature, nondogmatic students</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aThe findings for five students from the immature, dogmatic group and five students from the mature, nondogmatic group were not included in the tabulation because they took a combined philosophical position.

*bChi-square value must be 5.99 with 2df to be significant at .05 level of confidence.*
The chi-square figure of 2.54 revealed no statistically significant difference between the two dichotomous groups in the number of cues correctly restated, ignored, or misinterpreted for that point of view with which the members of each group did not agree, though the difference in the total number of cues correctly restated was in the expected direction.

The analytical phase of the Historical Evaluation Test as measured by this study did not support the hypothesized tendency of the immature, dogmatic student to restrict his perception of that philosophical position which was incongruent with his personal point of view. There was no statistically significant evidence that premature closure occurred, that the breadth of viewing of the immature, dogmatic group was limited by its assumed relevant personality characteristics.

One explanation of these findings is the fact that the subsample had the cues continually available in their visual field for ready reference. The visual availability of the new beliefs presented in the famous Doddlebug Problem in Rokeach's study eliminated any statistically significant difference between his closed-minded and open-minded groups as judged by recall ten minutes after problem-solving.\(^1\)

It can be concluded from the findings in this study's given situation, however, that the dichotomous groups demonstrate equal willingness to analyze controversial beliefs in historical context where reflective thought was assumed to have an opportunity to evidence itself.

Hypothesis Two. The immature, dogmatic group will not differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of cues correctly restated, ignored, and misinterpreted for that point of view with which each member agreed.

Table 6 shows the extent to which the cues were perceived by the thirty-six members of the subsample who expressed a preference for one of the philosophical positions, specifically for that position with which they agreed.

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF THIRTY-SIX HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS ON THEIR ABILITY TO PERCEIVE PHILOSOPHICAL CUES FOR THAT POINT OF VIEW WITH WHICH EACH DID AGREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Correctly Restated</th>
<th>Ignored</th>
<th>Misinterpreted</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13a</td>
<td>Immature, dogmatic students</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13a</td>
<td>Mature, nondogmatic students</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.15b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aThe findings for five students from the immature, dogmatic group and five students from the mature, nondogmatic group were not included in the tabulation because they took a combined philosophical position.

bChi-square value must be 5.99 with 2 df to be significant at .05 level of confidence.
The resulting chi-square figure of 4.15 supported the predicted hypothesis by showing no significant difference between the dichotomous groups in the number of cues correctly restated, ignored, or misinterpreted for that point of view with which the members agreed. As with the previous hypothesis, there was no statistically significant evidence that premature closure occurred more for one personality type than the other where the cues were congruent with each member's personal point of view.

Of interest to the author was the tendency for the immature, dogmatic group to restate fewer cues than their counterparts for that philosophical position with which they agreed. A possible explanation for this is that the immature, dogmatic members were more apt to take the cues congruent with their cognitive structure for granted when discussing them, consequently they failed to see a legitimate reason for restating them. More research will be necessary to investigate this possibility.

The author also was interested in noting any significant difference between the dichotomized groups on the synthetic phase of the cognitive processes. This was accomplished in two ways. First, there was a tabulation of the total number of cues that were grounded by the members of each group for that point of view with which they tended to disagree as well as for that point of view with which they agreed. Secondly, there was a tabulation of the total
number of hypotheses that were offered to ground those cues actually discussed for that point of view with which they agreed and for that point of view with which they disagreed. The following four hypotheses deal with the measuring of synthesis.

Hypothesis Three. The immature, dogmatic group will differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of cues that were grounded for that point of view with which each member did not agree.

Table 7 presents the total number of cues that were sufficiently grounded, ignored, or restated by the thirty-six members of the subsample who expressed a preference for one of the philosophical positions, specifically for that position with which they did not agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sufficiently Grounded</th>
<th>Ignored</th>
<th>Restated</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Immature, dogmatic students</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.94&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Mature, nondogmatic students</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 36</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The findings for five students from the immature, dogmatic group and five students from the mature, nondogmatic group were not included in the tabulation because they took a combined philosophical position.

<sup>b</sup>Chi-square value must be 5.99 with 2df to be significant at .05 level of confidence.
The chi-square statistic 1.94 indicates that the immature, dogmatic group statistically does not differ significantly from the mature, nondogmatic group in the number of cues that were grounded for that point of view with which each member of the subsample tended to disagree. There seemed to be no tendency displayed by the mature, nondogmatic students to prefer to synthesize significantly more cues for that point of view with which they did not agree.

Perhaps the initial request to substantiate the major cues for each point of view may simply be evaluating what the student "knows" about the cue, not what the student "believes" about it. This conclusion is highly probable if the topic chosen was not ambiguous enough to allow alternate conceptual perspectives to be consciously available or thought relevant while offering reasons they thought Jefferson or Hamilton might have had for believing what their respective cues or attributes imply. Perhaps any twelfth grade student, regardless of distinguishing personality characteristics, possessing a given intelligence level who has taken a course similar to American Civilization, Part One, the previous year may be assumed able to offer "some" grounding generalizations, acceptable as valid in this study, for each cue for either philosophical position without any threat being felt. That is, only in circumstances where an amount of indecision is possible could reflective thought
have an opportunity to come into play. Only on this level would any cognitive dissonance have a likelihood of being evidenced.

Hypothesis Four. The immature, dogmatic group will not differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of cues that were grounded for that point of view with which each member agreed.

Table 8 presents the total number of cues that were sufficiently grounded, ignored, or restated by the thirty-six paired members of the subsample who expressed a preference for one of the philosophical positions, specifically for that position with which they agreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sufficiently Grounded</th>
<th>Ignored</th>
<th>Restated</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Immature, dogmatic students</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Mature, non-dogmatic students</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.90&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The findings for five students from the immature, dogmatic group and five students from the mature, nondogmatic group were not included in the tabulation because they took a combined philosophical position.

<sup>b</sup>Chi-square value must be 5.99 with 2df to be significant at .05 level of confidence.
The chi-square figure of 1.90 shows that there was statistically no significant difference between the dichotomous groups in the number of cues that were grounded for that point of view with which each member agreed.

The finding was in the expected direction since it was assumed that the immature, dogmatic student would have no more difficulty than the mature, nondogmatic student in retaining within his perceptual and/or conceptual field those cues to be integrated or synthesized into his cognitive structure while grounding that philosophical position with which he agrees. There would be no expectation of any cognitive dissonance.

Hypothesis Five, The immature, dogmatic group will differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of hypotheses that were offered to ground those cues that were utilized to support that point of view with which each member did not agree.

Table 9 shows the mean scores for those eighteen members of the immature, dogmatic group who were paired with an equal number of mature, nondogmatic students who had expressed a preference for one of the philosophical positions on the Historical Evaluation Test.

The "t" value of .555 shows that no statistically significant difference exists between the dichotomous pairs of students in the number of hypothesized generalizations to support those cues representing the philosophical position with which the members did not agree. In the process of
TABLE 9
COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF THIRTY-SIX MEMBERS OF THE IMMATURE, DOGMATIC AND MATURE, NONDOGMATIC GROUPS ON THE NUMBER OF HYPOTHESES OFFERED TO GROUND THE PHILOSOPHICAL POINT OF VIEW WITH WHICH THEY DISAGREED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>&quot;t&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>Immature, dogmatic students</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.555b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>Mature, nondogmatic students</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a The findings for five students from the immature, dogmatic group and five students from the mature, nondogmatic group were not included in the tabulation because they took a combined philosophical position.

*b "t" value must be 1.70 with 35 df to be significant at .05 level of confidence.

bringing forth relevant hypotheses assumed to require a given amount of reconstructing of the historical event, defined in this study as synthesis, there seemed to be no significant difference in the ability of the mature, nondogmatic group to hypothesize more generalizations for that point of view with which they did not agree.

Perhaps, in this situation too, as mentioned in discussing Hypothesis Three, the presentation of historical data was not ambiguous enough to promote reflective thought. Also, possibly, the degree of student involvement was not sufficient to encourage reflection. Reflection only could be expected to occur when the exteriorly given cues were
able to arouse previously internalized generalizations. In such a situation personality characteristics would be assumed, according to the theory of this study, to have an opportunity to effect the cognitive selectivity of perceiving, remembering, and thinking.

Hypothesis Six, The immature, dogmatic group will not differ from the mature, nondogmatic group in the total number of hypotheses that were offered to ground those cues that were utilized to support that point of view with which each member agreed.

The findings also revealed an equivalent mean score of 2.66 for the dichotomous pairs of students in the number of generalizations hypothesized to ground that point of view with which each member of the subsample agreed. This result indicates that the immature, dogmatic group was equally as willing as the mature, nondogmatic group to ground that point of view with which they agreed. The reader is reminded that this conclusion implicitly assumes that a synthesis did occur or that a viable cognitive choice was evident to the students. An assumption the author, as mentioned above, has begun to doubt.

The author, finally, was interested in noting any significant difference between the dichotomized personality groups in their value-orientation and mode of expression. This factor was revealed in the evaluative-type statements that were aroused by the Historical Evaluation Test and were quoted in summary-type imports by the author for each member of the subsample on 5 x 8 cards. Two judges, subsequently,
analyzed and separated into equal piles the forty-six imports as to predicted personality tendencies on the immature, dogmatic-mature, nondogmatic continuum.

Hypothesis Seven, The value-orientation and manner of expression inherent in the generalizations offered as evaluative hypotheses will separate the immature, dogmatic group from the mature, nondogmatic group.

Table 10 shows how successful two qualified judges were in identifying the imports of the paired immature, dogmatic members and mature, nondogmatic members of the subsample.

**TABLE 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Judge A</th>
<th>Judge B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Immature, dogmatic students</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mature, nondogmatic students</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The chi-square equivalence of the phi coefficient must be 3.84 with 1 df to be significant at .05 level of confidence and 6.635 with 1 df to be significant at .01 level of confidence.

The resulting phi coefficient, adjusted to chi-square value 31.38 for Judge A and chi-square value 7.04 for Judge B, indicates that both judges differentiated between the dichotomous personality groups at a statistically significant
level (p < .01). The judges' results suggest that the structural and content classifications of Rokeach do guide qualified judges in detecting differences between students dichotomized on the immature, dogmatic-mature, nondogmatic continuum in their value-orientation and verbal expression in the evaluative type of hypothesized generalizations that were summarized in their imports.

By comparing a number of the major categories of Rokeach's working definition with select statements of the subsample, it is possible to note how the group of immature, dogmatic students tended to vary in its verbal expression and value-orientation from the group of mature, nondogmatic students. Section A of the working definition, see page 56, covers categories of the Belief-Disbelief System with respect to its organization along the belief-disbelief continuum. Category One relating to the closed mind states, "The magnitude of rejection of disbelief subsystems is relatively high at each point along the disbelief continuum." Import Number E-476 by an immature, dogmatic student illustrates this characteristic,

It shows that our Constitution was based on the conservative views as seen . . . [by Jefferson]. Intelligence runs human nature, and intelligence is conservatism. . . . It shows that liberals are two faced and don't really know what they believe, unless it is the ridiculous ideas as stated . . . [by Hamilton] in which liberals shouldn't be allowed to participate in our true government.
The low magnitude of rejection of disbelief subsystems for the open mind is represented in Import Number J-444 by a mature, nondogmatic student who says,

At the period of time when the Constitution was being written I agree with... [Hamilton] for I feel that the average class person lacked education which is a basic platform for affairs of state however with education given to a common person I believe that he is basically good and will work for the benefit of all while benefitting himself.

Category Two of Section A for the closed mind states, "There is isolation of parts within and between belief and disbelief systems." Import Number 123C reveals an inherent contradiction caused by the isolation within the belief system of this immature, dogmatic student. He states, "People have the tendency to do the exact opposite of what they are told. Most people will do what is right without having a person telling what to do but they need someone to guide them." The relative lack of isolation of parts within and between belief and disbelief systems is revealed by the following mature, nondogmatic Import Number F137:

I think a combination of the two points of view, that is faith in the ability of man while recognizing his human frailties. Realizing that government of the people, by the people may have drawbacks, but that is more in accordance with natural law, than arbitrary rule by a few.

Category Three of Section A for the closed mind states, "There is relatively great discrepancy in the degree of differentiation between belief and disbelief systems."

This excerpt from Import Number G-208 by an immature, dogmatic
student clearly points out this factor, "Since the people make major decisions, that often may make or break, they must know true facts and truths about situations as to keep their opinions pure and free of lies." The relative low discrepancy of differentiation between belief and disbelief systems by the open mind is illustrated by the mature, non-dogmatic Import Number B-4318 which states,

Personally I agree with . . . [Jefferson's] view. Oddly enough for the reasons given in . . . [Hamilton's] discourse. No person or small group of people can be trusted enough to run a country, and even if they could be trusted, who is to say which way and what is best? Only en masse can we please the majority without persecuting the minorities.

Category Four of Section A for the closed mind states, "There is relatively little differentiation within the disbelief system." This portion of the immature, dogmatic Import Number 728-B which was supposed to discuss the reasons the writer, Hamilton, with whom he disagrees, might have had for stating the given cues. Instead, the student offers this evaluation, "The writer has not much faith in his fellow man. Thus he feels that the leaders of the country govern for greed, ambition, and personal interest." In the mature, nondogmatic Import Number J-343 the student also prefers Jefferson but manages to be somewhat selective in offering opinions to justify Hamilton's lack of confidence in the common man. He mentions,

Everyone has certain ambitions in life and these motivate the way people act and thus since the
people believe in this way, the governments or institutions these people establish must also be affected in a similar manner.

Section B of Rokeach's working definition establishes categories of the Belief-Disbelief System with respect to the organization along the central-peripheral dimension. Category One in describing the closed mind states, "The specific content of primitive beliefs (central region) is to the effect that the world one lives in, or the situation one is in at a particular moment, is a threatening one."

Import Number l11a presents the immature, dogmatic student's perspective when he says, "I myself believe that . . . [Hamilton] seems more correct. It is true today as it was back then that man has a passion for corruptness if given the chance." Import Number J682 contains a passage which demonstrates the mature, nondogmatic perspective of the world being primarily a friendly one. He says,

Of the two theories expressed, neither seemed completely adequate to me, for justification of writing a Constitution such as ours. The two theories, specifically Hobbes and Locke, are controversial, however, I believe in a mixture of the two. . . . The essential goodness of man is the basic theory I maintain, however I am not so idealistic nor optimistic to believe that all men, when given the power to govern, will accept the responsibility in the correct manner. Therefore, I believe in both the basic Locke theory with some acceptance of Hobbes.

Category Two of Section B states for the closed mind,

The formal content of beliefs about authority and about people who hold to systems of authority (intermediate region) is to the effect that authority is absolute and that people are to be accepted
and rejected according to their agreement or disagreement with such authority.

The following portion of Import Number C-362 illustrates the tendencies in this direction of the immature, dogmatic student,

I feel that there should be a combination of both of these points of view. Although I feel that we should not be completely governed as in the [Hamilton] view, I feel that to have a successful democracy there must be a head man to watch over us. I do feel also that if we do have a top man there should be a checking system as we have today to keep the man from becoming too powerful.

The mature, nondogmatic student, though misinterpreting Hamilton, demonstrates his autonomous but responsible reaction to authority in Import Number C108. He says,

The man who wrote this feels that the person, himself, should be the one who can decide whether he likes a governing issue or not. He feels that it is man's instinct to be free and to decide on his own. He feels that when a person reaches adulthood, he should face the world. He should develop his interest in why he lives the way he does.

A survey of the complete set of imports in Appendix B will show that the categories illustrated above were not covered by each import. However, a sufficient number of the imports did seem to possess enough characteristics to allow the judges to utilize the criteria taken from Rokeach's working definition of the open and closed mind as their statistically significant results seem to indicate. There is that possibility, nevertheless, that the judges were unconsciously using other criteria either inherent in the
imports or other criteria gathered from their previous study of the authoritarian or dogmatic personality.

An example of the former possibility of other inherent criteria in the imports upon which the import might have been judged immature, dogmatic or mature, nondogmatic is that of the particular philosophical position agreed with. That is, the nondogmatics might be assumed to agree in a statistically significant number with Jefferson's philosophical position since it could be categorized as democratic. While the immature, dogmatic students might be assumed to agree in a statistically significant number more frequently with Hamilton's position since it could be categorized as anti-democratic. Table 11 indicates the philosophical positions taken by the thirty-six members of the subsample who did state a clear preference.

The chi-square figure of .468 indicates no statistically significant difference between the dichotomous groups on the basis of the philosophical position taken. The philosophical position is, therefore, not a very probable criteria outside the Rokeach criteria for having influenced the judges' decisions. No other outside criteria are apparent at this time. The other possibility of previous knowledge of the judges on the authoritarian-dogmatic personality influencing their choices will need further investigation.
TABLE 11
COMPARISON OF THIRTY-SIX MEMBERS OF SUBSAMPLE ON THEIR PHILOSOPHICAL PREFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Hamilton</th>
<th>Jefferson</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18^a</td>
<td>Immature, dogmatic students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.468^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18^a</td>
<td>Mature, nondogmatic students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aThe findings for five students from the immature, dogmatic group and five students from the mature, nondogmatic group were not included in the tabulation because they took a combined philosophical position.

^bChi-square value must be 3.841 with 1df to be significant at .05 level of confidence.

In summary, the author attempted to discover if the immature, dogmatic group of students would vary in an identifiable pattern from the mature, nondogmatic group of students in their cognitive behavior when explaining and evaluating value-laden historical material.

No significant difference was evidenced in the two groups' abilities to correctly restate, ignore, or misinterpret the major cues or attributes representing divergent philosophical points of view. Likewise, no significant difference was found between the dichotomous groups in the number of attributes or cues each group's members were willing to substantiate by an hypothesized generalization. Nor was there a statistical difference between the immature,
dogmatic group and the mature, nondogmatic group in the number of generalizations hypothesized for either that point of view with which they agreed or disagreed.

Two judges, familiar with the authoritarian or dogmatic personality, did differentiate at a statistically significant level between those imports done by immature, dogmatic students and those done by mature, nondogmatic students. This finding suggests that there was a pattern of cognitive behavior characteristic of each of the two groups that is evidenced by their written response to value-laden historical information and which is detectable according to Rokeach's criteria making up his working definition of the open and closed mind.

Further research will be necessary to clarify the following questions:

1) Would limited visual availability of cues differentiate the immature, dogmatic group from the mature, nondogmatic group at a statistically significant figure?

2) Would a more ambiguous presentation of value-laden historical material encourage more cognitive selectivity by the two dichotomous personality groups?

3) Would an evaluation of student involvement in a particular historical problem separate those actually thinking reflectively as evidenced by the methodology of the first six hypotheses?
If the rationale of the immature, dogmatic-mature, nondogmatic continuum and the technique of detection of this particular type of nonreflective student are reliable and valid as further studies need to indicate, the possibility of profitably using the theoretical model by the professional social studies teacher to aid in more effective direction of inquiry becomes greatly enhanced. The significance of such a possibility to social studies education will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The possibility suggested by this study of having an effective means of detecting those students evidencing the cognitive characteristics outlined in Rokeach's working definition of the open versus the closed mind suggests further avenues of empirical study for understanding and encouraging reflective thought operationally in the classroom.

Teacher Characteristics

Previous studies of classroom interaction have indicated significant positive or negative relationships related to student attitudes and achievement between various personality types of teachers with various personality types of students.

Heil, in defining his A-type teacher states,

The A (turbulent) teacher appears to place little emphasis on structure and order and has thinking, conjecturing and objectivity as a center of focus. In this connection, this teacher probably tends to deal objectively with ideas of children and is not likely to use value judgments in evaluating interpersonal relations of the children or their performance. Neutrality and attention to outcomes are likely to prevail rather than judgments of personal value in terms of
"good" and "bad." On the other hand, this type of teacher would tend to move away from people and move towards ideas and would not show much warmth in relating to the children. In fact, A type people are not, generally speaking, empathic. As to themselves, they are accepting of and free in expressing their impulses.¹

Though it should be kept in mind that Heil's frame of reference is the elementary school, it is possible, if one accepts this personality type as logical and congruent, to see the strengths and weaknesses of the type of teacher who is probably the most capable of motivating and guiding reflective thought for the mature, nondogmatic high school student. It would be logical to assume that this type of student could meet successfully the role expectations of such a teacher. He could maintain the breadth of viewing in various problematical situations that could entertain alternative solutions to which facts could be entertained. The mature, nondogmatic student's role expectations of the teacher would be complementary. He would expect the teacher to allow him to have his own personal opinions on a problem and be able to express them without fear of arousing the enmity of the teacher or offending the teacher's "good" judgment. The teacher would expect the student to use publicly verifiable knowledge to validate his point of view.

¹Louis M. Heil, Marion Powell, and Irwin Feifer, Characteristics of Teacher Behavior Related to the Achievement of Children in Several Elementary Grades (Cooperative Research Project No. 7285) (New York: Brooklyn College, May, 1960), p. 68.
and the student would expect the teacher to do likewise. The student would be more apt to be motivated, than offended, by the teacher's taking, on various occasions, incongruent philosophical positions because he does not expect always to agree even with those teachers with whom he finds the most in common.

Heil's findings of the A-type teacher showed that they were the most successful in obtaining significantly more achievement for all children in arithmetic and science. They were also more successful in assisting all children to obtain somewhat more developed personal feeling even though as Heil puts it, "... with such teachers there appears on the surface to be a less desirable perception of authority and a somewhat high level of projected hostility and anxiety."² In evaluating the suitability of such a teacher for elementary school children, Heil offers the following hypothesis:

The hypothesis is that such an environment is fundamentally threatening to all children (but more so to opposing and wavering children) and that children react to such threat with an upsurge of hostile feelings which may not be expressed overtly, but which will be projected onto the environment with a tendency to see many more things and people as hostile and hence more threatening.³

He draws the further implication from the hypothesis that children of elementary school age have not had

²Ibid., p. 68.
³Ibid.
experience in imposing their own order and structure upon events, social situations, etc., that may lead to misperception of facts and distortions of interpersonal relations and realities.

Could not the same critical remarks be made for the A-type high school social studies teacher required to work with immature, dogmatic students? The role expectations of teacher and student alike appropriate for reflective inquiry for a substantial number of high school students may be too incongruent with the personality type characterized as threatened and anxiety ridden seeking security and acceptance in a world that usually appears to be a jungle.

Phenix, in discussing course sequence and the role of history, religion, and philosophy as the synoptic realm of meanings also alludes to the element of student maturity necessary when making behavior judgments involving value-laden content:

... the synoptic fields, depending upon a substantial fund of other meanings to be integrated can most profitably be pursued at a later stage in the learner's career. The descriptive sciences may be entered upon with less prior preparation than can the moral disciplines, which gain significance only with the assumption of real responsibility.4

Recognizing the need in this study for the statistical control of verbal intelligence, it is nevertheless apparent

---

that there is a difference irrespective of this factor in the psychological or emotional maturity of a given age revealed in the present study by the value-orientations and verbal expressions detectable by qualified judges in a statistically significant manner between the dichotomous personality types. If the high school social studies teacher is to help meet the needs of these students, the teacher will have to play a different set of roles, at least initially, and reserve a somewhat different set of expectations for his students whom he has been able, perhaps through a technique similar to the Historical Evaluation Test, to classify as immature, dogmatic.

The teacher may have to display more of the teacher characteristics Heil has included in his B-type teacher who seemed to be the more effective in over-all achievement with all types of elementary school age children. He states,

This kind of teacher focuses on structure, order and planning. This focus is also accompanied by high work-orientation. There is likely to be a sensitivity to children's feelings and a warmth toward children, which is an integral part of this personality-type's character and which is not, therefore, predicated upon a need for her to feed upon the children's offering her affection. This teacher is also likely to emphasize interpersonal relationships in the classroom.5

Heil hypothesizes the success of the B-type teacher on the fact that authority is more effective, especially as seen by the opposing type of child who apparently, according to

5Heil, op. cit., p. 70.
Heil, is more likely to feel threatened and rebellious towards authority figures whom they regard as ineffectual.

Heil recognizes the following weaknesses of the B-type teacher which have particular, negative implications for the goal of encouraging reflective thought. He says,

A somewhat negative corollary is that children with B-type teachers appear to be less free in the expression of their feelings and tend to be less self-reliant, being more prone to disclaim responsibility and put it back in the hands of authority figures.6

Creativity and Learning

Studies in creativity and its cultivation can broaden the concepts of the immature, dogmatic personality and the mature, nondogmatic personality as to how these varying personalities may be more effectively guided toward their upper limits of genuine reflection. In discussing differences in classroom outcomes from his research on the integrative versus the dominating modes of social interaction, Anderson says,

The data confirm the hypothesis that integration in the teacher induces integrative behavior in the child. Moreover, children with the more dominating teacher showed significant higher frequencies of non-conforming behavior, directly supporting the hypothesis that domination incites resistance. The behavior of the children also supported the further hypothesis that severe domination produces not resistance but submission and atrophy.7

6Ibid., p. 71.

The writer is referring to the type of irrational non-conformity which is made clear in his emphasis on Social Development in contrast to Socialization. He says,

From the point of view of personality growth the contrasting aim of social development is to achieve for the child the socially integrative relation; that is, the maximum of spontaneity with the maximum of harmony. Obviously, much of the actual socializing process is a throttling of the child's spontaneity and a stifling of his creativity.

Creativity seems logically to be a part of the ability of the mature, nondogmatic student to be selective in developing a cognitive structure more in keeping with the belief-disbelief system defined by Rokeach's working definition as open-minded. Teachers, wishing to counteract the tendencies of the immature, dogmatic student resulting from the dominating type of environment, would gain much insight into classroom operations by studying the roles which Anderson favors in the integrative elementary school teacher. Many of the roles, slightly adjusted for differences in physical maturity and interests, would provide avenues for assisting the immature, dogmatic student to gain the confidence and self-respect necessary for more reflective thought. Anderson states the main purpose of integrative classroom activities when he says,

What is important is the process of choosing and the process of producing. Through action comes a confidence by which a child knows that he is

---

8 Ibid., p. 138.
free to choose and free to produce his own contribution without threat, censor, or guilt from the environment.\textsuperscript{9}

Getzels and Jackson's study dealing with creativity and intelligence indicates that teachers seem to fail to appreciate the needs of the mature, nondogmatic student or to be in a mood to encourage such need orientations in the immature, dogmatic student. In discussing the findings relevant to the teachers' concept of the preferred student, Getzels and Jackson state,

The data are quite clear-cut. The high IQ group stands out as being more desirable than the average student, the high creativity group does not. It is apparent that an adolescent's desirability as a student is not a function only of his academic achievement. Even though the scholastic performance is the same, the high IQ students are preferred over the average students by their teachers, the creativity students are not.

This result is quite striking, for, if anything, the reverse should be true. Here is a student--the high IQ one--who is doing scholastically only what can be expected of him. Here is another student--the high creativity one--who is doing scholastically better than can be expected of him.\textsuperscript{10}

This reaction of the teachers becomes more relevant and significant for this study when it is kept in mind that the high creative child seems to have similar role expectations of the teacher that already have been suggested for the mature, nondogmatic student. At the same time the creative

\textsuperscript{9}Ibid., p. 133.

\textsuperscript{10}Jacob W. Getzels and Philip W. Jackson, Creativity and Intelligence (London: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962), p. 30.
students appear more willing and able to perform the student role expected by Heil's Type-A teacher. Results on the nonverbal imaginative productions of the high IQ and those of the high creative adolescents give a fair representation of differences in performance tendencies. Getzels and Jackson conclude:

(1) The high creatives are more stimulus-free. They tend to structure the task in their own terms, rather than merely to comply with it in terms given. . . . (2) The high creatives tend to be more fanciful and humorous. Indeed, some of their pictures seem to be rather esoteric fantasies or elaborate pictorial puns, apparently intended as much for their own enjoyment as anyone else's. (3) The high creatives tend to express more aggression and violence. In this connection, it is not merely the presence or absence of violence that should be noted but that whereas the pictures of the high creatives seem to have personal meaning the pictures of the high IQ's seem only superficial representations.11

The lack of spontaneity and creativity has been linked by Anderson and Anderson (1954) among others to the threatened, anxious personality to be discussed below in terms of alienation.

Anxiety and Learning

Phenix has noted the development in present day society of a destructively critical spirit and the pervasive modern sense of meaninglessness which he attributes to the following four factors. He states,

The first is the spirit of criticism and skepticism. This spirit is part of the scientific

11Ibid., pp. 50-51.
heritage, but it has also tended to bring the validity of all meanings into question. The second factor is the pervasive depersonalization and fragmentation of life caused by the extreme specialization of a complex, interdependent society. The third factor is the sheer mass of cultural products, especially knowledge, which modern man is required to assimilate. The fourth factor is the rapid rate of change in the conditions of life, resulting in a pervasive feeling of impermanence and insecurity.\textsuperscript{12}

Unreflective behavioral reactions to these conditions have been irrational conformity or irrational nonconformity. The former reaction emphasizes an alienation of the individual from himself by forcing him to ignore his own needs and value-orientations in his attempt to meet those of others. The later reaction of irrational nonconformity causes an alienation of the individual from others by encouraging him to magnify his own needs and value-orientations, consequently ignoring the societal needs and cultural value-orientations. In discussing the process of alienation, the Josephsons state,

But if one acquires a self by communicating with others, especially through language, then anxiety about or loss of selfhood is a social as well as an individual problem. What this means is that the person who experiences self-alienation is not only cut off from the springs of his own creativity, but is thereby also cut off from groups of which he would otherwise be a part; and he who fails to achieve a meaningful relationship with others is deprived of some part of himself.\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} Phenix, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 5.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
The author does not mean to imply that these factors encouraging meaninglessness are necessarily unfortunate. In fact, the very factors inherently have the seeds creating a process for their solution if reflective thought has become the *modus operandi* of the individual or group. As Hullfish states,

When patterns of meaning which are held without undue emotional attachment are challenged, the *feeling* of incongruency acts as a spur to further reflection. The feeling may vary from a mild and pleasant intellectual curiosity to a driving sense of urgency; but, in any case, it supplies the motive power for the reflective activity needed to resolve the problem.\(^4\)

Massialas, in summarizing some studies of college men related to motivation at McGill University, states,

On the basis of the data furnished in the experiments one can hypothesize that the human animal cannot really survive and sustain himself unless challenging encounters in the environment provide the necessary excitement and stimulation. The human mind does not necessarily seek to avoid pain and unpleasantness in its perceptual terrain, but it creates, or, if necessary, fabricates problematic situations.\(^5\)

The problem for the social studies teacher arises with the different reactions of various personality types to thought questions that cast doubts upon the student's cherished


beliefs which are seen as a threat to their security. Some resulting anxiety appears to be beneficial, furnishing the needed motivating agent for reflection and discovery, while other types of anxiety become debilitating causing apathetic or fanatical blind acceptance. The role of anxiety is still quite elusive and highly debated among psychologists. As Jackson and Strattner state,

In England, the relationship between anxiety and learning is the object of some controversy. Conflict exists concerning not whether anxiety is related to learning but whether the relationship is linear. Lynn and Gordon (1961), for example, argued that there is a "golden mean of neuroticism or anxiety" for maximally efficient performance on tasks such as Raven's Progress Matrices (and also, presumably, for general academic proficiency). This "ideal" score coincided with the average score of university students.\(^{10}\)

All action in the social studies classroom, however, need not wait for a further clarification on this subject. In the meantime, the problem facing the social studies teacher does not seem to be whether he should create a climate that is somewhat threatening or not. The problem becomes how to develop a climate with various personality types of teachers that creates the type and level of anxiety with various personality types of students that appears to lead to a positive reaction of reflective thought rather

\(^{10}\)Philip W. Jackson and Nina Strattner, "Meaningful Learning and Retention," Review of Educational Research, XXXIV (December, 1964), 515.
than a negative reaction of excessive conformity or non-conformity or, on the other hand, just plain boredom and lack of interest.

Expanding Teacher-student Effectiveness for Reflective Thought

Flanders\(^\text{17}\) has demonstrated that interaction analysis can provide a useful means for the professional teacher to gain greater insight into his effectiveness in motivating and guiding relevant verbal interaction in the classroom. Similar techniques are being offered also to expand the insights of students now in teacher-education. The teacher or prospective teacher gains an insight into the rationale of the behavior categories or criteria used on the evaluation sheet while learning how to use the instrument in evaluating other teachers. In anticipating the use of the instrument by others while he is teaching, there is an added stimulus to adjust his own behavior in accord with the established criteria. He has a means of evaluating behaviorally the discrepancy between his intentions in the light of his performance as judged by the criteria stated on the interaction evaluation sheet.

Though a number of the ten categories of the Flanders' evaluation may be relevant in identifying differences in

teacher-pupil interaction among the immature, dogmatic students in contrast to the mature, nondogmatic students, a further study would be necessary to establish the validity of any logically relevant criteria. The development of such a modified instrument for evaluating oral verbal expression and value-orientations combined with an instrument along the lines of the Historical Evaluation Test to evaluate written verbal expression and value-orientations would provide a means of assisting teachers in gaining further insights for the encouragement of reflection.

The utilization of these instruments also would provide a well-rounded basis for noting the types of generalizations that are hypothesized as premises in student evaluation of historical or current value-laden happenings. Knowing more explicitly how various students react to various classroom topics and methods would direct the teacher in his own efforts, as well as in concert with other staff members, in planned experiences where similar personality types or certain combinations of personality types might more profitably research positively motivating problems in an appropriate content area with an appropriate teacher personality. The controversial issue or problem in such an environment would be assumed to provide a more healthy motivating effect upon inquiry for a greater portion of the student body. A means would have been provided to
accomplish the goal of the historically oriented social studies classroom which Massialas cogently defines when he states,

In sum, instruction in history and social studies should be directed toward increasing the store of dependable and reliable knowledge, enhancing the ability of students to utilize analytical tools in historical and social science investigation, offering the opportunity to engage in "intuitive" thinking, and encouraging the judicious analysis of moral issues confronting the world or the local community.18

In summary, the Historical Evaluation Test and a classroom interaction analysis instrument based on the Flanders' rationale and technique would assist a teacher in accomplishing the following three broad areas or concerns in stimulating reflective thought: (1) to empirically identify the controversial issues or areas of inquiry most challenging to certain individuals or groups of individuals (prospective "open" areas); (2) to empirically determine the combinations of students that could most profitably investigate a prospective "open" area; (3) to establish through empirical analysis the roles that the teacher should perform and the expectations of students for those particular combinations of students decided upon while investigating a particular unit of inquiry.

---
18 Massialas, op. cit., p. 625.
APPENDIX A
Historical Evaluation Test

YOUR EVALUATION PLEASE!

Background: At the time of the writing of the United States Constitution the following two points of view were popular. They related to what was the best type of government considering man's basic nature.

Directions: Please read the following opinion of one of the leading patriots of our country noting the few major ideas stated to be listed by you under the paragraph.

The passions of greed, ambition, interest govern most individuals and all public bodies. Political writers have established it as a rule, that, in establishing any system of government, and fixing the several checks and controls of the constitution, every man ought to be supposed a rogue, and to have no other end, in all his actions, but private interest. By this interest we must govern him; and by means of it, make him co-operate to public good, notwithstanding his insatiable greed and ambition. Without this, we shall in vain boast of the advantages of any constitution. The many are turbulent and uncontrollable, driven by nothing but blind passion, and hence too shameless to be entrusted with governmental power. The few, on the other hand, while also motivated by greed and selfishness, have

---


2 Saul K. Padover quotes Hamilton, "Political writer he argued ... have established it as a maxim, that, in contriving any system of government, and fixing the several checks and controls of the constitution, every man ought to be supposed a knave; and to have no other end, in all his actions, but private interest. By this interest we must govern him; and by means of it, make him co-operate to public good; notwithstanding his insatiable avarice and ambition. Without this we shall in vain boast of the advantage of any constitution," The Mind of Alexander Hamilton (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958), p. 13.
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enough sense and education to judge matters and, in consequence, can be depended upon to realize that their own best interests lay in using political power responsibly. 3

Further directions: Please answer the following questions in the remaining space on this sheet and on the blank sheet provided, stating the number of the question before you begin answering it.

1. List the major opinions offered by the writer.

2. Take each major idea you listed above and explain what you think would make the writer express such opinions . . . drawing your reasons from your knowledge of the historical period and your understanding of human nature.

---

3 Saul K. Padover paraphrases Hamilton, "The many, he said, were 'turbulent and uncontrollable,' driven by nothing but blind passion, and hence too imprudent to be entrusted with governmental power. The few, on the other hand, while also motivated by greed and selfishness, had enough sense and education to judge matters and, in consequence, could be depended upon to realize that their own best interests lay in using political power responsibly," The Mind of Alexander Hamilton (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958), pp. 13-14.
YOUR EVALUATION PLEASE!

Background: At the time of the writing of the United States Constitution the following two points of view were popular. They related to what was the best type of government considering man's basic nature.

Directions: Please read the following opinion of one of the leading patriots of our country noting the few major ideas stated to be listed by you under the paragraph.

I have no fear, but that the result of our founding of the republic will be, that men may be trusted to govern themselves without a master.¹ I am persuaded myself that the good sense of the people will always be found to be the best army . . . . The basis of our government being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right, and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government; I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter² . . . . I cannot act as if all men were unfaithful because some are so. I had rather be the victim of occasionally trusting someone mistakenly, than relinquish my general confidence in the honesty of men. With greater attainments the upper classes are more greedy and unscrupulous, always contriving to nestle themselves into the places of power and profit.³

¹Saul K. Padover quotes Jefferson, "I have no fear, but that the result of our experiment will be, that men may be trusted to govern themselves without a master," Jefferson (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1942), p. 154.

²Phillips Russell quotes Jefferson, "I am persuaded myself that the good sense of the people will always be found to be the best army. . . . The basis of our government being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government; I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter," Jefferson Champion of the Free Mind (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1956), p. 113.

³Frederick C. Prescott quotes Jefferson, "I cannot act as if all men were unfaithful because some are so . . . . I had rather be the victim of occasional infidelities, than relinquish my general confidence in the honesty of man. . . . With greater attainments the upper classes are more greedy and unscrupulous, always contriving 'to nestle themselves into the places of power and profit,'" Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson (New York: American Book Company, 1934), p. lvii.
Further directions: Please answer the following questions in the remaining space on this sheet and on the blank sheet provided, stating the number of the question before you begin answering it.

1. List the major opinions offered by the writer.

2. Take each major idea you listed above and explain what you think would make the writer express such opinions . . . drawing your reasons from your knowledge of the historical period and your understanding of human nature.
Now that you have analyzed these two points of view, please answer on the next lined page the following two questions:

1. What point of view makes the most sense to you---that is---with which do you agree? Why?

2. Which of the two views you considered represents in your opinion the point of view of those writing the United States Constitution? Why do you think so? Please continue to draw your reasons from your knowledge of the historical period and your understanding of human nature.
OPINIONNAIRE

The following is a survey of the opinions of people in general about a number of social and personal questions. Of course there are many different answers. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; You may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many other people feel the same as you do.

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

+1: I AGREE A LITTLE
-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE
+2: I AGREE ON THE WHOLE
-2: I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE
+3: I AGREE VERY MUCH
-3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH

1. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.

2. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.

3. I wish people would be more definite about things.

4. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.

5. Most people just don't know what's good for them.

6. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.

7. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers his own happiness primarily.

8. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.

9. I work under a great deal of tension at times.

10. I'd like it if I should find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.

11. Of all the different philosophies which have existed in this world there is probably only one which is correct.

12. Whether it's alright to manipulate people or not, it is certainly alright when it's for their own good.

13. It is when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that his life becomes meaningful.

14. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what is going on is to rely upon leaders or experts who can be trusted.

15. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.
16. There are a number of persons I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.

17. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.

18. It is when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that he becomes important.

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

20. A group which tolerates too much difference of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.

21. The businessman and manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.

22. It is only natural that a person should have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.

23. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, I sometimes have the ambition to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.

24. Plain common sense tells you that prejudice can be removed by education, not legislation.

25. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary at times to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.

26. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."

27. A person must be pretty stupid if he still believes in differences between races.

28. Most people just don't give a "damn" about others.

29. A person who gets enthusiastic about a number of causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.

30. Do unto others as they do unto you.

31. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.

32. If given the chance I would do something that would be of great benefit to the world.

33. The trouble with many people is that they don't take things seriously enough.
34. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by certain people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.

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

36. It bothers me when something unexpected interrupts my daily routine.

37. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.

38. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are on the side of truth and those who are against it.

39. What the youth needs is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.

40. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.

41. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.

42. I set a high standard for myself and I feel others should do the same.

43. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.

44. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.

45. Appreciation of others is a healthy attitude, since it is the only way to have them appreciate you.

46. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is the future that counts.

47. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what is going on.

48. People who seem unsure and uncertain about things make me feel uncomfortable.

49. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonely place.

50. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.

51. In general, full economic security is bad; most men wouldn't work if they didn't need the money for eating and living.

52. The worst crime a person can commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.
53. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.

54. The American re-armament program is clear and positive proof that we are willing to sacrifice to preserve our freedom.

55. Most of the ideas which get published nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.

56. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.

57. Most of the arguments or quarrels I get into are over matters of principle.

58. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.

59. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.

60. America may not be perfect, but the American way has brought us about as close as human beings can get to a perfect society.
This inventory consists of 120 statements which range over a wide variety of topics. As you read each statement you are asked to indicate quickly your agreement or disagreement with it in terms of the key given below. People have different reactions to these statements. This is not a test in which there are "right" and "wrong" answers. What is wanted here is your own quick personal reaction. You should be able to finish taking the inventory in 30 minutes or less.

In responding to these statements you will notice that there is no way provided for indicating a neutral position. It is desired that you indicate a tendency toward either agreement or disagreement even though you may prefer to remain undecided. It is important that you respond to every one of the 120 statements.

Before beginning work please record at the top of your answer sheet (1) your name, (2) date, (3) the name of your school, (4) your sex, (5) your academic class i.e., (Freshman, Sophomore, etc.), and (6) the name of this inventory.

The key you are to use in responding to these statements is reproduced at the top of each page. (Note that you will never use the fifth response space on your answer sheet.)
Key: 1. I strongly agree or accept the statement.
2. I tend to agree or accept the statement.
3. I tend to disagree or reject the statement.
4. I strongly disagree or reject the statement.

1. If you want a thing done right, you have to do it yourself.

2. There are times when a father, as head of the family, must tell the other family members what they can and cannot do.

3. Lowering tariffs to admit more foreign goods into this country lowers our standard of living.

4. Literature should not question the basic moral concepts of society.

5. Reviewers and critics of art, music and literature decide what they like and then force their tastes on the public.

6. Why study the past, when there are so many problems of the present to be solved.

7. Business men and manufacturers are more important to society than artists or musicians.

8. There is little chance for a person to advance in business or industry unless he knows the right people.

9. Man has an inherent guide to right and wrong—his conscience.

10. The main thing about good music is lovely melody.

11. It is only natural and right for each person to think that his family is better than any other.

12. All objective data gathered by unbiased persons indicate that the world and universe are without order.

13. Any man can find a job if he really wants to work.

14. We are finding out today that liberals really are soft-headed, gullible, and potentially dangerous.

15. A man can learn as well by striking out on his own as he can by following the advice of others.

16. The predictions of economists about the future of business are no better than guesses.

17. Being a successful wife and mother is more a matter of instinct than of training.

18. A person often has to get mad in order to push others into action.

19. There is only one real standard in judging art works—each to his own taste.

20. Business enterprise, free from government interference, has given us our high standard of living.

21. Nobody can make a million dollars without hurting other people.

22. Anything we do for a good cause is justified.

23. Public resistance to modern art proves that there is something wrong with it.

24. Sending letters and telegrams to congressmen is mostly a waste of time.

25. Many social problems would be solved if we did not have so many immoral and inferior people.

26. Art which does not tell a human story is empty.

27. You can't do business on friendship: profits are profits; and good intentions are not evidence in a law court.

28. A person has troubles of his own; he can't afford to worry about other people.

29. Books and movies should start dealing with entertaining or uplifting themes instead of the present unpleasant, immoral, or tragic ones.

30. Children should be made to obey since you have to control them firmly during their formative years.
31. The minds of many youth are being poisoned by bad books.

32. Speak softly, but carry a big stick.

33. Ministers in churches should not preach about economic and political problems.

34. Each man is on his own in life and must determine his own destiny.

35. New machines should be taxed to support the workers they displace.

36. The successful merchant can't allow sentiment to affect his business decisions.

37. Ministers who preach socialistic ideas are a disgrace to the church.

38. Labor unions don't appreciate all the advantages which business and industries have given them.

39. It's only natural that a person should take advantage of every opportunity to promote his own welfare.

40. We should impose a strong censorship on the morality of books and movies.

41. The poor will always be with us.

42. A person who is incapable of real anger must also be lacking in moral conviction.

43. If we allow more immigrants into this country, we will lower our standard of culture.

44. People who live in the slums have no sense of respectability.

45. We acquire the highest form of freedom when our wishes conform to the will of society.

46. Modern paintings look like something dreamed up in a horrible nightmare.

47. Voting determines whether or not a country is democratic.

48. The government is more interested in winning elections than in the welfare of the people.

49. Feeble-minded people should be sterilized.

50. In our society, a person's first duty is to protect from harm himself and those dear to him.

51. Those who can, do; those who can't, teach.

52. The best government is one which governs least.

53. History shows that every great nation was destroyed when its people became soft and its morals lax.

54. Philosophers on the whole act as if they were superior to ordinary people.

55. A woman who is a wife and mother should not try to work outside the home.

56. We would be better off if people would talk less and work more.

57. In some elections there is not much point in voting because the outcome is fairly certain.

58. The old masters were the only artists who really knew how to draw and paint.

59. Most intellectuals would be lost if they had to make a living in the realistic world of business.

60. You cannot lead a truly happy life without strong moral and religious convictions.
1. I strongly agree or accept the statement.
2. I tend to agree or accept the statement.
3. I tend to disagree or reject the statement.
4. I strongly disagree or reject the statement.

61. If we didn't have strict immigration laws, our country would be flooded with foreigners.
62. When things seem black, a person should not complain, for it may be God's will.
63. Miracles have always taken place whenever the need for them has been great enough.
64. Science is infringing upon religion when it attempts to delve into the origin of life itself.
65. A person has to stand up for his rights or people will take advantage of him.

66. A lot of teachers, these days, have radical ideas which need to be carefully watched.
67. Now that America is the leading country in the world, it's only natural that other countries should try to be like us.
68. Most Negroes would become overbearing and disagreeable if not kept in their place.
69. Foreign films emphasize sex more than American films do.
70. Our rising divorce rate is a sign that we should return to the values which our grandparents held.

71. Army training will be good for most modern youth because of the strict discipline they will get.
72. When operas are sung in this country they ought to be translated into English.
73. People who say they're religious but don't go to church are just hypocrites.
74. What the country needs, more than laws or politics, is a few fearless and devoted leaders in whom the people can have faith.
75. Pride in craftsmanship and in doing an honest day's work is a rare thing these days.

76. The United States may not have had much experience in international dealings but it is the only nation to which the world can turn for leadership.
77. In practical situations, theory is of very little help.
78. No task is too great or too difficult when we know that God is on our side.
79. A sexual pervert is an insult to humanity and should be punished severely.
80. A lot of science is just using big words to describe things which many people already know through common sense.

81. Manual labor and unskilled jobs seem to fit the Negro mentality and ability better than more skilled or responsible work.
82. A person gets what's coming to him in this life if he doesn't believe in God.
83. Public officials may try to be honest but they are caught in a web of influence which tends to corrupt them.
84. Science makes progress only when it attempts to solve urgent practical problems.
85. Most things in life are governed by forces over which we have no control.

86. Young people today are in general more immoral and irresponsible than young people of previous generations.
87. Americans may tend to be materialistic, but at least they aren't cynical and decadent like most Europeans.
88. The many different kinds of children in school these days force teachers to make a lot of rules and regulations so that things will run smoothly.
89. Jews will marry out of their own religious group whenever they have the chance.
90. The worst danger to real Americanism during the last 50 years has come from foreign ideas and agitators.
Key: 1. I strongly agree or accept the statement.  
2. I tend to agree or accept the statement.  
3. I tend to disagree or reject the statement.  
4. I strongly disagree or reject the statement.

91. Europeans criticize the United States for its materialism but such criticism is only to cover up their realization that American culture is far superior to their own.

92. The scientist that really counts is the one who turns theories into practical use.

93. No one can really feel safe when scientists continue to explore whatever they wish without any social or moral restraint.

94. Nudist colonies are a threat to the moral life of a nation.

95. One trouble with Jewish businessmen is that they stick together and prevent other people from having a fair chance in competition.

96. No world organization should have the right to tell Americans what they can or cannot do.

97. There is a source of knowledge that is not dependent upon observation.

98. Despite the material advantages of today, family life now is not as wholesome as it used to be.

99. The United States doesn't have to depend on the rest of the world in order to be strong and self-sufficient.

100. Foreigners usually have peculiar and annoying habits.

101. Parents know as much about how to teach children as public school teachers.

102. The best assurance of peace is for the United States to have the strongest army, navy, air force, and the most atom bombs.

103. Some day machinery will do nearly all of man's work, and we can live in leisure.

104. There are too many people in this world who do nothing but think about the opposite sex.

105. Modern people are superficial and tend to lack the finer qualities of manhood and womanhood.

106. Members of religious sects who refuse to salute the flag should be punished for their lack of patriotism.

107. Political parties are run by insiders who are not concerned with the public welfare.

108. As young people grow up they ought to get over their radical ideas.

109. Negroes have their rights, but it is best to keep them in their own districts and schools and to prevent too much contact with whites.

110. The twentieth century has not had leaders with the vision and capacity of the founders of this country.

111. There are a lot of things in this world that will never be explained by science.

112. Sexual relations between brother and sister are contrary to natural law.

113. There may be a few exceptions, but in general Jews are pretty much alike.

114. The world will get so bad that some of these times God will destroy it.

115. Children should learn to respect and obey their teachers.

116. Other countries don't appreciate as much as they should all the help that America has given them.

117. We would be better off if there were fewer psychoanalysts probing and delving into the human mind.

118. American free enterprise is the greatest bulwark of democracy.

119. If a person is honest, works hard, and trusts in God, he will reap material as well as spiritual rewards.

120. One will learn more in the school of hard knocks than he ever can from a textbook.
VERBAL REASONING

FORM A

Do not open this booklet until you are told to do so.

On your SEPARATE ANSWER SHEET, print your name, address, and other requested information in the proper spaces.

In the space after Form, print an A.

Then wait for further instructions.

DO NOT MAKE ANY MARKS IN THIS BOOKLET
VERBAL REASONING

DIRECTIONS

Each of the fifty sentences in this test has the first word and the last word left out. You are to pick out words which will fill the blanks so that the sentence will be true and sensible.

For the first blank, pick out a numbered word — 1, 2, 3, or 4. For the blank at the end of the sentence, pick one of the lettered words — A, B, C, or D. Combine the number and the letter you have chosen and mark that combination on the separate Answer Sheet after the number of the question you are working on.

EXAMPLE X. ..... is to water as eat is to .....  
1. continue 2. drink 3. foot 4. girl  
A. drive B. enemy C. food D. industry

Drink is to water as eat is to food. Drink is numbered 2, and food is lettered C, 2 and C are combined as 2C. The space under 2C has been filled in on line X on the sample Answer Sheet shown below.

Now look at the next example.

EXAMPLE Y. ..... is to one as second is to .....  
1. middle 2. queen 3. rain 4. first  
A. two B. fire C. object D. hill

First is to one as second is to two. 4A has been properly marked on line Y on the sample Answer Sheet as the correct answer. 4 is the number for first; A is the letter for two. They were combined to make 4A which was filled in on the sample Answer Sheet.

EXAMPLE Z. ..... is to night as breakfast is to .....  
1. flow 2. gentle 3. supper 4. door  
A. include B. morning C. enjoy D. corner

Supper, numbered 3, is to night as breakfast is to morning, lettered B. This number and this letter make the combination 3B which has been found and blackened on line Z on the sample Answer Sheet.

Fill in only one space for each question.

SAMPLE OF ANSWER SHEET

DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE TOLD TO DO SO.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. city</td>
<td>B. France</td>
<td>C. end</td>
<td>D. road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. horse</td>
<td>C. yard</td>
<td>D. cemetery</td>
<td>E. travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. store</td>
<td>D. fat</td>
<td>E. nothing</td>
<td>F. man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. disguise</td>
<td>E. intuitive</td>
<td>F. madame</td>
<td>G. feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. impute</td>
<td>F. last</td>
<td>G. verdure</td>
<td>H. imbue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. poet</td>
<td>G. crime</td>
<td>H. chisel</td>
<td>I. statue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. shell</td>
<td>H. hard</td>
<td>I. iron</td>
<td>J. pull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. bottle</td>
<td>I. fight</td>
<td>J. fish</td>
<td>K. brittle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. ivory</td>
<td>J. doe</td>
<td>K. work</td>
<td>L. elephant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. singer</td>
<td>K. score</td>
<td>L. soprano</td>
<td>M. sonata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. picture</td>
<td>L. revolution</td>
<td>M. gallows</td>
<td>N. criminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. bush</td>
<td>M. vine</td>
<td>N. tree</td>
<td>O. melon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE AND KEEP RIGHT ON WORKING.**
14. ..... is to pea as shell is to......
   1. green  2. sweep  3. pod  4. soup
   A. rifle  B. nut  C. crack  D. peel

15. ..... is to steer as pork is to......
   1. beef  2. bull  3. cow  4. barn
   A. steak  B. lard  C. chop  D. pig

16. ..... is to sentence as sentence is to......
   1. jail  2. word  3. period  4. question
   A. fine  B. comma  C. paragraph  D. phrase

17. ..... is to Dick as Margaret is to......
   A. Mary  B. Peggy  C. Joan  D. Frances

18. ..... is to childhood as adolescence is to......
   1. infancy  2. infancy  3. weaning  4. health
   A. adultery  B. maturity  C. sinecure  D. intelligence

19. ..... is to potato as beater is to......
   1. masher  2. mashed  3. skin  4. spud
   A. winner  B. baton  C. steak  D. egg

20. ..... is to dog as Guernsey is to......
   1. terrier  2. tail  3. bark  4. cat
   A. cow  B. Jersey  C. noble  D. furniture

21. ..... is to top as base is to......
   1. ibex  2. spin  3. side  4. apex
   A. vile  B. ball  C. bottom  D. home

22. ..... is to eagle as Pekinese is to......
   1. flag  2. sparrow  3. dollar  4. vulture
   A. Chinese  B. collie  C. yen  D. crow

23. ..... is to river as coast is to......
   1. flood  2. boat  3. bank  4. tide
   A. beach  B. spa  C. sea  D. sled

24. ..... is to foot as elbow is to......
   1. man  2. thigh  3. knee  4. toe
   A. hand  B. thumb  C. shoulder  D. finger

25. ..... is to day as calendar is to......
   1. noon  2. clock  3. sun  4. night
   A. year  B. weekend  C. March  D. century

TURN THE PAGE AND KEEP RIGHT ON WORKING.
26. is to constitution as prologue is to.....
1. independence    2. law      3. preamble      4. amendment
A. eulogy           B. writ      C. play            D. epilogue.

27. is to proceed as stop is to.....
1. profit           2. halt      3. recede          4. intercede
A. prevent          B. bottle    C. gone            D. go

28. is to horse as bray is to.....
1. drive            2. hoof      3. neigh           4. saddle
A. relay            B. pony      C. wagon          D. donkey

29. is to sea as rebellion is to.....
1. mutiny           2. navy      3. sailor          4. river
A. revolting        B. war       C. land            D. soldier

30. is to distance as pound is to.....
1. far              2. rod       3. Europe          4. travel
A. heavy            B. ounce     C. weight          D. noise

31. is to door as pane is to.....
1. home             2. lock      3. wood            4. panel
A. glass            B. window    C. ache            D. view

32. is to never as all is to.....
1. always           2. usually   3. seldom          4. often
A. none             B. whole     C. every           D. total

33. is to future as regret is to.....
1. ahead            2. opportunity 3. forecast        4. hope
A. past             B. atone     C. absent          D. sins

34. is to rain as levee is to.....
1. cloud            2. fog       3. water           4. umbrella
A. departure        B. flood     C. rise            D. wash

35. is to fish as gun is to.....
1. cod              2. bait      3. rod             4. fry
A. hunt             B. trigger   C. shot            D. bullet

36. is to pacifist as religion is to.....
1. war              2. atlantis  3. object          4. conscience
A. devout           B. sacred    C. atheist         D. minister

37. is to deft as awkward is to.....
1. clumsy           2. hearing   3. blindness       4. newt
A. skillful         B. stupid    C. ugly            D. left

38. is to nut as hook is to.....
1. fruit            2. sane      3. bolt            4. hazel
A. bend             B. golf      C. eyehole         D. pitch

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE AND KEEP WORKING.
39. .....is to land as knot is to....
1. desert  2. mile  3. acre  4. farm
A. rope    B. meter    C. sea   D. mountain

40. .....is to bird as shed is to....
1. call    2. fly      3. migrate  4. moult
A. barn    B. dog      C. hay    D. farm

41. .....is to physician as secretary is to.....
1. hospital  2. doctor  3. nurse  4. medicine
A. office    B. stenographer C. clerk   D. executive

42. .....is to England as lira is to.....
1. London    2. pound  3. king  4. colony
A. Italy    B. Mexico   C. mandolin D. money

43. .....is to city as national is to......
1. mayor    2. Chicago  3. limits  4. municipal
A. country    B. Federal C. government D. international

44. .....is to prison as Louvre is to.....
1. warden    2. Bastille 3. crime  4. bars
A. France    B. museum C. paramour D. artist

45. .....is to Canada as Havana is to.....
A. Puerto Rico B. Cuba   C. Mexico D. Florida

46. .....is to opera as lyric is to.....
1. baritone   2. drama  3. Wagner  4. composer
A. song      B. music C. poem    D. lilting

47. .....is to bleach as flushed is to.....
1. color    2. gay     3. sheep  4. combine
A. Blushed   B. drained C. wan    D. truffle

48. .....is to static as dynamic is to.....
1. radio    2. politic 3. inert  4. air
A. speaker   B. motor C. active D. regal

49. .....is to all as part is to......
1. each    2. right  3. none  4. full
A. whole    B. separate C. role   D. many

50. .....is to diamond as circle is to.....
1. square    2. shape   3. cube  4. gold
A. triangle  B. oval   C. round D. smooth
APPENDIX B
1. Imports are grouped in two categories
   1.1 Immature and dogmatic
   1.2 Mature and nondogmatic

2. Imports run in letter prefix or suffix sequence followed by any unlettered identification numbers

Dogmatic

- lla

Evaluation: "I myself believe that . . . [Hamilton] seems more correct. It is true today as it was back then that man has a passion for corruptness if given the chance."

In discussion Hamilton: "The writer would contain such opinions because at this time most people were poor. Thus to gain money and power, they became corrupt people. Also it is part of human nature that man should take advantage of situations."

In discussing Jefferson: "The second opinion expresses human nature. Man basically tries to find what is best for himself. He believes in survival of the fittest. Man will take almost any means to obtain money, power, and prestige for himself."

B-222

Evaluation: " . . . [Jefferson's] view makes the most sense to me. I feel that this writer, although optimistic, had a better outlook slightly than the second writer [Hamilton]. I feel that because the New America was at such a critical stage that the views of . . . [Hamilton] would only shadow the ideals of the American people."

In discussing Hamilton: "This writer feels that everyone, especially politicians, are greedy, domineering, selfish, over ambitious fools who should not be trusted to the responsibility of government. This writer may, as some people believe, judge other people by his own standards. This opinion may also be a result of the depression which he has henceforth been forced to live under and is expressing his hate of England in a general manner."

In discussing Jefferson: "The writer shows great confidence in human man. Many people despair after a few encounters with untrustworthy people and soon loose faith in human nature. Evidently he feels America will not turn out the way England has."
Evaluation: "I agree with . . . [Jefferson] that most men are honest, unselfish, and responsible."

In discussing Hamilton: "The writer has not much faith in his fellow man. Thus he feels that the leaders of the country govern for greed, ambition, and personal interest."

In discussing Jefferson: "This was probably written when the Republic was still very young. Man had a desire to rule himself. He was very confident that America would rise to be a great nation without the help of England. . . . The common class was gradually rising at this time and they scorned the upper class for being greedy, etc. Really, they were jealous and felt that they should get some of the assets of the new nation."

C102

Evaluation: "I agree with some of the opinions in both. I feel as in . . . [Jefferson's] opinion that the basis of government is the opinion of the people. I also agree with . . . [Hamilton] on the statement which he made concerning the governing of people."

In discussing Hamilton: "We must govern people's private interests. This opinion might be expressed by the writer because if we were free to do anything we wanted which might hurt others America would be in a state of uncontrol. We have laws and people should obey them. Some people break these laws and must be made to co-operate for the public good."

In discussing Jefferson: "I believe that he feels that high society is trying to always get into power. I agree with this man that upper class people want to run things."

123C

Evaluation: "I agree with both views. I agree with . . . [Jefferson] that it would be better with newspapers without a government because it would not really be a government. But also I agree with . . . [Hamilton] that man has to be guided."

In discussing Hamilton: "Society consists mostly of competition between one another. To get ahead some people become greedy. If the public had no interest or ambition there would be no progress. Man should be guided by a government just as a child needs a parent to guide them."

In discussing Jefferson: "People have the tendency to do the exact opposite of what they are told. Most people will do what is right without having a person telling what to do but they need someone to guide them."
C333

Evaluation: "I agree with . . . [Jefferson]. Our existing government is supposed to be ruled by the people and I feel that the point of view in the first passage illustrates a government ruled by the people."
In discussing Hamilton: "In trying to become a success many people become too greedy and are uncontrollable, therefore they are not fit to serve the public. The well-educated people who have good sense and willpower to control their emotions are fit to serve the public."
In discussing Jefferson: "If men put all their trust in one man, that man is liable to obtain too much power and set up a dictatorship. Man is afraid of being ruled under a dictatorship and therefore he will set up an efficient government."

C-362

Evaluation: "I feel that there should be a combination of both of these points of views. Although I feel that we should not be completely governed as in the [Hamilton] view, I feel that to have a successful democracy there must be a head man to watch over us. I do feel also that if we have a top man there should be a checking system as we have today to keep the man from becoming too powerful."
In discussing Hamilton: "Passions govern most individuals. This statement is true because most of us have passions which cannot be controlled. . . . Throughout history man has been shown to be basically evil."
In discussing Jefferson: "Although many countries, when loosing a leader by revolt or death fall apart or becomes corrupted, most of the citizens of the United States feel that America is completely different. Having been able to do almost anything we please within reason, we feel that there wouldn't be too much difference in having no rule at all. . . . However, I feel that most people, when getting power will become basically evil if not checked by others."

C-409

Evaluation: "I agree with . . . [Hamilton's] paragraph; because even though some of the things stated aren't so true they still make sense. By this, I form my thoughts that there are still a few people in government for power and greed. But every election this group is slowly being pushed out of the picture; and sometimes even before the election."
In discussing Hamilton: "Again it shows that there are too many people in the government or who are trying to get in that wants in just for the greed or just for all of the power they would hold."

In discussing Jefferson: "The people of that time wanted the freedoms in which they were fighting for. Now if they couldn't have a free newspaper which was honest and have free opinions, everything would be lost and they might as well go back to England or other home countries."

Evaluation: "In answering the first question, one must keep in mind the period in which the authors were living. Considering that citizens of the United States were uneducated and news traveled slow, few people had experience in public affairs. I agree with . . . [Hamilton]. I believe that man can make proper decisions when given the proper background material and knowledge of the problem. . . . Judging from history, man is a belligerent animal, yet usually when influenced by a demagogue. Thus . . . [Jefferson's] idea of man's basic good nature seems compatible to my viewpoint."

In discussing Hamilton: "The author's point of view in regards to the first opinion listed was probably influenced by an aristocratic upbringing where power and rule were usually in an oligarchy as in European monarchies. The author felt that the French Revolution was a fine example of mob rule destroying order."

In discussing Jefferson: "The author had probably associated with individuals of a lower class in society where there was actually little law enforcement by a united government, and man had to live by their own codes of conduct. The author probably believed that men could live happily without strife if left alone."

Evaluation: "Actually I have answered this in the two answers. I definitely believe that the conservative statement . . . [of Jefferson] is the brightest, more intelligent of the two. It shows that our Constitution was based on the conservative views, as seen . . . [by Jefferson]. Intelligence runs human nature, and intelligence is conservatism. . . . It shows that liberals are two faced and don't really know what they believe, unless it is the ridiculous ideas as stated . . . [by Hamilton], in which liberals shouldn't be allowed to participate in our true government."
In discussing Hamilton: "Overall, he is saying that we have a select few that should run the government, and that they should take care of everybody else, through mandatory social security, medicare and all types of welfare programs. This, of course, is repugnant to our American belief and it is contrary to our Constitution and our should-be conservative principles."

In discussing Jefferson: "Obviously, this must have been written by Thomas Jefferson, or a great leader like him. What he is saying is that the majority of the people in our country are quite capable of taking care of themselves. His ideas are simple. People don't need social security, medicare, and other forms of socialism to run their lives."

Evaluation: "I am not satisfied with either view by itself. I respect the ideas of . . . [Jefferson] as being ideal but, say a little wishful. I view . . . [Hamilton] as being correct partially in that most people are naturally influenced by concern for their own well-being. But I don't feel that government should be entrusted to a select group, because, perhaps, their lust will be present, too, and probably in greater proportions. I favor a system of government with checks and balances which allows only the individuals created by a democratic society who can best benefit to be placed in public power.

In discussing Hamilton: "This writer feels all men seek betterment and improvement. Their idea of success drives them toward goals which have respect for others. He is perhaps somewhat right in feeling that greed affects us all."

In discussing Jefferson: "An obvious fault of American Government is that an individual or group having favorable circumstances can gain control for their advantage. He discounts this by saying the great majority will be honest."

Evaluation: "... [Hamilton's] view is the plainer of the two to me. With all the faults of people and we must by trial and error find the right qualities one must possess to be a leader of our country. A selfless, ambitious person is the type best suited to give the power of running our government."
In discussing Hamilton: "For a fairly new nation to make progress, she should have a desire to expand and promote her culture. This is not a fault, but yet a strive for existence and expansion. To attain the many goals a country has, it must have great ambition. To become a leader and an advanced individual or public body, the qualities of greed and ambition must be present."

In discussing Jefferson: "The new country of America must now learn to shift more for herself. The king will no longer tell them what to do and say. Their lives are theirs to govern, as is the country theirs to govern. Since the people make major decisions, that often may make or break, they must know true facts and truths about situations as to keep their opinions pure and free of lies."

Evaluation: "I agree with . . . [Jefferson's] view, that we should be able to govern ourselves. Although at this time the mass of people were uneducated, they looked forward to widespread education and with this they would be perfectly capable of governing themselves."

In discussing Hamilton: "During this time when the nation was relatively new, everyone was more or less on his own and everyone was trying to build something for himself so this is probably why the author felt that the people were ambitious and greedy."

In discussing Jefferson: "Also during this period the upper-class businessmen were out to make great profits off this new nation and the author feared that some of these unscrupulous men would gain control of the government and work it entirely for their own means."

Evaluation: "Believing in individual's freedom, I advocate the belief that the central government should intervene as little as possible in the affairs of individuals. Being basically good and intelligent, the people are capable of controlling their own desires and deciding for themselves without the constant interfering of the federal government. The U.S. was created, emphasizing the importance of each man; this idea of liberty and freedom should not be "lost" in attempts by the government to do "what is best for the people." Let the people decide! I recognize no basis for certain governmental figures to establish themselves as all-knowing and consider themselves as the only judge as to
what is best for the people. Thus, a government should be dependent upon ruling according to the majority of the people but not infringing upon any individual's freedom." [Implicitly for Jefferson.] In discussing Hamilton: "One can easily understand why the author believes man is evil because of the ruthlessness and problems nations had encountered at this time just recovering from a revolution. Knowing man cannot be perfected, the author says the only thing to do is show him the best way through a strong government. In discussing Jefferson: "Opinions of the colonists had been so surpassed when they tried to speak to the English that the American patriot did not want the United States to make the same mistake; he highly advocates freedom of speech. The author relishes the idea of equality and not encouraging separation of classes. Believing man is basically good, the author is confident the nation would best survive by having the heart of the people in mind.

Evaluation: "I agree with . . . [Hamilton] because it is a statement that has the most truth in it. A government run by everyone is impossible." In discussing Hamilton: "Man has no other interest rather than to raise himself to the highest level possible. . . . There are few who do realize what is best for them." In discussing Jefferson: "During the period in which the Constitution was written, in the government there was much confusion; therefore, making the republic a mass of confusion. The writer of this passage would consequently form views that a government run by everyone would be better than what they had. . . . Although the government was corrupt, the writer still had a general trust in the people he knew."

Evaluation: "I agree with more of the views of Hamilton than Jefferson, though I do not agree with . . . [Hamilton's] point that only the rich should have power, but I do share his opinion that the well-educated sometimes are more aware of situations and are most likely to discover the answers to problems. However both the Jeffersonian idealism and the Hamiltonian educated aristocracy have been deleted by the American political system's corruption, ruthlessness and thirst for power."
In discussing Hamilton: "... [Hamilton] used much insight in his second point. It is evident that the rich benefit as well as the poor when there is a stable form of government, sound financial system, industry and commerce."

In discussing Jefferson: "I think that ... [Jefferson] was much too idealistic about the common man but from my knowledge of this period, I think I understand where he got such ideas. ... However, it is ridiculous to imagine such a pure republic because of our representative system and the political parties."

Evaluation: "I agree very much with ... [Jefferson]. It is much easier to understand and analyze. I have heard it--of course in different forms--many times and have agreed with it always. It is true the upper class composed of wealth are trying to take over the high seats in the government.

In discussing Hamilton: "A man shouldn't expose his political party desire to anyone. But the way the author wants it--is backwards. He stated that each man should have private interest in establishing a system of government. Then how would the other people react to this one man's interest?

In discussing Jefferson: "I agree with the author. Everyone might be happy to this setup--The news would probably be cheerful. But in opposition--a government without newspapers, I feel would make people have no meaning and feelings for the government."

Evaluation: "... [Hamilton's] view seems to make the most sense because the author although thinking correctly that the people are not capable of self-government, realizes that the best for a self-government is the upper classes since they have the education."

In discussing Hamilton: "Most men of this time were wanting of land or money. If a private individual could obtain something he wanted but had to hurt someone to get it, then he got it anyway."

In discussing Jefferson: "He believes that the people should govern themselves not because this is the only way but because he believes this is the best way. Everyone would have a "voice in the government" and this is what England would not give them."
Evaluation: "...[Hamilton] was less confusing and also of more logical content than ... [Jefferson]. It was a stronger point in relation to the basic mannerisms of man. The reasons were sounder and fit together better than ... [Jefferson].

In discussing Hamilton: "The many are already the powerful people who wish to extend their power and status through success. The few refers to people like the writer who are in the minority in feeling they can get the most for themselves under a government that would help everyone."

In discussing Jefferson: "This writer obviously was seriously affected by the powerful upperclass, in all fields—military, political, economic, and social. Or he was a member of this aristocracy who knew its evils and realized its danger in a government."

S-139

Evaluation: "I agree with ... [Jefferson] because history has shown that a people surpressed by a tyrannical government rebel, and, therefore, evidently a system of government by the people is best."

In discussing Hamilton: "When some people want something they get it no matter what the cost may be. Only a few people can judge the importance of a government in their lives, and, therefore, only they should be trusted in it."

In discussing Jefferson: "America was a nation with relatively no government but an informed people during the American Revolution. Britain had a very stable government but failed to let the people know what was going on. The interest of the people therefore was not behind the war in America because no one knew enough about it to gain an interest. This lack of interest was probably one of the factors in their loss of the colonies."

T 9.72863-10

Evaluation: "... I agree with [Jefferson]. In a broad cross-section of the country you have many different opinions. The one which is predominant is, many times, right. The people look out for their good, thereby, look out for the good of the masses; people will choose the right path which is good for their fellow Americans."

In discussing Hamilton: "Individuals tend to seek to better themselves. If something stands in the way, he will try to remove it so that he can achieve his goal. A powerful speaker can so influence a crowd as to make them perfectly willing to break the law to get what seemed right by the
speaker's reasoning, accomplished. The government can control the people so that they seek the good for all instead of self benefit alone."

In discussing Jefferson: "The rich do not seek to better the masses and the country as they claim because their greed has gone to their heads. They must have more money at the expense of others. Therefore, it is the rich who are unfit to govern and choose wisely and not the masses."

Zilll

Evaluation: "I agree with . . . [Hamilton's] view because of what little knowledge I do know about human nature. I know that without a doubt you can't trust the fellow man. Even with a government that has laws against stealing and others, people still do it. Definitely, . . . [Jefferson] must be crazy."

In discussing Hamilton: "When this man says that men are governed by greed, ambition, and interest, he is absolutely correct. Ten years before the writing of the Constitution, the Revolutionary War broke out. A very small percentage of colonists came to fight, and those that did, usually left after a few months to go home and look out for their families."

In discussing Jefferson: "This man is not too sure if we need a government or not. I disagree. He must have a great deal of confidence to think that man is big enough to govern himself."

Z-8887

Evaluation: "The view of . . . [Hamilton] that people are dishonest because one is less likely to get stung with a financial loss." On the Constitution, "The writers favored trusting people. This is shown in the 5th Amendment because they didn't intend it to be used as it is today. Furthermore with the liberties given out a trust of people is necessary."

In discussing Hamilton: "People stole land and possessions from the Tories looting houses and factories owned by them. When government orders came the greedy people ignored them and kept the loot of the Tories. This shows the dishonesty and greed of people."

In discussing Jefferson: "People then were trustworthy because they were self-sufficient and didn't need items often, and usually made their own instead of coming by them dishonestly."
Evaluation: "I agree with . . . [Hamilton], all men are just humans and all humans want the best things for themselves. Even though a man is dedicated to helping mankind, he will inside feel pride that he is a little famous and also that he may have money. I feel all men have a personal reason for doing anything do."

In discussing Hamilton: "It's a fact in human nature that anything man does if for his own personal gain, even people who become presidents got there for some personal reason. Everyone has these human frailties of greed and ambition. From a priest to a doctor to a King or President. He felt this way because these human characteristics are in all men."

In discussing Jefferson: Probably because this person fled from a country such as England, that had a government made up of a King. He feels that he left there to find a land where he could govern himself and he figures if his new land would form a government he would be back in the position that he was in before."

B-3901

Evaluation: "... [Jefferson's] point makes the most sense because if all of us were as greedy, both in private life and in government, as . . . [Hamilton] would have the reader believe, then a dictatorship, and not a democracy would be the most effective form of government. Of course, this has been proven false. Example: Nazi Germany fell, but the U.S. still remains strong."

In discussing Hamilton: "The colonists of this country had enough trouble protecting their personal welfare, and matters concerning a yet unstable government did not interest them. . . . Many didn't care about our country as a whole, being either soldiers who had just fought in the revolution and didn't want to help the government, or were concerned with themselves first, and only worried about personal interests. Others felt that because they had fought in the war [referring to "the few"], they wanted to see the nation grow strong, or because they hadn't partici-pated in the war cause, felt they owed an obligation, wanted to help out in government affairs."

In Discussing Jefferson: "In America, the "good sense" of the people help to create a true democracy, thus keeping our country strong within itself."
Evaluation: "Personally I agree with . . . [Jefferson's] view. Oddly enough for the reasons given in . . . [Hamilton's] discourse. No person or small group of people can be trusted enough to run a country, and even if they could be trusted, who is to say which way and what is best? Only en masse can we please the majority without persecuting the minorities."

In discussing Hamilton: "During this period of history few people believed a democracy could exist in any form. The aristocracy of the day distrusted the people immensely. The author of this cutting is obviously of this upper class and is proving his point by saying what he said."

In discussing Jefferson: "This person had real trust in the people of this country. The reason for this may have been a real trust in the democratic system. Also, to be this much in favor of popular rule, a person must have an innate trust in people."

Evaluation: "The paragraph that makes the most sense to me is 80% of . . . [Hamilton] 20% of . . . [Jefferson]. Mainly because a leader is needed to make decisions, help the government understand the people's views and to keep the country together. Then a leader is also needed that cannot gain control of the country. In other words he must always feel that the thumb of the people could erase his leadership at any time in which he unjustly ruled or took advantage of the people. . . . People always like a leader to follow if the majority of the people go along with what he stands for."

In discussing Hamilton: "The fact that there will always be some intelligent people in the world helps. But to stay in power, or to be greedy enough to want to stay in power, they must make the others happy which comes to number 3. The less intelligent however would find a government best based on violence and strong arm movements. This would be because during this time as yet governments are overthrown or new governments are started by violence."

In discussing Jefferson: "Because the man was mostly like a leader of the small forces in the revolution, he trusts the men who fought in the war with him. The leadership of the small forces were poor so he thinks that because a small force can defeat the enemy without a leader, a large population can govern themselves."
C108

Evaluation: "I feel that a little of each went into our government, being [what] T. Jefferson once wanted."

In discussing Hamilton: "The man who wrote this feels that the person, himself should be the one who can decide whether he likes a governing issue or not. He feels that it is man's instinct to be free and to decide on his own. He feels that when a person reaches adulthood, he should face the world. He should develop his interest in why he lives the way he does."

In discussing Jefferson: "The men at the time of the writing of the Constitution still felt the spirit of the revolution. They still wanted the things they had fought for."

C-133

Evaluation: "I agree with . . . [Jefferson] because in a large government which is responsible for such a large country, every representative, being in the public eye, will do his best to work for the benefit of the majority. Our government has worked this way, in most cases, since the constitution was written, and politicians on every level, national, state, and local, strive to uphold the integrity and honesty. . . .

In discussing Hamilton: "This was the theory of Hamilton when the early conflicts arose in the government. He had very little trust for the common man and wished to have a strong central government and a national bank so that greedy, rich men could not have too much power."

In discussing Jefferson: "This writer believed in the Jeffersonian theory of Democracy. This was probably written during the Jeffersonian period when men desired a loose interpretation of the Constitution, less federal intervention, a small army, and less executive and Congressional power."

D198

Evaluation: "I don't quite agree with either one but if I had to make a choice corresponding to that time in history I would pick . . . [Hamilton]. I feel this way because almost all the opinions expressed in the first one seemed to be personal opinions which did not seem to relate to the situation at the time."

In discussing Hamilton: "This is true, any man can do wrong if his greed and ambition are strong enough. This is not saying that all do, but one must always take precautions against those few who are rogues or who don't follow the
laws of society. . . . By governing a body so as to enhance their interests they are much more liable to conform to the government as not. Every man likes to have a vested interest in something especially, the rules by which he must live."

In discussing Jefferson: "He thinks that men may be trusted to be their own masters. There could be several reasons for this. But it appears his major reason is his belief in man's opinion being the basis of government."

Evaluation: "I wholeheartedly favor . . . [Jefferson's] paragraph. Looking into the future, optimism has a brighter outlook. Faith is an important quality. Without it, man and his future remain unstable. What good can come to mankind with growing greed, hatred, and resentment among men? I, personally, have faith in man and am willing also to give man the benefit of the doubt."

In discussing Hamilton: "Self preservation is instilled in man. Certainly most people credit themselves with some degree of importance. The writer expresses the idea that we must accept man as he is and proceed to advance instead of attempting to change man."

In discussing Jefferson: "The writer feels, too, that men above all else, should be trusted and believed in. If, perhaps, history maker don't succeed, continue to try and chalk up errors as experience. Don't allow man to be overcome by petty problems, thus enabling his government to fall."

Evaluation: "I agree with . . . [Jefferson]. The people of this country are not bad nor do they need a government of strict control. The government must do the will of the majority, not only a select few. There must be freedom to express our opinions, to the government can't help reach the goals of our society, which is the aim of our government."

In discussing Hamilton: "The revolutionary period was one of confusion. The ideas expressed here was one theory on forming our new government. From England came the idea of man's basic badness. If man were left in a free society, they believed he would look out for only his interests. The society would collapse from the chaos."
D-222--continued

In discussing Jefferson: "This author believes that man is basically good. In a free society man would work for the advancement of all. Man's greed is controlled by his good sense, for he knows that he mustn't think of himself only."

F-137

Evaluation: "I think a combination of the two points of view, that is a faith in the ability of man while recognizing his human frailties. Realizing that government of the people, by the people may have drawbacks, but that is more in accordance with natural law, than arbitrary rule by a few."

In discussing Hamilton: "The first statement which this writer makes is that all political bodies are necessarily corrupt because they are but instruments for promoting man's self interests. This writer might be an Englishman or an Anglophile because he seems to represent many of the views held by Britain at the time. Perhaps from his experience in studying the British he has decided that government operated by self-interested men (even Englishmen) cannot even come close to be perfect."

In discussing Jefferson: "The writer of the above paragraph probably considers man able to govern himself without needing a master because he had seen and/or experienced some bad results of the opposite point of view, when it was put into practice during the pre-Revolutionary War period. . . . Some philosophical theories which were popular at the time, such as the state of nature theory, might have influenced the writer's feelings on man being able to govern himself, for under this concept, as in nature, all people would be responsible for governing themselves, and the only laws would be those to prevent man from injuring others."

J-343

Evaluation: "I think the . . . [Jefferson] view makes better sense to me for many of the same reasons the writer expressed. I feel all men are basically good and if they are bad it is just because they have been led astray. They should be pitied, not scorned. . . . Man should be able to express what he feels. It is better to criticize and get something accomplished if it is for the good of the majority--even if a drastic incident may be the outcome."

In discussing Hamilton: "Everyone has certain ambitions in life and these motivate the way people act and thus since the people believe in this way, the governments or institutions these people establish must also be affected in a similar manner."
In discussing Jefferson: "He feels that even if the press, as it was very persuasive and effective at the time, disagrees with the government, it is better that this be made known than having a government against the best interest of the people."

Evaluation: "I tend to agree, to an extent, with both opinions. Each has its advantages and disadvantages. While government by a few would maintain order, it might yet be a government whose interests did not lie with the people. Conversely, government by the majority might be ideally beneficial; however, it may tend to be chaotic."

In discussing Hamilton: "By satisfying sectional interests, the authors of the Constitution hoped to make the people cooperate, thus unifying the thirteen states. The Founding Fathers had to levy tariffs to please the North and, at the same time, enable foreign countries to trade easily with the South. . . . The author of the above passage felt that because of the opposing sectional interests, there were few people who could govern the country objectively for the welfare of the entire nation."

In discussing Jefferson: "Because the republic was set up as a rule by the people, the majority of the people should therefore govern. A government by the few would resemble too much the type of government from which the nation had just broken away. The author feared that government by a few would not consider the interest of many, and they would concern themselves only with selfish ambitions."

Evaluation: "At the period of time when the Constitution was being written I agree with [Hamilton] for I feel that the average class person lacked education which is a basic platform for affairs of state however with education given to a common person I believe that he is basically good and will work for the benefit of all while benefitting himself."

In discussing Hamilton: "The writer felt that man was basically evil due to his own upbringing and background which is not given at this time. He felt that the masses of people were ignorant because only the wealthy could afford education and therefore the masses lacking education as a result also lacked sense making them irresponsible."

In discussing Jefferson: "The author has complete faith in the ability of the common man to run the government and he
J-444--continued

... furthermore says that even if one man was wrongly chosen and incapable of his duties, there is no reason to condemn all for another is capable.

J682

Evaluation: "Of the two theories expressed, neither seemed completely adequate to me, for justification of writing a Constitution such as ours. The two theories, specifically Hobbes and Locke, are controversial, however, I believe in a mixture of the two. . . . The essential goodness of man is the basic theory I maintain, however, I am not so idealistic nor optimistic to believe that all men, when given the power to govern, will accept the responsibility in the correct manner. Therefore, I believe in both the basic Locke theory with some acceptance of Hobbes."

In discussing Hamilton: "The author, in this paragraph, remains absolutely consistent in his expression of thought. He attributes to all men the natural selfishness and greed by which they live. And for these reasons man should be controlled by an adequate system of checks and balances."

In discussing Jefferson: "The major idea in the paragraph, possibly, is the theory of the goodness and natural responsibility exhibited by men on the whole. This is consistent to that of John Locke, whose major concept was of a goodness in men, a responsibility accepted when the need for it arose."

M1068

Evaluation: "I agree with . . . [Hamilton] of the elite rule as that my experiences show that the elect should rule with support and consent of the people. A compromise of both opinions seemed to have been combined in the Constitution, with far greater support given to . . . [Jefferson's] opinion. These people considered that they were just under tyranny and oppression. They wanted freedom."

In discussing Hamilton: "The author possibly assumed that as long as he is protected he will be easy to control. This is shown through the Bill of Rights which was necessary to be added in order for the Constitution to be accepted. The elite can control their emotions no more than the mass of common individuals. Certainly, they might be able to realize more fully their interests, but being that he (an elite person) cannot comprehend their derivation he can not control his passions any more than a . . . However, the author might have supposed that since the Intelligencia
was in control and was working for the public good, he could handle his personal passions."

In discussing Jefferson: "Men can govern themselves without a master--this truly is the ideal of society. However, it is a fallacy from its depth. We desire security, with some freedom."

---

Evaluation: "I had rather be the victim of occasionally trusting . . . [Jefferson]."

In discussing Hamilton: "Regardless of how patriotic, or selfless he believes himself to be, in times of personal gain, he is ready to receive. . . . This selfishness should exist, otherwise no one could support himself."

In discussing Jefferson: "In the business of existing, no matter how uneducated people may be they are aware of good sense in time of need. If this was not true, our great United States would have failed long ago. The opinions of others help to formulate ideas of our own."

---

Evaluation: "I agree with the . . . [Hamilton] view that a few chosen leaders with certain controls should lead the nation. Some people might probably think that we should suspend trade with Canada because it trades with Russia. But what about the people who have a different view. This leaving a government entirely to the people is not the solution. Rather it should be a government elected by the people who make the laws."

In discussing Hamilton: "The author obviously is able to face a situation sensibly. He knows how to face a situation and determine what to do. He realizes that most people are looking for their own interests. Therefore, he thinks there should be controls to stop him from stealing and misusing the government. He doesn't want anyone to have absolute power, as in England.

In discussing Jefferson: "Once again the author thought the majority of the people must be right. He possibly felt that they had fought the war because they were tired of aggression and since public sympathy was right then, he didn't want the rule of the people taken away again."
Evaluation: "I feel that the majority of people are capable of running their own country. I feel that this is one of the basic standings behind our government. People should live within a government that they have created. Human beings on this earth should be born to a free life. They should be able to have the opportunity to make of it what they want. No one has the right to rule over another."

[Implicitly for Jefferson.]

In discussing Hamilton: "The writer also points out that he feels the government has to be run by the few who are capable. This statement could have originated because of incidents of the past as well as the present. In the history of other countries, there are long list of lines of dictators and kings who have corrupted the country."

In discussing Jefferson: "His opinion of the upper-class is that they are greedy and unscrupulous. This could be because the wealthy people came to America to become rich. They did not have the same spirit of fighting and standing for their country."

Evaluation: "... [Jefferson's] view makes the most sense because the people are the ones who must live with and endure the restrictions and privileges the government or ruling body affords them. Also as time went on and progress was made the illiterate became educated and newspapers informed everyone of the surrounding activities."

In discussing Hamilton: "The people at this time were mainly illiterate and only the well-to-do could afford education. Therefore, it was felt that an educated mind, while being driven to human weakness, could fight back and resist temptations. Thus such important affairs as government would be safe."

In discussing Jefferson: "In most European countries the lines of succession of rulers were not completely up to the expectations and demands of the people. Often times many, many deeds were done to injure rather than aid the populace. Therefore, the colonists wished to choose their own leader and perhaps be mistaken in his true character but he would still be the choice of everyone."
Evaluation: "The democratic form of government seems best to me. With this system, the population of the country is able to voice their opinions and have a choice in the people who are elected. This is not only fair, but it tends to make people more interested in our government and its relationship with other countries." [Implicitly for Jefferson.]

In discussing Hamilton: "Helping the government is in our own best interests. If we can vote when elections are held, then why must some people let others elect officials to our government. These people, those who don't vote, are generally the ones who are left complaining about the situation."

In discussing Jefferson: "This democratic form of government also allows us to have a better chance to trust our fellow man. Not all people are status-seekers. Most people want to help better the lives of man, instead of getting only what they can for themselves."

Evaluation: "I tend to agree with . . . [Jefferson's] view. The group that remains in power for a long period of time tends to take advantage of his situation. He uses his inside information to gain more wealth. So if the common people are elected they have never experienced the feeling of wealth. They are not so nearly so apt to want the wealth. The masses will control the government."

In discussing Hamilton: "The only reason that a few would run the government fairly was to protect themselves. They had to make sure the government would stay in power. The wealthy had just seen what would happen in the American Revolution if they oppress the masses."

In discussing Jefferson: "The common man is basically honest individual. He works hard at earning his living. He wants his neighbors to enjoy the success that he is. In frontier times man worked together to survive."

Evaluation: "I agree with . . . [Hamilton] because I have associated with too many people with no responsibility at all. However I may have associated with the wrong people."

In discussing Hamilton: "You can tell the degree of a man's education or his common sense by how long it takes him to face the reality of the job. It makes no matter who he is
or where he is from, he might make the best President. But most men never see the reality."
In discussing Jefferson: "At this time it could be seen in France and in America that the people were realizing the bad in the aristocracy which governed them and began to revolt."

Evaluation: "... [Hamilton] makes more sense to me. This man feels that no man should be trusted in government. I agree with this simply because it's true. Our Constitution is written with checks and balances to prevent dictatorship. This point has been proven in Africa and Asia where a nation supposedly, for the people is run by one man."
In discussing Hamilton: "He probably felt this because through history man has shown greed and corruption. He offers as proof of his views. Britain had done this with America. They exploited the colonies."
In discussing Jefferson: "He seems to stress that all citizens have equal rights. Perhaps he was caught up in the revolutionary spirit when he said this. Because at that time there was no evidence that this kind of government would work. Although the man turned out to be right."
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