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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The initial interest in this study was sparked by a series of informal discussions among the professional staff of a particular junior high school in Ohio. A number of changes in the school program had been instituted during the year and, as might be expected, there had been a wide variety of student reactions to these changes. What puzzled the staff, however, was the diverse membership of the extreme groups -- the "strongly for" and the "strongly against" groups. Each of these groups enrolled some of the most able students as well as some of the poorest students. The school leaders were divided between the two groups. The positions taken regarding the changes seemed to cross all known school groupings.

It was suggested that perhaps there were some subtle characteristics which linked the members of each group. The observation was made that certain students in the "strongly for" group were the types who seemed to enjoy any departure from the usual classroom routine. Similarly, it was noted that some of the "strongly against" students had a reputation for being against just about everything that was different. The discussion evolved to the point where it was posited that perhaps the subtle characteristic that formed the groups was something which might be called "openness". In other words, those students who were "strongly for" the program changes held in common
a characteristic called openness. Likewise, the "strongly against" students held in common the opposite characteristic which might be called closedness.

The first task in this study was to find or develop a method of determining the level of openness or closedness that characterized each student. The search for a standardized instrument led to the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. This Scale provides scores ranging from 40 to 280 which facilitates the determination of open and closed groups. Considerable technical and normative data is available concerning this instrument.

A second task was to construct a situation which would test each student's reactions to program changes. A Questionnaire on Innovative Practices was developed to solicit students' reactions to five proposed program changes. A forced-choice answer scale ranging from strongly in favor to strongly against provided a score range from five to thirty-five.

The following hypotheses will be accepted or rejected in this study:

(1) The Open Minded will accept change to a significantly greater degree than the Closed Minded as indicated on the results of the Questionnaire Total and on each item of the Questionnaire.

(2) The Combined High and Low group will accept change to a significantly greater degree than the Middle group as indicated on the results of the Questionnaire Total and on each item of the Questionnaire.

A comprehensive treatment of the data will be undertaken in an effort to uncover significant information.
Significance of the Problem

There is ample evidence of the widespread concern for predicting human behavior. The employer tries to predict the future job behavior of a prospective employee. The academic institution attempts to predict the future academic performance of its students. The parole board tries to predict the probable behavior of the incarcerated man. Similarly, there is ample evidence of the widespread use of standardized instruments in the prediction of human behavior. The Mental Measurements Yearbook lists thousands of instruments used in the assessment of present and future human behavior.

But why attempt to measure the openness of junior high school pupils? Because the personal characteristics (feelings, attitudes, preferences, etc.) of students have become important ingredients in the effective operation of the school. In the not-too-distant past, the school official had the powers of a dictator and frequently used them in the same fashion. The principal stood in the hallway and bragged about not having shaggy heads or short skirts in his school. If something was stolen, he simply searched pockets, purses, and lockers until he found the item or he terrorized students until someone made a confession (whether the guilty party or not). If he wished to institute a different program or a new procedure, he simply said "this is the way it is going to be". While not all administrators operated in this fashion, society (parents, students, teachers, etc.) generally accorded such powers to the school administrator.
The school administrator's role is greatly changed today. The principal must tolerate a hallway in which long hair, armbands, slacks and shorts, and peace symbols are in and shoes, bras, and conventional appearance are out. If something is stolen, the principal had better keep in mind recent court rulings on search and seizure. If a change in program or procedure is contemplated, the wise administrator gets a "sounding" from teachers, students, and parents. In this atmosphere, the feelings and attitudes of students are important and the principal and his staff attempt to assess them as best they can.

Suppose the principal is considering a rather significant change in program. Suppose also that the principal had previously collected data concerning the openness of his students. If he made a special effort to explain the proposed change to the less-open students, he may greatly enhance his chances of overall acceptance of the proposed change.

In another situation, a principal may need a student to help on a committee dealing with a difficult and sensitive problem. It would seem that a student tending to be more open than the average would be more helpful on the committee. Such a student would be better able to participate in the give-and-take of the committee and would be better able to effect the compromise which usually results from committee activity. This type of maneuvering on the part of the principal may be too near manipulation for some persons but the line between manipulation and leadership is a very fine one at best.

An indication of a student's openness might also benefit the administrator as he attempts to adjudicate student-student and student-
teacher disagreements. The implication is that the less-open student is likely to encounter more abrasive situations and is more likely to have problems in interpersonal relationships. The fact that a student has average intelligence and obtains average grades provides no evidence of his ability to work with others.

The composite picture of a class or school on the basis of openness might also serve as an element in the evaluation of the effectiveness of the school program. If a goal of the school is to produce more-open types of students, it is incumbent on the staff to develop a way to measure the achievement of this goal.

In conclusion, the significance of the problem stems from the need for new techniques to be used in a new art of school administration. If the Rokeach Scale is determined to be an effective instrument in predicting students' reactions to program changes, it opens the door to using the Scale in a wide variety of administrative applications.

Definition of Terms

In order to facilitate the comprehension of this study, the following terms are defined.

1. **Openness**
   As used by the teaching staff, it is a relatively uncomplicated term referring to a student's willingness to go along with, or be exposed to, something new and different.

2. **Open-minded**
   This is a term defined by Rokeach as the ability to "...receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic
merits, unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside.\textsuperscript{1}

(3) Closed-minded
This is a term defined by Rokeach as a relative lack of the ability to "... receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic merits, unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside."\textsuperscript{2}

(4) the Dogmatism Scale
The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale E. A copy of the Scale and an answer sheet may be found in Appendix A of this study.

(5) the Questionnaire
The Questionnaire on Innovative Practices. A copy may be found in Appendix B of this study.

(6) high dogmatics
students whose scores were above one standard deviation above the mean

(7) low dogmatics
students whose scores were below one standard deviation below the mean

Limitations of the Study

This study has limitations in two general areas: (1) sample group, and (2) instrumentation.

All of the students in the same group attended a junior high school in a small midwestern community. All were 8th graders between the ages of fourteen and sixteen. On a socio-economic basis, the group would be considered relatively homogeneous. Generalizations


\textsuperscript{2}in loc cit.
from the data gathered in this study must be considered in the degree to which this group is representative of similar groups in like settings throughout the United States.

The characteristics of the setting, described more fully in Chapter III, placed certain limitations on the study. The school system and the community was not conducive to a prolonged extensive study. It would have been well, for example, to have the students discuss the ramifications of the various innovations proposed in the Questionnaire, but such a procedure would likely have aroused some strong feeling in the school and the community.

A limiting factor in this study may be the vocabulary level of the Rokeach Scale. Some of the students asked the proctors to define the meanings of words found on the Scale. In a study by Kemp and Kohler\(^3\) the vocabulary level of the Scale was found suitable for high school students. The population for their study came from 8th and 9th graders of a large urban high school in Ohio. Data is not available to determine whether the vocabulary levels of the two groups are comparable.

Twenty students were dropped from the experimental group because their test data was incomplete. Some of the students missed a testing session and others omitted critical items on the instruments. The effect of the loss of these students on the total results of the study is uncertain.

The instruments used in the study both have the limitations which characterize all self-report inventories. These limitations relate to an individual's

(1) Ability to read the questions with understanding.

(2) Self-insight and self-understanding.

(3) Willingness to reveal himself frankly.¹

The Questionnaire on Innovative Practices likely contains some weaknesses. The situations contrived in the Questionnaire failed to produce a normative distribution of scores; the scores were skewed to the approving end of the scale. Some of the negative elements in the situations apparently weren't sensed by the members of the experimental group.

To encourage the students to reveal themselves frankly and to minimize the possibility of stirring up the sensitivities of the community, the listing was attributed to a research effort of a nearby university. Under these circumstances, there was no need to provide anonymity for the responses — hence, students were asked to place their names on the answer sheets. The results of this study must be viewed in light of this procedure.

Organization of the Remainder of the Dissertation

Chapter II will deal with a review of the related literature.

Chapter III will describe the sample group and other demographic information pertinent to the study. Further, the methods and procedures employed in this study will be discussed.

Chapter IV will present the findings of the study.

Chapter V will contain the investigator's summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

The concluding section of the dissertation will list the bibliographic references and the appendixes exhibiting the instruments used in the study.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

The basic effort in this study is to compare the results of two different measures of attitude -- the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale E and a Questionnaire on Innovative Practices. The Dogmatism Scale has become widely used in research in the social sciences in recent years while the Questionnaire was specifically developed for this study.

The use of attitude questionnaires has become commonplace in the last twenty-five years. Buros' Mental Measurement Yearbooks acknowledges an extensive number of instruments of this type and the literature of the social sciences is replete with accounts of their use.

Basically, the attitude questionnaire is a self-report inventory designed to appraise an individual's favorableness toward some group, proposed action, social institution, or social concept. One notable use of the attitude questionnaire is in opinion polling to assess societal viewpoints on various social and political issues. The industrial morale survey is another practical application of attitude measurement. In the schools, questionnaires are used to appraise the public opinion of the school's patrons, to survey pupils' attitudes on school issues, and to study the status or change of pupil's

---

expressed beliefs after instruction. But the greatest use of attitude appraisal devices up to the present time has probably been for research studies of factors related to attitude differences, types of experiences that produce changes in attitude, or the influence of attitudes upon our perception of our world.\(^2\)

The efforts of Milton Rokeach in the area of attitude measurement over the past twenty years are reported in numerous articles and monographs and in a full-length book, *The Open and Closed Mind*.\(^3\) His basic premise is that an individual's attitudes are not isolated but "hang together"\(^4\) in systems of belief and disbelief. He has defined the distinguishing characteristics of open and closed belief systems in the following manner:\(^5\)

A Belief-Disbelief System Is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. to the extent that, with respect to its organization along the belief-disbelief continuum,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. the magnitude of rejection of disbelief subsystems is relatively low at each point along the continuum;</td>
<td>1. the magnitude of rejection of disbelief subsystems is relatively high at each point along the disbelief continuum;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. there is communication of parts within and between belief and disbelief systems;</td>
<td>2. there is isolation of parts within and between belief and disbelief systems;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\)in loc cit.  
\(^4\)Ibid., p. 4.  
\(^5\)Ibid., p. 55.
In an effort to measure individual differences in openness or closedness of belief systems, Rokeach and his associates developed a series of Dogmatism scales. The initial Form A was first tested at Michigan State University in 1952. It was composed of 57 items with a corrected reliability of .70. After an item analysis, 11 items were eliminated and Form B produced a corrected reliability of .75. Further
refinements led to a final form, Form E, which contained 40 items with corrected reliabilities of .81 for an English College II sample, .78 for an English worker sample and a range from .68 to .93 for samples from Michigan State University, The Ohio State University, and a Veteran's Administration domiciliary.\(^6\)

In reviewing the development of the Dogmatism scale, Rokeach made the following statement regarding the reliabilities obtained:

> These reliabilities are considered to be quite satisfactory, especially when we remember that the Dogmatism Scale contains quite a strange collection of items that cover a lot of territory and appear on the surface to be unrelated to each other. The fact that subjects agree or disagree with these items in a consistent manner is borne out by item analyses. These analyses compare subjects scoring in the upper and lower quarters of the frequency distribution (which is leptokurtic) on each of the items. They typically show that high and low dogmatic subjects differ consistently and in a statistically significant manner on the great majority of items.\(^7\)

Two validation studies\(^8\), using the Method of Known Groups, provided mixed results. In the first study, using college professors as raters, no differences were found between high and low dogmatic groups. In the second study, using graduate students in psychology as raters, the high dogmatic subjects scored considerably and significantly higher than the low dogmatic subjects. In reference to the validity of the Dogmatism scale, Rokeach stated:

\(^6\)Ibid., p. 89.

\(^7\)Ibid., p. 90. For a more detailed analysis of the technical aspects of the above, Rokeach refers the reader to: Milton Rokeach, "Political and Religious Dogmatism" An Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality," Psychological Monographs, 70, No. 18 (Whole No. 425).

\(^8\)Ibid., pp. 101-108.
How can we tell whether the theory . . . is a fruitful one? To find out is no simple matter. Like any other theory, it can only be tested step by step, by exploring its consequences. Like any other theory, it would be hard to prove or disprove. At best, research findings can only raise or lower the probability of its validity.  

One negative reaction to the validity of the Dogmatism Scale (and other similar scales) has been registered by Dean Peabody. Following from the efforts of L. J. Cronbach in response sets and test validity and R. Likert in the measurement of attitudes, Peabody cites three shortcomings of the Dogmatism Scale:

1. The person who has no definite attitudes on a particular item is forced to respond either pro or anti (this response is based on "response set", according to Peabody).

2. The items are deliberately made ambiguous.

3. The items are all in one direction — worded favorably to the attitude object with agreement scored positively . . . instead of including statements worded unfavorably to the attitude object with agreement scored negatively . . . As a result, agreement response set is systematically confounded with procontent attitudes.

Efforts to test for agreement set, according to Peabody, have been hampered by treating it as entirely general or as a mechanical process. Dismissing agreement set by the circular argument that it is a characteristic of authoritarians is not satisfactory either. Finally,

---

9Ibid., p. 71


11Ibid., p. 1.
reinterpretation was suggested for many correlates of the F Scale measure of authoritarianism that may actually reflect a lack of any definite attitudes.

Also questioning the construction of the Dogmatism Scale was Lichtenstein\(^{12}\) who undertook a study designed to demonstrate that the Dogmatism Scale is just as vulnerable to acquiescent response set as is the California F Scale. Two measures of acquiescence were developed and administered, along with the Dogmatism and F scales and a measure of verbal intelligence, to 40 adult neuropsychiatric inpatients. Both acquiescence measures were positively related to both the Dogmatism and the F scales. It was concluded that the Dogmatism measure contains acquiescent response set variance. As a result of these findings, Lichtenstein made two recommendations:

(1) . . . that previous work with Dogmatism should be reexamined with an eye to determining which measures are related to Dogmatism by virtue of their sharing variance in acquiescence. As with the F Scale, the correlation between Dogmatism and other response biased measures cannot be interpreted unambiguously.

(2) Future studies relating the F Scale and Dogmatism to other acquiescence-biased measures should include an independent measure of acquiescence as a matter of routine. This will make it possible to specify to what extent obtained relationships are attributable to construct rather than methods variance.\(^{13}\)

---


\(^{13}\)Ibid., p. 637
The possibility that the Dogmatism Scale is subject to social bias is posited in a study by Robert Ziller.\textsuperscript{14} The subjects in the study were twenty-one clinical psychologists from four Veterans Administration Hospitals and sixteen trainees in clinical psychology assigned to these same hospitals from various universities throughout the Eastern United States. The experimental design involved a comparison of the "don't know" responses of the group of clinical psychologists and the group of trainees. It was determined that the decision to defer judgment because of insufficient information is perceived by professionals as incongruent with their professional role; as admitting a lack of professional knowledge, inadequate professional judgment, lack of confidence in professional judgment, or perhaps simply as indicating indecision. Thus, Ziller concludes that dogmatism is a status defense mechanism and that response sets may have social correlates as well as personality correlates.

Ziller's study is suggestive of an added dimension to the concept of dogmatism but can hardly be considered a valid criticism of the Dogmatism Scale. His study was concerned with "don't know" responses and the Dogmatism Scale is a forced-choice scale without a "don't know" alternative. The answers to questions on the Dogmatism Scale would not likely be shared with members of the peer group; in fact, Rokeach recommends that individuals "... take the tests without putting their names on them, in order to encourage frank and honest answers."\textsuperscript{15}


\textsuperscript{15} Rokeach, p. 87.
A study which supports the construct validity of the Dogmatism Scale and presents a different method of scoring is reported by Harold Korn.\(^\text{1}\) Three scales from the California Psychological Inventory -- Well-being, Tolerance and Flexibility -- were all negatively correlated with Dogmatism. Some evidence of a relationship between scale score and measures of intellectual aptitude was found if both sex of subjects and type of aptitude are taken into account. In an attempt to counter the effects of response set, Korn proposes a scoring system which is based on the frequency of agree responses (P). By scoring the scale for P, the variance associated with the dichotomous agree-disagree response can be separated from the variance associated with intensity of response.

Despite the reservations that have been expressed concerning the Dogmatism Scale, it continues to be a popular instrument for research study. The 1968-69 Subject Index of Dissertation Abstracts lists twenty-three studies relating to dogmatism with most of the studies using the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale E.

Numerous attempts have been made to assess the usefulness of the Dogmatism Scale with school-age populations. Kemp and Kohler\(^\text{17}\) studied a group of 370 eighth and ninth grade students in an attempt to determine the usefulness of the Dogmatism Scale with adolescents. The first


step in the standardization process was a word study of the items and instructions used in the Scale. It was determined that the 282 words were within the range of high school students.

A validation effort using the average ratings of a group of teachers and scores on the Dogmatism Scale produced a correlation of .74. The reliability of the Scale through a test-retest procedure produced a coefficient of .82. A second method employing the Rulon Formula gave a reliability coefficient of .92. On the basis of this data, it was concluded that the Scale was suitable for use with high-school students.

Figert went even farther by adapting the Dogmatism Scale to children in grades four through six. The paper-and-pencil scale contained fifty items of a forced-choice type found to be at a third grade reading level. The instrument's reliability coefficient (odd-even) was found to be .67. All items discriminated between low and high scores at P .05.

Figert summarizes his findings thusly:

Some of the data, it was concluded, could be interpreted as evidence of the instrument's validity . . . . None of the data, it was concluded, could be interpreted as evidence that would tend to invalidate the instrument. For the sample population, it was concluded, the instrument was functioning relatively effectively as a measuring device and was measuring some of the same facets of openness-mindedness-closedmindedness among children that adult forms of the instrument measure among adults.

---


19 Ibid., pp. 20-21.
Another attempt to adapt the Dogmatism Scale to a specific population was undertaken by Ernestine Pannes. The population for the study was 675 students in grades nine through twelve. The Bills-Silverman Index of Self Acceptance was used to determine the level of self acceptance. Dogmatism Scale E for Junior-Senior High School, adapted by the investigator from Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale E (for adults), was used to determine degree of dogmatism in adolescent subjects. The following conclusions were posited for a junior-senior high school population:

1. That the higher the level of self acceptance, the higher the degree of dogmatism.

2. That both degree of dogmatism and level of self acceptance decrease with advance in school grade.

3. That the higher the IQ of the student, the lower is both his degree of dogmatism and his level of self acceptance.

One popular use of the Dogmatism Scale is to relate the scores to some aspect of the curriculum. Stranges examined the open and closed-minded students' preferences for lecture or discussion methods. No significant relationship was found between the degree of dogmatism possessed and the teaching mode preferred by the open and the closed-minded. These students overwhelmingly preferred the discussion method. Stranges addressed himself to six related questions:


1. How similar or different in age are the open and closed-minded? 
   . . . the open-minded subjects had an average age that was younger than the closed-minded.

2. How similar or different in mobility and stability in residency are the open and the closed-minded? 
   . . . the closed-minded group was slightly more mobile in residency than the open-minded.

3. How similar or different in family background are the open and the closed-minded? 
   For the open-minded, mother rather than father was more frequently absent from the home, and the reverse was found for the closed-minded . . . the open-minded had fewer than three siblings while the closed-minded had more than five.

4. How similar or different in participation in activities and preferences in interests are the open and the closed-minded? 
   Organizational participation for both . . . tend to be low. First preference for both . . . was sports . . . the open-minded . . . favored participation in activities supervised by the school . . .

5. How similar or different in academic ability are the open and the closed-minded? 
   The data . . . showed the open-minded superior to the closed-minded. 
   The open-minded subjects had higher levels of aspirations than the closed-minded population.

6. How similar or different in vocational aspirations are the open and the closed-minded? 
   . . . interests in future employment were nearly the same for both groups.22

Another attempt to study dogmatism in relation to specific curriculum content was reported by David Cram.23 The purpose of the study was to determine whether or not the student's attitude toward a

22Ibid., pp. 91-97.

particular subject is influenced by the interaction between the type of assignment he has and one aspect of his personality, that of dogmatism. Three questions relating to dogmatism were investigated:

1. Will the high-dogmatic student finish the course with a higher positive affect for the subject matter if he writes the test assignment than if he writes the critique?

2. Will the low-dogmatic student have a higher positive affect at the conclusion of the course if he writes the critique than if he writes the test?

3. Given a choice, will the high-dogmatic students tend to choose the test writing assignment and will the low-dogmatic students tend to choose the critique?

An analysis of the data indicated no significant differences in post-test attitude scores. Examination of the measuring instruments showed that the class was favorably disposed toward media at the beginning and at the end of the course, and the skewness of the results may have clouded differences which might have been apparent on more precise instruments.

The Questionnaire on Innovative Practices was developed for this study. Its basis of acceptance is its face validity.

Conclusions

The emphasis in this review of the literature has been on research related to the construction of the Dogmatism Scale, on attempts to establish the Scale for use with school-age children, and on research efforts in the public schools.
The conclusions are mixed concerning the construction of the Dogmatism Scale. The limitations suggested, while important, are no more serious than those proposed for other instruments in common use today.

The efforts at adopting the Scale to younger age groups suggests that the Dogmatism Scale is suitable for use only with adults. On the other hand, the study by Kemp and Kohler and the continued use of the Scale with junior and senior high populations attest to the suitability of the Scale for pre-adults.

Use of the Dogmatism Scale in the public schools has been directed at a correlation with some demographic characteristic or with some aspect of curriculum. There apparently have been no studies to examine the relationship of Dogmatism scores to student reaction to innovative practices.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between student scores on the Rokeach Opinionnaire and student scores based on attitudes toward innovative practices in the schools. Significant findings would recommend the Opinionnaire as a predictive instrument in assessing the level and locus of support for proposed innovations in school programs and procedures. The concern for the study (as outlined in Chapter I) developed in an actual school program and thereby presented a ready-made setting and sample group for the study.

The Setting

The study was conducted in a junior high school in an exempted-village school system in Northwestern Ohio. It is very difficult to describe the setting without resorting to clichés and overly-simplistic analyses but the methodology and the results of this study are understandable only in terms of the particular characteristics of the setting. It is necessary, therefore, to present a description of the setting despite the limitations of language and objective data.

Northwestern Ohio pretty well fits the time-worn descriptions of Middle America. It is an agricultural area with a light sprinkling of villages, towns, and small cities. There is some light industry throughout the area but the heavy industry is concentrated primarily
in the metropolitan areas along Lake Erie. Economically and politically, the area falls on the conservative side of the American spectrum.

The particular county in which the study was conducted is oriented to agriculture. Many of the residents of the county are of German decent and the mores and institutions of the communities reflect this background. There is very little poverty and a surprising number of affluent families. Monetary policies are very conservative -- a home loan for 15 years is the maximum, taxes are relatively low, institutions are business entities first, etc. Persons in prominent positions have openly bragged about there not being one member of the black race in the county. There is the usual pattern of fear of state and federal government and little sympathy or understanding in the areas of campus unrest and racial turmoil. Yet, there is a certain strength in the county -- there is very little crime and delinquency, institutions are stable and durable, and there is a certain cohesiveness among the people.

The school system in which the study was conducted encompasses most of the county previously described. Quite naturally, it reflects the attitudes of the people of the county. The school is viewed as a business which happens to be in the area of education. Little money is spent on "frills" -- no counselors or art teachers or professional librarians before high school, one of seven elementary principals holds regular certification, no kindergarten until 1970-71, no elective subjects before high school, etc. Tax monies for schools do not come easily because property taxes are not popular with farmers, many
retired persons on fixed incomes live in the towns, and because the educational expectancy is not high. The common excuses like "it was good enough for me and it's good enough for my children", "why should we educate them for other communities or other styles of living -- what's wrong with this community?" are frequently heard. Yet, as in the county, there is a certain strength. School destruction and disruption are almost non-existent. The teachers, despite some personal and academic deficiencies, are able to convey a sincere interest in the welfare of each student. There have been no court cases challenging the authority of the school and informal challenges are relatively rare. In general, teachers and other school staff are held in comparatively high regard.

The exempted village school system was created out of six local school districts about eight years ago. Elementary schools continue to exist in each local area but the junior and senior high schools have been centralized. Some bitterness remains as a result of the quarrelling which preceded the actual consolidation. Item Two on the "Questionnaire on Innovative Practices" produced comments about the "city" kids being the only ones to benefit from the proposed change. Voting patterns on school issues still follow the old battle lines drawn on the consolidation issue. In other words, old fears and disagreements relating to consolidation are important considerations in the setting for the study and quite likely had some effect on the outcome.

In addition to the four elementary schools in the outlying areas, the school district has three elementary schools, a junior high school,
and a senior high school in the central town (which also happens to be the seat of county government). The senior high school, which was built as a result of consolidation, is relatively new and features a unique architectural style. The junior high school is located in the old building which at one time handled grades one through twelve. At the present time, there are about 410 students in grades seven and eight as well as one room each of grades one through six in the building. The experimental group for the study consisted of the eighth grade in this building.

Two factors concerning the junior high school would seem pertinent to the setting of the study. First of all, some of the students in the sample group were spending their eighth year in this particular building. The building itself was built in three or four stages. The oldest section of the building, which housed the shop areas, the locker rooms, and the gymnasium, was built in the 1880's. There were open manifestations of the work of cockroaches and the building had been condemned many times over the years. The newest section of the building had been dedicated in 1935 and had the styling and appointments of an old building. Although the building in general was attractive and extremely well-maintained, students could hardly escape the feeling that they were in an old building. The fact that the junior high students shared the building with elementary children was not a particular endearing feature to the older students.

Another factor which would seem pertinent to a consideration of the setting of the study relates to the over-all program at the junior high level. There had been an annual procession of school principals
for the past four or five years and none had felt secure enough to tamper with the program. This fact combined with a fairly conservative superintendent and a conservative community had produced a junior high program that was many years out of date. During the school year preceding the study, a number of modest changes had been instituted. Shorter class periods were established. Staggered lunch periods with a noon movie program came into being. At mid-year, the eighth graders went on individual schedules with some ability grouping. In general, the atmosphere of the school became much less repressive. Students were for the most part highly accepting of these changes. At the time of the study, the students mental set was one of feeling very positively about the recent changes and anticipating more changes to come. This factor likely accounts for the high level of acceptance evidenced on the "Questionnaire on Innovative Practices."

Population

The population for this study included the entire eighth grade of the school system described in this chapter. The original group numbered one hundred and ninety-one but school absences and incomplete data eliminated nineteen members of the group. The experimental group then, consisted of one hundred and seventy-two eighth grade students. Of this number, eighty-four were males and eighty-eight were females.

By most standards the group would be considered relatively homogeneous. Most of the students had lived in this particular county all their lives and many were still living in the residence where they had
been born. Most came from working-class families where the home life was strong and broken homes were rare.

On the negative side, they seemed reasonably content with a stultifying school experience and the resultant provincialism which goes with it. Secondly, the town-rural antagonisms built up over the years seemed to distort their thinking. This latter fact was affirmed in this study.

In age, all students were fourteen, fifteen, or sixteen. It was the practice in this particular school system to keep students pretty well in their own age groups.

Student interests centered around the school, the church, and various 
U-H-type activities. In the fashion of rural and small-town Ohio, community interest was very high in athletics. Cultural life was limited primarily to a few professional families who pursued their interests in nearby cities.

Instruments Used in the Study

The original proposition in this study was that there were some significant differences among those students who took particular positions on innovative practices in the school. It was further proposed that perhaps these differences could be accounted for by the concept of open or closed-mindedness. The instrumentation required to study these propositions was a measure of attitudes toward innovative practices and a measure of open or closed-mindedness. The first need could be met by Rokeach Dogmatism Scale E -- an instrument
currently in wide use in social science research. The second need could be filled by a questionnaire which was developed to meet the unique situation in this particular school.

Rokeach Dogmatism Scale - Form E

This scale was developed by Milton Rokeach and his associates during the 1950's and has been used widely in research in the subsequent years. As indicated in Chapter II of this study, the theory behind the Scale and the Scale itself have been the object of much research and professional consideration in the many disciplines of the social sciences. Rokeach and his associates have outlined the theory and development of the Scale in numerous articles, monographs, and in the full-length book, The Open and Closed Mind.

The primary purpose of the Dogmatism Scale is to measure individual differences in openness or closedness of belief systems. Items on the Scale in the first edition (Scale A, around 1952) were chosen to tap what were believed to be characteristics of open or closed systems. The Dogmatism Scale went through five editions designed to take advantage of continuing refinements in theory and to increase reliability.

1 The Dogmatism Scale (E) and the answer sheet used in this study may be found in Appendix A.


3 Ibid., pp. 71-73
The first form (Form A) included fifty-seven items and had a corrected reliability of .70. Following an item analysis, 14 items were dropped and the subsequent form (Form B) had a corrected reliability of .75. After another item analysis and the elimination of seven items, the third form (Form C) produced a corrected reliability of .73. Form D with thirty items more than the previous form resulted in a reliability of .91. The final form (Form E) contained forty items (twenty-six items had been dropped from Form D after an item analysis) and resulted in a series of reliabilities ranging from .68 to .93. Rokeach commented on the findings in the following manner, "These reliabilities are considered to be quite satisfactory ..." Other attempts have been made to test the reliability of Scale, including one by Kemp and Kohler, where coefficients of .82 and .92 were obtained.

Validation studies using the Method of Known Groups produced mixed results. Other studies using similar instruments, such as the California F Scale, have produced mixed results also. Critics of the Scale often are also critics of the validating instruments.

4 Ibid., p. 89
5 Ibid., p. 90
6 op. cit., pp. 384-5
7 Rokeach, p. 105.
The forty items of the Dogmatism Scale are generally interspersed with twenty filler items to disguise the purpose of the Scale. Subjects indicate disagreement or agreement with each item on a scale ranging from -3 to +3, with the 0 point excluded in order to force responses toward agreement or disagreement. After disregarding the filler items, the Scale is converted for scoring purposes to a 1-to-7 scale by adding a constant of 4 to each item score. The total score is the sum of scores obtained on all forty items in the test. A high score is considered closed-minded and a low score open-minded. Students normally take the tests without putting their names on them in order to encourage frank and honest answers.

**Questionnaire on Innovative Practices**

The Questionnaire resulted from extensive discussions between this researcher and two members of the staff of the school. It was concluded that the items of the Questionnaire needed to be selected carefully to meet the following criteria:

1. They should be short and completed in one sitting.

2. They should provide a spread of scores.

---


11 The Questionnaire on Innovative Practices used in this study may be found in Appendix B.
(3) They should have some plausibility but yet contain some elements of ambiguity and uncertainty.

The need for short items which could be completed in one sitting arose from some of the characteristics of the setting. It was felt that undue attention to the proposed innovations might stir some hostilities in the community which would be to the detriment of the host school. Likewise, it was felt that certain elements within the school system might feel threatened by the discussion of proposed innovations and might provoke some administrative difficulties.

The content of the proposed innovation had to be selected in such a way as to produce a range of scores. The effort was made to select items acceptable to most students. This effort is depicted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Unacceptable</th>
<th>Highly Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remain in Jr. Hi. Bldg.</td>
<td>Zero Period</td>
<td>Flexible Scheduling</td>
<td>Seminar Weeks</td>
<td>Campus-Type Operation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the proposed innovations on the Questionnaire were feasible. At the same time, enough was left unsaid to provoke uncertainty in the minds of the more fearful. Item Five, for example, indicated that students would have time free from class in which they could exercise a number of options on what to do. To students who have had considerable regimentation for as many as eight years, the thought of having to exercise some options would likely be frightening, at least to the more fearful.
Another consideration relating to the content of the proposed changes requires elaboration. None of the changes proposed in the Questionnaire would be viewed as innovations in many school systems. However, in light of the school atmosphere described earlier in the chapter, each of the proposed changes would represent innovation to the experimental group in this study. The effort was also made to follow to some degree the history of innovation in the schools. At one time, a change in the location of a grade level represented an innovation. Zero periods and flexible scheduling came along later and in recent years seminar weeks and campus-type operations have become more common.

**Procedures**

The Dogmatism Scale was administered to all eighth graders attending school on Tuesday, May 5, 1970. An extended homeroom period was used and the regular homeroom teachers administered the Scale. About three weeks later, the Questionnaire on Innovative Practices was given to all eighth graders in attendance. The time interval was intended to discourage students from linking the two testing sessions. Immediately after the instruments were administered, the materials were returned to the building principal.

**Treatment of the Data**

The Dogmatism Scale was scored in the prescribed manner. All filler items were lined out and a +1 was added to the remaining items. The sum of the scores on the forty items produced a total score falling between 40 and 280.
The Questionnaire answers followed the same format as the Dogmatism Scale. By adding a +4 to each question and summing the five questions, a total score falling between 5 and 35 was obtained.

A total of nine items of information was keypunched onto data processing cards. These items were:

1. Dogmatism Scale - Total Score
2. Questionnaire - Total Score
3. Questionnaire - Item #1 Score
4. Questionnaire - " #2 "
5. Questionnaire - " #3 "
6. Questionnaire - " #4 "
7. Questionnaire - " #5 "

While not all items were required to respond to the hypotheses of this study, it was felt that the additional information might contribute to the interpretation of the results.

Using pre-packaged statistical programs available at the computer center at Ohio State University, a comprehensive analysis of the data was completed. The discussion of the findings in Chapter IV will provide a further description of the treatment of the data.

Summary

In this chapter the methods and procedures employed in this study have been described. The characteristics of the setting and of the sample group, instruments employed in the study, methodology for collection of data and treatment of the data were presented. Chapter IV contains a presentation of the findings and a discussion of their implications.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

One hundred and seventy-two eighth grade students in a junior high school in Northwestern Ohio responded to the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and to a Questionnaire on Innovative Practices. Two hypotheses were advanced regarding the relationships of the scores from these two instruments. These hypotheses were:

(1) The Open Minded will accept change to a significantly greater degree than the Closed Minded as indicated on the results of the Questionnaire Total and on each item of the Questionnaire.

(2) The Combined High and Low group will accept change to a significantly greater degree than the Middle group as indicated on the results of the Questionnaire Total and on each item of the Questionnaire.

Various statistical analyses were run on the test results to accept or reject the hypotheses.

The treatment of the data was facilitated through the use of packaged computer programs and the computer services available through The Ohio State University. The Basic Data Description package developed by the Health Services Computing Facility, U.C.L.A., was used in the initial step in the treatment of the data. The information includes the Mean, Standard Deviation, and Range (also maximum and minimum) for the Dogmatism Scale, the Questionnaire total, and the individual
items of the Questionnaire. Table 1 presents the basic normative data on the Dogmatism Scale in relation to similar normative data obtained in other studies.

**TABLE 1**

**NORMATIVE DATA ON THE DOGMATISM SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year and Researcher</th>
<th>Sample Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970 - Hall</td>
<td>Ohio Students 8th grade</td>
<td>176.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>167 (249-82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 - Stranges&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Ohio Students 11th grade</td>
<td>169.9</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>157 (240-83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965 - Kemp&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Ohio Students 8th &amp; 9th grades</td>
<td>165.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>138 (239-101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955 - Ehrlich&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Ohio State Univ. Group V</td>
<td>141.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954 - Rokeach&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>English Colleges Group II</td>
<td>152.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Workers</td>
<td>175.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean obtained in this study is somewhat higher than that obtained in other research efforts - a fact which will be discussed in Chapter V of this study.

The high mean score obtained by English workers is attributed to the fact that the sample population contained some English communists.


who usually score in the high-dogmatic range. In general, however, the normative data obtained in this study is in line with that reported in other studies using the Dogmatism Scale.

The normative data concerning the Questionnaire on Innovative Practices is presented in Table 2.

| TABLE 2 |
| NORMATIVE DATA ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE OF INNOVATIVE PRACTICES |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>No.in Sample</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #1</td>
<td>4.0465</td>
<td>2.3441</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; #2</td>
<td>5.5000</td>
<td>1.7688</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; #3</td>
<td>5.6017</td>
<td>1.6598</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; #4</td>
<td>5.9360</td>
<td>1.5863</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; #5</td>
<td>5.9186</td>
<td>1.7719</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.9884</td>
<td>4.5807</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of observations may be made from the data in Table 2. First of all, the mean level of acceptance was relatively high — falling between the "slightly in favor" and the "somewhat in favor" categories. The mean level of acceptance of the individual items ranked as intended with but one juxtaposition.

Unacceptable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Position</th>
<th>Actual Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>1 (4.0465)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>2 (5.5000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>3 (5.6017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>5 (5.9186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>4 (5.9360)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acceptable
The order of the acceptance of the proposed innovations was (1) seminar weeks; (2) campus-type operation; (3) flexible scheduling; (4) zero period; and (5) remain in jr. high building.

The full range of answers -- from "strongly in favor" to "strongly against" was recorded on each item of the Questionnaire.

A "t" test of significant differences was run using the individual and the total scores on the Questionnaire for the Open and Closed Groups.

The results are shown in Table 3.

### TABLE 3

A COMPARISON OF THE SCORES ON QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE OPEN AND THE CLOSED GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Difference of the Mean</th>
<th>&quot;t&quot;</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>4.3214</td>
<td>1.3214</td>
<td>2.0859</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.2000</td>
<td>5.7500</td>
<td>0.5500</td>
<td>0.9513</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9500</td>
<td>5.7143</td>
<td>0.7643</td>
<td>1.2287</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>6.3214</td>
<td>0.3214</td>
<td>0.7763</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>5.5714</td>
<td>0.4286</td>
<td>0.7541</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25.1500</td>
<td>27.6786</td>
<td>2.5286</td>
<td>1.7148</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant difference (at the .05 level) was found between the responses of the Open and the Closed groups on Item #1 (Remain in the Jr. Hi. Building). A significant difference (.10 level) is found between the Questionnaire total scores of the Open and the Closed groups. The "t" value misses significance at the .05 level by a mere 0.0142.
As indicated by the mean scores, the Closed group was more ac-
cepting of the proposed changes on all items except Item #5. Per-
haps this is a result of the manner in which the Questionnaire was
administered. If quick answers are required without the opportunity
for discussion, the Closed group may be more accepting.

A "t" test of significant differences was run between the com-
bined Open and Closed Groups and the Middle Group. Table 4 contains
the results.

**TABLE 4**

A COMPARISON OF THE SCORES ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE
COMBINED (OPEN AND CLOSED GROUPS) AND THE MIDDLE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean Open and Closed</th>
<th>Mean Middle Group</th>
<th>Difference of the Mean &quot;t&quot;</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7708</td>
<td>4.1532</td>
<td>0.3824</td>
<td>0.9616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5208</td>
<td>5.4919</td>
<td>0.0289</td>
<td>-0.0921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3958</td>
<td>5.6855</td>
<td>0.2897</td>
<td>0.8927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1875</td>
<td>5.8387</td>
<td>0.3488</td>
<td>-1.4221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7500</td>
<td>5.9839</td>
<td>0.2339</td>
<td>0.7219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.6250</td>
<td>27.1290</td>
<td>0.5040</td>
<td>0.6082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the differences are significant.

Testing the Hypotheses

Hypothesis No. 1 - The Open-Minded will accept change to a sig-
nificantly greater degree than the Closed Minded as indicated on the
results of the Questionnaire Total and on each item of the Question-
naire.
This hypothesis is rejected. A significant difference (.05 level) was found for Item #1 and a significant difference (.10 level) was found for the Questionnaire total. No significant difference was found for the remaining items. Table 3 (Page 38) presents this data.

Hypothesis No. 2 - The Combined High and Low group will accept change to a significantly greater degree than the Middle group as indicated on the results of the Questionnaire Total and on each item of the Questionnaire.

This hypothesis is rejected. No significant differences were found. Table 4 (Page 39) presents this data.

Summary

This chapter contains the major findings of this study. Chapter V will be devoted to a summary of the investigation, the drawing of some conclusions, a discussion of implications, and the presentation of recommendations.
CHAPTER V
"SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS"

This chapter, concluding the dissertation, is divided into three sections. The first section will review the objectives of the study, describe the study group, the instrumentation, and briefly consider the literature which has relevance for this investigation. The second section will contain the conclusions drawn from the data presented in Chapter IV. The final section of this chapter lists recommendations for further research.

An Overview

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of measures of dogmatism and measures of attitudes toward innovative practices. Two hypotheses were posited:

1) The Open-Minded will accept change to a significantly greater degree than the Closed Minded as indicated on the results of the Questionnaire Total and on each item of the Questionnaire.

2) The Combined High and Low group will accept change to a significantly greater degree than the Middle group as indicated on the results of the Questionnaire Total and on each item of the Questionnaire.

A review of related literature indicated that attitude measurement has been a popular activity over the past two or three decades and that the use of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale has blossomed in recent years.
Various attempts to determine the reliability and validity of the Dogmatism Scale have met with mixed results. Several studies undertaken to determine the usefulness of the Scale with school-age children have sanctioned such use. Research efforts combining the Dogmatism Scale with various non-standardized instruments (or varying types of data) are reported widely in the literature.

The study was conducted in a junior high school in an exempted-village school system in Northwestern Ohio. The experimental group consisted of one hundred and seventy-two eighth grade students. Each student was given the Dogmatism Scale and a Questionnaire on Innovative Practices.

The treatment of the data was facilitated through the use of packaged computer programs and the computer services available through The Ohio State University. The data was presented in tabular form and briefly discussed in Chapter IV. The hypotheses were tested and reported in the final section of Chapter IV.

Conclusions

As indicated in Table 1, the mean score on the Dogmatism Scale obtained in this study is considerably higher than those obtained in the other studies depicted -- with the exception of the "English worker" sample which included some unusual population (communists). The mean score varies from seven to eleven points higher than other samples from school-age populations in central and northwestern Ohio. This fact can only be accounted for in light of the characteristics of the setting presented in Chapter III.
The relative socio-economic homogeniety which characterizes the population of this study would likely move them to the more closed-minded end of the continuum. Isolation from other cultures, races, religions, and social classes would affect the responses to those items on Dogmatism Scale relating to Intolerance and Authoritarianism.¹ The lack of a stimulating and challenging school program would also be a factor. To some extent, the age of the population (junior-high school) may be an additional factor since the curriculum at this point (especially in this system) would not yet have included those courses which seriously question commonly-held beliefs. In this type of community, controversial issues are customarily avoided or badly watered-down until the 12th grade, if not avoided completely. The high mean score obtained in this study then, likely reflects the closed-minded nature of the community rather than any other factor or combination of factors.

The mean score on the Questionnaire on Innovative Practices was 26.9881 which represents an answer slightly more positive than "slightly in favor". If there had been a normal distribution of answers on the Questionnaire, the mean would have been 20.0000. How does one account for the difference? One possibility is that the "mental set" of the population was in favor of change. As previously indicated, the students were finishing a year in which they had been subjected to considerable change which they had, for the most part, enjoyed. A second plausible explanation for the positive mean on the Questionnaire

¹Rokeach, pp. 77-78.
is that the language of the items failed to trigger negative or "threat" feelings on the part of the students. Perhaps they simply did not read into the questions the negative features which seemed so obvious to those who were involved in the construction of the Questionnaire. It is possible also that the way that the Questionnaire was presented led to the high level of acceptance of the proposed changes. The students were forced to respond rather rapidly to the five questions presented to them and this may not have permitted them time to think of the negative aspects of the proposed changes. A final possibility is that the students were reluctant to respond negatively since they were signing their names to the answer sheet.

The first hypothesis concerned the relationship between scores of the Open group and those of the Closed group. Although the total hypothesis was rejected, some significant differences were noted. On Item #1 (Remain in the Jr. Hi. Building), a difference significant at the .05 level was found. The Closed group was much more amenable to staying behind at the junior high building than was the Open group.

Some judgment of the motives behind the positions taken on this issue can be derived from the comments offered in the Questionnaire. Most of those who were against staying in the junior high another year were looking forward to certain classes or activities at the high school or were concerned about the crowding that would result at the junior high school. Those preferring to stay at the junior high school cited the fact that they knew everyone there and that they were familiar with the building and the routine. These differences in attitudes
toward change are in line with theoretical postulations concerning the open and the closed-minded.

A significant difference (.10 level) was indicated between the Questionnaire total for the Open and the Closed groups. This test missed significance at the .05 level by a mere .01. Differences were ranked in the following order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Group More Accepting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Favor moving out of Jr. Hi.</td>
<td>1.3214</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Favor flexible schedule</td>
<td>1.2357</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Favor zero period</td>
<td>.5500</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Favor campus-type operation</td>
<td>.4286</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Favor seminar weeks</td>
<td>.3214</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A couple of generalizations from this data and from the comments on the Questionnaire would seem in order. All groupings of the population were united in favoring change from what is presently happening in the schools. The Closed group, however, was more accepting of those Items (2, 3, and 4) which constituted comparatively minor change while the Open group favored more-sweeping change.

The second hypothesis in this study concerned the relationship of the combined extremes (the Open and the Closed groups) and the Middle groups. This data is found in Table 4. The hypothesis - that significant differences would be found between the Combined Group and the Middle Group on each item and the total of the Questionnaire - was rejected. In this study, the Open group and the Closed group
differed on opposite sides of the Middle group with the result that no significant differences were found in this particular comparison.

Implications

The primary purpose of this study as developed in Chapter I was to determine whether the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale could provide helpful insights to the school teacher, counselor, or administrator. It was indicated that the public school personnel can no longer depend on authority or the "big stick" to maintain effective relations with students. In this situation, the school official needs to know how the different individuals and groups are going to react to what he proposes. In light of this study and basic theoretical propositions advanced by those concerned with open and closed systems, the Dogmatism Scale can provide helpful insights to the school staff.

First of all, the identification of the Open, the Closed, and the Middle groups serves as a starting point. Theoretically, little is known about the characteristics of the Middle group. Commonly referred to as the "non-changers", the members of the Middle group are seldom the focus of research efforts. The members of the Open and the Closed groups, the "changers", generally are the subject of most research.

The "changers" have been characterized in the following manner:

It is thus obvious that we must avoid associating the open mind with change and the closed mind with non-change. A more defensible view is that persons with relatively closed systems may sometimes manifest change and sometime fixedness for basically the same reasons. These reasons have been variously described as conformity, other-directedness, identification with authority, ego
defense, compartmentalization, isolation, opportunism, and expediency. Conversely, change and non-change in open systems may result equally from a correct appraisal of reality, from intellectual conviction rather than dogmatic conviction, and from independence rather than subservience to conformity pressures.\textsuperscript{2}

In light of these characteristics of the "changers", and the fact that the changers can be identified through the use of the Dogmatism Scale, how does the practicing school administrator bring about innovations? If the innovation is not realistic or rational the administrator can expect little help from the Open group which establishes its position on the basis of "a corrected appraisal of reality, from intellectual conviction or from independence."\textsuperscript{3} To win the support of the Open group in this study, the school principal or other staff member would have to be able to show how remaining in the Jr. High building would be a rational move. A number of students indicated in their comments that they knew the building would be required to handle an increased number of elementary classes due to a renovation plan in another building and that all (elementary and the 9th grade) could not fit in the building. The school official trying to sell the Open group on the idea of remaining in the building would have to show that there was indeed room enough for all. Similarly, a number of students who had unhappy experiences with hour-long periods could oppose the proposed flexible schedule on this basis. The school official would have to be ready to document the advisability of instituting the required hour-long periods.

\textsuperscript{2}C. Gratton Kemp, "Changes in Values in Relation to Open-Closed Systems," \textit{The Open and Closed Mind}, p. 337.

\textsuperscript{3}in loc cit.
The implications for dealing with the Closed group are many also. In this study, the Closed group was more supportive of the proposed changes than either the Open or the Middle groups. Assuming that the school staff is desirous of implementing the proposed innovations, no further work with the closed group would be indicated. However, in the event that the support of the Closed group is needed, certain steps would be recommended to deal with "conformity, other-directness, identification with authority, ego defense, compartmentalization, isolation, opportunism, and expediency." Possible schemes or programs in this effort are almost limitless and are too extensive to deal with in any great length in this paper. There would be certain ethical questions which the schemer would have to answer -- such as, would he be willing to play on the fears and insecurities of the Closed group in order to accomplish his objectives?

Another implication of this study is that it may not be useful to seek differences between the extreme (the Closed and the Open groups together) and the Middle group. No significant differences were found in this test because one group was on each side of the mean of the Middle group with the result that the two extremes cancelled each other. The only sure thing about the extremes is that they may be either for or against but for different reasons.

Recommendations for Further Research

Any research that is worth the effort raises more questions than it answers. While few questions were answered in this study, a number
of fruitful avenues for future research were uncovered. The remainder of this study is devoted to examining some of those avenues.

Rokeach suggests that subjects be granted anonymity when responding to the Dogmatism Scale. As previously stated, anonymity was not considered essential when establishing the research model for this study. However, when trying to interpret the results, the specter of the effect of respondees signing their names to the answer sheet rose again and again. It would be highly recommended that all future studies of this type be designed to guarantee anonymity for the respondees.

There is no way to assess the depth of feeling which the students experiences in responding to the instruments. The comments offered on the Questionnaire suggested some pretty strong feeling but not all students made comments. The Dogmatism Scale does not provide a method for respondees to indicate their depth of involvement. The effect should be made in future studies to insure that the respondees feel that their answers are important and will have a direct effect on them.

A fertile area for further study would be the Questionnaire on Innovative Practices. Considerable research effort could be expended in improving it or replacing it with a better means of assessment. It could be improved through a series of steps utilizing item analysis techniques. Items showing little discriminatory powers would be eliminated and new items examined.

In view of the limitations of the self-report inventory, it might be well to examine students' responses to innovation through some
other method of assessment. Simulation would seem to be an excellent way to observe how a student reacts to an innovative situation. By constructing situations where the student is forced to verbalize about an innovation, some insight into his attitudes toward innovation would be obtained. A similar approach to assessing a student's attitudes toward innovation could be obtained through role-playing.

Another interesting possibility for research would involve varying lengths of discussion of proposed innovations prior to assessing a student's position on them. It was stated in this study that there was no opportunity for the students to discuss the multiple ramifications of the proposed innovations. If the proposed changes were discussed over a period of two days, two weeks, or two months, what would be the effect?

It would be interesting to examine the changes in attitudes over time. A student might be asked to respond to a proposed innovation immediately after it is presented, again in four hours, and possibly two days later. Do the high dogmatics change positions more than the low dogmatics or the Middle group?

What would be the effect on attitudes toward innovation by the use of various techniques of persuasion and intimidation after the proposed innovation had been presented. Which groups change more through oral persuasion? Which attitudes are changes through threat or appeal to authority? Which attitudes stay fixed despite all types of attempts to change them?

What is the effect on a student's attitudes toward innovative practices of the characteristics of the school setting. In the
discussion in this study of the high acceptance level of the proposed changes, it was suggested that previous positive experiences with innovations caused a type of "response set" that accounts for the high level of acceptance. What would be the students' attitudes toward innovative practices after a particularly painful or unpleasant innovation?

The same research design as employed in this study could provide insights into students' attitudes toward innovative teaching methods and materials in a particular classroom. The possibilities along this line are unlimited.
The following is a survey of the opinions of people in general about a number of social and personal questions. Of course there are many different answers. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others. Whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many other people feel the same as you do.

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

+1: I AGREE A LITTLE
-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE

+2: I AGREE ON THE WHOLE
-2: I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE

+3: I AGREE VERY MUCH
-3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9. I work under a great deal of tension at times.
+1:  I AGREE A LITTLE          -1:  I DISAGREE A LITTLE
+2:  I AGREE ON THE WHOLE      -2:  I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE
+3:  I AGREE VERY MUCH         -3:  I DISAGREE VERY MUCH

10. I'd like it if I should find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.
11. Of all the different philosophies which have existed in this world there is probably only one which is correct.
12. Whether it's alright to manipulate people or not, it is certainly alright when it's for their own good.
13. It is when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that his life becomes meaningful.
14. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what is going on is to rely upon leaders or experts who can be trusted.
15. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.
16. There are a number of persons I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.
17. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.
18. It is when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that he becomes important.
19. It is better to be a dead hero than a live coward.
20. A group which tolerates too much difference of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.
21. The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.
22. It is only natural that a person should have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.
23. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, I sometimes have the ambition to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.
+1: I AGREE A LITTLE
+2: I AGREE ON THE WHOLE
+3: I AGREE VERY MUCH

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

24. Plain common sense tells you that prejudice can be removed by education, not legislation.
25. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary at times to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.
26. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all".
27. A person must be pretty stupid if he still believes in differences between races.
28. Most people just don't give a "damn" about others.
29. A person who gets enthusiastic about a number of causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.
30. Do unto others as they do unto you.
31. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.
32. If given the chance I would do something that would be of great benefit to the world.
33. The trouble with many people is that they don't take things seriously enough.
34. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by certain people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.
35. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.
36. It bothers me when something unexpected interrupts my daily routine.
37. Once I get wound-up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.
38. There are two kinds of people in this world; those who are on the side of truth and those who are against it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

51. In general, full economic security is bad; most men wouldn't work if they didn't need the money for eating and living.
52. The worst crime a person can commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.

53. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.

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

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

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

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

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

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

60. America may not be perfect, but the American way has brought us about as close as human beings can get to a perfect society.
Opinionnaire
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Dear Student,

Serious thought is being given to a number of changes in programs and practices for next school year. Since you will likely be directly involved in any changes that are made, your feelings about them are being solicited in the following pages. Please consider each one carefully and indicate your feeling about each one.

Chances are being considered for at least two important reasons. First of all, our society is changing rapidly and the needs of our young people are changing at the same time. If our schools are to be truly responsive to the needs of young people, they must change also. A great variety of new programs and practices may be found in the schools of our country. It is generally agreed, however, that no single practice or program is appropriate for all schools and that each community must decide what is "right" for its young people.

A second reason for considering some different programs and practices arises from the fact that the high school is presently over-crowded. This situation leads to a number of problems. Some classes are larger than they should be. Each classroom is used every period of the day. Student organizations often can't find a suitable place to hold meetings during the regular school day. There is no room available for special education classes at the high school level. Some of the office personnel must work out of converted broom closets.

To get with the times and to overcome space limitations, the changes found on the following pages are being given consideration. Stated in the form of a proposition, each should be considered separately. Indicate the degree of your approval or disapproval of each proposition by placing a check-mark in the appropriate blank.

Thank you very much for your help and cooperation.

Your Name _______________________________
PROPOSITION # 1 - Grade Nine moved to the junior high school

It has been proposed that grades seven, eight, and nine be housed at the junior high building next year. By remodeling some areas and by using some of the rooms presently occupied by the administration, adequate space can be made available for the three grades.

Many of the schools which compete with our junior high school are organized on a seven, eight, and nine basis. Music and athletic activities could be scheduled at the same time for both 8th and 9th grades.

Moving the ninth grade from the high school would assure adequate space for a number of years. With adequate space, a number of other program changes would be possible for the upper three grades.

Check One

  _____ Strongly in favor of this proposition
  _____ Somewhat in favor of this proposition
  _____ Slightly in favor of this proposition

  _____ Slightly against this proposition
  _____ Somewhat against this proposition
  _____ Strongly against this proposition

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
PROPOSITION # 2 - Zero Period

It has been proposed that the high school add a "zero" period. A zero period is one which is held before 1st period each morning. Selected students, perhaps mostly town students, would attend a zero period class and then be finished around 2:30 each afternoon. This procedure makes more room available during the day.

It also makes possible the addition of more sections of a subject thereby lowering the class size throughout the day.

Check One

___ Strongly in favor of this proposition
___ Somewhat in favor of this proposition
___ Slightly in favor of this proposition
___ Slightly against this proposition
___ Somewhat against this proposition
___ Strongly against this proposition

Comments:

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
PROPOSITION # 3 - Flexible Scheduling

It has been proposed that classes in the high school be of varying length ranging from one-half hour to possibly one hour and fifteen minutes. In general, the more able students would not be required to spend as much time in class. A class in Spanish might be one-half hour for able students while regular students would spend a full hour in class (as all students presently do). Able students would be permitted to carry more subjects and to spend more time in independent study. The hour-long classes would provide time for supervised study in which the teacher would be available to help those students who are having difficulty. In general, the flexible schedule would make room available for additional classes, meetings, etc.

Check One

___ Strongly in favor of this proposition
___ Somewhat in favor of this proposition
___ Slightly in favor of this proposition
___ Slightly against this proposition
___ Somewhat against this proposition
___ Strongly against this proposition

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
PROPOSITION # 4 - Seminar Weeks

It has been proposed that the high school devote at least one week each semester to an important seminar topic (current topics would be the Vietnam War, pollution, crime, American education, minority rights, etc.). No regular classes would meet during the seminar week. Perhaps the first two days would be given to independent study of the topic. Some students might do library research while others might take field trips or hold interviews on the topic. On other days of the week, outside speakers would be brought to the school to lecture to and hold discussions with the students. Friday might be used as a summary day where groups of students would pool their ideas and try to establish positions on the seminar topic.

Check One

[ ] Strongly in favor of this proposition
[ ] Somewhat in favor of this proposition
[ ] Slightly in favor of this proposition

[ ] Slightly against this proposition
[ ] Somewhat against this proposition
[ ] Strongly against this proposition

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________
PROPOSITION #5 - Campus-type Operation

It has been proposed that the high school change to a campus-type operation similar to that of a college or university. In this plan, students are required to be in school only when they have an actual class (Math, Chemistry, Phys. Ed., etc.). Since the time between classes would be less than an hour, most students would likely stay in or around the school building throughout the day. Various types of study areas, the library, and the commons would be available when students were not in class. However, there would be no required study halls as there are now.

Check One

___ Strongly in favor of this proposition
___ Somewhat in favor of this proposition
___ Slightly in favor of this proposition
___ Slightly against this proposition
___ Somewhat against this proposition
___ Strongly against this proposition

Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
BOOKS


ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS


