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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Antecedent Studies

The present study represents a continuation of the research of Mylonas and Reckless. For his doctor's dissertation, Mylonas studied the attitudes of Ohio Penitentiary prisoners (only property offenders) toward law and legal institutions. Inter alia, he found that mean scores on attitudes toward law and legal institutions varied in expected directions by race, marital status, and amount of previous criminal involvement (criminal record and time spent in correctional institutions). In addition, he discovered a moderate degree of positive association between scores on attitudes toward law and scores on the Socialization Scale of the California Psychological Inventory which measures direction toward or away from good socialization as well as on the Rundquist-Sletto Morale scale which measures personal morale. (1)

Using eighty-nine of the most discriminating "law" items from the original Mylonas schedule, Reckless administered them again to a sample of Ohio Penitentiary male prisoners (new admissions), to sample of labor union members (who were taking a continuing education course given by Ohio
State University), to newly admitted prisoners at the Lebanon Correctional Institution (which receives the better adjusted prisoners from the Ohio Reformatory), to the active case load of male probation cases in the Common Pleas Court of Montgomery County, Ohio (Dayton, Ohio), and finally to a sample of smalltown Mormon males. (2)

An item analysis was run to identify these items which most significantly distinguished the white Ohio Penitentiary prisoners from the presumably non-criminal labor union members (all white also). He selected twenty-four of the most significant out of the original eighty-nine items. Then he derived total scores on these significant twenty-four "law" items for each respondent in each sample and computed total mean scores for each sample. All criterion groups scored precisely as expected. The maximum security prisoners of the Ohio Penitentiary scored the most unfavorably, the Lebanon Correctional Institution cases next, the probation cases next, the labor union cases next, and the Mormon cases last. In other words, the Mormon males had the most favorable scores on attitudes toward the law and legal institutions, which performance was expected in view of their usually high ethical standards; the labor union members who elected to take a night course in labor education scored next most favorable; the probation sample, which represented the cream of the crop which comes before the
felony court, scored next in favorable direction; the reformatory cases, less favorable and the penitentiary cases the least favorable.

Reckless interpreted the significant Mylonas items as indicating a possible criminality level in terms of direction toward criminal behavior or, as he called it, a "criminality level index." He projected the idea that such a measure might be more indicative of the actual direction toward criminality, present or past, than the usually fortuitous police records or prison records, which contain the number of previous arrests and previous sentences. The adventitious character of administrative criminal statistics results from the fact that a criminal record depends on the offense being reported in the first place (which is by no means a certainty according to our knowledge about "crimes known to the police"), upon clearances by arrest (including fingerprint cases) which are only a small part of the crimes known (reported), upon the adjudication in the court system which is a very important variable, and upon a conviction which ultimately (but not always) leads to admission to a penal institution (which is a very, very small part of the number of cases arrested). Best estimates indicate that of one hundred major crimes known to the police, only twenty-five result in arrest, twenty in a formal charge, seven in trial, 5.5 in conviction, and but 3.5 in incarceration.
On the face of it then, attitudinal variables may be as good or better as administration and legal process results in specifying criminality level.

Attitudes toward law represent the residues of experience and are internalized as are any other set of attitudes. Residual attitudes, therefore, have much to do in determining the direction of behavior—toward crime or away from crime. A very unfavorable set of attitudes is expected to be associated with law-abiding or non-criminal behavior. The gradient which existed among the samples Reckless studied support the idea of the directionality which a set of attitudes determines. The most ethical group of all, the Mormon males, were by far the most favorable in attitudinal direction, which outcome was predicted. The maximum security prisoners were expected to be the most unfavorable in attitudes—the most criminal in direction, and they were, while the other samples fitted into the directional gradient according to expectation.

It was then decided to discover whether an attitudinal gradient also existed among known (criterion) groups in other countries. And this is where the present study, which concerns itself with a comparison of samples in Korea, West Pakistan, Greece, and Ohio (U.S.A.), fits into the plan. But more on this later.
At this point, it might be well to see how the concept of a criminality level index (based on attitudes toward law and legal institutions) is related to concepts of crime and criminality which have emerged in years past. (3)

**Historical Conceptions of Crime**

The idea that offenses against the moral or legal code were outcroppings of "possession" by a demon (demoniacal possession) is one of the oldest explanations of criminal behavior, which idea represents an analogue of superstition and magic. During the pre-Medieval and Medieval ages and the years up to the 17th Century, criminality was conceived to be a manifestation of "sin" and "social ill," according to theological and "social contract" thinking of the times. The natural law of God was assumed and the human actor was conceived to be a part of nature. The individual was considered to be personally responsible to God.

The 18th Century witnessed the emergence of the Classical School of Criminology, in which the dominant conception of criminality was a combination of idealism, rationalism, utilitarianism and hedonism. More particularly, criminality was conceived to be a product of the freedom of the will. The violation of any law made the offender criminally responsible, in view of that fact that he made the choice (under free will) to commit the crime.
In the middle part of the 19th Century, the doctrine of responsibility and free will was modified slightly as a result of the M'Naghten rule, which exempted persons who were insane at the time of the deed from being held responsible. In addition, the law and the courts recognized degrees of premeditation more and more emphasis was placed on the setting in which the offense occurred.

However, during this period, emphasis was still on the cognitive (conscious, free will) aspect of motivation which should not be confused with cathetic (emotional) aspect of motivation.

With the increasing popularity of determinism and empiricism, the Positive School of Criminology emerged in the latter part of the 19th Century. Free-will was de-emphasized and criminality was seen as a product of forces beyond the individual's control—forces located in heredity, the biological constitution, mental abnormalities, and the physical and social environment.

The 20th Century witnessed the synthesis of the older views and the introduction of newer ones. Among the newer ideas of the 20th Century, one finds an emphasis on a factor type theory of crime, which resulted from the application of different methods and focii of the developing disciplines of the behavioral sciences.
Most present-day theories and explanations of delinquency and criminal behavior are still positivistic. The individual is propelled toward violational or deviant behavior. These theories represent "hard determinism."

There is some evidence that "hard determinism" is yielding a bit to so-called "soft determinism," according to which a limited amount of choice is assumed to be available in risk-taking behavior of the individual actor. (4) The choice factor in this case does not imply absolute free-will and rational calculation; nor complete helplessness of the human actor. Criminality in the light of "soft determinism" may be viewed as an individual tendency toward criminal involvement within limiting social conditions and the strength or weakness of the self as a controlling agency.

There is much to be recommended in the growing acceptance of "soft determinism" because human action is not mere activation of fixed traits, triggered by the stimulus situation. Rather, it is a product of a selection process of the salient stimulus and response through the medium of a "filter," provided by set of attitudes and perceptions. As long as socialization is an ongoing process in social life and the pattern of social interaction is modifiable, an attitudinal-perceptual set is changeable and shows different configuration. In any given situation, attitudinal-perceptual set functions as the intervening variable between stimulus
and response. It acts as a "filter" through which responses are strained or assessment of situations are made. (5)

Certainly, a set of attitudes toward law and legal institutions, acquired in socialization process or through internalization of experience, acts as a filter through which direction toward or away from deviant behavior is strained. Hence, the set may be conceived as an index of the level of criminality (or criminality level index as Reckless calls it).

The Present Study

As far as the present writer knows, there has not been any cross-cultural study of a criminality level as measured by an attitude set, except the one designed by Reckless of which the present study is an integral part. This study explores the possibility of utilizing an already validated American instrument with cross-cultural sample populations. In this sense, the present study is an extension of the aforementioned criminality level index.

The instrument measuring the criminality level of respondents was administered to sample groups in four distinctive cultures—namely, Greece, Korea, West Pakistan, and Ohio (U.S.A.), which represent the four corners of the world. These countries have grossly contrasting cultural elements such as language, religion, ethics, food, dress, and general way of life.
Undoubtedly, there are a large number of unknown factors when schedules are administered by different administrators, under different conditions, to respondents in different countries. More will be said on this in the next chapter, dealing with the methods and procedures followed in the study. But more particularly, there is a very important unknown factor, namely the differential response to items on a schedule which was pretested and standardized in Ohio (U.S.A.) and used in three other vastly different countries. It is not known to what extent the respondents conceive of the meaning or content of the items in the schedule in different ways, reflecting differences in attitudes and values. All that it was possible to do in this initial study was to make sure that the items were translated into the language of the common man who has little schooling.

Finally, the present study, because of its trailblazing character, will not attempt to formulate and test hypotheses as such relative to differences and similarities cross-culturally in attitudes toward law and legal institutions of various samples of the population in the four diverse countries.

The study, however, will attempt to discover whether an attitudinal gradient exists between prisoners and laborers in the four countries sampled, whether the gradient is larger in the sample populations of one country compared with
another, whether the specific items which distinguish the
samples of any country are different from those which dis-
tinguish the samples in the other countries. Perhaps a
crude sorting of the items which differentiate the various
groups might reveal cross-cultural differences.

1Anastassios Demosthenes Mylonas, Prisoners' Attitudes
Toward Law and Legal Institutions, Ph.D. Dissertation. The
Ohio State University, 1962, pp. 72-76.

2Walter C. Reckless, "The Development of a Criminality
Level Index," Interdisciplinary Problems in Criminology:
Papers of the American Society of Criminology, 1964, Walter
C. Reckless and Charles L. Newman, eds., Columbus, Ohio: The
College of commerce and Administration, The Ohio State Univer-
sity, 1965, pp. 71-82.

3H. E. Barnes and N. K. Teeters, New Horizons in
Herman Mannheim, Comparative Criminology, New York: Hough-
1957; Edwin H. Sutherland and Donald R. Cressey, The Princi-
1960; Paul Tappan, Crime, Justice, and Correction, New York:
McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960; George B. Vold, Theoretical

4For more on the risk-taking behavior, see H. E. Raw-
son, The Relationship of Moral Value Dimensions and Unethi-
cal Behavior under Varying Conditions of Risk, Ph.D. Disserr-
tation, The Ohio State University, 1961; Salomon Rettig and
H. E. Rawson, "The Risk Hypothesis in Predictive Judgments
of Unethical Behavior," Journal of Abnormal and Social
Psychology, 1963, 1966, pp. 213-243; Salomon Rettig and
Paras Nath Singh, "The Risk Hypothesis in Judgments of Uneth-
tical Behavior: A Cross-Cultural Replication," Manas, 1962,
pp. 13-23.

5This view has theoretical affinity with symbolic
interactionism.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The Schedule

The schedule which was developed by Dr. Reckless for assessing the attitudes toward law and legal institutions by various samples in Ohio was administered to various samples in Greece, Korea, and West Pakistan. The schedule consisted of fifty-four items which compose the Socialization Scale of the California Psychological Inventory, which scale measures direction toward good or poor socialization; (6) eighty-nine items taken from the original study of Mylonas, which assess the attitudes toward law and legal institutions; and a fifty-item scale measuring moral judgments, as developed by Crissman. (7)

Perhaps a word of explanation is in order regarding the eighty-nine "law" items which compose the inventory which will be analyzed in this study. As was stated previously at the beginning of Chapter I, the eighty-nine items were taken from a schedule of 110 items used by Mylonas in his original study. (8) All of the "law" items had been carefully selected. Some were taken from previous scales dealing with attitudes toward the law. For example, twenty-two of the 110 items were taken from a "law scale" developed by Rundquist and Sletto several years ago. (9) In addition,
Mylonas incorporated sixteen items, comprising a law scale which was developed by Katz, into the 110 items. (10) The remaining seventy-two items were developed by Mylonas himself, taking clues from studies in criminology and books on criminal law. In other words, the 110 items which Mylonas used in his inventory were well-selected items. Mylonas pretested these items on several different grades of prisoners at the Ohio Penitentiary and found that the prisoners understood the questions and could respond to the answer format of the schedule.

Mylonas administered his schedule to three hundred newly admitted prisoners in the Ohio Penitentiary, just after the three-week admission-orientation processing had been completed and just before the prisoners were assigned to jobs and cells in the prison population—about thirty prisoners per week for ten weeks. He scored the responses on the schedules and the information was transferred to IBM statistical cards for tabulation and analysis. Eighty-nine of the 110 items were found to be highly discriminating and highly significant statistically—at the .001 level of confidence. It was these eighty-nine items which Reckless used in his Ohio schedule, which he initially administered to several Ohio samples, representing known criterion groups in reference to their criminal involvement and law-abiding backgrounds.
Collection of Greek, Korean, and Pakistan Samples

In the summer of 1964, Dr. Mylonas returned to Athens, Greece, and administered the Ohio schedule, developed by Reckless, to two hundred adult male prisoners. In the summer of 1965, he administered the schedule to two hundred laborers in Athens, working in large factories. In the summer of 1966, he administered the schedule to two hundred Greek police in Athens (which sample will not be used in this study). Mylonas, being a Greek and having been educated in Greece, translated the schedule into Greek of the common man and pretested it in Athens, to see whether the least literate respondents could understand how to respond to the directions and to the items. The responses to the schedule were coded on standard code sheets, which information was punched by trained IBM operators at the Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research. The statistical cards were verified by re-punching the originally punched cards from the original code sheets.

In the summer of 1965, the writer returned to Seoul, Korea, and made arrangements to administer the schedule to a sample of prisoners at two prisons near Seoul, and to two hundred laborers who were miners at one of the Korea's largest mines in Kangwon Province in the eastern part of Korea. The prisoner sample was divided into groups of twenty-five to thirty and the schedule was administered to them for
eight weeks. They were newly admitted prisoners. The Korean laborer group was divided into five groups each consisting of forty-five to fifty miners. Prior to his departure from Columbus, Ohio, for Seoul, Korea, the writer translated the Ohio schedule into Korean for the common man. The present writer revised the translated schedule with the help of his colleagues among whom were a criminal court judge in Seoul, Korea, and three advanced graduate students in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea. The revised schedule was pretested with small groups of prisoners and miners prior to actual administration of the schedule, to see that they understood and could answer the questions. The writer transferred the responses to code sheets and the keypunch operators of the Bureau of Business Research at The Ohio State University punched the information on IBM statistical cards and also verified the punching of each card.

In the summer of 1966, arrangements were made with Mr. Riaz Ul Hassan, an advanced graduate student in the Department of Sociology at The Ohio State University, to administer the Ohio schedule to samples in West Pakistan. He translated the Ohio schedule into Urdu (the language of West Pakistan), had his translations revised by several Pakistani students at the university, and then pre-tested it on several respondents when he returned to Lahore,
Pakistan, in June, 1966. He worked out the details of administration of the translated and pretested schedule to samples of prisoners, police, laborers, and teachers. (The writer will only use the prisoner and laborer samples.) He brought the completed schedules back with him to the university and the writer coded the responses on code sheets. Once again, the operators in the Bureau of Business Research of The Ohio State University punched the information on IBM statistical cards and verified the punching.

It was decided, as suggested several times above, that it would be best for purposes of this international study, to use similar but contrasting samples in each of the four countries: Ohio, U.S.A., Greece, Korea, and West Pakistan. This meant that prisoner and laborer samples could be compared in each country. There is no question but that each one of these samples varies considerably in background characteristics of the samples will be made to equate the prisoners in each country with one another and equate the laborers in each country with one another as much as possible.

Characteristics of the Samples

To begin with, the Ohio prisoners were slightly younger than the white labor-union members. The majority of both groups fell within the thirty to forty-nine years of age.
Fifty-six per cent of the prisoners had attended or graduated from high school and 3.5 per cent had attended or graduated from college. In comparison, while 73.0 per cent of the laborers had attended or graduated from high school, 13.8 per cent had attended or graduated from college. Forty per cent of the prisoners were married, 33.5 per cent divorced or separated and 25.0 per cent single, whereas 89.7 per cent of the laborers were married, 5.7 per cent divorced or separated and 4.6 per cent single. Twenty-six per cent of the prisoners unskilled and almost 60.0 per cent skilled or semi-skilled while 51.8 per cent of the laborers were skilled or semi-skilled and 46.1 per cent were clerical workers. The majority (77.5 per cent) of the Ohio prisoners had no contacts with the police or court authorities as juveniles (arrest before seventeen years of age); however, 80.6 per cent of the Ohio prisoners had been arrested two or more times since adulthood; 42.6 per cent had been previously incarcerated and only 10.0 per cent had been in prison more than two times.

The majority of the Greek prisoners and laborers were under thirty-five years of age although the prisoners were slightly younger than the laborers. Fifty per cent of the prisoners and 33.0 per cent of the laborers had attended or graduated from high school. Almost 50.0 per cent of the prisoners as well as of the laborers were married and only a
small number in both groups were either divorced or separated leaving few persons single. Only 12.0 per cent of the prisoners but almost half of the laborers were unskilled. Fifty-two per cent of the prisoners were property offenders and of these, two-thirds were sentenced for the crime of larceny and one-third for forgery. Eighty-one per cent had no contacts with the police or court authorities as juveniles and 62.0 per cent of the sample had been arrested only once since adulthood. Sixty-one per cent had never been incarcerated while only 10.0 per cent had been in prison more than two times.

The median age for the Pakistani prisoners was thirty-two to thirty-five years of age and the laborers had a median age of twenty-five years. The prisoners had a median educational achievement of five years or less while the laborers consisted of a mixed group with varying educational achievements. Forty to fifty per cent of one of two groups of the Pakistani laborers attended labor education class held at a municipal college and the other group of the Pakistani laborers had minimum educational achievement. Most of the Pakistani prisoners were farm laborers, a few were small peddlers and tonga drivers, and extremely few were skilled workers. Those who attended labor education class were mostly semi-skilled workers and the remainder were farm laborers. Most of the prisoners were sentenced for property
offenses and only 4 out of 165 were sentenced for attempted murder. The majority were first-time offenders and a large number had been convicted previously.

Some 61.34 per cent of the Korean prisoners fell within the twenty to twenty-nine years of age range (78.35 per cent within twenty to thirty-nine years of age) and 49.72 per cent of the laborers were within the twenty to twenty-nine years of age (88.83 per cent within twenty to thirty-nine years of age). The Korean prisoners and laborers showed similar educational achievement: 3.61 per cent of the prisoners and 3.35 per cent of the laborers had graduated from college; 30.41 per cent of the prisoners and 31.84 per cent of the laborers had graduated from high school; 29.38 per cent of the prisoners and 32.96 per cent of the laborers had educational achievement of six years or more; 31.44 per cent of the prisoners and 30.73 per cent of the laborers had educational achievement of nine years or more. As for the marital status, 25.26 per cent of the prisoners were married, 7.21 per cent were either divorced or separated and 67.01 per cent were single. In contrast to this, 80.45 per cent of the laborers were married, only 1.12 per cent were either divorced or separated and 17.88 per cent were single. Of the prisoners, 13.40 per cent were farm laborers, 35.57 per cent were unskilled laborers, 17.53 per cent were semi-skilled workers, 4.12 per cent were skilled workers, and
11.86 per cent were office workers. In comparison with this, 36.87 per cent of the laborers were farm laborers, 30.17 per cent were unskilled laborers, 5.59 per cent were semi-skilled workers, 3.94 per cent were skilled workers and 10.56 per cent were office workers. The majority (84.02 per cent) of the Korean prisoners had no record of arrest before seventeen years of age and only 9.79 per cent showed an arrest before this age. Slightly less than one-third (29.38 per cent) of the prisoners were first-time offenders and 55.67 per cent showed one or two arrests since eighteen years of age (39.18 per cent with one arrest and 16.49 per cent with two arrests). A large number (60.31 per cent) were sentenced for larceny, 16.49 per cent for forgery and fraud, 9.79 per cent for assault. Close to 20 per cent of the Korean prisoners had never been incarcerated while 41.24 per cent had been in prison once and 39.17 per cent had been in prison more than two times. (To be more specific, 29.89 per cent had been in prison less than three times.)

To summarize for a cross-cultural comparison of the prisoners and laborers from four different countries in terms of their social and criminal background characteristics, the Pakistani prisoners were the youngest of them all (a median age of twenty-five years) and the Ohio prisoners and laborers represented the oldest groups (a median age of thirty to forty-nine). The Greek prisoners and laborers
were older than the Korean prisoners and laborers but younger than the Ohio samples.

The Pakistani prisoners and laborers had the lowest level of educational achievement (five years or less) and the Ohio laborers showed the highest level of educational achievement (73.0 per cent of them showed nine to twelve years plus and 13.8 per cent were college graduates). One group of the Pakistani laborers had 40-50 per cent of the members who presumably had nine to twelve years of educational achievement; however, the Pakistani laborers in general followed other cross-cultural groups. The Korean laborers showed the second highest, the Korean prisoners the third highest, the Greek prisoners the fifth highest and the Greek laborers the sixth highest, just above the Pakistani laborers.

As far as the marital status is concerned, the Ohio laborers showed the highest percentage of married persons (87.0 per cent) and the Korean prisoners showed the lowest (35.26 per cent) probably due to late marriage in view of the age factor. The Pakistani prisoners were excluded for this comparison due to lack of data. The majority of the Greek prisoners and laborers were married. The Korean prisoners were 80.45 per cent single persons against 25 per cent single persons among the Ohio prisoners. As described earlier, divorce and separation seemed to be primarily
an American pattern; as many as 33.5 per cent of the Ohio prisoners (5.7 per cent of the Ohio laborers) were either divorced or separated. Extremely few Greek prisoners (and laborers) were divorced or separated whereas 7.21 per cent of the Korean prisoners and 1.12 per cent of the Korean laborers were either divorced or separated.

In reference to criminal involvement, the Ohio prisoners, the Greek prisoners, and the Korean prisoners showed similar records of arrest before seventeen years of age; 77.5 per cent, 81.0 per cent, and 84.02 per cent respectively. The Ohio prisoners led the Greek and Korean prisoners in arrest rate of two or three times since adulthood; 30.6 per cent, less than 40 per cent (62.0 per cent for one arrest), and 30.44 per cent respectively. The imprisonment record was shown as follows: 47.4 per cent of the Ohio prisoners had no record, 42.6 per cent one time, and 10.0 per cent two times; 61.0 per cent of the Greek prisoners showed no record of imprisonment, 29.0 per cent one time, and 10.0 per cent two times; 19.59 per cent of the Korean prisoners showed record of imprisonment; 41.24 per cent one time, and 39.17 per cent two times. No record was available for the Pakistani prisoners.

Because of the great differences in law enforcement and administration of justice in the four countries, it is very difficult to say what special selection took place
from offense to prison commitment in each country. Differential risk factor may be in operation in these countries, however. Particularly it would be hard to contend that the one sample of prisoners was a more recidivistic group or much more criminally-inclined and involved group than the samples of prisoners in the other countries. Response to the schedule items reflects the criminal tendency and/or differential risk, or the interaction pattern between the prisoners and the legal authorities. Just by a sense of feel, obtained from Mylonas' knowledge of Greece, the writer's own familiarity with Korea, and Hassan's close acquaintance with Pakistan (all three native-born sons) and from Reckless' knowledge of the Ohio samples, the face value of the record on the criminal involvement of these prisoners is accepted. The reader should be reminded again that this statement is based upon "feel" and not on "hard" data. However, any inference based upon the social backgrounds of these prisoners was based upon "hard" though incomplete data.

Administration of the Schedule

One should note that the conditions of administration were somewhat uniform, however. An opening statement, eliciting cooperation and allaying fears and suspicions, was made by Dr. Mylonas, by the writer, and by Mr. Hassan, to each assembled group, varying from thirty to fifty respondents
at a time. Each administrator read out each item on the schedule and indicated the response format, reminding the group from time to time, that "there are no right or wrong answers and that the right answer for you is the way you feel about things." Each one of the administrators had assistants who circulated among the thirty or fifty assembled respondents, to help them understand an item on the schedule (when they raised their hands). All three administrators in the three foreign countries reported good cooperation. All three of them were thoroughly familiar with the procedures in administration of the schedule to small assembled groups before they actually administered the schedules in their own countries. In short, conditions of administration were about as uniform as could be mobilized.

The number of cases in the various samples is presented in Table I below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>West Pakistan</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring of Responses

It should be noted that each one of the eighty-nine law items in the Ohio schedule had a standard five-point response format: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree. Depending on the way the item or question was stated, strongly agree was scored as five or one, agree as four or two, undecided always three, disagree as two or four, and strongly disagree as one or five. The response scoring was consistently made in the unfavorable direction. Five was assigned to a response of strongly agree or strongly disagree, depending on how the item was stated. For example, if one consults the schedule of "law" items in Appendix A, he will note that the response of strongly agree to item 55, "The law protects property rights at the expense of human rights," is scored as five, agree as four, undecided as three, disagree as two, and strongly disagree as one. If one examines item 57, "A person should obey the laws no matter how much they interfere with his personal ambitions," he will note that strongly agree is scored as one, agree as two, undecided as three, disagree as four, and strongly disagree as five. Consequently, directionality of scoring is uniform—high score on the responses represents the unfavorable direction of attitudes toward law and legal institutions and low score on the responses, favorable direction.
Item Analysis

An item analysis was made by Reckless and Cleaver of each of the eighty-nine law items in the schedule administered to white male Ohio prisoners and white male Ohio labor union members. (11) The responses of the prisoners and of the laborers were separately totaled and an average (mean) response score for each item was obtained for the prisoner sample and the labor union sample on each item. The difference between the mean score of the prisoners and the mean score of the laborers was determined statistically for each of the eighty-nine items. (12) If the difference between the two mean scores was significant at the .001 level, the item was accepted as being significantly discriminating as between the two criterion groups, the sample of prisoners and the sample of labor union members (presumably non-criminal).

On the basis of the criterion of .001, Reckless found that there were twenty-four out of the eighty-nine items which significantly differentiated the responses of prisoners from those of labor union (non-criminal) members. (13) He then added the scores of each respondent in each sample for each of the twenty-four statistically significant items and thus, assigned a total score to each respondent. He then computed an average (mean) total score on the twenty-four significantly discriminating law items for the
prisoner sample and for the labor union sample in Ohio. And he discovered that a significant difference in mean total scores existed (as was expected) and that the prisoners who represented the sample most involved in criminality in Ohio had a much higher total mean score than the labor union members who were presumably a non-criminal group. (14)

Uniform Procedure

Exactly the same procedure of scoring and the same procedure of item analysis was followed for all the other samples in this study: for the Greek prisoners and Greek laborers, the Korean prisoners and Korean laborers, and the West Pakistani prisoners and the West Pakistani laborers.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the scoring of the responses on all the schedules was done by the writer, from the original Ohio study through the West Pakistani samples. He worked out a plastic stencil sheet to overlay the format of the schedule, with the direction of the responses indicated thereon. In this way, the writer was able to facilitate the coding of the scored responses onto coding sheets, which were turned over to the keypunch operators. In all samples a 10.0 per cent re-check of the coding was done, to test for errors. If errors were too abundant at any point in the re-check of the schedule coding, the writer examined and re-coded several schedules.
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CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Gradients on Total Score

One of the important aspects of this study is to discover whether a gradient in attitudes toward the law exists between criminal samples (prisoners) and the presumably non-criminal samples (laborers) for the three widely diversified countries of the world; namely Greece, West Pakistan, and Korea, as was found to exist in the state of Ohio, where the first sounding was made. In Table 2 on the following page are given the average total scores for the responses to each of the eighty-nine items in the schedule. (See Appendix A for the schedule of eighty-nine items.) One notices that significant differences in the total mean scores do exist in the three foreign countries as well as in Ohio.

The difference in mean total score between the criminal and non-criminal samples is greatest for Korea, Greece, and the state of Ohio, whereas it is much less for West Pakistan. In view of the overall social and criminal background characteristics discussed in Chapter II, the Pakistani prisoners and laborers may be regarded as the two most impoverished groups. The Korean laborers showed higher educational achievement than prisoners; in fact, they
### TABLE 2
Mean Scores on Eighty-nine Law Items for Prisoner and Laborer Samples in Ohio, Greece, West Pakistan, and Korea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Prisoners</th>
<th></th>
<th>Laborers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>C.R. in Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>238.81</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>203.32</td>
<td>30.49</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>281.48</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>249.07</td>
<td>32.41</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Pakistan</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>283.75</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>262.28</td>
<td>21.47</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>250.19</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>224.07</td>
<td>34.96</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

represented the older, more mature, and maritally stable group. These factors might have operated in favor of the Korean laborers over prisoners. There was not much basis for comparing the Greek prisoners and laborers because both groups showed so much similarity in age, education, and marital status. Perhaps relative deprivation might have worked in an extremely negative manner for the Greek prisoners considering better educational achievement of the prisoners. As far as the Ohio prisoners and laborers were concerned, the laborers showed better educational achievement, were slightly older, and showed definite marital stability; however, these factors might have made much more
difference were it not for the fact that the Ohio prisoners in general maintained better position than prisoners from other countries.

In all four countries, the criminal samples of prisoners appear to have internalized somewhat more unfavorable attitudes toward law and legal institutions than have the non-criminal samples of laborers.

**Rank Orders of Total Scores**

On the other hand, when the mean total scores on the eighty-nine items assessing attitudes toward law and legal institutions are ranked from high (most unfavorable) to low (most favorable), certain other interesting conjectures appear. See Table 3.

One notices in Table 3 that West Pakistani prisoners lead the eight samples in unfavorable direction of mean total scores on attitudes toward the law, followed very closely by Greek prisoners. Why these two samples of prisoners should rank at the top of unfavorable attitudes toward law and legal institutions can only be a matter of educated conjecture at this juncture of an initial probing. Recalling the overall social and criminal background characteristics in Chapter II, we may state that the Pakistani prisoners and Greek prisoners appear to have favorable conditions for the formation of anti-social attitudes. The Pakistani prisoners
TABLE 3
Rank Order From High to Low of Mean Total Scores by Various Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Pakistan Prisoners</td>
<td>283.75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Prisoners</td>
<td>281.48</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Pakistan Laborers</td>
<td>262.28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Prisoners</td>
<td>250.19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Laborers</td>
<td>249.07</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Prisoners</td>
<td>238.81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Laborers</td>
<td>224.07</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Laborers</td>
<td>208.32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

showed the lowest education achievement and the Greek prisoners were better educated than the Pakistani prisoners. The Greek prisoners might have experienced acute frustration due to relative deprivation in view of the better educational achievement than the Greek laborers as mentioned earlier. Furthermore, the Pakistani and Greek prisoners when compared with the Korean and Ohio prisoners, show lower educational achievement and were younger, thus, perhaps, less mature groups.

The West Pakistani laborers lead the four labor samples in unfavorable attitudes. The Greek laborers show the second
most unfavorable set of attitudes, while Korean laborers show less favorable attitudinal set than the Greek laborers. The Ohio laborers display the least unfavorable attitudinal set of the laboring samples or the most favorable attitudinal set.

Undoubtedly, the special class and educational selection of the Ohio laborers accounts for their highly favorable direction in attitudes toward the law. It will be remembered that they were labor union members who were attending labor education courses given at night by the Labor Education program of continuing education of The Ohio State University. The writer, being a native son of Korea, believes that the sample of Korean laborers shows up next most favorably in the scores on attitudes toward the law, because they were relatively less impoverished group than the Pakistani and Greek laborers in terms of educational achievement. The Korean laborers maintained the second highest place in educational achievement, the Greek laborers the sixth highest place and the Pakistani laborers the seventh place, just next to the bottom occupied by the Pakistani prisoners. Dr. Mylonas has given the writer to understand that the sample of laborers he obtained in Athens, Greece, would represent a group with minimal education, just one step removed from deprivation. The relative educational achievement of the Greek laborers
when compared with the Greek prisoners is poorer and this may validate Mylonas' view.

**Gradient on Scores of Significant Items**

While a gradient in the attitudes toward law and legal institutions exists for the mean total scores on the responses to the eighty-nine items of the schedule, one should expect that it exists also for the mean scores on the twenty-four most significantly discriminating items which distinguished the criminal and non-criminal samples in each country. See Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Prisoners</th>
<th>Laborers</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>68.19</td>
<td>53.62</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>85.74</td>
<td>67.61</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>10.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Pakistan</td>
<td>85.33</td>
<td>73.42</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>81.58</td>
<td>68.32</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest attitudinal gradient exists between the Greek prisoners and Greek laborers; the smallest, between the West Pakistani prisoners and West Pakistani laborers.
Here again the reasons for this differential discrepancy in the attitudes toward law and legal institutions are not obvious. The present study has comparative data on age and educational achievement for the Pakistani laborers and prisoners and for the Greek prisoners and laborers and such data would aid interpretation on the trend. The Pakistani laborers represented younger groups (a median age of twenty-five) than prisoners (a median age of thirty-two to thirty-five) and this fact might explain "youthful rebelliousness," in the response to the schedule items by the laborers. There was slight age difference between the Greek prisoners and laborers. The laborers might have shown more difference in attitudes toward law and legal institutions if they had attained better or equal educational achievement in comparison with the Greek prisoners. As the matter stands, it might be assumed that the better direction of attitudes on the part of the Greek laborers might be based upon the tendency for people in the upper lower class and lower middle class, that is the working class next to the lowest class— to be puritanical in acceptance of legal and moral standards. In any case, this is a matter of speculation at this juncture.

It is possible to indicate whether an attitudinal gradient exists for the criminal and non-criminal samples when mean scores are computed on the twenty-four significant
items of one country for all other three countries; Greece, West Pakistan, and Korea by the twenty-four significant Ohio items; Ohio, West Pakistan, and Korea by the twenty-four significant Greek items; Ohio, Greece, and Korea by the twenty-four significant West Pakistani items; and Ohio, Greece, and West Pakistan by the twenty-four significant Korean items. Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 present the results of this operation. One notices that attitudinal gradients between the criminal and non-criminal samples exist cross-culturally, regardless of the particular set of significant items.

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Prisoners</th>
<th>Laborers</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>68.19</td>
<td>53.62</td>
<td>14.59</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>80.15</td>
<td>69.76</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Pakistan</td>
<td>86.57</td>
<td>81.96</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>70.30</td>
<td>61.51</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6

Mean Scores on the 24 Significant Items Distinguishing Criminal from Non-criminal Samples in Greece, by Criminal and Non-criminal Samples in Ohio, West Pakistan, and Korea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Prisoners</th>
<th>Laborers</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>85.74</td>
<td>67.61</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>10.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>71.50</td>
<td>62.88</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Pakistan</td>
<td>82.60</td>
<td>73.98</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>76.66</td>
<td>67.30</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 7

Mean Scores on the 24 Significant Items Distinguishing Criminal from Non-criminal Samples in West Pakistan, by Criminal and Non-criminal Samples in Ohio, Greece, and Korea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Prisoners</th>
<th>Laborers</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Pakistan</td>
<td>85.33</td>
<td>73.42</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>65.11</td>
<td>55.88</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>78.40</td>
<td>70.69</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>63.85</td>
<td>59.60</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8
Mean Scores on the 24 Significant Items Distinguishing Criminal from Non-criminal Samples in Korea, by Criminal and Non-criminal Samples in Ohio, Greece, and West Pakistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Prisoners</th>
<th>Laborers</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>81.58</td>
<td>68.32</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>68.67</td>
<td>57.02</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>80.48</td>
<td>67.20</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Pakistan</td>
<td>88.20</td>
<td>85.03</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rank Order of Scores on Significant Items

A possible cross-cultural differential in attitudinal set might be indicated in the rank ordering of the eight samples (prisoners and laborers in the four countries) by the mean scores on the twenty-four significant items applying to each country. See Tables 9, 10, 11, and 12. Table 13 presents a summation of the rank positions revealed in the four previous tables. One notices that the sum of the rankings on the four sets of twenty-four significant items corresponds to the ranking of the samples on the entire eighty-nine items. There is, therefore, a certain consistency in cross-cultural attitude sets, which not only seems to validate the presence of an attitudinal gradient but also
appears to point to the existence of some basic cross-cultural differences in attitudes toward law and legal institutions.

TABLE 9

Rank Orders of Mean Scores on the 24 Significant Ohio Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani Prisoners</td>
<td>86.57</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani Laborers</td>
<td>81.96</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Prisoners</td>
<td>80.15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Prisoners</td>
<td>70.30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Laborers</td>
<td>69.76</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Prisoners</td>
<td>68.19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Laborers</td>
<td>61.51</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Laborers</td>
<td>53.62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10  
Rank Orders of Mean Scores on the 24 Significant Greek Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek Prisoners</td>
<td>85.74</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani Prisoners</td>
<td>82.60</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani Laborers</td>
<td>78.98</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Prisoners</td>
<td>76.66</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Prisoners</td>
<td>71.50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Laborers</td>
<td>67.80</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Laborers</td>
<td>67.61</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Laborers</td>
<td>62.88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 11  
Rank Orders of Mean Scores on the 24 Significant West Pakistani Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani Prisoners</td>
<td>85.33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Prisoners</td>
<td>78.40</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani Laborers</td>
<td>73.42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Laborers</td>
<td>70.69</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Prisoners</td>
<td>65.11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Prisoners</td>
<td>63.85</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Laborers</td>
<td>59.60</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Laborers</td>
<td>55.88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12

Rank Orders of Mean Scores on the 24 Significant Korean Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani Prisoners</td>
<td>83.20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani Laborers</td>
<td>85.03</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Prisoners</td>
<td>81.58</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Prisoners</td>
<td>80.48</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Prisoners</td>
<td>68.67</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Laborers</td>
<td>68.32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Laborers</td>
<td>67.20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Laborers</td>
<td>57.02</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13
Summation of Rank Orders of Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>24 U.S. Items</th>
<th>24 Greek Items</th>
<th>24 Korean Items</th>
<th>24 Pakistani Items</th>
<th>Sum of Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani Prisoners</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani Laborers</td>
<td>6.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Prisoners</td>
<td>6.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Laborers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Prisoners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.5&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Laborers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Prisoners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Laborers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Pakistani laborers were 1.76 points higher than Greek prisoners.
<sup>b</sup> Korean laborers were 0.19 points higher than Greek laborers.
<sup>c</sup> Korean prisoners were 1.10 points higher than Greek prisoners.
<sup>d</sup> U.S. prisoners were 1.26 points higher than Korean prisoners.
Content Analysis of Items

For ready reference to the twenty-four most significant items from among the total eighty-nine in the schedule, which were found in the Ohio, Greek, Pakistani, and Korean samples, one should consult Table 14, whose item identification numbers will refer to the eighty-nine items of the schedule which is duplicated in Appendix A. Tables 15 and 16 are based on Table 14.

TABLE 14

Listing by Schedule Number of Significant Items in the Criminal and Non-criminal Samples of Ohio, Greece, West Pakistan, and Korea
Taken from Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ohio Items</th>
<th>Greek Items</th>
<th>Pakistani Items</th>
<th>Korean Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63*</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75*</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Significant</td>
<td>24 Significant</td>
<td>24 Significant</td>
<td>24 Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>112*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>114**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "Non-Police" Items

** "Police" Items
In inspecting the eighty-nine law items in Appendix A, one notices that items 55 through 111 are the fifty-seven non-police items and that items 112 through 143 are the thirty-two police items. The distribution of police and non-police items in each of the four sets of twenty-four significant items is given in Table 15.

**TABLE 15**

Number of Police and Non-Police Items Occurring in the 24 Significant Items in the Item Analysis of Criminal and Non-Criminal Samples of Ohio, Greece, West Pakistan, and Korea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Police Items</th>
<th>Non-Police Items</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Pakistan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously, the prisoner sample and the laborer sample in Korea differ almost exclusively on attitudes toward the police. This must mean that prisoners in Korea develop, in the course of their experience, a more hostile set of perceptions or feelings toward police than do ordinary laborers. On the other hand, the West Pakistan samples distinguish themselves more on non-police than on police items—14 to 10,
whereas the Ohio and Greek samples are close to one another in responding to the police more hostilely and unfavorably than to non-police items. The extent to which this pattern of attitude hostility will be confirmed in further study and the extent to which, if confirmed, some cross-cultural differential can be found to explain the pattern, is purely a matter of conjecture, on which this study unfortunately has no insight. Nevertheless, this content analysis of significant items does seem to point to the operation of cross-culture differences.

Finally, there remains the identification of similar items in the four different sets of twenty-four significant items. Examination once again of Table 14 will indicate the presence of uniquely independent items, not duplicated in any of the other three lists of items duplicated in two, three, and four sets of significant items. Table 16 gives the summary of unique and overlapping items in the four sets of twenty-four significant items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th></th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th></th>
<th>West Pakistan</th>
<th></th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sched.#</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Sched.#</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Sched.#</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Sched.#</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique—no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>75-100-</td>
<td>69-80-</td>
<td>59-71-</td>
<td>74-76-</td>
<td>108-113-</td>
<td></td>
<td>105-113-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109-110-</td>
<td>81-93-</td>
<td>74-76-</td>
<td>96-107-123-</td>
<td>115-124-</td>
<td></td>
<td>127-130-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131-139</td>
<td>94-136</td>
<td>96-107-</td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap in 2 sets</td>
<td>79-86-98-</td>
<td>65-103-</td>
<td>79-86-</td>
<td>98-117-</td>
<td>98-117-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105-106-</td>
<td>112-125-</td>
<td>112-135-</td>
<td></td>
<td>138-72-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114-117-</td>
<td>135-141</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap in 3 sets</td>
<td>118-119-</td>
<td>113-119-</td>
<td>119-121-</td>
<td>118-120-</td>
<td>118-120-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120-121-</td>
<td>120-132-</td>
<td>116-140-</td>
<td>121-132-</td>
<td>121-132-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132-134-</td>
<td>134-143</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>134-140-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140-143</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>143-116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap in 4 sets</td>
<td>122-126</td>
<td>122-126</td>
<td>122-126</td>
<td></td>
<td>122-126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 16
Schedule Numbers and Numerical Count of Unique and Overlapping Items in Four Sets of 24 Significant Items by Countries
One notices that the Ohio sample has six unique items in its set of twenty-four significant items; Greece, 8; West Pakistan, 10; Korea, 7. West Pakistan has the most, whereas Ohio has the least. All four countries have about the same number of overlaps in two sets. Three countries have about the same number of overlaps in three sets. The four countries have two overlaps each in four sets. In view of ten unique items and only four overlaps in three sets, West Pakistan stands somewhat apart from the other three countries. This might indicate the presence of a differential cultural factor. But what this factor is, is not known. One might say that it could be the operation of Mohammedanism, since this is the most obvious cultural trait distinguishing West Pakistan from the other three countries. Even if this were true, it is not known how this religious factor would work, to cause uniqueness in attitudes toward the law and legal institutions.

Table 16 may also be more closely re-examined for the distribution of police and non-police items in the non-overlap and overlap items. In the thirty-one non-overlapping significant "law" items, registered by the criminal and non-criminal samples of the four countries, one finds that only eleven of the thirty-one are police items and twenty are non-police items. In the fifteen overlapping items in two sets, (a count of 30: 15x2), there are eight overlapping police
items and seven overlapping non-police items. In the nine overlapping items in three sets (a count of 27: 9x3), all nine are police items (there are no non-police items). In the two overlapping items in four sets (a count of 8: 2x4), each of the two items is a police item.

One notices that the overall count consists of thirty-one unique items, of which eleven are police items; thirty overlap items in two sets, of which sixteen are police items; twenty-seven overlap items in three sets, of which all are police items. This constitutes the total count of ninety-six items or four sets of twenty-four significant items.

However, on the non-duplicating count, there are eleven out of thirty-one unique items which are police items; eight out of the fifteen overlap items in two sets; nine out of the nine overlap items in three sets; two out of the two overlap items in four sets. Out of fifty-seven non-duplicating items in the four sets of twenty-four significant items, thirty are police items and twenty-seven are non-police items. Out of the twenty-six non-duplicating items which overlap in two, three, and four sets of twenty-four significant items, nineteen are police items. Consequently, it appears that police items make up the heaviest cluster of items in the four sets. On this basis, one might assume that there is a sort of common cultural core, focusing on attitudes toward
police, in the attitudinal-perceptual set of the criminal and non-criminal samples in the four widely separated countries of the world.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

The principal conclusions from the study of attitudes toward law and legal institutions expressed on a pencil and paper test by criminal and non-criminal samples of adult males in four widely separated and widely divergent countries of the world are listed as follows:

1. A gradient exists in the mean scores of the criminal and non-criminal samples in all four countries, which indicates that each prisoner sample is more unfavorable in attitude toward law and legal institutions than the counterpart sample. Difference in mean scores between the prisoners and laborers were significant at .001 level in each national sample comparison.

2. The gradient between prisoners and laborers was smallest for the West Pakistan sample, and was practically the same for the other three countries (Ohio, Greece, and Korea).

3. The mean total scores on attitude toward the law were the highest (the most unfavorable) for the West Pakistani prisoners and were much lower for the Korean prisoners and Ohio prisoners. The mean total score among four labor samples while the mean total score was next to lowest for the Korean laborers.
It should be noted that, taken separately, the height of the mean scores (not the gradient difference in mean scores between prisoner and laborer samples) most probably reflects cross-cultural attitudes toward law, legal institutions, and law enforcement officials. The height of the mean scores also reflects in important measure differences in socio-economic and educational background. For example, the fact that West Pakistani prisoners have the highest total scores and highest scores on the twenty-four significant items probably is due to the operation of attitudes of greater traditional hostility toward agencies of oppression as well as poor socio-economic background and low educational status. This is undoubtedly true of the high scores of the West Pakistani laborers. Greek prisoners also have high scores on unfavorable attitudes toward the law—probably for the same reasons. The low scores of the Korean and Ohio samples undoubtedly reflect much less hostility to agencies of control—much less feeling of oppression.

There is one further point which might be considered in interpreting the height of unfavorable attitudes of West Pakistani prisoners and laborers. The possibility exists that Pakistani respondents identified the eighty-nine "law" items with institutions and procedures which came with the "colonial rule" of Great Britain. It is even possible that the Pakistani respondents felt that answers to questions on
a schedule were machinations of the United States government, through C.I.A. or other agencies, since the schedule came from the United States and the student administering it came from the United States (although a Pakistani himself).

4. A gradient exists in attitude level between criminal and non-criminal samples for all four countries when mean scores on the most significantly discriminating items are computed, which trends follow the same trend followed in the mean total score on all of the eighty-nine law items. Likewise, the statistical difference in the mean scores between prisoner groups and labor groups are highly significant. Here again we are dealing with a gradient difference between offenders and non-offenders—not height of unfavorable direction of attitude. The gradient differences, existing between prisoners and laborers in all four countries, independent of the height of attitude scores, undoubtedly reflects the internalization of unfavorable or favorable attitudes and not cross-cultural differences due to tradition, class, and education.

5. The biggest difference in mean scores of the criminal and non-criminal exists for the Greek prisoners and laborers, as were the mean scores difference on the total eighty-nine items. Once again, the smallest difference on the twenty-four significant items was found to exist for the West Pakistani prisoners and laborers as was true also
for the means total score for the entire eighty-nine items of the schedule. There is no ready explanation for these differentials.

6. When criminal and non-criminal samples of all four countries are scored on the four different sets of twenty-four significant items, a gradient was found in the attitudinal level of prisoners and laborers. (See interpretive comments in 4 on the preceding page.

7. Consistency in rank-order of mean scores on the four sets of twenty-four significant items was established and this consistency corresponds exactly with rank-order of various samples according to mean total scores. If one particular group from one particular country ranked highest in unfavorable scores in one set of twenty-four significant items, it ranked also highest in all other three sets and mean score for the eighty-nine total items. Conversely, if one particular group from one particular country ranked lowest in unfavorable score in one set of twenty-four significant items, it ranked also lowest in all other three sets and mean score for the eighty-nine total items.

8. It was found that the original eighty-nine Ohio items contained fifty-seven "non-police" and thirty-two "police" items. Of the twenty-four significant items distinguishing criminal from non-criminal groups in the Korean sample, twenty-one items were police items; hence the Korean
sample seemed to distinguish almost exclusively on attitude toward police. Of the twenty-four significant items distinguishing the West Pakistani prisoners and laborers, only ten were police items. The twenty-four items differentiating two Ohio samples contained fifteen police items while the twenty-four significant Greek items contained fourteen police items. There is undoubtedly some cross-cultural factor at work in the greater or lesser focus on police items.

9. Examination of the twenty-four items in the four sets of significant items reveals that there is considerable overlap of significant items in two and three sets (as between two and three countries). There are only two items which are significant in the four sets of the twenty-four significant items in all four countries.

10. The significant items which overlap in two, three, and four sets of twenty-four significant items overwhelmingly are distributed among the police items. Consequently, interaction with police seems to be a very important part of the differential attitude which separates the criminal from the non-criminal sample.

The present study has certainly raised many more questions than it can answer. Perhaps, the most important theoretical and scientific by-product of the present study is the extensive difference in the attitudinal level (unfavorable) for various samples. Why should the West Pakistani
prisoners and Greek prisoners show so much more unfavorable attitudes toward the law and legal institutions than other prisoner groups? Is this spurious result of administering a schedule of items based on American ideas and experience? Is this the result of internalized attitudes in the life histories of these prisoners? Is it the operation of special punitive factors within the law enforcement and court procedures? Or is it the operation of special cross-cultural factors which determine certain hostile attitudes? We suggested the operation, cross-culturally, of a differential traditional attitude toward agencies of oppression as well as differentials in class and education.

We could ask the same questions relative to much less unfavorable showing of the Ohio prisoners when compared with attitude scores of the Greek and West Pakistan prisoners. The same questions can be asked relative to the widely varying levels of the labor samples. Why should the West Pakistani laborers display the most unfavorable attitude toward the law and legal institutions of all the four groups? Why should the Greek laborers less unfavorable than the West Pakistani laborers in their attitude toward the law? Why should the Korean laborers display more favorable or less unfavorable attitudes toward the law than the Greek laborers? Why did the Ohio laborers show the least unfavorable or most favorable attitude toward the law than any of the four groups?
Our knowledge of the Ohio laborers indicated that this sample came from good background in class and education in comparison with other labor groups. On the basis of comparative data described and used in previous sections, that the Korean laborers showed more favorable attitudes toward the law than the Greek laborers is understandable. The Korean laborers had a higher educational achievement and were older more mature group than the Greek laborers who seemed to have suffered also from relative deprivation when compared with the Greek prisoners. It is thought that the most unfavorable attitude shown by the West Pakistani laborers among all four labor groups might be due to their greater economic deprivation and their poverty of education. Even the Greek laborers showed better educational achievement and more maturity.

One immediate suggestion for follow-up research can be made at this time. The scores on the responses to the eighty-nine items in the schedule could be subject to a factor-analysis study. Here the idea would be to obtain, through intercorrelation of scores on all items, within samples and between samples, clusters of items which seem to "hang together." The computer could be asked to produce four or five factors or clusters. These could be identified by inspection and could be labeled with appropriate labels. The labeled clusters or factors could be treated as basic
dimensions, such as the "rejection dimension," or the "negative dimension," etc. It should be possible to re-score the samples on appropriate dimension items obtained from factor analysis. Such an analysis might reveal more similarity in height of unfavorableness and more distance in gradient differences.

The next step after factor analysis would be to improve the items on the schedule—in other words, obtain more meaningful items in reference to criminal and non-criminal involvement. Likewise, it might be important to explore the possibility of developing an efficient self-reporting instrument, to indicate the life history involvement of various individuals in crime and delinquency. Then it would be possible to correlate the attitudinal dimensions with the self-reported behavior. It could be learned whether self-reports and internalized attitudes are related or go in different directions.
APPENDIX A

THE ORIGINAL 89 LAW ITEMS
ON THE OHIO SCHEDULE

The following pages contain a number of statements about which there is no general agreement. People differ widely in the way they feel about each item. There are no right answers. The purpose of the survey is to see how different groups feel about each item. We should like your honest opinion on each of these statements.

Read each item carefully and circle the answer which best expresses your feeling about the statement. Circle SA if you STRONGLY AGREE with the statement, circle A if you AGREE, circle U if you are UNDECIDED, circle D if you DISAGREE with the statement, and circle SD if you STRONGLY DISAGREE.

SA A U D SD 55. The law protects property rights at the expense of human rights.

SA A U D SD 56. It is all right to evade the law if you do not actually violate it.

SA A U D SD 57. A person should obey the laws no matter how much they interfere with his personal ambitions.

SA A U D SD 58. Personal circumstances should never be considered an excuse for law-breaking.

SA A U D SD 59. A person who reports minor law violations is only a trouble-maker.

SA A U D SD 60. A hungry man has a right to steal.

SA A U D SD 61. All laws should be strictly obeyed because they are laws.

SA A U D SD 62. Laws are so often made for the benefit of small selfish groups that a man cannot respect the law.
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63. Violators of the law are nearly always detected and punished.

64. It is all right for a person to break the law if he doesn't get caught.

65. We would have less crime if our laws were more strict.

66. The law does not benefit the common man.

67. Our laws should be greatly revised.

68. If a person tries to be honest, he will never get anywhere in business.

69. Most people have to do something dishonest everyday.

70. In order to get ahead these days, one has to realize that the laws are made to be broken.

71. We have too many laws.

72. The law as a whole is sound.

73. I believe in the use of force to get rid of laws.

74. Men are not all equal before the law.

75. It is more wrong to get caught than it is to steal.

76. The law is made in response to pressure of private interests.

77. Nearly all laws deserve our respect.

78. Crooks often hide behind the law.

79. Law is the enemy of freedom.
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SA A U D SD 80. Individual laws are frequently unjust.
SA A U D SD 81. Some parts of the law are bad.
SA A U D SD 82. It is our duty to obey all laws.
SA A U D SD 83. The individual who refuses to obey the law is a menace to civilization.
SA A U D SD 84. The law is for the poor to obey and for the rich to ignore.
SA A U D SD 85. All laws should be overthrown.
SA A U D SD 86. The law enslaves the majority of people for the benefit of a few.
SA A U D SD 87. Laws are usually bad.
SA A U D SD 88. We should obey the law even though we criticize it.
SA A U D SD 89. The law is rotten to the core.
SA A U D SD 90. The judges' sentences are determined by their prejudices.
SA A U D SD 91. On the whole, judges are honest and kind-hearted.
SA A U D SD 92. Almost any jury can be fixed.
SA A U D SD 93. Court decisions are almost always just.
SA A U D SD 94. In the courts a poor man will receive as fair treatment as a millionaire.
SA A U D SD 95. My trial was a farce.
SA A U D SD 96. A man should tell the truth in a court regardless of the consequences.
SA A U D SD 97. A person is justified in giving false testimony to protect a friend on trial.
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Almost anything can be fixed in courts if you have enough money.

My trial was a fair one.

You can't get justice in court.

My trial did not get at all the truth.

The big criminal always has a good chance to escape conviction in court.

For the most part, police and the courts are just.

A judge is a good man.

Juries seldom understand a case well enough to make really just decisions.

Most juries are fixed.

Many of the people in prisons are actually innocent of the crime for which they were convicted.

On the whole, lawyers are honest.

Prosecutors are nothing but politicians.

No decent lawyer would ever be a prosecutor.

Fake witnesses are often produced by the prosecutor.

On the whole, policemen are honest.

A cop is a friend to people in need.

Cops often carry a grudge against men who get in trouble with the law and treat them cruelly.

Police arrest only the poor man.
The big-time crooks never get arrested; it is just the little guy that gets caught.

Police put on a show by arresting people.

A policeman usually judges you as guilty.

Police hound ex-convicts.

Police work rests mainly upon information given by stool pigeons.

The policeman's standing in his Department depends upon the number of arrests he makes.

Police often use the third degree to secure confessions.

Without the third degree the police would be helpless in combating crime.

The police departments do not use humane methods in obtaining confessions.

Policemen are more loyal to the police than to the citizens.

Influential or rich suspects are not given the third degree; it is restricted to petty or non-influential cases.

Our society would be better off if there were more policemen.

Policemen are seldom selected for personal merit and ability.

Policemen are mostly poorly trained for their job.

Policemen show favoritism to politicians.
Police rarely get their man in difficult cases.

Police are careful not to arrest innocent persons.

Police seldom treat suspected criminals courteously.

Police disregard constitutional rights in the interest of efficiency.

Police usually apprehend criminals in difficult cases.

Policemen are mostly selected for personal merit and ability.

You can seldom find a policeman who doesn't take bribes.

Policemen are just as crooked as the people they arrest.

Police rarely try to help people.

Policemen should be paid more for their work.

Police almost never treat suspected criminals brutally.

Life would be better with fewer policemen.

Police almost always respect constitutional rights of suspected criminals.
APPENDIX B

TABLE 17

Group 1-Ohio Prisoners  Group 2-Ohio Laborers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean (1)</th>
<th>Mean (2)</th>
<th>Diff. (1-2)</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (1)</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>-.93</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Mean (1)</td>
<td>Mean (2)</td>
<td>Diff. (1-2)</td>
<td>C.R.</td>
<td>Std. Dev. (1)</td>
<td>Std. Dev. (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 17--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean (1)</th>
<th>Mean (2)</th>
<th>Diff. (1-2)</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (1)</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N (1) = 218  N (2) = 195
# APPENDIX B

## TABLE 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean (1)</th>
<th>Mean (2)</th>
<th>Diff. (1-2)</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (1)</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean (1)</th>
<th>Mean (2)</th>
<th>Diff. (1-2)</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (1)</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 18--Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean (1)</th>
<th>Mean (2)</th>
<th>Diff. (1-2)</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (1)</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>-.97</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N (1) = 200   N (2) = 200
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean (1)</th>
<th>Mean (2)</th>
<th>Diff. (1-2)</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (1)</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 19—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean (1)</th>
<th>Mean (2)</th>
<th>Diff. (1-2)</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (1)</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>27.81</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 19—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean (1)</th>
<th>Mean (2)</th>
<th>Diff. (1-2)</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (1)</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N (1) = 165  N (2) = 170
### APPENDIX B

#### TABLE 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1-2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Mean (1)</td>
<td>Mean (2)</td>
<td>Diff. (1-2)</td>
<td>C.R.</td>
<td>Std. Dev. (1)</td>
<td>Std. Dev. (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>33.49</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>29.56</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>34.22</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Mean (1)</td>
<td>Mean (2)</td>
<td>Diff. (1-2)</td>
<td>C.R.</td>
<td>Std. Dev. (1)</td>
<td>Std. Dev. (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N (1) = 194     N (2) = 179
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