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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Developmental Psychology, after many years of dormancy, seems finally to be entering a phase of contemporary acceptance. Why the sudden change? Perhaps the answer can be found not so much within the development of the field, but rather by focusing on the increased awareness exemplified by numerous other aspects of society. Apparently the infant is finally growing-up and is beginning to suffer the pains associated with increased awareness of its existential needs. No longer can the being remain infantile, as is overtly evidenced by its shedding its submissive, dependent role and crying-out for responsibility and independence. To say the least, the development of a child into an adolescent is no quiescent period of life. Strange new needs begin to approach the awareness level of the developing youngster, and discovery of the "how's" of need gratification must painfully occur on an individual trial-and-error level.

Organizational Psychology, after many years of dormancy, seems finally to be entering a phase of contemporary acceptance. Why the sudden change? The answer seems to be reflected in an increased awareness by multitudes of societal members. First, the people are beginning to become aware of their needs, and second, they are beginning to realize that their needs are not being met. Members of
society are first beginning to realize that they desire responsibility and that other members of society are basically attempting to keep them from reaching adulthood. The interesting paradox is that the child simply develops into a chronologically older child exemplifying the same submissive-dependency behaviors to different authority figures in his life.

This chronic pattern passed-on to generation after generation of America's working classes has apparently been the desired state of affairs by those occupying positions of power. Generally, only one of two things will occur when a need which one realizes is blocked from gratification. Either the individual will constantly exert maximum effort to reach his goal even in the face of continuous blocking, or realizing that blocking is inevitable, the individual will eventually begin to believe that the need does not exist at all and exhibit behaviors indicative of such cognitions. In other words, if an individual is constantly blocked from achieving responsibility, and if in fact the opposite behavior is reinforced, he simply does what he is told; sometimes less, never more. If he is told to do more, he expects more in return. It is a quite unique creature who continues his exertion of maximum effort under such conditions.

Early management philosophers argued that this constant blocking of responsibility was best for organizational homeostasis. While the individual might have been curtailed in his search for responsibility, quite frankly his employer couldn't care less believing that this was best for business. More frequently, the case was probably a sincere
belief that workers simply do not want to be responsible and that they would solely respond to authority and threats of punitive action. Recent rebellions by organizational employees have brought this question of individual needs to the heart of management thinking. Apparently to protect their organizations they must do more than simply marginally involve men in their jobs. Thus, to protect themselves there finally seems to be a gradual awakening on behalf of management. To maximize organizational profitability individual needs must be recognized. This type of acceptance of employee needs as a necessary evil is truly unfortunate since the prime requisite to long term organizational development is the recognition of its human resources as its most important asset.

This dissertation is being written to attempt to exhibit, in a small way, that organizational administrators and decision makers must consider the needs of the individual not because "if we don't, they'll rebel," but rather because individuals constitute the heart of any organization. A consideration of individual needs is synonymous with a consideration of the maintenance of the organization.

Organizational Power Distributions: Past and Present

Tracing the development of managerial "do's" and "dont's" represents a philosophically dichotomous history. The early 1900's saw the entry of "scientific" principles into management's domain. Taylor (1947) developed a series of well defined regulations based on

---

1This literature review is largely based on a more comprehensive review provided by Wood (1970, 1972).
assumptions which basically exemplify infant behavioral patterns. Tayloristic dictates prescribed a strict delegation of authority from above exercised solely through a neatly boxed pyramidal organizational structure. This scientific management position simply represented a mechanistic one-best-way of meshing men and machines to maximize organizational profit. The primary assumption underlying the proposed effectiveness of the system was simply that workers will expend effort in response to threats of economic deprivation, and later, to promises of economic reward. Thus, we find managers perceiving themselves to be better equipped for decision-making functions, possessing the centrality of power and delegating this power according to the perceived economic nature of workers.

Similar positions have been advocated by numerous other classical organizational theorists. Fayol (1949) emphasized a scalar chain of authority as being necessary to maintain simplistic unity of command and direction for simplistic employees. Gulick (1937) fostered a network of subdivisions of labor connected, once again, by a hierarchical system of authority, with primary decision-making powers vested in the chief executive. A rather unique "classicist" position was developed by Follett (Metcalf and Urwick, 1942) who made a significant departure from unilateral power theology. Rather than legitimate authority generating coordination, the converse was suggested as more accurately reflecting the necessary component for organizational utilization of manpower. Further, Follett stressed the importance of interaction and cooperation between power bases within the organization,
and as such, must be considered as an initial precursor of employee participation concepts. Bureaucratic organizational theory as expounded by Weber (1960) similarly focuses on the centrality and unilateral exercise of power. The bureaucracy was hypothesized to optimize productivity, unity and strict subordination, while minimizing conflict by utilizing principles of office hierarchy vis-à-vis distinct levels of graded authority. Once again, we find power concentrated in the top of the organizational pyramid with appointment to the various power boxes, and monetary rewards exchanged for presumed guarantees of loyalty on behalf of the incumbent.

In strong contrast to the above classical assumptions about power centralization based on an economic model of man, more recent theorists have incorporated the ego and social needs of individuals into their organizational theories. Concomitant with their negation of economic incentives as being sufficient to generate acceptance of formal authority and organizational effectiveness, we also find a power-equalization thesis replacing the power-centralization thesis. "The power-equalization principle comprises part of the broad human relations approach to organizational development, which gained momentum, especially after the mid 1940's, as a reaction to scientific management approaches. Maslow's (1954) innovative theory of human motivation and research on the social psychology of the work environment (Mayo, 1945; Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939) gave particular impetus to the human relations "movement," as did the general increase in economic affluence among American workers and businessmen" (Wood, 1970, p. 15).
The classicists conception of man as basically responding to economic needs has been severely challenged by Maslow's "need hierarchy." He formulated an ascendancy of needs from physiological, to safety, to social, to egoistic, to finally self-actualization needs. A need in the hierarchy becomes dominant when the next lowest need has been satisfied. Although man works in order to satisfy his needs, based on the hierarchical patterning of needs and the process of need dominance relative to the hierarchy, it is fairly obvious that a satisfied need is no longer a motivator of behavior. Thus, by having organizational members participate in decision-making and perceptually acquire power, we are satisfying social, ego, and self-actualization needs rather than merely satisfying safety needs, which is largely all that monetary rewards is capable of satisfying. However, it should be noted that Opsahl and Dunnette (1966) have more recently questioned the negation of importance attributed to economic reinforcement, and have suggested numerous mechanisms by which monetary rewards can become instrumental in the fulfillment of higher-level needs.

Power-sharing, or participative decision-making (PDM) as it is more commonly known as, although deriving great impetus from the early studies conducted at Western Electric bringing to focus the importance of the informal organization (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939), is more closely associated with a series of other studies.

Coch and French (1948) investigated the problem of overcoming resistance to changes in work methods exhibited by female workers at
the Harwood Company. Four experimental groups were instituted: (1) A "representative participation" group, where the group chose representatives from their own ranks to be trained in the new methods and then explain the changes to the remaining group members while also being able to make suggestions about the changes to management; (2) Two "total participation" groups, where all of the group members were involved in the design of work methods; (3) A control group, where all of the group members merely received management's explanation for the changes. Results indicated a slight improvement in productivity and marked increases in turnover and aggression against management in the control group. The representative participation group exhibited a similar improvement in productivity, however, turnover and counter-management aggressions were relatively nonexistent. In contrast, members of the total participation group significantly increased their productivity while also maintaining good relations with management, and there were no quits. Two and one-half months later, the remaining members of the original control group were given total participation rights. As with the original total participation group, productivity increased significantly, and quits and aggressions against management were completely lacking. Despite numerous methodological criticisms aimed at the Harwood study, it still serves as the launching base for further research in the field.

Another "classic" field experiment on participative decision-making was conducted by Morse and Reimer (1956). An "Autonomy program" was instituted for employees in two comparable work divisions. In
these groups, worker decision-making powers were increased. In two other comparable work divisions, a "Hierarchical program" was set up to increase the power of upper level management. Although short-term productivity increased slightly more in the hierarchically-controlled groups, the following other results can be seen as supportive of PDM hypotheses: (1) Workers in the Autonomy groups perceived a significant increase in control; (2) Feelings of self-actualization increased in the Autonomy groups and decreased in the Hierarchical groups; (3) Better relations with supervisors and more favorable attitudes toward the company were found in the Autonomy program, in contrast to members of the Hierarchical groups where attitudes decreased in favorability; (4) Job satisfaction decreased in the Hierarchical groups and increased slightly in the Autonomy program. Thus, we begin to find a trend of results apparently indicating that as we move closer to states of power-equalization, short-term performance remains unchanged, however, plausible factors contributing to long-term performance changes such as employee attitudes, increase in favorability.

Likert (1961, 1967) and associates began a series of studies in 1947 referred to as the "Michigan leadership studies," which undoubtedly represents the greatest cumulative "participative management" research effort. In comparing organizational groups high on a criterion of performance or satisfaction versus low-producing or low-satisfaction groups, a number of leadership behavior differences seem to constantly appear: (1) High-producing units have employee-
centered leaders focusing more on human problems, while low-producing units have leaders who are more job-centered; (2) High-producing units maintain more general supervision as opposed to the close supervision characteristic of low-producing units; (3) Attitudes toward the organization are more closely associated with effectiveness criteria such as turnover and absenteeism rather than productivity; (4) Favorable attitudes toward supervision, working conditions, compensation and the work itself are associated with productivity; (5) Freedom for the group to set its own pace and goals is related to productivity. Thus, power-equalization is apparently related to productivity and overall job satisfaction.

More recent theories postulated by Likert (1967) focus more specifically on PDM as a critical feature of managerial effectiveness. Four systems of management are delineated: exploitive-authoritative, benevolent-authoritative, consultative, and participative. The efficacy of "System 4," or participative group management, is best exemplified by its utilization of the following operating characteristics: (1) a full use of economic, ego, and higher motives, (2) reward systems developed through participation, (3) favorable attitudes toward the organization, (4) mutually reinforcing motivational forces, (5) responsibility, trust, and confidence at all levels, (6) high levels of job satisfaction, (7) full and accurate communications in all directions, (9) extensive, cooperative, friendly interaction, (10) extensive subordinate influence on work goals and methods, (11) decentralized decision-making processes, with
informational inputs from all levels, and based on a group pattern of operation, (12) a synonymity of formal and informal organization, (13) high productivity, low absence and turnover rates, and minimal wastes, with control mechanisms serving to guide, rather than police, the worker.

One possible criticism of group decision making relates to the criterion of decision quality. Even if upper level management did produce better quality decisions, and then handed these down to workers under an authoritative management system, worker acceptance of these decisions would be minimal. According to N.R.F. Maier (1955), the primary value of participation lies in generating decisions which are acceptable to organizational workers. Thus, participation serves to provide an optimal organizational balance between decision quality and acceptance.

The use of participation is also consonant with other organizational theorists. McGregor (1960) discusses the importance of his Theory Y assumptions relative to organizational effective utilization of "The Human Side of Enterprise." Classical Theory X is rooted in the following assumptions: "(1) The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can; (2) Because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives; (3) The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, wants security above
all." (McGregor, 1960, pp. 33-34). Based on these assumptions, worker passivity, hostility or refusal to accept responsibility is readily attributable to his inherent "human nature," rather than considering these behavioral patterns as symptoms of social and egoistic need deprivational illnesses. In contrast, the following Theory Y assumptions appear more veridical relative to man's striving for self-control in organizations: "(1) The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest. The average human being does not inherently dislike work. Depending upon controllable conditions, work may be a source of satisfaction (and will be voluntarily performed) or a source of punishment (and will be avoided if possible); (2) External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort toward organizational objectives. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed; (3) Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement. The most significant of such rewards, e.g., the satisfaction of ego and self-actualization needs, can be direct products of effort directed toward organizational objectives; (4) The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility. Avoidance of responsibility, lack of ambition, and emphasis on security are generally consequences of experience, not inherent human characteristics; (5) The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not
narrowly, distributed in the population; (6) Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized." (McGregor, 1960, pp. 47-48).

Jobs that have been fractionalized, with pyramidal and rigid chains of command, narrow spans of control, etc., in accordance with "scientific management" principles, tend to generate dependent-submissive workers using few of their important abilities. Argyris (1957, 1964) suggests that employees aspiring toward psychological success experience greater frustration, conflict, and psychological failure, as the job controls more of the individual further and further down the chain of command. Activities such as absenteeism, turnover, quota restriction, slow downs, increasing emphasis on material factors and decreasing emphasis on human factors, noninvolvement, withdrawal from work and alienation, merely represent attempted employee adaptation to the work environment in the face of relative acceptance of frustration, conflict and failure as inevitable. Similar to the Theory Y position implying the utilization of participation as one means of generating more effective organizational manpower teams, Argyris recommends the application of participative decision making as one means of resolving individual-organization conflict vis-a'-vis increasing employee responsibility, autonomy, and success.

Power-sharing can also be viewed along a continuum rather than a simple dichotomy between power-centralization and power equalization. Blake and Mouton (1961) have devised ratios exemplifying different
power relationships between superiors and subordinates, or any two groups or persons. The opposing ends of the continuum are complete competition (denoted as a 1/1 relation: maximum superior and subordinate power) and complete powerlessness (a 0/0 relation: no power exercised by superior or subordinate), with a mutual exercise of power (.5/.5) by superior and subordinate at the midpoint. Data from several studies indicate both supervisor and subordinate feelings of responsibility to be of equally high magnitudes along similar curvilinear patterns in the .5/.5 power sharing condition. Although supervisory satisfaction decreased linearly from 1/0 to 0/1, while subordinate satisfaction increased linearly across the same conditions, supervisory and subordinate satisfaction was relatively equal in the .5/.5 condition.

One assumption inherent in a vast majority of PDM literature is that the total amount of power within an organizational group is a fixed quantity. Certainly, Blake and Mouton's .5/.5 case of power equalization represents a theoretical condition in which each person exercises half of the total amount of power. This power distribution, along with countless others, is based on the assumption that to the extent that one person acquires power, another person must lose power since total power is a constant sum. Tannenbaum and associates (1956, 1957, 1961, 1962, 1968) seriously challenge this dominant assumption of a "fixed influence pie" arguing that when a leader behaves so as to give more power to his subordinates, he also enhances his own power. They report research conducted in several
organizations supporting the hypothesis that the total amount of group and organizational power is variable, and with proper management practices, the total influence pie can actually expand. Data from such diverse organizational settings as Leagues of Women Voters (Tannenbaum, 1961), labor unions (Tannenbaum & Kahn, 1956), insurance agencies (Bowers, 1964), utility plants (Mann & Hoffman, 1960), and a glass factory in Communist Yugoslavia (Zupanov & Tannenbaum, 1968) support the concept of an "expanding influence pie."

"While the power-sharing doctrine is represented in many spheres of applied social psychology, it is by no means universally accepted. Just as the human relationships reacted strongly to Taylorism, many contemporary theorists have either attempted to refute the power-sharing thesis or at least to modify it." (Wood, 1970, p. 36). Rather than concentrating on this side of the coin, the following unavoidable dysfunctional consequences of participation programs, as reported by Strauss (1963), are being presented merely to note the existence of plausible threats to external validity: (a) Resulting cohesiveness may counter organizational goals, (b) Management may be unable to fulfill expectations for continuous participation, (c) Participants who have their ideas rejected may become hostile and alienated, (d) Participation can be frustrating and generate decisions of marginal quality, (e) Participation can readily become a manipulative tool of management. In addition, if gains attributable to power-sharing are not at least commensurate with costs associated with its implementation, then PDM must die as a pragmatic organizational concept; this is
unlikely. Since much of applied PDM research rests on correlational data, isolated causes of PDM resultant-variables, such as improved job attitudes, cannot be experimentally specified, and, hence, threats to internal validity are also plausible. Certainly, crucial questions remain to be examined, and if critics of power-sharing serve to generate further hypothesis-testing rather than a blanket rejection of PDM, then they have provided an invaluable impetus to the development of applied psychology as a science. There remains little doubt that PDM hypotheses require further refinement, or in some cases, even viable alternatives to full PDM should be investigated.

"Riskiness" as a Decision-Making Criterion

As we have just seen, there are numerous factors to be investigated prior to fully accepting participative decision making as an organizational panacea. An even further constraint is that participation as a group-oriented process might tend to obscure, rather than crystalize, preferences of individual employees. In other words, the process of PDM strictly generates group products rather than products reflective of the actual preferences of any member.

It is indeed obvious that different real-life decision-making groups generate different "products," depending on the nature of the decisional task, e.g., a group deciding on the optimal number of bolts to be placed on an automobile will generate "X number of bolts" as their product; a group deciding where to market a new product will generate "X locations" as their product; a group deciding on employees to be promoted will generate "X people" as their product,
etc. While these represent entirely different products, each may conceivably be measured along several dimensions, e.g., quality of decision, cost of implementing decision, long-term utility of decision, etc. However, one product dimension in particular has received an abundance of research attention: the risky-cautious continuum. As suggested by Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick (1970), a particularly fruitful area of research to explore is the effects of participation on this decision-making criterion. "The implications of the risky shift are considerable. When members participate in decision making, organizations may become committed to courses of action which place their future in more jeopardy than is intended. Group decisions can outrun organizational capabilities for response." (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick, 1970, p. 433).

Although there exists a preponderance of studies relating to group risk taking, current hypotheses remain quite controversial. There are, however, four primary theories available.² The first of these is known as the "diffusion-of-responsibility theory," advanced by Wallach, Kogan, and associates (Bem et al., 1965; Kogan & Wallach, 1967; Wallach & Kogan, 1965; Wallach et al., 1964; Wallach, Kogan & Burt, 1967). This theory holds that when people make decisions in groups, they advocate the adoption of more risky alternatives than when they make independent judgments. This is based on the hypothesis that responsibility for negative consequences is psychologically

²This literature review is largely based on a more comprehensive review found in Pruitt (1971).
"diffused" between all of the members of the group rather than resting on any single member's shoulders. This reduced individual responsibility is associated with a reduction of anxiety about the possible negative consequences of making a risky decision, making it possible for the group to accept a risky alternative.

"Familiarization theory" constitutes the second major theory. Bateson (1966) suggests that increased familiarity with items discussed makes people more willing to take risk on these items because of a general reduction in uncertainty. Thus, any procedure that increases familiarity will cause a risky shift, whether the procedure is completed with groups or isolated individuals.

The third theory relating to group-induced shifts is denoted as "leadership theory". This theory contends that higher risk takers are more "persuasive" in group decisions that produce a risky shift (Collins and Guetzkow, 1964). In other words, there is a positive correlation between the riskiness of an individual's decision and his perceived "persuassiveness," i.e., the amount of influence which the other group members perceive this individual to have had relative to the group's decision (Marquis, 1962; Wallach, Kogan and Bem, 1962). One version of leadership theory called "leader-confidence theory" offers, as explanation for the above, the hypothesis that people who make higher risk decisions are more confident in their position, and that this confidence translates itself into greater assertiveness and therefore greater influence during group discussion (Burnstein, 1969).
Finally, there are a set of five theories which are called "value theories." These five theories have in common the assumption that groups shift in a direction toward which most members of the group are already attracted as individuals. The first of these value theories is known as "risk-as-value social-comparison theory" (Brown, 1965). This states that riskiness is a culturally prescribed value which causes the typical American to want to be at least as risky in his behavior as other people similar to him. The assumption of a social-comparison process inherent in this theory means that the individual tries to determine where other people stand relative to the decision problem facing him, and that he then chooses a level of risk that is at or above what he assumes to be the group average. This theory is also applicable to cautious shifts in terms of a "value of caution" which causes some individuals to be equally or more cautious than the group average.

The second value theory is known as "pluralistic-ignorance theory." This theory is used to describe a situation in which the members of a group possesses one attitude but believe that others hold another attitude. In other words, decision making in this situation is guided by a conflict between what the individual would really like to do (an "ideal preference") and what he thinks other people favor (an "assumed group standard"). This conflict leads to the choice of a compromise position which lies part way between the ideal and the assumed group standard (Levinger and Schneider, 1969). Typically, group discussion reveals other people's choices, which leads to a readjustment of the
assumed group standard and, as a result, a shift in the individual's decision. Pluralistic-ignorance theory can be applied to the group induced risk phenomenon if the assumption is made that people value risk or the outcomes associated with risk, but do not realize how widely their values are shared. Under these conditions, group discussion reveals more social support for risk taking than anticipated, and thus allows the individual to move toward greater risk.

The third value theory is known as "release theory." Like pluralistic-ignorance theory, it begins with the assumption that most people are in conflict when they are asked to commit themselves as individuals to a level of risk. Evidence that conflict surrounds individual risk taking is presented by Pruitt (1969). He found people tended to make cautious decisions, but to view their decisions as being risky. This effect was labeled a "Walter Mitty" effect portraying the subject as acting like the famous Thurber character: "engaging in ego-gratifying fantasies of himself as a high risk taker but acting cautiously when faced with an actual decision" (Pruitt, 1971, p. 351).

According to release theory, in group discussion the risky shift occurs "because the discovery of a single group member (the 'model') who endorses high risk taking 'releases' the more cautious group members from the assumed social constraints that are holding them back from risk taking. In other words, finding a high risk taker in their group gives them the 'courage of their convictions' "(Pruitt, 1971, p. 351). The finding cited earlier relative to leadership
theory, that high risk takers are seen as having more influence over the group discussion than low risk takers, lends support to release theory.

Obviously, there is a major difference between the contentions of release theory and the two other value theories discussed above. Social-comparison theory and pluralistic-ignorance theory both contend that individual group members respond to what they perceive to be the average level of risk taking among the other group members. In contrast, release theory asserts that the group member taking the highest level of risk will become a model for other group members because his behavior best exemplifies the values associated with the risky option which most group members share. Thus, according to release theory, individuals will be influenced not by the average level of risk taking in their group, but by the highest level taken.

The fourth form of value theory, known as "relevant-arguments theory," simply states that the persuasive arguments in a group discussion are elicited by the dominant values in a decision problem, and that it is these persuasive arguments which convince the group members to move further in the direction of the values which caused the elicitation of the arguments.

The last value theory is known as "commitment theory." This theory views group discussion as a setting for the individual to commit himself to his initial decision within the typical risky-shift experimental paradigm, rather than a setting in which he can learn about other people's choices or opinions. "In the course of handling
the information, as he interacts with real or imaginary interlocutors, he chooses alternatives, binds himself to the choice, and thus commits himself to the work he is doing" (Moscovici and Zavalloni, 1969, p. 127). This commitment serves to move the individual further in the direction of his initial decision, with the "value pull" of each item determining the direction of the initial decision and hence of the further commitment that occurs during discussion.

The vast majority of research on the "choice shift" phenomenon ("group induced shift" in some cases, "group induced shift toward risk" in other cases) has consistently utilized a within-subjects design in which both individual and group decisions are made by the same subjects. This is the type of design that permits use of the term "shift." The standard experimental paradigm requires individuals first to make decisions on a task involving risk. After this pretest, they discuss the task as a group and arrive at a group decision. Finally, individuals are again asked for their private decisions. The difference between the mean level of risk chosen during the individual pretest and the level of risk chosen during the group posttest defines the amount and direction of "shift." As discussed throughout this section, the outcome of this paradigm typically exhibits an increase in risk from the individual to the group discussion.

It is particularly important to note that this standard paradigm does not permit the conclusion that discussion per se produces the risky shift, but rather that discussion produces this shift in the context of a pretest (McCueley, Teger and Kogan, 1971). If researchers
wish to ascertain the effect of group discussion per se, then an appropriate control group in which group discussion is not preceded by individual decision must be incorporated into current risky-shift paradigms. Group decisions in this no-pretest condition could then be compared to the initial individual decisions of other subjects. Thus, caution should be observed in generalizing the findings of risky-shift research to real-life situations where group members are not exposed to the decision task until the group interaction. If such generalizability is desired, the typical within-group risky-shift paradigm must be replaced by a between-group design.

"Commitment" as a Factor Influencing Decision Outcomes

In the original studies of risk, most of the items involved recommendations which were impersonal and did not violate social norms. An important qualification of the risky shift effect emerged in the work of Rabow, Fowler, Bradford, Hofeller and Shibuya (1966). They found that when the adoption of a riskier position would also violate a social norm, members of groups did not shift toward riskier positions. Further, the risky shift did not occur when the group was making recommendations for someone to whom they were personally committed.

This points out an important distinction between individual and social responsibility. Individual or personal responsibility refers to a feeling of liability for a decision whose consequences affect oneself. In contrast, social responsibility refers to one's sense of liability when his decisions primarily affect others who lack any voice in formulating decisions. Jones and Gerard (1967) suggested that
social responsibility inhibits the risky shift and counteracts the diffusion of personal responsibility. A similar curtailment of risky shifts was found by Dion, Miller and Magnan (1971) under conditions of high perceived social responsibility.

Kogan and Zaleska (1969) present further empirical support for this "common-sense" expectation that an individual will make more cautious decisions when outcomes impinge upon another than when outcomes affect only the decision-maker himself. The cautious shifts obtained were interpreted as a simple effort to achieve the best possible match to beliefs of the other's self choice, based on the hypothesis that individuals perceive others' decisions to be more conservative than their own (e.g., Brown, 1965; Wallach and Wing, 1968). Teger and Kogan (1971) lend support to this shift toward caution when deciding for others, however they indicate that when an individual makes a decision affecting another person, the decision will be no more cautious than a decision affecting himself.

More generally, the concept of commitment is central to most social psychological formulations of the decision-making process. Recent work by Mann and Taylor (1970) investigated the prospect of commitment as a determinant of objective decisional behavior. They found that warning the decision maker that his choice would be binding and irrevocable served to induce more cautious decision making. Similar results were reported by Mann (1971) relative to a series of studies conducted on a sample of preschool children. He suggests that a commitment warning is capable of eliciting "mature" responses on a
decision due to a psychological set of approach decisions "carefully and decisively" initiated by the commitment warning. Further, it was found that the time taken to announce a decision increases under commitment warning conditions.

Other researchers (Clark and Willems, 1969; Johnson and Andrews, 1971) have investigated the relationship between perceived "seriousness" of consequences associated with a risky choice and degree of shift toward risk. "Seriousness" is interpreted as being quite analogous to "commitment warning" (Mann & Taylor, 1970; Mann, 1971) and "anticipation of future commitment" (Kiesler & Kiesler, 1969, p. 80). In other words, "seriousness" refers to perceptions of future consequences to the decision maker associated with specific choices. Results indicated a negative relationship between amount of risky shift and the seriousness of negative consequences associated with the risky choice. In other words, when people are forced into commitment to their decisions, particularly when the decision has negative consequences, a shift toward risk is highly unlikely.
FOCUS OF THE PRESENT RESEARCH

The current research focuses on the effects of commitment and participation in various stages of decision-making relative to three primary output parameters: perceived influence, satisfaction, and decision-riskiness.

The foregoing review of relevant literature suggests: first, that perceived influence and satisfaction in decision-making groups can be enhanced through the use of participation; second, that participation in decision making (i.e., group decision-making) elicits the adoption of risky courses of action by group members; and third, that more cautious decisions are made when individuals are personally committed to their decisions. These derivations from the literature set the stage for the major hypotheses investigated in this study.

Treatment Parameter I: Participation

The most widely advocated means of power sharing is that of group, or participative, decision making (GDM). Several descriptions of GDM as a multiphased process of varying activities (i.e., in terms of the process phase in which subordinates participate) have been suggested. However, the consequences of participative involvement in the various stages per se, have received only minute research attention. A beginning step toward filling this research gap has recently been
presented by Wood (1970). Utilizing theoretical descriptions of decision making (Cyert and March, 1963; Bass, 1965) and empirical assessments of problem-solving interactions (Bales and Strodtbeck, 1951), Wood has formulated a three phased process model of decision making. Relative to a specific decision task, the three phases, presented in their order of natural occurrence, are: (1) a "G" phase which involves the generation of alternative resolutions relative to the problem; (2) an "E" phase which focuses on an evaluation of these alternatives; (3) a "C" phase consisting of a terminal choice of alternative resolutions.

"Analysis of GDM in terms of phase participation does not necessitate assuming an underlying dimension of influence although decision styles have previously been distinguished in this manner. Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) suggested seven styles, ranging from a leader's making a decision and announcing it, to his permitting subordinates to function within leader-defined limits. These styles were presumed to vary across a continuum of leader power. Similarly, Heller and Yukl (1969) have suggested that delegative, consultative and joint decision-making styles can be placed along a continuum of influence. Such assumptions will be valid only to the extent that manipulations of participation relate directly to the exercise of influence and group members' perceptions of influence relationships" (Wood, 1972, p. 18).

Rather than assuming participative-influence equivalence, Wood (1970) tested the hypothesis that influence perceptions of group
members depend upon the phases of decision making in which they can participate. Utilizing the formerly noted three-phase process model, four participation conditions were manipulated and viewed relative to their effects on influence. Full participation (GEC) implied both leader and member participation in each of the three successive stages. In contrast, partial participation conditions stipulated member participation in only two stages, such that G'EC indicates member participation prohibited in G, GE'C indicates member participation prohibited in E, and GEC' refers to member participation prohibited in C. Relative to these four participation conditions, results indicated the following: (1) Perceived member influence tends to be greater in full participation than in any of the partial participation conditions; (2) Differences between partial participation conditions were negligible, however the weakest perceived member influence occurred when they were unable to participate in the final choice phase (GEC'); (3) The "influence pie" was largest with complete-process participation (GEC), but the size of the pie was attributable to increased member perceived influence only since a mutual heightening of both member and leader perceived influence did not occur.

"Based on the research cited above, there is no clear evidence for differential phase effects, although nonsignificant trends across decision situations suggested that abdicating the group decision method in generation and choice phases may place more severe limits on subordinates' influence than preventing a group evaluation of alternatives. In terms of practical and theoretical implications, such
an hypothesis seems worthy of further testing" (Wood, 1972, p. 16).

In the present research, participation was manipulated within the framework of Wood's three-stage decision process model with the aim of investigating resultant perceptions of influence and satisfaction, as well as decision-riskiness, relative to participation in specific stages. Thus, the decision process under consideration once again involved the generation, evaluation and final choice of alternative resolutions to a specific decision problem. However, rather than investigating partial participation conditions created by omitting member participation in one phase, the present experiment created partial participation treatments by permitting member participation in only one phase, conforming most closely to commonly cited organizational "participatively-oriented" programs, e.g., "suggestive boxes." In all, four participation treatments were created:

G EC: This represents full participation, with group members able to participate in each of the three decision-making phases.

G E'C': This represents a partial-participation condition, with group members able to participate in the generation of alternatives only. A theoretical "external group" (see Chapter III: Research Methods), analogous to upper level organizational decision-making groups, was responsible for the evaluation and final choice of alternatives partially based on the alternatives
generated by the experimental group.

G'E'C': This situation represents a second partial-participation condition. Here group members are able to participate in the evaluation of alternatives only, with the "external group" being responsible for generating alternatives, and later making final choices partially based on the experimental group's evaluation of the alternatives.

G'E'C: This represents the last partial-participation condition. Here group members are able to participate in the final choice of alternatives only, based on the "external group's" generation and evaluation of alternatives.

The following specific hypotheses concerning the effects of participation relative to perceived influence, satisfaction and decision-riskiness, were tested:

(I) TREATMENT PARAMETER: PARTICIPATION

(A) OUTPUT PARAMETER: INFLUENCE

Hypothesis IA: Individual perceptions of influence in participative decision-making situations depend on the degree of participation in the different stages of the decision-making process.

IA.1: Perceived self-influence is greatest when the group has participated in each of the successive stages (GEC).

Further, when the group has participated in only one stage,
perceived self-influence is greater when that single stage is Final Choice (C), in contrast to Generation (G) or Evaluation (E).

'IA.2: Perceived influence of the other two group members is greatest when the group has participated in each of the stages (GEC). Further, when the group has participated in only one stage, perceived influence of the other two group members is greatest when that single stage is C, in contrast to G or E.

'IA.3: Perceived external group influence is greatest when the group has not participated in each of the stages. Further, when the group has participated in only one stage, perceived external group influence is greater when that single stage is G or E, in contrast to C.

'IA.4: Sequential to hypotheses IA.1, IA.2 and IA.3, perceptions of total intragroup influence increase as more influence is attributed to both self and other group members, and less influence is attributed to external groups. Since intragroup influence and external group influence together have a constant sum of 100%, varying percentages of intragroup influence are possible with varying percentages of external group influence. Thus, the total internal "influence pie" is greatest when the group has participated in each of the stages (GEC). Further, when the group has participated in only one stage,
the total "influence pie" is greater when that single stage is C, in contrast to G or E. Thus, moving from G or E only, to C only, and finally to GEC exhibits an "expanding intragroup influence pie."

(B) OUTPUT PARAMETER: SATISFACTION

Hypothesis IB: Individual perceptions of satisfaction in participative decision-making situations depend on the degree of participation in the different stages of the decision-making process.

- Perceived satisfaction is greatest when the group has participated in each of the successive stages (GEC).

Further, when the group has participated in only one stage, perceived total satisfaction is greater when that single stage is C, in contrast to G or E.

(C) OUTPUT PARAMETER: GROUP DECISION RISK-

GROUP DECISION QUALITY

Hypothesis IC: Group decision-riskiness and decision-quality in participative decision-making situations depends on the degree of participation in the different stages of the decision-making process.

-IC.1 (a): When individual pretask ratings of task-importance are varied, group decision-riskiness is greatest when the group has participated in GEC.

Further, differences between single stage participation treatments are nonsignificant. Previous research suggests
that increased group interaction permits an increased diffusion of individual responsibility leading to a shift toward more risky decisions. Since participation in each of the three successive stages implies three times as great interaction potential, compared to single stage participation, decision-riskiness is greatest for groups which have participated in GEC.

• IC.1 (b): When individual pretask ratings of task-importance are high, decision-riskiness is not significantly affected by participation treatments. With high pretask ratings of task-importance, each group member is personally responsible for the decisions produced. High interaction potential provided by participation in GEC, associated with increased diffusion of individual responsibility when pretask ratings of task importance are varied, is no longer a determiner of decision-riskiness when pretask ratings of task-importance are high since individual responsibility-diffusion is not desired.

• IC.2 (a): When individual pretask ratings of task-importance are varied, group decision-quality is greatest when the group has not participated in each of the stages. In these groups, quality is a less important criterion for decision-making than is risk.

• IC.2 (b): When individual pretask ratings of task-importance are high, decision-quality is not significantly affected by
participation treatments. In these groups, quality is a more important criterion for decision-making than is risk. Thus, high quality decisions are produced because pretask ratings of task-importance are high, and a quality criterion was utilized as the basis for decision-making.

**Treatment Parameter II: Commitment**

Although previous research has to some extent investigated commitment to decisions as a dependent variable, the utilization of commitment as an independent variable has apparently received little research attention. This is particularly evident when one turns to available industrial-organizational psychology literature.

The few studies relative to commitment noted in Chapter I suggested that more cautious decisions are produced when people are placed in decision-making groups in which they anticipate personal commitment to their choices. The present study attempted to expand this neglected research focus by examining the effects of personal commitment and non-commitment to group decision-making outcomes, relative to perceived influence, satisfaction and decision-riskiness. Specifically, the following hypotheses concerning commitment versus non-commitment, were tested.

**(II) TREATMENT PARAMETER: COMMITMENT**

**(A) OUTPUT PARAMETER: INFLUENCE**

Hypothesis IIA: Individual perceptions of influence in participative decision-making situations depend on whether
each group member is committed to perform the final choices of the decision-making session.

• IIA.1: Perceived self-influence is greatest when each group member is committed to perform the final choices of the decision-making session.

• IIA.2: Perceived influence of the other two group members is greatest when each group member is committed to perform the final choices of the decision-making session.

• IIA.3: Perceived external group influence is greatest when each group member is not committed to perform the final choices of the decision-making session.

• IIA.4: Sequential to hypotheses IIA.1, IIA.2 and IIA.3, perceptions of total intragroup influence increase as more influence is attributed to both self and other group members, and less influence is attributed to external groups. Thus, the total internal "influence pie" is greatest when each group member is committed to perform the final choices of the decision-making session.

(B) OUTPUT PARAMETER: SATISFACTION

Hypothesis IIB: Individual perceptions of satisfaction in participative decision-making sessions depend on whether each group member is committed to perform the final choices of the decision-making session.

• Perceived satisfaction is greatest when each group member is committed to perform the final choices of the
Hypothesis IIC: Group decision-riskiness and decision-quality in participative decision-making situations depends on whether each group member is committed to perform the final choices of the decision-making session.

•IIC.1(a): When individual pretask ratings of task-importance are varied, group decision-riskiness is greatest when each group member is not committed to perform the final choices of the decision-making session.

•IIC.1 (b): When individual pretask ratings of task importance are high, decision-riskiness is not significantly affected by commitment treatments. With high pretask individual ratings of task-importance, each group member is personally responsible for the decisions produced, i.e., each group member is "precommitted" to the task.

•IIC.2 (a): When individual pretask ratings of task-importance are varied, group decision-quality is greatest when each group member is committed to perform the final choices of the decision-making session. In these groups, quality is a less important criterion for decision-making than is risk, i.e., low decision-riskiness is preferred when each group member is committed to perform the final choices.
IIC.2 (b): When individual pretask ratings of task-importance are high, decision-quality is not significantly affected by commitment treatments. In these groups, quality is a more important criterion for decision-making than is risk. Thus, high quality decisions are produced because pretask ratings of task-importance are high, and a quality criterion was utilized as the basis for decision-making.

While these hypotheses represent the major aims of the present experiment, they are by no means intended to be inclusive. Numerous other analyses of the data relevant to existing research controversies will be presented and discussed in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODS

The effects of commitment and participation in decision-making on perceptions of influence, satisfaction and decision-riskiness were investigated in small laboratory groups. Forty groups, each consisting of three members, were arranged to discuss structured decision issues. Groups functioned under the constraints imposed by manipulations of participation and commitment, the two basic treatments.

Pre-task measures of risk preference and task commitment orientation, as well as post-task measures of degree of overall participation, criteria utilized in decision-making, perceptions of risk, influence, satisfaction and task commitment, were obtained through questionnaire responses. Analyses of variance and correlational analyses were conducted on the resulting data to test the hypotheses presented in Chapter II, and other relationships relevant to the current experiment.

Participants

The group members consisted of 120 students enrolled in General Psychology courses at The Ohio State University. A breakdown of the sample by sex, age, college year, grade point average and pre-

---

3 The cooperation of Charles Boltwood, David Cordea, Victoria Fein, Anne Harlan, John Murray and Charles Raben for assisting in the signing-up of subjects is gratefully appreciated.
acquaintance with other group members indicated the following: (1) 67 females (55.8% of the sample), 53 males (44.2%); (2) 63 participants 18 years of age or younger (52.5% of the sample), 37 participants 19 years of age (30.8%), 12 participants 20 years of age (10%), eight participants 21 years of age or older (6.7%) and an overall mean participant age of 18.9; (3) 82 Freshman participants (68.3% of the sample), 30 Sophomores (25%), six Juniors (5.0%), and two Seniors (1.7%); (4) an overall mean GPA of 2.67 out of a possible 4.00; (5) 93 participants who were not acquainted with any of their group members prior to the experimental session (77.5%), and 27 participants who did know one or two group members prior to the session (22.5%). In addition, a group breakdown of the sample by sex indicated 32 sexually heterogeneous groups (80% of the sample), five all-female groups (12.5%), and three all-male groups (7.5%).

The 120 participants, formed into three-person groups vis-à-vis the available time of day each signed-up for, were randomly assigned to treatment conditions depending upon how many experimental hours they signed-up for. They were required to participate in experiments as a part of their course requirement and received credit toward the fulfillment of this requirement as follows: (1) If they signed-up for two hours of credit, they were randomly assigned to one of the full participation conditions. If this condition also involved post-decisional commitment, the participant received three hours of credit; if it was a non-commitment condition, he received only two hours of credit. (2) If they signed-up for one hour of credit,
they were randomly assigned to one of the partial participation conditions. If this was also a commitment condition, the participant received two hours of credit; if it did not involve post-decisional commitment, he received only one hour of credit. Thus, the amount of experimental hours which participants signed-up for served as a minor design constraint not permitting a completely random sampling procedure.

Thirty participants, randomly assigned to 10 groups, experienced full-phase PDM. In contrast, ninety participants, randomly assigned to 30 groups, participated in only one of the three decision-making phases, such that 30 participants (10 groups) experienced Generation only, another 30 (10 groups) experienced Evaluation only, and the remaining 30 (10 groups) were assigned to Final-Choice-Only conditions. These forty three-person groups represented five group replications per each participation (4 levels) - commitment (2 levels) treatment combination.

Decision Tasks

The development of an appropriate task relative to the present research, as well as the sample of participants, was guided by the following set of a priori specifications, based on a similar set of task specifications presented by Wood (1970): (1) To heighten external validity, the type of task should be representative of decision-making in organizational settings; (2) The content of the task should be relevant to the student participants; (3) The task should have potential outcomes important to the future "organizational"
characteristics in which the participants function; (4) The task should not specify "correct" or "best" outcomes, but rather should provide opportunities for discussion variety; (5) The task should permit alternative resolutions as required by the various participation-staging treatments; (6) The task should be of intermediate difficulty relative to the student decision-makers, and consist of content familiar to the decision-makers; (7) The task should permit manipulation of the commitment treatments; (8) The task should permit objective measurement of treatment-specific decisional criteria.

With these considerations in mind, a decision task was developed which focused on the determination of attitude statements to be included in a campus survey of student attitudes. Experimental groups were instructed to select, evaluate and/or make final choices of questions to be included in the survey. Further, group members were told either that they had to conduct interviews with other students on campus themselves (commitment conditions), or that other students would conduct the interviews (non-commitment conditions).

The determination of specific attitude topics and items to be posed to the experimental groups, proceeded as follows: First, four General Psychology classes, with approximately 65 students in each class4, were asked to generate four topics which they felt should be included in a campus survey of student attitudes. Relative to each topic generated, students were further asked to generate six

4The cooperation of Charles Boltwood and Victoria Fein for making these sections, which they instructed, available, is gratefully appreciated.
questions, designed to tap student attitudes for the specific topic, two of which should be "risky" questions to pose to another student on campus, two "low-risk" questions, and two "intermediate-risk" questions. "Riskiness" as a criterion is operationally defined later in this section.

This massive compilation of topic-specific questions was then narrowed down to six topics with 12 items for each, choosing the most frequently generated topics and items. Further, a preliminary "subjective scaling" of the items for each topic was conducted with the aim of establishing four high-risk items, four of intermediate risk and four low-risk items, along a twelve item risk hierarchy. It was initially expected that both high-risk and low-risk items would be low-quality items, and that intermediate-risk items would be high-quality items. Quality as a criterion is also operationally defined below.

To ascertain whether this trichotomized risk continuum was related to item-quality in the manner expected, the 72 total attitude items were presented in random order, independent of topic, to graduate students in an advanced industrial-organizational psychology research seminar at The Ohio State University. These students were asked to evaluate the potential "riskiness" of each of the items by indicating the probability of a college student interviewer not wanting to personally confront another college student with the attitude question. This definitional criterion of "riskiness" is highly analogous to a definition of risk, recently suggested by
Belovicz and Finch (1971), which views risk, at a minimum, as a function of the desirability and probability of the decisional consequences. The rating form for the 72 items, including instructions for the raters, is presented in Appendix A.

Next, to determine topical risk ratings, independent of the attitude items inherent in each topic, the six topics were presented to these graduate students. They were now asked to evaluate the potential "riskiness" of each topic by indicating the probability of college student interviewers not wanting to personally confront another college student with an attitude question on the topic. The rating form for the six topics, including the instructions for the raters, is presented in Appendix B.

Finally, to determine quality ratings of the attitude items relative to each topic, the twelve items per each topic were presented in random order, within topic, to the graduate students. They were asked now to evaluate how good each of the items would be, compared to the other attitude questions available, as attitude items included in a survey designed to tap personal attitudes toward specific topics. Since there are many different lists of criteria available for the construction or evaluation of attitude items, it was decided to permit raters to simply utilize their own conceptual criteria rather than imposing further selective definitional restrictions upon them. The rating form for the twelve items per each of the six topics, including the instructions for the raters, is presented in Appendix C.
The mean topic-risk, item-risk and item-quality values resulting from the ratings performed by the graduate students are presented in Appendix D. It should be noted that topical risk ranks, gathered either from the direct ratings of topic risk (Appendix B) or by determining topic risk values vis-à-vis the mean of the twelve risk-rated items which constitute the topic (Appendix A), were identical.

Although a curvilinear relationship was originally expected between overall item quality and riskiness, results of the ratings conducted at the graduate research seminar indicated a high negative correlation between the two criteria ($r = -.51, p < .01$). Thus, high risk implied low quality, and high quality was associated with low risk.

The item-risk and quality-risk values presented in Appendix D served as the risk and quality decisional dependent variables for the present experiment. It was important to have these ratings prior to the experiment to insure a random risk and quality presentation of topics and items to group members, as well as for numerous other method-bound constraints discussed below. An example of such a random presentation of topics and items to group members is shown in Appendix E.

Measures

Prior to their participation in the decision-making groups, subjects were asked to complete a "Background Form" designed to obtain the following information: sex, age, college year, GPA, pretask acquaintance with other group members (item #1), pretask interaction
preference (items #4, 6, and 7), pretask risk preference (item #3: racetrack risk; item #5: job risk), and pretask commitment (item #2: task importance; item #8: survey participation; item #8a: time-donate; item #8b: payment expected; item #8c: minimum payment expected). These Background Form items are presented in Appendix F.

After the conclusion of each decision-making session, subjects were then asked to complete a "Feedback Form" composed of four parts. Part I was designed to obtain information relevant to the following: treatment manipulation checks (item #2: selection; item #10: evaluation; item #6: final choice; item #7: commitment), degree of "overall" participation (items #1 and 4), perceptions of "overall" influence (item #11: individual overall influence; item #8: group overall influence), decisional criterion utilized (item #3: quality; item #5: risk) and perceptions of risk (item #9: self-risk; item #12: "relative" risk). These twelve items constituting Part I of the Feedback Form are presented in Appendix G.

The rating of perceived influence was accomplished in Part II of the Feedback Form. Each group member was instructed to distribute a constant sum of hypothetical influence points among the three members of his group and "any other decision-making groups" which exercised influence over the final choices. This form, along with instructions for completion, is presented in Appendix H.

Part III of the Feedback Form was designed to tap participant perceptions of satisfaction with various elements of the decision-making session. Participants indicated their degree of satisfaction
with each of the following: the group decision outcomes (item # 2: final questions to be asked of students on campus; item # 10: the accomplishments of the group), the decisions reached by the group (item # 1), the participants role in decision-making (item # 6: his part in the group discussion; item # 9: the influence which he had over the group), the participants contribution to the outcome (item # 11), the decision-making procedure (item # 3: the way the group went about making a decision; item # 7: the method of decision-making used), interpersonal relationships (item # 5: relationships between group members; item # 8: the feeling of togetherness between group members), the task on which the participants worked (item # 4) and overall satisfaction (item # 12: the whole experimental session).

The format of presentation of the satisfaction questionnaire, shown in Appendix I along with instructions for completion, provided a partial control for response bias in that the scale anchors (completely satisfied......completely dissatisfied) were randomly reversed for half of the items.

Part IV, the final section of the Feedback Form, was designed to tap post-task responses to the same commitment items presented to participants before the decision-making sessions: task importance, survey participation, time-donate, payment expected and minimum payment expected. These items, along with an additional item in Part IV (item # 3: group decision-making participation), are presented in Appendix J.
Treatment Manipulations

The experimental manipulation of the eight participation-commitment treatment combinations was accomplished through differential instructions presented by research assistants to the various experimental groups. Seven advanced undergraduate students\(^5\) at The Ohio State University, serving as research assistants for the present experiment, were introduced to the design and general aims of the study two weeks prior to the actual group decision-making sessions. Each assistant was then presented with eight sets of instructions, one for each treatment combination, so as to familiarize himself with the procedures well in advance of the experimental sessions. These instructions consisted of a general description of the purpose of the group sessions and specific procedures for each commitment and participation condition to be transmitted to the group members. The research assistant informed the group members of the specific procedure to be employed prior to the beginning of the decision-making phase(s) in which they were to participate. The sets of instructions are summarized as follows:

(I) General instructions for all groups:

Research assistant to group members: "This is not an experiment in the usual sense. Rather we are giving you experi-

\(^5\)The author would like to thank John Beech, Michael Brown, Robert Cristiana, Steven Doerrer, Barry Sach, Justin Vana and Ruth Zwelling for conscientiously performing their roles as research assistants.
mental credits for telling us what you think are important questions which should be included in an O.S.U. survey of students' personal attitudes. In other words, rather than us selecting, evaluating, and choosing the questions to be included in the survey, we felt that it would be more realistic for actual students to do this."

"Specifically, we decided to use psychology students for their inputs as to what they think are important questions, first, because of the large number of psychology students available, and second, because of the many different types of students in psychology; that is, they typically represent a good cross-section of the O.S.U. student population."

"We've also decided to use students to ask the actual questions on campus because of the obviously better rapport which students, in contrast to an outside group of interviewers, can establish with other students. Since we're very much interested in obtaining truthful answers to our questions, this good rapport is essential to the success of the survey."

(II) In addition to the above instructions, group members then received one of the following sets of commitment instructions dependent upon which of the two commitment conditions they were assigned to.

IIA. Instructions for commitment conditions:

Research assistant to group members: "As a matter of fact, you, as good rapport-creators, will be the actual students asking questions of your fellow students on campus, in face-to-face
individual interviews."

"The survey itself will be conducted by you the week of February 21st, when all participating students have completed their choices of items to be included in the survey. Thus, all interviewing will take place during the same one-week period."

"Each of you will receive an additional hour's credit for interviewing four students, two of the opposite sex and two of the same sex as yours, at selected locations on campus. You will receive notification of the exact location where you will interview, as well as interview forms to be completed and returned to me through your instructor. However, you should note that while we are giving you additional credit now for interviewing later, if for one reason or another you do not actually conduct your interviews, you will lose all experimental credit which you have earned to date and your experimental requirement will automatically double."

IIB. Instructions for non-commitment conditions:

Research assistant to group members: "The survey itself will be conducted the week of February 21st on campus with other students, and not yourselves, doing the actual interviewing.

(III) In addition to the general instructions and instructions for commitment or non-commitment conditions, group members then received one of the following sets of participation instructions dependent upon which of the four participation conditions they were assigned to.

IIIA. Instructions for participation in generation-stage-
only conditions:

Research assistant to group members: "For the following decision-making tasks, we'd like all of this group's members to produce group rather than individual products. Since we'd rather have products which reflect the group's consensus, rather than individual biases, it is suggested that you vote on each question to achieve a consensus opinion. To further insure that each product is the group's, do not write your name on anything, but rather simply write your group's number which is ____.

"Here is a list of six topics with 12 questions on each topic which we've generated to provide some guidelines for your selection of questions during the limited amount of time available. During the next 20 minutes, we'd like you to select three topics with only six questions for each topic. Your choices should be indicated by simply circling your 18 total selections. The questions which you select should be those which you feel are most relevant for inclusion in the survey of students personal attitudes even though these

---

6These 72 topic-specific attitude questions are those shown in Appendix E.

7Due to the need for objective measurement of decisional criteria across all participation conditions, the topic and item domain had to be specified a priori. Although this necessitated "selection," rather than "generation" of items, the representation of organizational participative-decision-making programs now appears more realistic. In other words, organizations can be seen as more frequently utilizing a modified form of generation (i.e., "selection") rather than completely unstructured generation of choices. Since selection can be considered as a form of generation (i.e., "structured generation"), the terms are used interchangeably throughout this paper.
selections merely represent your preliminary selections and not your final choices. You should also attempt to be consistent across topics in the type of questions which you select."

"This preliminary selection phase will be followed by two five-minute periods during which another group\(^8\) will first evaluate each of your selections and then decide on a final set of two topics with three questions for each topic which will be the actual questions asked of students on campus."

"This other group is made up only of graduate students who are more educationally advanced in evaluating attitude items and making final choices. We decided to use this other group, rather than yourselves, to evaluate your selections and make final choices, simply because this other group is more qualified in these areas. However, your input is important because the other group is restricted to evaluating and choosing from only those items and topics which you select."

"Look at the forms. Are there any questions? Fine, you

---

\(^8\)The concept of "another group" represents a theoretical decision-making group, since in this experiment no external decision-making group actually existed. The author served as coordinator throughout the group sessions, "creating" feedback, which the "other group" supposedly generated, to be transmitted to the group members by the research assistants. In other words, this "external group" was created to function as a perceived source of varying amounts of influence relative to decisions produced. This may be considered analogous to upper-level organizational decision-making groups which remain completely external (e.g., not visible physically) to most organizational members, yet exert great amounts of influence in organizational decision-making.
have 20 minutes to select three topics with six questions for each topic, starting now. I'll return in 20 minutes."

The research assistant then left the discussion room\textsuperscript{9}, and returned in 20 minutes.

"Now I will take your selections to the other group, and they will first evaluate them and then make final choices. I'll return in ten minutes, when they should be completed, to tell you what their final choices are, based on your selections."

"During this next ten-minute period, I'd like each of you to independently list what you feel are the best places on campus to approach students for interviews\textsuperscript{10}. Keep it in mind that we'd like to have as wide a sampling of all "types" of students as possible. Remember this should be done individually and not discussed with the other two group members."

The research assistant then collected the group's selections and left the discussion room to give these items to the "other group" to evaluate and make final choices. He returned in

\textsuperscript{9}Research assistants were instructed to leave the room during group selection, evaluation, and/or final choice phases so as to permit unrestricted interactive discussions by the group members.

\textsuperscript{10}This task of listing places on campus to interview was merely a "filler task." Responses were collected, but not analyzed.
ten minutes with the "other group's" choices.11

"These are the other group's final choices and represents the actual questions which will be asked of students on campus."

IIIB. Instructions for participation in evaluation-stage-only conditions:

Research assistant to group members: "For the following decision-making tasks, we'd like...... simply write your group's number which is_____." (same instructions as on p. 49).

"Here is a selection of three topics with six questions for each topic which represents another group's preliminary selection from a list of six topics with 12 questions on each topic during the past five minutes and represents their "choice" of topics and items

11A set of decision-guidelines based on the decision-making group's input was developed to determine the exact topics and items which would constitute the "other group's" final choices for feedback to the decision-making group. When the input was selection of items, the following guidelines were utilized: First, from the three topics selected by group members, the highest and lowest risk topics were chosen. Next, one group-selected item was chosen for each of the above chosen topics, along with one unselected slightly-higher risk item, and one unselected slightly-lower risk item for each of the two topics. These two topics with three items for each, representing the "other group's" final choices, based on the experimental group's selection input, were then presented to the group members. Although group members were then told that the "other group" would make final choices of items based only on their selections, this was obviously not the case, as four unselected items were included in the feedback.
to be included in the survey. During the next 20 minutes, we’d like you to evaluate these selections on the following Evaluation Forms.

"Your evaluations should represent your opinions on three descriptive scales as to which items should be included in the survey of students personal attitudes. Simply write in which topic, and then which item under that topic, each evaluation is for."

"This evaluation phase will then be followed by a ten-minute period during which the other group will then decide on a final set of two topics with three questions for each topic which will be the actual questions asked of students on campus. This other group is made up only of graduate students who are more educationally advanced in selecting attitude items on a preliminary basis as well as in making final choices. We decided to use this other group, rather than yourselves, to make preliminary selections and final choices simply because this other group is more qualified in these

---

12Since time was limited, group members in the evaluation-only conditions could not be presented with all 72 items to be evaluated. Rather, they were asked to evaluate only three topics with six items for each. A random sampling of topics and items would obviously not have been appropriate since any restriction of the risk-range of the items to be evaluated could threaten the validity of the response measurement. To minimize this possible confounding, topic-item combinations which representatively sampled the range of points along the risk continuum and possessed nearly equivalent total risk values were selected for each evaluation-only group.

13Page 1 of the Evaluation Form is presented in Appendix K. There were two similar additional pages for evaluations of items inherent in two other topics.
areas. However, your input is important because the other group's final choices will be based on your evaluations only."

"Remember that you're attempting to help us determine which questions should be included in the survey. Look at the Evaluation and Selection Forms. Are there any questions? Fine, you have 20 minutes to evaluate the other group's 18 selections starting now. I'll return in 20 minutes."

The research assistant then left the discussion room, and returned in 20 minutes.

"Now I will take your evaluations to the other group and they will make the final choices. I'll return in 10 minutes when they should be completed to tell you what their final choices are, based on your evaluations."

"During this next ten-minute period, I'd like each of you to independently list...... and not discussed with the other two group members." (same instructions as on p. 51)

The research assistant then collected the group's evaluations and left the discussion room to give these to the "other group" to make final choices. He returned in ten minutes
with the "other group's" choices.¹⁴

"These are the other group's final choices and represents the actual questions which will be asked of students on campus."

IIIC. Instructions for participation in final choice-stage-only conditions:

Research assistant to group members: "For the following decision-making tasks, we'd like...... simply write your group's number which is _____." (same instructions as on p. 49) 

"I'm going to present you with a selection of six attitude topics with 12 items for each topic. This will represent another group's preliminary selection and evaluation of topics and items which they have judged to be included in the survey of students personal attitudes. Their selection is from a much larger pool of

---

¹⁴The decision-guidelines utilized when input was evaluation of items, were as follows: First, the highest and lowest risk topics were chosen from the three topics provided for evaluation. Next, the group's most favorably-evaluated item (based on ratings along the three descriptive continua) was chosen for each of the above chosen topics, along with two other items for each of the two topics which the group evaluated as slightly unfavorable. An unfavorable evaluation (negative ratings) was considered analogous to the item not being selected in the generation-only conditions, in contrast to a favorable evaluation (positive ratings) indicating selection of the item. Thus, there is some degree of equivalency between the products of each stage. The two topics with three items for each, representing the "other group's" final choices, based on the experimental groups evaluations, were then presented to the group members. Although group members were told that the "other group" would make final choices of items based only on their evaluations, this was obviously not the case, as four unfavorably-rated items were included in the feedback.
topics and items which they will be presented with during the next ten-minute period. Your task will be to choose, as a group, from their selections, a final set of two topics with three questions for each topic. These questions will be the actual ones which will be asked of students in face-to-face interviews on campus. Thus, your task is to take this other group's selections from a much larger pool of items, and make final choices representing what you believe to be items which should be included in the survey."

"The other group is made up only of graduate students who are more educationally advanced in selecting attitude items on a preliminary basis and in evaluating the selections. We decided to use this other group, rather than yourselves, to make preliminary selections and then to evaluate the selections simply because this other group is more qualified in these areas. However, your input is important because, given their selections, you will be making the final choices."

"During the next two five-minute periods, the other group will first have to select and then evaluate items. During this ten-minute period, I'd like each of you to independently list...... and not discussed with the other two group members (same instructions as on p. 51). I'll return with the other group's selections in ten minutes when they should be completed."

The research assistant then left the discussion room to pick-up the "other group's" selections after their completion. These "selections" were the 72 items as presented in Appendix E. He
returned in ten minutes with these items representing the other group's selections.

"Now, during the next 20 minutes we'd like you to make a final choice of two topics with three questions for each, based on these selections and evaluations completed by the other group. Simply write in your final choices on this Final-Choice Form.\textsuperscript{15} Your choices do not have to be in any type of ranking order."

"Look at the form. Are there any questions? Fine, you have 20 minutes to make the final choices starting now. I'll return in 20 minutes."

The research assistant then left the room and returned 20 minutes later, at which time he collected the group's final choices.

"Are you sure that these represent your group's final choices? Good."

IIID. Instructions for complete participation conditions:

Research assistant to group members: "For the following decision-making tasks, we'd like...... simply write your group's number which is _____." (same instructions as on p. 49)

"Here is a list of six topics with 12 questions on each topic which we've generated...... be consistent across topics in the type of questions which you select." (same instructions as on pp. 49-50)

"This preliminary selection phase will be followed by

\textsuperscript{15}The Final Choice Form is presented in Appendix L.
another 20 minute period during which you will evaluate each of your selections, and finally we'll have a 20 minute final-choose period during which you will decide on a final set of two topics with three items for each topic which will be the actual questions asked of students on campus."

"Look at the forms. Are there any questions? Fine, you have 20 minutes to select three topics with six questions for each topic, starting now. I'll return in 20 minutes."

The research assistant then left the discussion room and returned in 20 minutes.

"Now, we'd like you, as a group, to evaluate only the three topics with the six questions for each topic which you've just selected on these Evaluation Forms. Remember that you're still attempting to determine which questions should be included in the survey of students' personal attitudes."

Look at the forms. Simply write in which topic, and then which item under that topic, each evaluation is for. Are there any questions? Fine, you have 20 minutes to evaluate your 18 items starting now. I'll return in 20 minutes."

The research assistant then left the room again and returned in 20 minutes.

"Now, we'd like you to make a final choice, as a group, of two topics with three questions for each topic. This final choice should be based on only the three topics with six questions for each which you have selected and just evaluated. Your choices
are the actual questions which will be asked of students on campus in face-to-face individual interviews."

Look at the forms. Simply write in your final choices on these Final Choice Forms. Your choices do not have to be in any type of ranking order. Are there any questions? Fine, you have 20 minutes to make a final choice of two topics with three questions for each topic starting now. I'll return in 20 minutes."

The research assistant then left the room and returned 20 minutes later, at which time he collected the group's final choices.

"Are you sure these represent your group's final choices? Good."

Each of the above sets of treatment-specific instructions was preceded by the administration, completion and collection of the pre-task questionnaire (Background Form) and followed by the administration, completion and collection of the post-task questionnaire (Feedback Form). After each completed post-task questionnaire was checked for missing responses, subjects were given one, two or three hours of credit for participation and dismissed. Subjects were completely debriefed by a letter and verbal communication if initiated by the subject, which explained the experiment and which was distributed after all experimental sessions were completed.

Research Design

The experimental design of the present study involves two treatment parameters: participation and commitment. These two factors were manipulated within the 4 X 2 factorial design presented
Table 1 exhibits four "levels" of participation and two "levels" of commitment. The participation treatments are shown as four columns, with the three stages of the decision-making process represented by the letters G, E, and C. A prime notation (') after a particular letter denotes that group members did not participate in the stage represented by that letter. Commitment and noncommitment conditions are represented by the rows of the table. The complete two-factor design thus involved eight distinct treatment combinations. Within each of these eight cells there were five group replications, or 15 subjects. The participants were randomly assigned to treatment conditions, with each individual participating in only one treatment combination. The experimental sessions were completed over a three-week period, beginning with the third week of the academic quarter, and ending with the termination of the fifth week (January 17th to February 4th).
It should be noted that this design, as suggested in the literature review of the "risky-shift" phenomenon presented earlier in this paper, represents a between-subjects design, in contrast to a within-subjects design. In other words, comparisons were not made between repeated decision tasks within-subjects, but rather between-subjects relative to only one decisional task.

For tests of hypotheses presented in an earlier section, the basic statistical treatment of the data, in accord with the research design, involved a two-way analysis of variance, with both the participation and commitment treatments treated as fixed factors. The principal dependent variables in these analyses were the influence and satisfaction data derived from the post-task questionnaire, and the risk and quality scores for the attitude items selected, evaluated or chosen as the final questions, during the decision-making session.

Although measurement of perceptions of influence and satisfaction was discussed earlier, the determination of risk and quality scores is briefly discussed below, since acquaintance with the treatment manipulations is a prerequisite to understanding exactly how the risk and quality scores were determined. Relative to the decisions produced in any of the decision-making phases, risk and quality scores were directly derived from the pre-rated risk and quality values presented in Appendix D. The number of attitude items which served as the basis for determining mean risk and quality scores depended upon the phase(s) of decision-making which the subjects participated
in. When they participated in generation-only, mean risk and quality scores were based on the pre-rated risk and quality values for the 18 attitude items selected by the group members during the session. For final-choice-only and full-phase participation conditions, the mean scores were based on the pre-rated risk and quality values for the six items chosen during the final choice phase. Finally, for evaluation-only conditions, the mean scores were based on the pre-rated values for the items which were evaluated "favorably" (positive ratings) only. That is, mean scores were based on only those items which received a total positive rating across all three descriptive continua presented in the Evaluation Form (see Appendix K). As noted earlier, there is indeed equivalency between evaluation products and selection and/or final-choice phase products, in that a favorable evaluation can be considered as essentially the same as an item being selected or chosen.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Prior to an examination of results pertinent to the hypotheses tested in this research, a preliminary set of analyses examining the efficacy of the experimental manipulations must be considered. It is essential that the observed effects of any experiment are attributable to only those conditions hypothesized to cause the effects.

A consideration of internal validity in this experiment necessitates specific analysis of the effectiveness of participation and commitment as treatment manipulations. In other words, to validly conclude that differences in perceived influence, satisfaction and decision-riskiness across treatment conditions are due to differences in participation and commitment, it must be demonstrated that the independent manipulations did in fact realistically create different degrees of participation and commitment for the group decision-making members. That is, for the experiment's intended creation of participation for group members in a particular decision-making stage to be deemed an effective manipulation of the independent participation variable, the members should have perceived higher participation in this stage, compared to other members not in the stage. Similarly, for the commitment treatment
to be deemed effective, groups presented with this manipulation should have perceived greater personal commitment to conduct the interviews, compared to the other groups which did not experience this manipulation.

Results of analyses of variance on responses to items in the posttask questionnaire designed to serve as treatment-manipulation checks are presented in Tables 2-6.

**TABLE 2**

**TREATMENT EFFECTIVENESS: MEAN PERCEIVED PARTICIPATION IN GENERATION STAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>GEC</th>
<th>GE'C'</th>
<th>G'EC'</th>
<th>G'E'C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-commitment</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $F_p = 11.27$, df = 3/112, $p < .001$;

$F_c = 1.72$, df = 1/112, n.s.;

$F_p \times c = 2.03$, df = 3/112, n.s.
### TABLE 3

**TREATMENT EFFECTIVENESS: MEAN PERCEIVED PARTICIPATION IN EVALUATION STAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>GEC</th>
<th>GE'C'</th>
<th>G'EC'</th>
<th>G'E'C'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-commitment</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $F_p = 12.83$, df = 3/112, $p < .001$;  
$F_c = 1.60$, n.s.; $F_p \times c = 0.31$, n.s.

### TABLE 4

**TREATMENT EFFECTIVENESS: MEAN PERCEIVED PARTICIPATION IN FINAL CHOICE STAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>GEC</th>
<th>GE'C'</th>
<th>G'EC'</th>
<th>G'E'C'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-commitment</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $F_p = 36.71$, df = 3/112, $p < .001$;  
$F_c = 0.06$, n.s.; $F_p \times c = 1.06$, n.s.
### TABLE 5

**TREATMENT EFFECTIVENESS: MEAN PERCEIVED "OVERALL" PARTICIPATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>GEC</th>
<th>GE'C'</th>
<th>G'EC'</th>
<th>G'E'C'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>30.73</td>
<td>20.07</td>
<td>20.47</td>
<td>28.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-commitment</td>
<td>29.40</td>
<td>20.87</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>25.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $F_p = 24.89$, df = 3/112, $p < .001$;  
$F_c = 0.40$, n.s.; $F_p \times c = 4.59$, df = 3/112, $p < .01$.

### TABLE 6

**TREATMENT EFFECTIVENESS: MEAN PERCEIVED COMMITMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>GEC</th>
<th>GE'C'</th>
<th>G'EC'</th>
<th>G'E'C'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-commitment</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $F_p = 3.80$, df = 3/112, $p < .05$;  
$F_c = 210.50$, df = 1/112, $p < .001$;  
$F_p \times c = 2.65$, n.s.
The results offer consistent support of the efficacy of the experimental manipulations. The experimental group members did react in accord with the participation-staging manipulations as indicated by the high F ratios for the three participation-stage analyses (Tables 2-4) with mean differences in the appropriate direction. There was also a significant effect of participation-staging on overall psychological participation (Table 5). A series of planned, orthogonal, individual and multiple comparisons for fixed effects among means (Winer, 1971) indicated significantly higher perceptions of overall participation when group members experienced complete (GEC) in contrast to partial-participation (G, E or C only) conditions (p < .001); significantly higher perceptions of overall participation under C-only conditions in contrast to G-only and E-only conditions (p < .001); as well as significantly higher perceptions of overall participation under E-only in contrast to G-only conditions (p < .05).

Results also offered support for the effectiveness of the commitment manipulation. Group members perceived significantly higher personal commitment under appropriate conditions as indicated by the high F ratio reported in Table 6.

Effects of Participation and Commitment on Perceived Influence

The first set of hypotheses tested for each treatment parameter concerned the effects of the experimental manipulations on influence distribution outcomes. Results pertinent to these hypotheses were obtained through analyses of variance in the responses of the
decision-making group members to the posttask influence measures.\textsuperscript{16}

Hypotheses IA.1 and IIA.2 predicted differences in perceived self-influence resulting from differing degrees of participation in the decision-making process and commitment to the outcomes of the process. The results presented in Tables 7 and 8 indicate that perceptions of self-influence were significantly affected by the participation and commitment treatments.

\textbf{TABLE 7}

\textbf{MEAN PERCEIVED SELF-INFLUENCE}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>GEC</th>
<th>GE'EC'</th>
<th>G'E'EC'</th>
<th>G'E'EC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>37.87</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>17.67</td>
<td>33.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-commitment</td>
<td>38.40</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>24.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{16}Results presented in this chapter are based on analyses of variance in several sets of outcome variables dealing with influence and satisfaction as well as decision-riskiness, even though some or all of these sets of dependent variables are not orthogonal. The rationale for applying multiple cases of the univariate form of analysis is twofold: (1) It is of substantive interest to isolate specific conditions under which, for example, perceptions of influence are equally as high as in complete participation. (2) While these variables are not independent, they are rarely highly interrelated, leaving room for different treatment effects.
TABLE 8
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY: EFFECTS
OF PARTICIPATION AND COMMITMENT
ON PERCEIVED SELF-INFLUENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3023.14</td>
<td>31.65</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>589.63</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P X C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>138.50</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>95.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratings of perceived self-influence varied with member participation in decision-making stages as well as with commitment to decision-making outcomes. Relative to hypothesis IA.1, the cell means show that perceived self-influence was greatest when the group had participated in each of the successive stages. When the group participated in only one stage, perceived self-influence was greater when that single stage was C, in contrast to G or E. Orthogonal comparisons among means indicated significant differences for complete vs. partial participation conditions (p<.001) and C-only vs. G-only and E-only conditions (p <.001). In other words, as predicted, full-phase participation caused significantly higher perceived self-influence than did partial-phase conditions, and participation in final-choice only caused significantly higher perceived self-influence than did generation-only or evaluation-only
conditions. Further, differences between G-only and E-only conditions were non-significant.

Results also supported hypothesis IIA.1. Perceived self-influence was significantly greater under commitment in contrast to non-commitment conditions (p < .05). However, this overall difference between commitment conditions was apparently attributable to a large commitment vs. non-commitment difference under the C-only participation condition, in that this difference was the only significant commitment difference (p < .05) within participation conditions.

Hypotheses IA.2 and IIA.2 predicted differences in perceived influence of the other two group members resulting from different participation and commitment conditions. The results presented in Tables 9 and 10 indicate that these perceptions of influence were in fact significantly affected by the two treatments.

TABLE 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>GEC</th>
<th>GE'C</th>
<th>G'EC'</th>
<th>G'E'C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>62.13</td>
<td>40.67</td>
<td>33.87</td>
<td>62.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-commitment</td>
<td>61.60</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>28.07</td>
<td>46.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY: EFFECTS OF PARTICIPATION AND COMMITMENT ON PERCEIVED INFLUENCE OF OTHER GROUP MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6543.57</td>
<td>32.43</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1976.37</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P X C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>337.46</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>201.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratings of perceived influence of the other group members varied with member participation and commitment. Pertinent to hypothesis IA.2, the cell means show that perceived influence of the other group members was greatest under complete participation conditions. Further, among the three single-stage participation conditions, the greatest perceived influence of the other group members occurred under C-only conditions. Orthogonal comparisons among means indicated significant differences for complete vs. partial participation conditions (p < .001) and C-only vs. G-only and E-only conditions (p < .001). Differences between G-only and E-only conditions were non-significant.

Results also supported hypothesis IIA.2. Perceived influence of the other group members was significantly greater under commitment in contrast to non-commitment conditions (p < .01). However, once
again, this overall difference between commitment conditions was apparently attributable to a large commitment vs. non-commitment difference under the C-only participation condition, which was the only significant commitment difference ($p < .01$) within participation conditions.

Hypothesis IA.3 and IIA.3 predicted differences in perceived external group influence resulting from different participation and commitment conditions. The results presented in Tables 11 and 12 support these hypotheses.

**TABLE 11**

MEAN PERCEIVED EXTERNAL GROUP INFLUENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>GEC</th>
<th>GE'C'</th>
<th>G'EC'</th>
<th>G'E'C'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>37.33</td>
<td>48.47</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-commitment</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>53.53</td>
<td>56.80</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY: EFFECTS OF PARTICIPATION AND COMMITMENT ON PERCEIVED EXTERNAL GROUP INFLUENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18335.00</td>
<td>54.53</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4725.06</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P X C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>901.64</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>336.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratings of perceived external group influence varied with member participation and commitment. Pertinent to hypothesis IA.3, the cell means show that perceived external group influence was lowest under complete participation conditions. Further, among the three single-stage participation conditions, the lowest perceived external group influence occurred under C-only conditions. Orthogonal comparisons among means indicated significant differences for complete vs. partial participation conditions (p < .001) and C-only vs. G-only and E-only conditions (p < .001). Differences between G-only and E-only conditions were non-significant. In other words, as predicted, perceived external group influence was greatest under partial-participation conditions with G-only and E-only conditions causing the highest perceived external group influence.

Results also supported hypothesis IIA.3. Perceived external group influence was significantly greater under non-commitment in
contrast to commitment conditions ($p < .001$). However, once again, this overall difference between commitment conditions was apparently attributable to a large and significant ($p < .001$) commitment vs. non-commitment difference under the C-only participation condition.

Hypotheses I.A.4 and IIA.4 predicted differences in total intragroup influence resulting from differing degrees of member participation and commitment. Sequential to the three sets of results presented above, perceptions of total intragroup influence increased as perceived self-influence and influence of the other group members increased, and perceived external group influence decreased.

Pertinent to hypothesis I.A.4, results indicated that total perceived intragroup influence was greatest when the group had participated in each of the successive stages. When the group participated in only one stage, perceived intragroup influence was consistently greater when that single stage was C in contrast to G or E. Differences between G-only and E-only conditions were also consistently non-significant. Thus, results supported the hypothesis that moving from G-only or E-only, to C-only, and finally to complete GEC, exhibits an expanding intragroup influence pie.

Results also supported hypothesis IIA.4. Total perceived intragroup influence was consistently greater under commitment in contrast to non-commitment conditions.

Supporting data providing convergent validity for the above conclusions, is also available. An analysis of variance of ratings of the percent of influence attributed to group member one, another
analysis for the percent of influence of group member two and a third analysis for the percent of influence of member three, all provided support for the above conclusions. The effects of participation were significant \((p < .001)\) in each analysis. The percent of influence for each group member was consistently highest under full participation conditions, followed by C-only, with C-only and E-only conditions always causing the lowest perceptions of influence for each member. Further, the percent of influence attributed to each group member was highest in each analysis under commitment in contrast to non-commitment conditions.

A positive relationship between ratings of perceived self-influence and the sum of the other two group members attribution of influence to this member, was found \((r = .73, p < .01)\). This correlation provides important convergent validity for members perceptions of influence, i.e., self-influence perceptions accurately reflected the other group members perceptions of influence.

Finally, correlations were computed between perceptions of self-influence and percent of influence attributed to each group member. There was a high positive relationship between perceived self-influence and percent of influence attributed to each of the other group members \((r = .68, p < .01)\). In other words, as perceived self-influence increased, so did perceptions of influence for each group member. Thus, it can be concluded that under certain participation conditions (e.g., full GEC) and commitment, an expanding intragroup influence pie was found, e.g., when perceived self-influence is high,
influence to group members one, two and three is also high. However, the importance of the high positive correlation between perceived self-influence and influence attributed to each group member, now becomes evident since this provides convergence for the conclusion that the expanding influence pie was not solely attributable to a single group member; rather, total intragroup influence was spread equally among all members.

Effects of Participation and Commitment on Perceptions of Satisfaction

The second set of hypotheses tested for each treatment parameter concerned the effects of the experimental manipulations on perceptions of satisfaction. Results pertinent to these hypotheses were obtained through analyses of variance in the responses of the decision-making group members to the posttask satisfaction measures.

Hypotheses IB and IIB predicted different degrees of satisfaction resulting from differing degrees of participation and commitment. Based on the sum of the ratings of the twelve satisfaction items, the results presented in Tables 13 and 14 indicate that perceptions of satisfaction were significantly affected by the participation and commitment treatments.

TABLE 13
MEAN DEGREE OF TOTAL SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>GEC</th>
<th>GE'C'</th>
<th>G'EC'</th>
<th>G'E'C'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-commitment</td>
<td>88.33</td>
<td>80.67</td>
<td>78.67</td>
<td>92.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>87.07</td>
<td>70.27</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>79.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1063.71</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1260.82</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P X C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>261.76</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>213.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratings of satisfaction varied with member participation and commitment. Pertinent to hypothesis IB, the cell means show that the highest degrees of satisfaction were reported under complete participation conditions. When the group participated in only one stage, total satisfaction was higher when that single stage was C in contrast to G or E. Orthogonal comparisons among means indicated significant differences for complete vs. partial participation conditions (p <.02) and C-only vs. G-only and E-only conditions (p <.01). In other words, as predicted, full-phase participation caused significantly higher perceptions of satisfaction than did partial-phase conditions, and participation in final-choice-only caused significantly higher perceived satisfaction than did generation-only or evaluation-only conditions. Further, differences between G-only and E-only conditions were non-significant.
Results failed to support hypothesis IIB. Satisfaction was significantly greater under non-commitment in contrast to commitment conditions. Thus, although perceived intragroup influence increased under commitment conditions, perceived satisfaction decreased. This overall difference between commitment conditions was apparently attributable to a large commitment vs. non-commitment difference under the C-only participation condition which was the only significant commitment difference (p < .05) within participation conditions. In other words, since full GEC caused consistently high perceptions of satisfaction, and G-only and E-only conditions caused consistently low degrees of satisfaction, C-only was the main contributor to the overall significant commitment difference.

If, as suggested, the overall difference between commitment conditions is largely due to commitment vs. non-commitment differences under C-only conditions, then apparently group members in C-only were less satisfied with their limited participation under commitment conditions relative to the high member satisfaction under non-commitment conditions. An examination of the mean ratings of satisfaction items presented in Table 13 provides further exemplification of this point. Perceived satisfaction by group members under C-only by commitment conditions was more similar to the mean ratings under partial participation conditions rather than full participation conditions. In contrast, perceived satisfaction under C-only by non-commitment conditions was more similar to the mean ratings under full participation conditions rather than the partial
conditions. In fact, C-only by non-commitment conditions caused the highest perceptions of satisfaction of all eight treatment combinations. Thus, there was a dichotomy of satisfaction perceptions under commitment conditions, indicating that full participation causes distinctly higher perceptions of satisfaction than does partial participation treatments, as well as a dichotomy under non-commitment conditions, however in this case indicating that full participation and C-only conditions cause distinctly higher perceptions of satisfaction. Apparently, group members found participation in only the final-choice stage highly satisfying when they were not committed to the outcomes, in contrast to relatively low perceptions of satisfaction in C-only when they were committed to the outcomes.

The mean ratings of satisfaction item #12 ("the whole experimental session in general") presented in Table 15, were directionally identical to results based on the sum of the ratings of all twelve satisfaction items reported above.
TABLE 15
MEAN DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH THE EXPERIMENTAL SESSION IN GENERAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>GEC</th>
<th>G'E'C'</th>
<th>G'EC'</th>
<th>G'E'C'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-commitment</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $F_p = 3.89$, $df = 3/112$, $p < .02$;  
$F_c = 3.19$, $df = 1/112$, n.s.;  
$F_p \times c = 1.39$, $df = 3/112$, n.s.

The cell means, once again, show the highest degree of satisfaction under complete GEC with C-only conditions causing higher perceptions of satisfaction than G-only or E-only conditions. Significant differences were found for complete vs. partial participation conditions ($p < .02$) as well as C-only vs. G-only and E-only conditions ($p < .05$). Differences between G-only and E-only were non-significant. Satisfaction was also higher under non-commitment in contrast to commitment conditions, with this overall difference once again apparently attributable to a large commitment vs. non-commitment difference under the C-only participation condition, the only significant commitment difference ($p < .05$) within participation conditions.

A matrix containing intercorrelations of responses to the twelve satisfaction measures in the posttask questionnaire was
submitted to the computerized Wherry-Wherry Hierarchical Factor Analysis on the IBM 7094 computer. This procedure does a principal factor analysis using Multiple R Squares as communality estimates and then conducts a Minres analysis to correct for any erroneous estimates (Harman and Jones, 1966). Next, the procedure employs a varimax rotation and a hierarchical rotation (Wherry, 1959). Optimally, the solution contains factors in a hierarchical order which are orthogonal and achieve simple structure.

The factorization resulted in the extraction of three orthogonal factors, one of which was a higher-order group factor. The three group factors and their loadings are presented in Table 16.
### TABLE 16

**SATISFACTION MEASURES: FINAL FACTOR LOADINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var. a No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>h²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Decisions reached by group</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Way group made decisions</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Feeling of togetherness</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Member influence over group</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The task</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Whole experimental session</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Final questions to be asked</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Accomplishments of group</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Member contribution to outcome</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Relationships between members</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Member part in group discussion</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Method of decision-making used</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The range of residuals in this analysis was 0.130 to -0.094.

Factors and variables arranged to maximally disclose simple structure.*

*Decimal points omitted.*
Factor I, the higher-order group factor, consisted of high loadings on all satisfaction items with the exception of three: the task, the session in general and decisions reached by the group.

Factor II was composed of high loadings for six items. Two of these items were the task and the session in general and appear again in Factor III. The remaining four items dealt with decisions reached by the group, the way the group made decisions, the feeling of togetherness between members and member influence over the group. These four items represent the "process" component of group decision-making in contrast to the "product" or outcome component which appears in Factor III.

Factor III consisted of high loadings on three items representing the product component of group decision-making in addition to the high loadings on items dealing with the task and the session in general. The product-related items dealt with the final questions to be asked on campus, accomplishments of the group and member contributions to the outcome.

The importance of this factor analysis lies in the resulting distinction between process-related and product-related items. However, a necessary next step would be to ascertain whether specific experimental treatments are causally related to either of these two classes of satisfaction responses. Accordingly, analyses of variance were conducted on responses to each satisfaction item with the participation and commitment treatments serving as independent variables in each analysis.
Results indicated that participation treatments significantly affected satisfaction with the final questions to be asked on campus \((F = 11.27, \text{df} = 3/112, p < .001)\), relationships between members \((F = 3.56, \text{df} = 3/112, p < .05)\) and the session in general \((F = 3.98, \text{df} = 3/112, p < .02)\). In contrast, commitment treatments significantly affected satisfaction with accomplishments of the group \((F = 4.43, \text{df} = 1/112, p < .05)\), member contribution to the outcome \((F = 4.83, \text{df} = 1/112, p < .05)\), as well as member part in group discussion \((F = 4.89, \text{df} = 1/112, p < .05)\) and relationships between members \((F = 4.02, \text{df} = 1/112, p < .05)\). Thus, commitment treatments affected responses to some of the items constituting the product-related component of group decision-making vis-à-vis the factorization of satisfaction ratings while participation treatments did not differentially affect either component. In other words, although there was a distinction found between responses to process-related and product-related items, commitment treatments might be associated with the product component, but participation treatments are apparently not differentially related to either.

**Effects of Participation and Commitment on Decision-Riskiness and Decision-Quality**

The third set of hypotheses tested for each treatment parameter concerned the effects of the experimental manipulations on decision-riskiness and decision-quality. Results pertinent to these hypotheses were obtained through analyses of variance in the decision-making group's selections, evaluations and/or final choices of attitude items.
Hypothesis IC.1 (a), IIC.1 (a), Ic.2 (a) and IIC.2 (a) predicted differences in group decision-riskiness and group decision-quality resulting from different participation and commitment conditions when individual pretask ratings of task importance were varied. Since pretask ratings of task importance were consistently high, and not at all varied (mean rating = 1.97, SD = .18, where a mean rating of 2.00 would indicate that each of the 120 participants rated the task as important), this set of hypotheses is not applicable to the present data. Instead, hypothesis IC.1 (b), IIC.1 (b), IC.2 (b) and IIC.2 (b), which involved predictions based on high pretask ratings of task importance, are appropriate.

This latter set of hypotheses predicted that group decision-riskiness and group decision-quality are not significantly affected by participation and commitment treatments. Results presented in Tables 17 and 18 exhibit support for acceptance of these null hypotheses.

TABLE 17
MEAN DECISION-RISKINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>GEC</th>
<th>G'E'C'</th>
<th>G'EC'</th>
<th>G'E'C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-commitment</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $F_p = 1.74$, df = 3/32, n.s.; $F_c = 2.04$, df = 1/32, n.s.; $F_p x c = 0.53$, df = 3/32, n.s.
### TABLE 18
MEAN DECISION-QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>GEC</th>
<th>GE'C'</th>
<th>G'EC'</th>
<th>G'E'C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-commitment</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $F_p = 1.94$, df = 3/32, n.s.;
$F_c = 0.59$, df = 1/32, n.s.;
$F_p x c = 2.79$, df = 3/32, n.s.

Pertinent to hypotheses IC.1 (b) and IIC.1 (b) results presented in Table 17 show small, non-significant differences in decision-riskiness between treatment conditions, while results presented in Table 18 pertinent to hypotheses IC.2 (b) and IIC.2 (b), exhibit small, non-significant differences in decision-quality between treatment conditions.

Since pretask ratings of task importance was high, each group member was "precommitted" to the task. Apparently, this voluntary personal responsibility for decisions reached caused all groups to select, evaluate and/or choose items on a final basis which were high quality items. Further, since item risk and quality values, as presented in Appendix D, were negatively correlated, high quality decisions necessarily implies low-risk decisions if in fact decisions
were heavily influenced by this personal "precommitment."

The overall mean decision-riskiness value was 2.91, SD = .95, out of a possible range of 0.5 to 9.6 (see risk values in Appendix D), while the overall mean decision-quality value was 3.34, SD = .10, out of a possible range of 2.38 to 4.15 (see quality values in Appendix D). Thus, decisions reached were generally extremely low-risk and high-quality decisions, as predicted. Obviously, this decisional consistency was not affected by either participation or commitment treatments. Implications of these results will be presented in Chapter V along with definitive research-design suggestions for future investigations in this potentially fruitful research area.

Supporting the above results, it should further be noted, as suggested in the hypotheses, that group members did in fact consider quality a more important criterion for decision-making than risk. Responses to items in the posttask questionnaire dealing with the major factor guiding decisions, i.e., quality or risk, indicated a mean rating of 7.02, SD = 1.70, out of a possible range of 1.00 to 9.00, for the quality criterion in contrast to a mean rating of 4.37, SD = 2.76, out of the same possible range for the risk criterion. Thus, quality, rather than risk, was the major factor which guided the selections, evaluations and/or final choices of these "precommitted" participants.

Although overall differences in decision-riskiness and decision-quality between treatment conditions were nonsignificant, it is of interest to note that the C-only participation conditions produced
the largest commitment vs. non-commitment differences. Mean decision-riskiness was second highest under C-only by commitment conditions in contrast to being lowest under C-only by non-commitment conditions. Mean decision-quality, on the other hand, was lowest under C-only by commitment conditions and highest under C-only by non-commitment conditions (p < .01). Thus, as with previous results pertinent to perceptions of influence and satisfaction, the C-only participation condition appears to be the largest contributor to overall variance between commitment conditions relative to decision-riskiness and decision-quality.

Relationships Between Questionnaire Responses

In addition to testing the effects of participation and commitment on perceptions of influence, satisfaction and decision-riskiness and decision-quality, numerous other relationships relevant to research theories presented in Chapter I, and future research designs suggested in Chapter V, were examined. The results of correlational analyses performed between responses to pretask and posttask questionnaire items are presented in Table 19.
TABLE 19
INTERCORRELATIONS OF PRETASK AND POSTTASK QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS*(N = 120)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretask Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. College year</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. G.P.A.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Acquaintance</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Horse-risk preference</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Job-risk preference</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Task importance</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Survey participation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Commitment sum</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Posttask Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Overall participation</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Quality criterion</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Risk criterion</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Self-risk</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Relative risk</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Self-influence</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Other members influence</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. External group influence</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Total satisfaction</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Task importance</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Survey participation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Decision participation</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Commitment sum</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Decimal points omitted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretask Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>College year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>G.P.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Horse-risk preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Job-risk preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Task importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Survey participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Commitment sum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttask Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Overall participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Quality criterion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Risk criterion</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Self-risk</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Relative risk</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Self-influence</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Other members influence</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>External group influence</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-83</td>
<td>-93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Total satisfaction</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Task importance</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Survey participation</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Decision participation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Commitment sum</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first set of correlational results to be discussed briefly are the following participant-characteristic relationships: (1) Males indicated a greater preference for higher risk jobs than did females ($r = .39$, $p < .01$). Of course, this correlation reflects job preferences for college students only. It is quite possible that older males with greater familial responsibility would prefer more financially stable positions. (2) Upperclassmen indicated higher risk preference for both job-risk ($r = .29$, $p < .01$) and horse-risk ($r = .21$, $p < .05$) items. Apparently, students closer to graduation are willing to assume greater risks than students in their freshmen years. (3) Students with higher grade point averages perceived lower self-influence ($r = -.20$, $p < .05$) and higher external group influence ($r = .20$, $p < .05$). This suggests that students with higher GPA's felt that they had exercised less influence than they had desired, especially in contrast to the high influence which they perceived the external group had exercised.

The second set of correlations of interest are the following commitment-related item relationships: (1) When pretask ratings of task importance were high, the major factor which guided decision-making was the quality of each item ($r = .23$, $p < .01$). This relates directly to results presented pertinent to the effects of the experimental treatments on decision-riskiness and decision-quality, i.e., decisions were generally of low risk and high quality. (2) Students who indicated a pretask desire to participate in a survey of student attitudes did not consider the riskiness of each item as the
major factor which guided their decision-making \( r = -0.18, p < 0.05 \). This is also directly pertinent to results indicating generally low decision-riskiness and high decision-quality. (3) When pretask ratings of task importance were high, posttask ratings of task importance were equally as high \( r = 0.60, p < 0.01 \). This relationship, along with other correlations between pretask and posttask commitment-related items presented below, form the basis for a discussion of future research designs to be presented in the concluding chapter. (4) When students indicated a pretask desire to participate in the survey, ratings of the following posttask commitment-related items were also high: task importance \( r = 0.18, p < 0.05 \), survey participation \( r = 0.65, p < 0.01 \), decision-making participation \( r = 0.33, p < 0.01 \) and commitment sum\(^{17} \) \( r = 0.36, p < 0.01 \). (5) When the pretask commitment sum\(^{17} \) was high, ratings of the following posttask commitment-related items were also high: task importance \( r = 0.18, p < 0.05 \), survey participation \( r = 0.31, p < 0.01 \) and commitment sum \( r = 0.79, p < 0.01 \). Thus, ratings of pretask commitment-related items were generally positively correlated with ratings of posttask commitment related-items. Specifically, since pretask commitment was generally high, posttask commitment was

\(^{17}\text{Pretask and posttask commitment sums were based on ratings of the following commitment-related items: time donate, payment expected (reversed coding) and minimum payment expected (reversed coding). For purposes of descriptive consistency, reverse codings for two components of the sum were used so that a high commitment sum would indicate high commitment.}\)
The third set of correlations of interest are the following anticipated satisfaction and influence-perceptions relationships: (1) When perceived influence of the other two group members was high, perceived self-influence was also high ($r = .56, p < .01$). Further, when perceived external group influence was high, both perceived self-influence ($r = -.83, p < .01$) and perceived influence of the other group members ($r = -.93, p < .01$) were low. This is pertinent to results presented earlier indicating an expanding intragroup influence pie under certain participation and commitment conditions. (2) Also relevant to this conclusion are correlations between perceptions of overall participation and perceived self-influence ($r = .47, p < .01$), perceived influence of the other group members ($r = .41, p < .01$) and perceived external group influence ($r = -.49, p < .01$). When perceived self-influence or influence of the other group members was high, perceived overall participation was also high. In contrast, when perceived external group influence was high, perceived overall participation was low. Thus, since perceived self-influence and influence of the other group members were highly correlated, when either is high, total intragroup influence is high, and perceived overall participation is also high. (3) When perceived overall participation was high, total perceived satisfaction was also high ($r = .33, p < .01$). However, the only satisfaction item yielding significant correlations ($p < .01$) with perceptions of influence (posttask items #16, 17 and 18, in Table 19)
was item two: "The final question chosen to be actually asked of students on campus" (r's = .44, .32 and -.42, respectively). When ratings of relative risk were high, i.e., when group members perceived other member-preferences as being riskier than their own, total satisfaction was low (r = -.29, p < .01). Since group decision-making was guided more by the quality of items than item-riskiness, and since decisions were generally high-quality and low-risk, apparently high-quality decisions were preferred.

The final set of correlations of interest are the following perceived risk relationships: (1) Perceived self-risk and perceived relative risk were positively related (r = .39, p < .01). Participants perceived themselves and other group members as preferring equivalent levels of risk. Since the mean rating of self-risk was 3.34, SD = 2.16, out of a possible range of 1.00 to 9.00, and the mean rating of relative risk was 2.44, SD = 1.70, out of the same possible range, both perceived levels of risk were low. This further indicates that participants had veridical perceptions of their riskiness, i.e., they viewed their decisions as being cautious, and in fact, made cautious decisions. (2) Correlations between the various measures of perceived risk and the various measures of perceived influence were all non-significant (p < .05).

These results suggest, at minimum, equivocal reliance upon several "risky-shift" value theories presented earlier in this paper. "Pluralistic-ignorance theory," for example, states that the members of a group possess one attitude but believe that others hold another
attitude. In contrast, results of this study indicated equivalent perceptions of risk between all group members. "Release theory" presents a further equivocal prediction by stating that subjects make cautious decisions but view their decisions as being risky, i.e., the Walter Mitty" effect (Pruitt, 1969). However, participants in this study exhibited veridical perceptions of their riskiness. This theory has also been recently questioned by Castore, Goodrich, and Peterson (1970) who also presented results indicating veridical perceptions of risk under various experimental conditions. Finally, "leadership theory" presents a similarly questionable position by contending that higher risk-takers are perceived by other group members as having had greater amounts of influence relative to the group's decision. Since correlations between perceived risk and perceived influence were non-significant, this theory must also remain quite tenuous.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Hypotheses derived from previous theory and research focused on the effects of commitment and participation in various stages of decision-making relative to three primary output parameters: perceived influence, satisfaction and decision-riskiness. The following review and implications of the major conclusions of this study exhibit general support for these hypotheses:

(A) Perceptions of total intragroup influence increased as perceived self-influence and influence of the other group members increased, and perceived external group influence decreased.

Total perceived intragroup influence was greatest when the group had participated in each of the successive stages. When the group participated in only one stage, perceived intragroup influence was consistently greatest when that single stage was "final choice" (C) in contrast to "generation" (G) or "evaluation" (E). Differences between G-only and E-only conditions were consistently non-significant. Total perceived intragroup influence was also consistently greater under commitment in contrast to non-commitment conditions.

Thus, results indicated that moving from G-only or E-only, to C-only, and finally to complete GEC, especially under commitment conditions, exhibits an "expanding intragroup influence pie," and as such, provides support for the research findings of Tannenbaum.
and associates presented in Chapter I. Further, results exhibit the importance of participation in the final-choice stage of decision-making relative to resultant influence perceptions. Certainly, abdication of participation in this stage must place severe limitations on subordinates' influence, as implied by Wood (1972). This may also lead to employee hostility and alienation if ideas are rejected by upper-level management, as suggested by Strauss (1963). Conversely, participation in final-choice only may serve as an extremely viable alternation to full-phase participation for organizations in which the latter is simply not practical for numerous reasons, e.g., if potential gains attributable to full-phase participation are not commensurate with costs associated with its implementation.

(B) Perceived satisfaction was also greatest under full-phase participation conditions. When the group participated in only one stage, perceived satisfaction was once again greatest when that single stage was C in contrast to G or E. Differences between G-only and E-only conditions were non-significant.

Perceived satisfaction was greater under non-commitment in contrast to commitment conditions. Thus, although perceived intra-group influence increased under commitment conditions, perceived satisfaction decreased. This overall difference between commitment conditions was attributable to a large commitment vs. non-commitment difference under the C-only participation condition.

(C) Group decision-riskiness and group decision-quality were not
significantly affected by the participation and commitment treatments. Decisions reached were generally extremely low-risk and high-quality decisions.

Since pretask ratings of task importance were consistently high, each group member was "precommitted" to the task. Further, quality, in contrast to risk, was rated as the major factor which guided the selections, evaluations and/or final choices of these "precommitted" participants. Thus, decisions were more heavily influenced by "precommitment" than treatment manipulations, causing greater decisional consistency than variance between treatment conditions.

Correlational analyses were also presented suggesting equivocal reliance upon several "risky-shift" value theories as well as providing a basis for future research-design recommendations.

Thus, results of this study suggest that decision-quality will be generally high, and decision-riskiness low, when members of decision-making groups consider the task to be important. Since high decision-quality is a desired decisional outcome from the standpoint of organizations, results at minimum provide evidence of one important factor directly influencing this valued product: the task itself. Other studies have provided similar results indicating the importance of characteristics of the task as determinants of decision-outcomes (Moscovici and Zavalloni, 1969; Fischer, 1970; Silverthorne, 1971). However, in light of the fact that the task itself is usually predetermined in real-world settings, future research must focus on possible methods which will effectively increase employee "commitment"
to decisional tasks, e.g., maximize decision-quality. The present research, for example, attempted to determine the effects of participation on decision-outcomes, however participants were "precommitted" to the task which, as noted earlier, was positively correlated with posttask commitment.

Organizations which recognize the importance of their human assets spend millions of dollars and thousands of man-hours attempting to achieve an integration of individual and organizational goals. "Natural precommitment" to organizational tasks on behalf of most organizational members is found solely in "fantasy-organizations." Cognizance of this reality necessitates future research investigations utilizing tasks to which participants are initially not-committed. Specifically, it is suggested that research studies incorporate both tasks to which participants are initially committed, and tasks to which they are not initially committed. Various degrees of participation in decision-making could then be utilized between groups with results exhibiting whether in fact participation differentially affected decision outcomes such as quality and risk between task conditions. Results of such a study should exhibit whether participation is actually capable of affecting outcomes such that decisions indicative of commitment to the task, e.g., high quality decisions, are produced by competent participants who were initially not committed to the task. If such were to be the case, the use of participation as an instrument for integrating individual and organizational goals would be further supported. Results would further
provide sustenance for Patchen's (1970) equivalent assumption that
decisional participation leads to organizational commitment in
contrast to recent results presented by Alutto and Belasco (1972)
suggesting that shared decision-making is not a viable organizational
strategy.

An interesting view of the group nature of modern occupational
life presented by Quey (1971) provides direction for an
additional future research consideration. He suggests that group
decisions serve to enable convenient disclaiming of individual
responsibility so that finally a point is reached where no one bears
ultimate accountability for any decision. This relates to the
concept of "individual responsibility" presented in Chapter I, which
refers to a feeling of liability for a decision whose consequences
affect oneself, in contrast to "social responsibility" which refers
to one's sense of liability when his decisions affect others who
lack any voice in formulating the decisions. Obviously, there are
numerous variants of such decision-making situations. The present
research investigated two such variants: (1) group members deciding
for themselves and the other members of the group (commitment
conditions) and (2) group members deciding for others not in the
group (non-commitment conditions).

Since past research suggests potential differences in decision-
risk between decisions made for oneself in contrast to others, it is
of interest to investigate this responsibility factor. In addition to
the two situations utilized in this experiment, three additional group
situations are suggested for future research investigations: (1) self deciding only for self, (2) self deciding only for other group members and (3) self deciding for others not in the group.

These latter three situations, in contrast to those utilized in the present experiment, involve non-interaction stipulations between group members since in each case decisions are produced individually. This interaction vs. non-interaction dichotomy may serve to provide even further results of interest relative to decision outcomes, particularly when tasks are used to which participants are initially not committed. These results may also provide interesting constraints or support for the findings of Vroom, Grant and Cotton (1969) which indicated that interaction during the evaluation stage of problem solving is functional in contrast to interaction during the generation stage being dysfunctional, i.e., fewer high-quality ideas are produced. It is of minor interest to note that the present author is grateful that interaction vs. non-interaction conditions, although originally incorporated in the present research design, were later dropped. Obviously, all "risky-shift" literature offers different explanations for the same fact: decisions produced by groups are riskier than decisions produced by individuals. Since mean decision-riskiness produced by groups in this study was extremely low because of high "precommitment" to the task, it is extremely doubtful that noninteracting individuals could have produced even lower-risk decisions. However, this must remain a viable condition to be utilized in conjunction with tasks to which
participants are not initially committed.

This dissertation has provided a small shred of evidence concerning the importance of considering individual needs. An abundance of research attention has been devoted to the locus of power in an organization, its consequences for the effectiveness of decisions and its effects on the attitudes of the organization members. The present study has contributed to this research base by suggesting certain organizational alternatives to "full" and/or currently utilized "partial" participative-decision-making programs, while also exhibiting important individual perceptual changes in influence distributions and satisfaction resulting from increased attention to individual needs such as increased responsibility vis-à-vis participative instrumentation.

The systematic study of power relationships provided in this paper will hopefully have important implications for psychological theories of organizational control as well as application to specific problems of organizational effectiveness. At minimum, perhaps this study will help bring the problem of recognizing, and then effectively dealing with, individual needs to an increased awareness level on behalf of those occupying positions of power who can institute changes beneficial to both individual and organizational goals.
APPENDIX A

ATTITUDE ITEMS PRESENTED TO RESEARCH SEMINAR TO BE RATED ALONG RISK CONTINUUM

Evaluate the potential "riskiness" of each of the following questions by indicating the probability of college-student interviewers NOT wanting to personally confront another college student with the question. That is, if you believe that the probability of a college-student interviewer NOT wanting to personally confront another college student with a specific question is high, then the item has a high risk value which would be indicated by your circling the value which you believe appropriate.
1. Should drug pushers (sellers) be punished more than they are now (i.e., greater prison sentences)? ____________
   DISCUSSION: Which drug pushers? Punished how severely? Why?

   Maximum | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0
   Minimum | 10  |  9  |  8  |  7  |  6  |  5  |  4  |  3  |  2  |  1  |  0

2. Have you ever used a contraceptive device expressly for the purpose of controlling population growth? ____________
   DISCUSSION: Which device? Do you recommend this course of action?

   Maximum | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0
   Minimum | 10  |  9  |  8  |  7  |  6  |  5  |  4  |  3  |  2  |  1  |  0

3. Do you believe that young men should be FORCED to fight and kill and/or maybe get killed in a war which they don't believe in? ____________
   DISCUSSION: Why?

   Maximum | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0
   Minimum | 10  |  9  |  8  |  7  |  6  |  5  |  4  |  3  |  2  |  1  |  0

4. Should "sex-education" courses be offered in public school systems on a mandatory attendance basis? ____________
   DISCUSSION: Why? At what age should it be taught? Should it be offered on a voluntary basis?

   Maximum | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0
   Minimum | 10  |  9  |  8  |  7  |  6  |  5  |  4  |  3  |  2  |  1  |  0

5. Should campus fraternities and sororities continue searching for more of their "own kind" rather than voluntarily accepting student members of other subgroups of the population? ____________
   DISCUSSION: Why? If you are a fraternity or sorority member, why haven't you accepted these students?

   Maximum | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0
   Minimum | 10  |  9  |  8  |  7  |  6  |  5  |  4  |  3  |  2  |  1  |  0
6. Have you (or your girlfriend or wife) ever thought you were pregnant and planned to have an abortion, but, for one reason or another, later found out that you didn't require one? 
DISCUSSION: How many times did this happen? 
What was the reason? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>0.9</th>
<th>0.8</th>
<th>0.7</th>
<th>0.6</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>0.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Should there be an O.S.U. abortion clinic to help any pregnant woman who requires and desires to have an abortion? 
DISCUSSION: Why? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>0.9</th>
<th>0.8</th>
<th>0.7</th>
<th>0.6</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>0.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Do you prefer states of euphoria (i.e., "feeling high") achieved through artificial means rather than "natural highs"? 
DISCUSSION: Why? Which "natural highs"? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>0.9</th>
<th>0.8</th>
<th>0.7</th>
<th>0.6</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>0.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Is it true that you have never participated in any way in your fellow man's efforts to clean up our environment? 
DISCUSSION: Why? If you did participate, how? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>0.9</th>
<th>0.8</th>
<th>0.7</th>
<th>0.6</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>0.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Should the people of our democratic nation be permitted to exercise their right to participate in decisions by voting on Vietnam issues such as the spending of our tax monies to support the war, etc.? 
DISCUSSION: What about "immediate" decisions which have been made: should we be able to reverse these decisions? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>0.9</th>
<th>0.8</th>
<th>0.7</th>
<th>0.6</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>0.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Have you ever enlisted in the U.S. Army, Marines, Navy or Air Force knowing that you might have to kill or permanently maim another human being?  YES  NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Would you join the military in time of need?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum risk</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Have you ever contracted venereal disease?  YES  NO
DISCUSSION: How many times? At what age(s)? Contracted from a "lover" or a prostitute?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum risk</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Do you prefer to limit your family size voluntarily by the use of contraceptives as a means of controlling the population problem?  YES  NO
DISCUSSION: What size family would you prefer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum risk</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Should different forms of sexual behavior such as masturbation, homosexual acts between willing parties, orgies, etc., be punished?  YES  NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Which acts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum risk</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. Is it true that you never had or would date a black (white) person?  YES  NO
DISCUSSION: Why? If you have, how many times?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum risk</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
16. If you (or your girlfriend or wife) became pregnant without specifically wanting to, or planning for it, would you prefer having an abortion to having the unplanned-for child? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why?

Maximum risk 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk

17. Do you prefer sex without love? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Is sex possible without love?

Maximum risk 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk

18. Have you ever dealt in (i.e., sold) drugs? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Which drugs? With whom? Why?

Maximum risk 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk

19. Should private citizens give greater support to efforts such as Ralph Nader’s in an attempt to make large industry more socially conscious and responsible? YES NO
DISCUSSION: What kind of support? Which other efforts?

Maximum risk 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk

20. Should American men in Vietnam fight, kill and die because the United States has an obligation to protect the people of South Vietnam? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Are there any other reasons for our men to be in Vietnam, i.e., to help ourselves?

Maximum risk 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk

21. Are you in contact with (i.e., do you know) people who take drugs? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Which drugs? How do you know these people?

Maximum risk 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk
22. Do you prefer friends who are your "own kind", i.e., not black (white)?

DISCUSSION: Why?

YES ___ NO ___

Maximum risk

| 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 |

Minimum risk

(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

23. Have you ever had sexual intercourse without some means of protecting against pregnancy?

DISCUSSION: Why? What would you do if pregnancy occurred?

YES ___ NO ___

Maximum risk

| 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 |

Minimum risk

(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

24. Do you believe that people should NOT engage in sexual intercourse unless they are prepared to bring and raise a child in the world?

DISCUSSION: Why?

YES ___ NO ___

Maximum risk

| 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 |

Minimum risk

(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

25. Do you believe that unless WE take positive action in support of the ecology effort starting now, the quality of life for ourselves and our children will be severely threatened?

DISCUSSION: Why? What type of action?

YES ___ NO ___

Maximum risk

| 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 |

Minimum risk

(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

26. Do you, or would you, prefer to have your future son(s) forced to serve in a military organization in which they fight and kill and/or maybe get killed?

DISCUSSION: What alternative would you suggest to your son(s)?

YES ___ NO ___

Maximum risk

| 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 |

Minimum risk

(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
27. Should the possession or use of marijuana be legalized? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Any age limitations? Why legalized? Expect greater use of the drug after legalization?

Maximum risk

| 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 |

Minimum risk

(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

28. Do you believe that certain minority groups are in any way inferior? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Which minority groups? How are they inferior?

Maximum risk

| 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 |

Minimum risk

(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

29. Should abortions be free to anybody who desires but can't afford one as a population control device, to protect unwanted children, or because of the burden placed on society by unwanted children? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Because of which reason?

Maximum risk

| 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 |

Minimum risk

(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

30. Should all polluting industries be forced to discontinue and correct their polluting or simply discontinue all operations and close down? YES NO
DISCUSSION: What about those industries that can't discontinue all their polluting?

Maximum risk

| 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 |

Minimum risk

(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

31. Have you ever had sexual relations with a member of the SAME sex as your own? YES NO
DISCUSSION: How frequently? First occasion was at what age?

Maximum risk

| 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 |

Minimum risk

(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
32. Should society consider alternatives to the traditional institution of marriage, i.e. probationary periods which, if the people involved decide to call it quits, do not result in formal divorces but merely broken relationships?  
YES NO  
DISCUSSION: Why? Any other alternatives?

33. Have you ever killed or maimed another human being while in the military?  
YES NO  
DISCUSSION: Why? How do you feel about it now? If you haven't, would you?

34. Should the United States NOT discontinue its bombing of Vietnam because innocent human beings may be killed or injured?  
YES NO  
DISCUSSION: Why? Does the bombing help us?

35. Are you in contact with (i.e., do you know) people who sell drugs?  
YES NO  
DISCUSSION: Which drugs? How do you know these people?

36. Do you prefer female rather than male contraceptives as a means of protecting yourself to the greatest possible degree against unwanted pregnancy?  
YES NO  
DISCUSSION: Which female contraceptive devices? Are male contraceptives risky? Why?
37. Have you ever discriminated against any human being in any way because he or she was a member of a specific minority group?  
DISCUSSION: Why? Which minority group?  
YES__NO__

Maximum 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk

(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

38. Do you believe that the so-called present sexual revolution is leading to a new set of moral standards which will have NEGATIVE effects on youths?  
DISCUSSION: Why? What negative effects?  
YES__NO__

Maximum 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk

39. Have you ever organized, or participated in, demonstrations to end the war or the military draft?  
DISCUSSION: Why? Were the demonstrations violent?  
YES__NO__

Maximum 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk

40. Should the United States discontinue its compulsory military draft and change to an all-volunteer Army?  
DISCUSSION: Why? Would enough men volunteer to safeguard national security?  
YES__NO__

Maximum 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk

41. Do you believe that marijuana is more dangerous to the individual user than alcohol?  
YES__NO__

Maximum 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk
42. Do you believe that we should NOT deliberately take action to compensate for past oppression of minority group members by lowering certain traditional "acceptance standards" (i.e., educational) in order to help these people to begin to help themselves? YES__NO__
DISCUSSION: Why?

43. Should there be an O.S.U. contraceptive clinic to make contraceptives available to those who desire them? YES__NO__
DISCUSSION: Why? Any age limitations? Would you expect greater sexual activity with contraceptives readily available, or simply greater use of contraceptives?

44. Have you ever engaged in different forms of sexual behavior such as sexual acts with more than one person at one time or self-stimulative acts? YES__NO__
DISCUSSION: Acts with more than one other person or masturbatory acts, or both? How frequently?

45. Should the government establish laws restricting the number of children which two people can bring into the world, or provide financial rewards for those who choose not to have any children as a means of controlling population growth? YES__NO__
DISCUSSION: Would financial rewards alone work? What would be the penalty for breaking the law?

46. Have you (or your girlfriend or wife) ever had an abortion? YES__NO__
DISCUSSION: How many abortions? Why (i.e., not married)? Post-abortion negative effects?
47. Should white Americans participate in demonstrations or work in other ways to help insure black equality?  YES  NO
DISCUSSION: Why? What other ways? Why is white participation important?

Maximum 1.0 0.9 0.8 0.7 0.6 0.5 0.4 0.3 0.2 0.1 0.0 Minimum risk

48. Do you, or would you, prefer to "create" your own children rather than adopt children?  YES  NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Does this help control population growth? Would you also adopt children?

Maximum 1.0 0.9 0.8 0.7 0.6 0.5 0.4 0.3 0.2 0.1 0.0 Minimum risk

49. Have you ever lied about your beliefs, status, etc., to evade the military draft?  YES  NO
DISCUSSION: Why? What lies did you tell?

Maximum 1.0 0.9 0.8 0.7 0.6 0.5 0.4 0.3 0.2 0.1 0.0 Minimum risk

50. Do you believe that abortions should NOT be performed simply because they always involve the taking of a human life?  YES  NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Religious reasons?

Maximum 1.0 0.9 0.8 0.7 0.6 0.5 0.4 0.3 0.2 0.1 0.0 Minimum risk

51. Do you prefer marijuana over alcohol?  YES  NO
DISCUSSION: Why?

Maximum 1.0 0.9 0.8 0.7 0.6 0.5 0.4 0.3 0.2 0.1 0.0 Minimum risk

52. Should Federal actions be taken to insure minority subgroups the right of equal opportunity in every aspect of life?  YES  NO
DISCUSSION: Why? What actions should be taken?

Maximum 1.0 0.9 0.8 0.7 0.6 0.5 0.4 0.3 0.2 0.1 0.0 Minimum risk
53. Have you ever had sexual relations with a member of the opposite sex?
   YES  NO
   DISCUSSION: How frequently? First occasion was at what age?

   Maximum 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0
   Minimum 0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0

54. Do you, or would you, prefer to leave the country if drafted into the military rather than serve in such an organization?
   YES  NO
   DISCUSSION: If yes, is this preference because of the military itself or Vietnam?

   Maximum 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0
   Minimum 0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0

55. Have you ever knowingly polluted our environment in any way?
   YES  NO
   DISCUSSION: How? How often? Why?

   Maximum 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0
   Minimum 0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0

56. Should there be an O.S.U. drug clinic to help drug users who wish to kick the habit or those who are ill from the effects of drugs?
   YES  NO
   DISCUSSION: Help which group? Why?

   Maximum 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0
   Minimum 0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0

57. Do you believe that people should marry their "own kind" ONLY, i.e., not black (white)?
   YES  NO
   DISCUSSION: Why? Because of their children?

   Maximum 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0
   Minimum 0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0

58. Do you believe that it is important to marry a virgin?
   YES  NO
   DISCUSSION: Why? What about experience?

   Maximum 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0
   Minimum 0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0 .0
59. Should every American citizen support the ecology effort? Is the issue really as critically important as scientists would have us believe it is? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why?

Maximum risk

60. Do you believe that "saving face" by remaining in Vietnam is more important than safeguarding the lives of our fighting men and P.O.W.'s? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Is "saving face" the real issue, i.e., what about the fate of South Vietnam or the spread of Communism if we withdraw?

Maximum risk

61. Have you ever taken drugs? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Which drugs? How often? Why?

Maximum risk

62. Should there be an O.S.U. contraceptive and/or V.D. (venereal disease) clinic for those requiring such services? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Any age limitations for either?

Maximum risk

63. Has any person close to you ever had an abortion? YES NO
DISCUSSION: How was this person related to you? Post-abortion negative effects?

Maximum risk

64. Should drug users be punished more than they are now (i.e., greater prison sentences)? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Which drug users? Punished how severely? Why?

Maximum risk
65. Do you prefer to have sexual relations with someone prior to considering marriage with them? YES  NO
DISCUSSION: Why? How many times are necessary?

Maximum risk 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk
(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)

66. Is it true that you never have had or would have any close friends who are black (white)? YES  NO
DISCUSSION: Why? If you have, how many?

Maximum risk 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk

67. Should abortions be legalized throughout the United States? YES  NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Medically safer if legalized?

Maximum risk 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk

68. Is it true that you have never voluntarily quit a polluting organization which employed you? YES  NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Would you in the future?

Maximum risk 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk

69. Should the Federal Government continue the policy of mandatory busing of students in order to achieve racial balances between schools? YES  NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Why is racial balance important?

Maximum risk 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk

70. Do you believe that there are probable harmful effects associated with the use of drugs? YES  NO
DISCUSSION: Long term? Short term? Which drugs? What effects?

Maximum risk 1.0 .9 .8 .7 .6 .5 .4 .3 .2 .1 .0 Minimum risk
71. Do you believe that we should take action against private citizens who contribute to the pollution of our environment, i.e., driving instead of using mass transit?

DISCUSSION: What legal action?

Maximum risk | 1.0 | .9 | .8 | .7 | .6 | .5 | .4 | .3 | .2 | .1 | .0

72. Have you ever felt a strong dislike for any minority group?

DISCUSSION: Why? Which minority group? How did you overtly express this dislike? Do you think this was "prejudice"?

Maximum risk | 1.0 | .9 | .8 | .7 | .6 | .5 | .4 | .3 | .2 | .1 | .0

Minimum risk | 1.0 | .9 | .8 | .7 | .6 | .5 | .4 | .3 | .2 | .1 | .0
APPENDIX B

ATTITUDE TOPICS PRESENTED TO
RESEARCH SEMINAR TO BE RATED
ALONG RISK CONTINUUM

Evaluate the potential "riskiness" of each of the following TOPICS by indicating the probability of college student interviewers NOT wanting to personally confront another college student with an attitude question on the TOPIC. That is, if you believe that the probability of a college student interviewer NOT wanting to personally confront another college student with attitude questions on this specific topic is high, then the topic has a high risk value which would be indicated by your circling the value which you believe appropriate.
1. Personal attitudes about abortions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum risk</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>.0</th>
<th>Minimum risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Personal attitudes about ecology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum risk</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>.0</th>
<th>Minimum risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Personal attitudes about sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum risk</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>.0</th>
<th>Minimum risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Personal attitudes about the military draft and Vietnam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum risk</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>.0</th>
<th>Minimum risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Personal attitudes about drugs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum risk</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>.0</th>
<th>Minimum risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Personal attitudes about racism and discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum risk</th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>.9</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.7</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.3</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.1</th>
<th>.0</th>
<th>Minimum risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(10) (9) (8) (7) (6) (5) (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Topic-Specific Attitude Items Presented to Research Seminar to be Rated along Quality Continuum

Evaluate how good each of the following questions would be, compared to the other questions available, as attitude items included in a survey designed to tap personal attitudes toward specific topics.
PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT DRUGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good attitude item compared to other items</th>
<th>Better than most items</th>
<th>About the same as most items</th>
<th>Poorer than most items</th>
<th>Extremely poor attitude item compared to other items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Should the possession or use of marijuana be legalized? **YES** _NO_  
   DISCUSSION: Any age limitations? Why legalized? Expect greater use of the drug after legalization?

2. Do you believe that marijuana is more dangerous to the individual user than alcohol? **YES** _NO_  

3. Are you in contact with (i.e., do you know) people who sell drugs? **YES** _NO_  
   DISCUSSION: Which drugs? How do you know these people?
4. Do you believe that there are probable harmful effects associated with the use of drugs?  

**YES**  **NO**  

**DISCUSSION:** Long term? Short term? Which Drugs? What effects?

5. Should there be an O.S.U. drug clinic to help drug users who wish to kick the habit or those who are ill from the effects of drugs?  

**YES**  **NO**  

**DISCUSSION:** Help which group? Why?

6. Have you ever taken drugs?  

**YES**  **NO**  

**DISCUSSION:** Which drugs? How often? Why?

7. Are you in contact with (i.e. do you know) people who take drugs?  

**YES**  **NO**  

**DISCUSSION:** Which drugs? How do you know these people?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good attitude</th>
<th>Better than</th>
<th>About the same than</th>
<th>Poorer than</th>
<th>Extremely poor attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>item</td>
<td>most</td>
<td>as most</td>
<td>most</td>
<td>item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compared to other items</td>
<td>items</td>
<td>items</td>
<td>items</td>
<td>compared to other items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)

8. Should drug pushers (sellers) be punished more than they are now (i.e., greater prison sentences)? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Which drug pushers? Punished how severely? Why?

9. Do you prefer marijuana over alcohol? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why?

10. Have you ever dealt in (i.e., sold) drugs? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Which drugs? With whom? Why?

11. Do you prefer states of euphoria (i.e., "feeling high") achieved through artificial means rather than "natural highs"? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Which "natural highs"?

12. Should drug users be punished more than they are now (i.e., greater prison sentences)? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Which drug users? Punished how severely? Why?
### PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT ABORTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good attitude</th>
<th>Better than</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Poorer than</th>
<th>Extremely poor attitude item compared to other items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>item</td>
<td>than</td>
<td>as most</td>
<td>most</td>
<td>item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compared to</td>
<td>items</td>
<td>items</td>
<td>items</td>
<td>items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) |

1. Has any person close to you ever had an abortion?  
   DISCUSSION: How was this person related to you?  
   Post-abortion negative effects?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>About</th>
<th>Poorer</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you believe that people should NOT engage in sexual intercourse unless they are prepared to bring and raise a child in the world?  
   DISCUSSION: Why?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>About</th>
<th>Poorer</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Should there be an O.S.U. abortion clinic to help any pregnant woman who requires and desires to have an abortion?  
   DISCUSSION: Why?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>About</th>
<th>Poorer</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Have you (or your girlfriend or wife) ever thought you were pregnant and planned to have an abortion, but, for one reason or another, later found out that you didn't require one?  
   DISCUSSION: How many times did this happen? What was the reason?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>About</th>
<th>Poorer</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely good attitude item compared to other items</td>
<td>Better than the same as most items item compared to other items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If you (or your girlfriend or wife) became pregnant without specifically wanting to, or planning for it, would you prefer having an abortion to having the unplanned-for child?  
**DISCUSSION:** Why  
**YES NO**

6. Should abortions be legalized throughout the United States?  
**DISCUSSION:** Why? Medically safer if legalized?  
**YES NO**

7. Have you (or your girlfriend or wife) ever had an abortion?  
**DISCUSSION:** How many abortions? Why (i.e., not married)? Post-abortion negative effects?  
**YES NO**

8. Do you believe that abortions should not be performed simply because they always involve the taking of a human life?  
**DISCUSSION:** Why? Religious reasons?  
**YES NO**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good attitude</th>
<th>Better than</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Poorer than</th>
<th>Extremely poor attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>item compared to other items</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Should there be an O.S.U. contraceptive clinic to make contraceptives available to those who desire them? **YES** **NO**

**DISCUSSION:** Why? Any age limitations? Would you expect greater sexual activity with contraceptives readily available, or simply greater use of contraceptives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>About</th>
<th>Poorer</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>than item</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Have you ever had sexual intercourse **without** some means of protecting against pregnancy? **YES** **NO**

**DISCUSSION:** Why? What would you do if pregnancy occurred?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>About</th>
<th>Poorer</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>same item</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Should abortions be free to anybody who desires but can't afford one as a population control device, to protect unwanted children, or because of the burden placed on society by unwanted children? **YES** **NO**

**DISCUSSION:** Because of which reason?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>About</th>
<th>Poorer</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>same item</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Do you prefer female rather than male contraceptives as a means of protecting yourself to the greatest possible degree against unwanted pregnancy? **YES** **NO**

**DISCUSSION:** Which female contraceptive devices? Are male contraceptives risky? Why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>About</th>
<th>Poorer</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>same item</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good attitude item compared to other items</th>
<th>Better than most items</th>
<th>About the same as most items</th>
<th>Poorer than most items</th>
<th>Extremely poor attitude item compared to other items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Have you ever engaged in different forms of sexual behavior such as sexual acts with more than one other person at one time or self-stimulative acts? **YES** _**NO**_
   DISCUSSION: Acts with more than one other person or masturbatory acts, or both? How frequently?

2. Do you prefer to have sexual relations with someone prior to considering marriage with them? **YES** _**NO**_
   DISCUSSION: Why? How many times are necessary?

3. Should "sex-education" courses be offered in public school systems on a mandatory attendance basis? **YES** _**NO**_
   DISCUSSION: Why? At what age should it be taught? Should it be offered on a voluntary basis?
Extremely good attitude item compared to other items

Better than the same as most items compared to other items

About the same as most items

Poorer than most items

Extremely poorer than most items

(5).............(4)...............(3)................(2)..............(1).

4. Do you believe that the so-called present sexual revolution is leading to a new set of moral standards which will have NEGATIVE effects on youths? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? What negative effects?

Extremely good Better About Poorer Extremely poor

5. Have you ever contracted venereal disease? YES NO
DISCUSSION: How many times? At what age(s)? Contracted from a "lover" or a prostitute?

Extremely good Better About Poorer Extremely poor

6. Should different forms of sexual behavior such as masturbation, homosexual acts between willing parties, orgies, etc., be punished? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Which acts?

Extremely good Better About Poorer Extremely poor

7. Should there be an O.S.U. contraceptive and/or V.D. (venereal disease) clinic for those requiring such services? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Any age limitations for either?

Extremely good Better About Poorer Extremely poor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good attitude</th>
<th>Better than</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Poorer than</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>item compared to other items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Have you ever had sexual relations with a member of the SAME sex as your own?  
   YES  NO  
   DISCUSSION: How frequently? First occasion was at what age?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good</th>
<th>Better about</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Poorer than</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Do you prefer to have sex without love?  
   YES  NO  
   DISCUSSION: Why? Is sex possible without love?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good</th>
<th>Better about</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Poorer than</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Have you ever had sexual relations with a member of the OPPOSITE sex?  
    YES  NO  
    DISCUSSION: How frequently? First occasion was at what age?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good</th>
<th>Better about</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Poorer than</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Should society consider alternatives to the traditional institution of marriage, i.e., probationary periods which, if the people involved decided to call it quits, do not result in formal divorces but merely broken relationships?  
    YES  NO  
    DISCUSSION: Why? Any other alternatives?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good</th>
<th>Better about</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Poorer than</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. Do you believe that it is important to marry a virgin?  
    YES  NO  
    DISCUSSION: Why? What about experience?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good</th>
<th>Better about</th>
<th>About the same</th>
<th>Poorer than</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT RACISM AND DISCRIMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good attitude than most as most items compared to other items</th>
<th>Better than the same as most items compared to other items</th>
<th>About the same as most items</th>
<th>Poorer than most items compared to other items</th>
<th>Extremely poor attitude than most as most items compared to other items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Do you prefer friends who are your "own kind," i.e., not black (white)?
   - YES _ NO
   - DISCUSSION: Why?

2. Should the Federal Government continue the policy of mandatory busing of students in order to achieve racial balances between schools?
   - YES _ NO
   - DISCUSSION: Why? Why is racial balance important?

3. Should campus fraternities and sororities continue searching for more of their "own kind" rather than voluntarily accepting student members of other subgroups of the population?
   - YES _ NO
   - DISCUSSION: Why? If you are a fraternity or sorority member, why haven't you accepted these students?

4. Have you ever discriminated against any human being in any way because he or she was a member of a specific minority group?
   - YES _ NO
   - DISCUSSION: Why? Which minority group?
5. Do you believe that certain minority groups are in any way inferior?  
YES NO  
DISCUSSION: Why? Which minority groups? How are they inferior?

6. Have you ever felt a strong dislike for any minority group?  
YES NO  
DISCUSSION: Why? Which minority group? How did you overtly express this dislike? Do you think this was "prejudice"?

7. Should white Americans participate in demonstrations or work in other ways to help insure black equality?  
YES NO  
DISCUSSION: Why? What other ways? Why is white participation important?

8. Do you believe that people should marry their "own kind" ONLY, i.e., not black (white)?  
YES NO  
DISCUSSION: Why? Because of their children?

9. Should Federal actions be taken to insure minority subgroups the right of equal opportunity in every aspect of life?  
YES NO  
DISCUSSION: Why? What actions should be taken?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good attitude</th>
<th>Better than most items</th>
<th>About the same as most items</th>
<th>Poorer than most items</th>
<th>Extremely poor attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Is it true that you never have or would date a black (white) person?  
DISCUSSION: Why? If you have, how many times?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good</th>
<th>Better than</th>
<th>About the same as</th>
<th>Poorer than</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Do you believe that WE should NOT deliberately take action to compensate for past oppression of minority group members by lowering certain traditional "acceptance standards" (i.e., educational) in order to help these people to begin to help themselves?  
DISCUSSION: Why?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good</th>
<th>Better than</th>
<th>About the same as</th>
<th>Poorer than</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. Is it true that you never have had or would have any close friends who are black (white)?  
DISCUSSION: Why? If you have, how many?  

| Extremely good | Better than | About the same as | Poorer than | Extremely poor |
PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT THE MILITARY DRAFT AND VIETNAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely good attitude</th>
<th>better than</th>
<th>About the same as</th>
<th>Poorer than</th>
<th>Extremely poor attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>item</td>
<td>most items</td>
<td>items items</td>
<td>most items</td>
<td>compared to other items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)

1. Should the people of our democratic nation be permitted to exercise their right to participate in decisions by voting on Vietnam issues such as the spending of our tax monies to support the war, etc.? **YES NO**

DISCUSSION: What about "immediate" decisions which have been made: should we be able to reverse these decisions?

2. Do you, or would you, prefer to have your future son(s) forced to serve in a military organization in which they fight and kill and/or maybe get killed? **YES NO**

DISCUSSION: What alternative would you suggest to your son(s)?

3. Do you, or would you, prefer to leave the country if drafted into the military rather than serve in such an organization? **YES NO**

DISCUSSION: If yes, is this preference because of the military itself or Vietnam?

4. Have you ever killed or maimed another human being while in the military? **YES NO**

DISCUSSION: Why? How do you feel about it now? If you haven't, would you?
5. Should American men in Vietnam fight, kill and die because the United States has an obligation to protect the people of South Vietnam?  
YES  NO  
DISCUSSION: Why? Are there any other reasons for our men to be in Vietnam, i.e., to help ourselves?

6. Have you ever lied about your beliefs, status, etc., to evade the military draft?  
YES  NO  
DISCUSSION: Why? What lies did you tell?

7. Should the United States discontinue its compulsory military draft and change to an all-Volunteer Army?  
YES  NO  
DISCUSSION: Why? Would enough men volunteer to safeguard national security?

8. Have you ever enlisted in the U.S. Army, Marines, Navy or Air Force knowing that you might have to kill or permanently maim another human being?  
YES  NO  
DISCUSSION: Why? Would you join the military in time of need?
9. Do you believe that young men should be FORCED to fight and kill and/or maybe get killed in a war which they don't believe in? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why?

10. Should the United States NOT discontinue its bombing of Vietnam because innocent human beings may be killed or injured? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Does the bombing help us?

11. Have you ever organized, or participated in, demonstrations to end the war or the military draft? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Were the demonstrations violent?

12. Do you believe that "saving face" by remaining in Vietnam is more important than safeguarding the lives of our fighting men and P.O.W.'s? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Is "saving face" the real issue, i.e., what about the fate of South Vietnam or the spread of Communism if we withdraw?
PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT ECOLOGY

1. Have you ever knowingly polluted our environment in any way?  

2. Do you believe that unless WE take positive action in  
   support of the ecology effort starting now, the  
   quality of life for ourselves and our children  
   will be severely threatened?  YES___NO___  
   DISCUSSION: Why? What type of action?

3. Have you ever used a contraceptive device expressly  
   for the purpose of controlling population growth?  YES___NO___  
   DISCUSSION: Which device? Do you recommend this course of action?

4. Should every American citizen support the ecology effort?  
   Is the issue really as critically important as scientists  
   would have us believe it is?  YES___NO___  
   DISCUSSION: Why?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>About</th>
<th>Poorer</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good attitude</td>
<td>than</td>
<td>the same</td>
<td>than</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item</td>
<td>most</td>
<td>as most</td>
<td>most</td>
<td>attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compared to other items</td>
<td>items</td>
<td>items</td>
<td>items</td>
<td>compared to other items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) (4) (3) (2) (1)

5. Is it true that you have never voluntarily quit a polluting organization which employed you? **YES NO**
DISCUSSION: Why? Would you in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>About</th>
<th>Poorer</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Do you believe that WE should take action against private citizens who contribute to the pollution of our environment, i.e., driving instead of using mass transit? **YES NO**
DISCUSSION: What legal action?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>About</th>
<th>Poorer</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Should private citizens give greater support to efforts such as Ralph Nader's in an attempt to make large industry more socially conscious and responsible? **YES NO**
DISCUSSION: What kind of support? Which other efforts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>About</th>
<th>Poorer</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Is it true that you have never participated in any way in your fellow man's efforts to clean up our environment? **YES NO**
DISCUSSION: Why? If you did participate, how?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>About</th>
<th>Poorer</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 9:
Should all polluting industries be forced to discontinue and correct their polluting or simply discontinue all operations and close down? **YES**  **NO**

**DISCUSSION:** What about those industries that can't discontinue all their polluting?

### Question 10:
Do you, or would you, prefer to "create" your own children rather than adopt children? **YES**  **NO**

**DISCUSSION:** Why? Does this help control population growth? Would you also adopt children?

### Question 11:
Should the government establish laws restricting the number of children which two people can bring into the world, or provide financial rewards for those who choose not to have any children, as a means of controlling population growth? **YES**  **NO**

**DISCUSSION:** Would financial rewards alone work? What would be the penalty for breaking the law?

### Question 12:
Do you prefer to limit your family size voluntarily by the use of contraceptives as a means of controlling the population problem? **YES**  **NO**

**DISCUSSION:** What size family would you prefer?
APPENDIX D

RISK AND QUALITY VALUES

FOR THE ATTITUDE ITEMS
PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT SEX

$\bar{X}$ RISK = 6.2 (Risk rank = 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>1. Have you ever had sexual relations with a member of the SAME sex as your own? YES NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9.6  | 3.08    | DISCUSSION: How frequently?
|      |         | First occasion was at what age? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>2. Have you ever engaged in different forms of sexual behavior such as sexual acts with more than one other person at one time or self-stimulative acts? YES NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>DISCUSSION: Acts with more than one other person or masturbatory acts, or both? How frequently?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>3. Have you ever contracted venereal disease? YES NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>DISCUSSION: How many times? At what age(s)? Contracted from a &quot;lover&quot; or a prostitute?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>4. Do you prefer to have sexual relations with someone prior to considering marriage with them? YES NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>DISCUSSION: Why? How many times are necessary?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>5. Do you prefer to have sex without love? YES NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>DISCUSSION: Why? Is sex possible without love?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>6. Have you ever had sexual relations with a member of the OPPOSITE sex? YES NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.2  | 3.00    | DISCUSSION: How frequently?
|      |         | First occasion was at what age? |

| RISK | QUALITY | 7. Do you believe that it is important to marry a virgin? YES NO |
|------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------
| 4.3  | 3.15    | DISCUSSION: Why? What about experience? |
3.5 3.24 8. Should different forms of sexual behavior such as masturbation, homosexual acts between willing parties, orgies, etc., be punished? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Which acts?

1.9 4.15 9. Should society consider alternatives to the traditional institution of marriage, i.e., probationary periods which, if the people involved decide to call it quits, do not result in formal divorces but merely broken relationships? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Any other alternatives?

1.8 3.08 10. Should there be an O.S.U. contraceptive and/or V.D. (venereal disease) clinic for those requiring such services? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Any age limitations for either?

1.6 3.38 11. Do you believe that the so-called present sexual revolution is leading to a new set of moral standards which will have NEGATIVE effects on youths? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? What negative effects?

0.7 3.54 12. Should "sex-education" courses be offered in public school systems on a mandatory attendance basis? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? At what age should it be taught? Should it be offered on a voluntary basis?
## Personal Attitudes about Abortions

\[ \bar{X} \text{ Risk} = 4.9 \text{ (Risk rank = 2)} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1. Have you (or your girlfriend or wife) ever had an abortion?**

- **Yes**
- **No**

**Discussion:** How many abortions? Why? (i.e., not married)? Post-abortion negative effects?

**2. Have you (or your girlfriend or wife) ever thought you were pregnant and planned to have an abortion, but, for one reason or another, later found out that you didn't require one?**

- **Yes**
- **No**

**Discussion:** How many times did this happen? What was the reason?

**3. Have you ever had sexual intercourse without some means of protecting against pregnancy?**

- **Yes**
- **No**

**Discussion:** Why? What would you do if pregnancy occurred?

**4. Do you prefer female rather than male contraceptives as a means of protecting yourself to the greatest possible degree against unwanted pregnancy?**

- **Yes**
- **No**

**Discussion:** Which female contraceptive devices? Are male contraceptives risky? Why?

**5. Has any person close to you ever had an abortion?**

- **Yes**
- **No**

**Discussion:** How was this person related to you? Post-abortion negative effects?

**6. If you (or your girlfriend or wife) became pregnant without specifically wanting to, or planning for it, would you prefer having an abortion to having the unplanned-for child?**

- **Yes**
- **No**

**Discussion:** Why?
7. Do you believe that people should NOT engage in sexual intercourse unless they are prepared to bring and raise a child in the world?  
DISCUSSION: Why?  
YES  NO

8. Do you believe that abortions should NOT be performed simply because they always involve the taking of a human life?  
DISCUSSION: Why? Religious reasons?  
YES  NO

9. Should abortions be free to anybody who desires but can't afford one as a population control device, to protect unwanted children, or because of the burden placed on society by unwanted children?  
DISCUSSION: Because of which reason?  
YES  NO

10. Should abortions be legalized throughout the United States?  
DISCUSSION: Why? Medically safer if legalized?  
YES  NO

11. Should there be an O.S.U. contraceptive clinic to make contraceptives available to those who desire them?  
DISCUSSION: Why? Any age limitations? Would you expect greater sexual activity with contraceptives readily available, or simply greater use of contraceptives?  
YES  NO

12. Should there be an O.S.U. abortion clinic to help any pregnant woman who requires and desires to have an abortion?  
DISCUSSION: Why?  
YES  NO
### PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT RACISM AND DISCRIMINATION

\[ \bar{X} \text{ RISK} = 4.8 \text{ (Risk rank } = 3) \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RISK</td>
<td>QUALITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE</td>
<td>VALUE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Have you ever discriminated against any human being in any way because he or she was a member of a specific minority group?  
   YES NO  
   DISCUSSION: Why? Which minority group?

2. Is it true that you never have had or would have any close friends who are black (white)?  
   YES NO  
   DISCUSSION: Why? If you have, how many?

3. Have you ever felt a strong dislike for any minority group?  
   YES NO  
   DISCUSSION: Why? Which minority group? How did you overtly express the dislike? Do you think this was "prejudice"?

4. Do you prefer friends who are your "own kind," i.e., not black (white)?  
   YES NO  
   DISCUSSION: Why?

5. Is it true that you never have or would date a black (white) person?  
   YES NO  
   DISCUSSION: Why? If you have, how many times?

6. Do you believe that certain minority groups are in any way inferior?  
   YES NO  
   DISCUSSION: Why? Which minority groups? Who are they inferior?

7. Do you believe that people should marry their "own kind" ONLY, i.e., not black (white)?  
   YES NO  
   DISCUSSION: Why? Because of their children?
8. Do you believe that WE should NOT deliberately take action to compensate for past oppression of minority group members by lowering certain traditional "acceptance standards" (i.e., educational) in order to help these people to begin to help themselves?  
DISCUSSION: Why?

9. Should the Federal Government continue the policy of mandatory busing of students in order to achieve racial balances between schools?  
DISCUSSION: Why? Why is racial balance important?

10. Should campus fraternities and sororities continue searching for more of their "own kind" rather than voluntarily accepting student members of other subgroups of the population?  
DISCUSSION: Why? If you are a fraternity or sorority member, why haven't you accepted these students?

11. Should white Americans participate in demonstrations or work in other ways to help insure black equality?  
DISCUSSION: Why? What other ways? Why is white participation important?

12. Should Federal actions be taken to insure minority subgroups the right of equal opportunity in every aspect of life?  
DISCUSSION: Why? What actions should be taken?
PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT DRUGS

\[ \bar{X} \text{ RISK} = 4.7 \ (\text{Risk rank} = 4) \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Have you ever taken drugs? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Which drugs? How often? Why?

2. Are you in contact with (i.e., do you know) people who sell drugs? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Which drugs? How do you know these people?

3. Have you ever dealt in (i.e., sold) drugs? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Which drugs? With whom? Why?

4. Do you prefer marijuana over alcohol? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why?

5. Are you in contact with (i.e., do you know) people who take drugs? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Which drugs? How do you know these people?

6. Do you prefer states of euphoria (i.e., "feeling high") achieved through artificial means rather than "natural highs"? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Which "natural highs"?

7. Should the possession or use of marijuana be legalized? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Any age limitations? Why legalized? Expect greater use of the drug after legalization?

8. Should drug pushers (sellers) be punished more than they are now (i.e., greater prison sentences)? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Which drug pushers? Punished how severely? Why?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RISK</td>
<td>QUALITY</td>
<td>VALUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>9. Should drug users be punished more than they are now (i.e., greater prison sentences)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION: Which drug users? Punished how severely?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>10. Do you believe that there are probable harmful effects associated with the use of drugs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION: Long term? Short term? Which drugs? What effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>11. Do you believe that marijuana is more dangerous to the individual user than alcohol?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>12. Should there be an O.S.U. drug clinic to help drug users who wish to kick the habit or those who are ill from the effects of drugs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION: Help which group? Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT THE MILITARY DRAFT AND VIETNAM

\[ \bar{X} \text{ RISK} = 2.1 \text{ (Risk rank} = 5) \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Have you ever lied about your beliefs, status, etc., to evade the military draft? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? What lies did you tell?

2. Have you ever killed or maimed another human being while in the military? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? How do you feel about it now? If you haven't, would you?

3. Do you, or would you, prefer to leave the country if drafted into the military rather than serve in such an organization? YES NO
DISCUSSION: If yes, is this preference because of the military itself or Vietnam?

4. Have you ever organized, or participated in, demonstrations to end the war or the military draft? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Were the demonstrations violent?

5. Have you ever enlisted in the U.S. Army, Marines, Navy or Air Force knowing that you might have to kill or permanently maim another human being? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Would you join the military in time of need?

6. Should the United States NOT discontinue its bombing of Vietnam because innocent human beings may be killed or injured? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Does the bombing help us?
7. Do you believe that "saving face" by remaining in Vietnam is more important than safeguarding the lives of our fighting men and P.O.W.'s? YES NO 
DISCUSSION: Why? Is "saving face" the real issue, i.e., what about the fate of South Vietnam or the spread of Communism if we withdraw?

8. Do you believe that young men should be forced to fight and kill and/or maybe get killed in a war which they don't believe in? YES NO 
DISCUSSION: Why?

9. Should American men in Vietnam fight, kill and die because the United States has an obligation to protect the people of South Vietnam? YES NO 
DISCUSSION: Why? Are there any other reasons for our men to be in Vietnam, i.e., to help ourselves?

10. Do you, or would you, prefer to have your future son(s) forced to serve in a military organization in which they fight and kill and/or maybe get killed? YES NO 
DISCUSSION: What alternative would you suggest to your son(s)?

11. Should the people of our democratic nation be permitted to exercise their right to participate in decisions by voting on Vietnam issues such as the spending of our tax monies to support the war, etc.? YES NO 
DISCUSSION: What about "immediate" decisions which have been made: should we be able to reverse these decisions?

12. Should the United States discontinue its compulsory military draft and change to an all-volunteer Army? YES NO 
DISCUSSION: Why? Would enough men volunteer to safeguard national security?
### PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT ECOLOGY

\[ \bar{X} \text{ RISK} = 1.0 \ (\text{Risk rank} = 6) \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK VALUE</th>
<th>QUALITY VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Have you ever used a contraceptive device expressly for the purpose of controlling population growth?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION: Which device? Do you recommend this course of action?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is it true that you have never voluntarily quit a polluting organization which employed you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION: Why? Would you in the future?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is it true that you have never participated in any way in your fellow man's efforts to clean up our environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION: Why? If you did participate, how?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you prefer to limit your family size voluntarily by the use of contraceptives as a means of controlling the population problem?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION: What size family would you prefer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you, or would you, prefer to &quot;create&quot; your own children rather than adopt children?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION: Why? Does this help control population growth? Would you also adopt children?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Have you ever knowingly polluted our environment in any way?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION: How? How often? Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.5 3.46 7. Do you believe that WE should take action against private citizens who contribute to the pollution of our environment, i.e., driving instead of using mass transit? YES NO DISCUSSION: What legal action?

1.3 4.00 8. Should the government establish laws restricting the number of children which two people can bring into the world, or provide financial rewards for those who choose not to have any children, as a means of controlling population growth? YES NO DISCUSSION: Would financial rewards alone work? What would be the penalty for breaking the law?

0.9 3.46 9. Do you believe that unless WE take positive action in support of the ecology effort starting now, the quality of life for ourselves and our children will be severely threatened? YES NO DISCUSSION: Why? What type of action?

0.6 3.54 10. Should all polluting industries be forced to discontinue and correct their polluting or simply discontinue all operations and close down? YES NO DISCUSSION: What about those industries that can't discontinue all their polluting?

0.5 3.85 11. Should private citizens give greater support to efforts such as Ralph Nader's in an attempt to make large industry more socially conscious and responsible? YES NO DISCUSSION: What kind of support? Which other efforts?

0.5 3.23 12. Should every American citizen support the ecology effort? Is the issue really as critically important as scientists would have us believe it is? YES NO DISCUSSION: Why?
APPENDIX E

A RANDOM PRESENTATION

OF THE TOPIC-SPECIFIC

ATTITUDE ITEMS
1. Have you ever knowingly polluted our environment in any way? YES___NO___
   DISCUSSION: How? How often? Why?

2. Do you believe that unless we take positive action in support of the ecology effort starting now, the quality of life for ourselves and our children will be severely threatened? YES___NO___
   DISCUSSION: Why? What type of action?

3. Have you ever used a contraceptive device expressly for the purpose of controlling population growth? YES___NO___
   DISCUSSION: Which device? Do you recommend this course of action?

4. Should every American citizen support the ecology effort? Is the issue really as critically important as scientists would have us believe it is? YES___NO___
   DISCUSSION: Why?

5. Is it true that you have never voluntarily quit a polluting organization which employed you? YES___NO___
   DISCUSSION: Why? Would you in the future?

6. Do you believe that WE should take action against private citizens who contribute to the pollution of our environment, i.e., driving instead of using mass transit? YES___NO___
   DISCUSSION: What legal action?

7. Should private citizens give greater support to efforts such as Ralph Nader's in an attempt to make large industry more socially conscious and responsible? YES___NO___
   DISCUSSION: What kind of support? Which other efforts?

8. Is it true that you have never participated in any way in your fellow man's efforts to clean up our environment? YES___NO___
   DISCUSSION: Why? If you did participate, how?

9. Should all polluting industries be forced to discontinue and correct their polluting or simply discontinue all operations and close down? YES___NO___
   DISCUSSION: What about those industries that can't discontinue all their polluting?
10. Do you, or would you, prefer to "create" your own children rather than adopt children? YES__NO__
DISCUSSION: Why? Does this help control population growth? Would you also adopt children?

11. Should the government establish laws restricting the number of children which two people can bring into the world, or provide financial rewards for those who choose not to have any children, as a means of controlling population growth? YES__NO__
DISCUSSION: Would financial rewards alone work? What would be the penalty for breaking the law?

12. Do you prefer to limit your family size voluntarily by the use of contraceptives as a means of controlling the population problem? YES__NO__
DISCUSSION: What size family would you prefer?
PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT ABORTIONS

1. Has any person close to you ever had an abortion? YES____NO____
   DISCUSSION: How was this person related to you? Post-abortion negative effects?

2. Do you believe that people should NOT engage in sexual intercourse unless they are prepared to bring and raise a child in the world? YES____NO____
   DISCUSSION: Why?

3. Should there be an O.S.U. abortion clinic to help any pregnant woman who requires and desires to have an abortion? YES____NO____
   DISCUSSION: Why?

4. Have you (or your girlfriend or wife) ever thought you were pregnant and planned to have an abortion, but, for one reason or another, later found out that you didn't require one? YES____NO____
   DISCUSSION: How many times did this happen? What was the reason?

5. If you (or your girlfriend or wife) became pregnant without specifically wanting to, or planning for it, would you prefer having an abortion to having the unplanned-for child? YES____NO____
   DISCUSSION: Why?

6. Should abortions be legalized throughout the United States? YES____NO____
   DISCUSSION: Why? Medically safer if legalized?

7. Have you (or your girlfriend or wife) ever had an abortion? YES____NO____
   DISCUSSION: How many abortions? Why (i.e., not married)? Post-abortion negative effects?

8. Do you believe that abortions should be performed simply because they always involve the taking of a human life? YES____NO____
   DISCUSSION: Why? Religious reasons?
9. Should there be an O.S.U. contraceptive clinic to make contraceptives available to those who desire them? [YES  NO]
   DISCUSSION: Why? Any age limitations? Would you expect greater sexual activity with contraceptives readily available, or simply greater use of contraceptives?

10. Have you ever had sexual intercourse without some means of protecting against pregnancy? [YES  NO]
    DISCUSSION: Why? What would you do if pregnancy occurred?

11. Should abortions be free to anybody who desires but can't afford one as a population control device, to protect unwanted children, or because of the burden placed on society by unwanted children? [YES  NO]
    DISCUSSION: Because of which reason?

12. Do you prefer female rather than male contraceptives as a means of protecting yourself to the greatest possible degree against unwanted pregnancy? [YES  NO]
    DISCUSSION: Which female contraceptive devices? Are male contraceptives risky? Why?
PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT SEX

1. Have you ever engaged in different forms of sexual behavior such as sexual acts with more than one other person at one time or self-stimulative acts? 
   DISCUSSION: Acts with more than one other person or masturbatory acts, or both? How frequently?  YES NO

2. Do you prefer to have sexual relations with someone prior to considering marriage with them?  YES NO
   DISCUSSION: Why? How many times are necessary?

3. Should "sex-education" courses be offered in public school systems on a mandatory attendance basis?  YES NO
   DISCUSSION: Why? At what age should it be taught? Should it be offered on a voluntary basis?

4. Do you believe that the so-called present sexual revolution is leading to a new set of moral standards which will have NEGATIVE effects on youths?  YES NO
   DISCUSSION: Why? What negative effects?

5. Have you ever contracted venereal disease?  YES NO
   DISCUSSION: How many times? At what age(s)? Contracted from a "lover" or a prostitute?

6. Should different forms of sexual behavior such as masturbation, homosexual acts between willing parties, orgies, etc., be punished?  YES NO
   DISCUSSION: Why? Which acts?

7. Should there be an O.S.U. contraceptive and/or V.D. (venereal disease) clinic for those requiring such services?  YES NO
   DISCUSSION: Why? Any age limitations for either?

8. Have you ever had sexual relations with a member of the SAME sex as your own?  YES NO
   DISCUSSION: How frequently? First occasion was at what age?

9. Do you prefer to have sex without love?  YES NO
   DISCUSSION: Why? Is sex possible without love?

10. Have you ever had sexual relations with a member of the OPPOSITE sex?  YES NO
    DISCUSSION: How frequently? First occasion was at what age?
11. Should society consider alternatives to the traditional institution of marriage, i.e., probationary periods which, if the people involved decide to call it quits, do not result in formal divorces but merely broken relationships? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? Any other alternatives?

12. Do you believe that it is important to marry a virgin? YES NO
DISCUSSION: Why? What about experience?
PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT THE MILITARY DRAFT AND VIETNAM

1. Should the people of our democratic nation be permitted to exercise their right to participate in decisions by voting on Vietnam issues such as the spending of our tax monies to support the war, etc.?  
   YES  NO  
   DISCUSSION: What about "immediate" decisions which have been made: should we be able to reverse these decisions?

2. Do you, or would you, prefer to have your future son(s) forced to serve in a military organization in which they fight and kill and/or maybe get killed?  
   YES  NO  
   DISCUSSION: What alternative would you suggest to your son(s)?

3. Do you, or would you, prefer to leave the country if drafted into the military rather than serve in such an organization?  
   YES  NO  
   DISCUSSION: If yes, is this preference because of the military itself or Vietnam?

4. Have you ever killed or maimed another human being while in the military?  
   YES  NO  
   DISCUSSION: Why? How do you feel about it now? If you haven't, would you?

5. Should American men in Vietnam fight, kill and die because the United States has an obligation to protect the people of South Vietnam?  
   YES  NO  
   DISCUSSION: Why? Are there any other reasons for our men to be in Vietnam, i.e., to help ourselves?

6. Have you ever lied about your beliefs, status, etc., to evade the military draft?  
   YES  NO  
   DISCUSSION: Why? What lies did you tell?

7. Should the United States discontinue its compulsory military draft and change to an all-volunteer Army?  
   YES  NO  
   DISCUSSION: Why? Would enough men volunteer to safeguard national security?

8. Have you ever enlisted in the U.S. Army, Marines, Navy or Air Force knowing that you might have to kill or permanently maim another human being?  
   YES  NO  
   DISCUSSION: Why? Would you join the military in time of need?
9. Do you believe that young men should be FORCED to fight and kill and/or maybe get killed in a war which they don't believe in? YES ___ NO ___
DISCUSSION: Why?

10. Should the United States NOT discontinue its bombing of Vietnam because innocent human beings may be killed or injured? YES ___ NO ___
DISCUSSION: Why? Does the bombing help us?

11. Have you ever organized, or participated in, demonstrations to end the war or the military draft? YES ___ NO ___
DISCUSSION: Why? Were the demonstrations violent?

12. Do you believe that "saving face" by remaining in Vietnam is more important than safeguarding the lives of our fighting men and P.O.W.'s? YES ___ NO ___
DISCUSSION: Why? Is "saving face" the real issue, i.e., what about the fate of South Vietnam or the spread of Communism if we withdraw?
PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT RACISM AND DISCRIMINATION

1. Do you prefer friends who are your "own kind," i.e., not black (white)?
   DISCUSSION: Why?
   YES/NO

2. Should the Federal Government continue the policy of mandatory busing of students in order to achieve racial balances between schools?
   DISCUSSION: Why? Why is racial balance important?
   YES/NO

3. Should campus fraternities and sororities continue searching for more of their "own kind" rather than voluntarily accepting student members of other subgroups of the population?
   DISCUSSION: Why? If you are a fraternity or sorority member, why haven't you accepted these students?
   YES/NO

4. Have you ever discriminated against any human being in any way because he or she was a member of a specific minority group?
   DISCUSSION: Why? Which minority group?
   YES/NO

5. Do you believe that certain minority groups are in any way inferior?
   DISCUSSION: Why? Which minority groups? How are they inferior?
   YES/NO

6. Have you ever felt a strong dislike for any minority group?
   DISCUSSION: Why? Which minority group? How did you overtly express this dislike? Do you think this was "prejudice"?
   YES/NO

7. Should white Americans participate in demonstrations or work in other ways to help insure black equality?
   DISCUSSION: Why? What other ways? Why is white participation important?
   YES/NO

8. Do you believe that people should marry their "own kind" ONLY, i.e., not black (white)?
   DISCUSSION: Why? Because of their children?
   YES/NO

9. Should Federal actions be taken to insure minority subgroups the right of equal opportunity in every aspect of life?
   DISCUSSION: Why? What actions should be taken?
   YES/NO
10. Is it true that you never have or would date a black (white) person? 
   DISCUSSION: Why? If you have, how many times?  
   YES  NO

11. Do you believe that WE should NOT deliberately take action to compensate for past oppression of minority group members by lowering certain traditional "acceptance standards" (i.e., educational) in order to help these people to begin to help themselves? 
   DISCUSSION: Why?  
   YES  NO

12. Is it true that you never have had or would have any close friends who are black (white)? 
   DISCUSSION: Why? If you have, how many?  
   YES  NO
PERSONAL ATTITUDES ABOUT DRUGS

1. Should the possession or use of marijuana be legalized? YES NO
   DISCUSSION: Any age limitations? Why legalized? Expect greater use of the drug after legalization?

2. Do you believe that marijuana is more dangerous to the individual user than alcohol? YES NO

3. Are you in contact with (i.e., do you know) people who sell drugs? YES NO
   DISCUSSION: Which drugs? How do you know these people?

4. Do you believe that there are probable harmful effects associated with the use of drugs? YES NO
   DISCUSSION: Long term? Short term? Which drugs? What effects?

5. Should there be an O.S.U. drug clinic to help drug users who wish to kick the habit or those who are ill from the effects of drugs? YES NO
   DISCUSSION: Help which group? Why?

6. Have you ever taken drugs? YES NO
   DISCUSSION: Which drugs? How often? Why?

7. Are you in contact with (i.e. do you know) people who take drugs? YES NO
   DISCUSSION: Which drugs? How do you know these people?

8. Should drug pushers (sellers) be punished more than they are now (i.e., greater prison sentences)? YES NO
   DISCUSSION: Which drug pushers? Punished how severely? Why?

9. Do you prefer marijuana over alcohol? YES NO
   DISCUSSION: Why?

10. Have you ever dealt in (i.e. sold) drugs? YES NO
    DISCUSSION: Which drugs? With whom? Why?

11. Do you prefer states of euphoria (i.e., "feeling high") achieved through artificial means rather than "natural highs"? YES NO
    DISCUSSION: Why? Which "natural highs"?
12. Should drug users be punished more than they are now (i.e., greater prison sentences)?

YES ___ NO ___

DISCUSSION: Which drug users? Punished how severely? Why?
APPENDIX F
BACKGROUND FORM

SEX (CIRCLE ONE) MALE (1) FEMALE (2)

AGE_______

COLLEGE YEAR (CIRCLE ONE) FRESH (1) SOPH (2) JUNIOR (3) SENIOR (4)

ESTIMATED CUMULATIVE (OVERALL) GRADE-POINT AVERAGE_______

1. In reference to the other members of this group. Check one:
   
   (5) I know two of them well
   (4) I know one of them well
   (3) I know two of them
   (2) I know one of them
   (1) This is my first acquaintance with any of them

2. Do you believe that a major survey of student attitudes is (or can be) important and should be conducted? Check one:

   (2) Yes  (1) No

3. If you were at a racetrack, would you prefer to take a chance and wager $10.00 on a horse at 10-1 odds and POSSIBLY win $100.00, OR would you prefer to wager $10.00 on a horse at even (1-1) odds and almost certainly (not guaranteed) win only $10.00? Check one:

   (3) Prefer to bet on horse at 10-1 odds
   (2) Prefer to bet on horse at 1-1 odds
   (1) Prefer not to bet any money at all

4. Do you usually produce better term papers, etc., when you work alone OR with other classmates, friends, etc.? Check one:

   (1) Produce better when work alone
   (2) Produce better when work with others
5. After graduation, would you prefer a job with a probability of earning an extremely great deal of money ($50,000 per year) knowing that there is an equal probability of earning just about nothing ($2,000 per year) with this job, OR, would you prefer a job with a fixed guaranteed salary ($7,500 per year) and fixed increases over the years ($250 per year increase up to maximum salary of $11,500)? Check one:

(1) Prefer guaranteed salary
(2) Prefer great deal or very little

6. Would you prefer to work on an assigned class project alone OR with other equally competent students in a group? Check one:

(1) Prefer to work alone
(2) Prefer to work with others

7. Would you prefer to spend a quiet evening alone with just your girlfriend (boyfriend), or go to a party with only your closest friends? Check one:

(1) Prefer to be alone with girlfriend (boyfriend)
(2) Prefer to go to party with only closest friends

8. If O.S.U. was to conduct a major survey to determine student attitudes, would you like to participate by serving as an interviewer actually asking questions of students on campus? Check one:

(2) Yes  (1) No

(a) How much of your time would you "donate" in one quarter to the survey? (Circle one)

| 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 |

HOURS

(b) How much financial payment would you expect in return for 10 hours of interviewing students on campus? (Circle one)

| 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 |

DOLLARS($)

(c) What would be your minimum acceptable payment in return for 10 hours of interviewing students on campus? (Circle one)

| 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 |

DOLLARS ($)
APPENDIX G

FEEDBACK FORM: PART I

Below you will find twelve statements regarding the activities of your discussion group. Describe the degree to which each of these statements is true or false by marking the appropriate space on the line below each statement. At one end of the line is the description "Completely True," and at the other end the description "Not at all True." The spaces between these points indicate varying extents to which each statement is true or not true. Respond to the statements by making only one mark for each.

1. Each of us was able to get some of his ideas incorporated in the decisions of our group.

Not at all  True
Completely

2. I was able to participate in the preliminary selection of items.

Not at all  True
Completely

3. The major factor which guided my evaluation or selection of questions to be included in the attitude survey, was the quality of each question.

Not at all  True
Completely

4. I was able to actively discuss my opinions, choices, etc., with the other members of my group.

Not at all  True
Completely

5. The major factor which guided my evaluation or selection of questions to be included in the attitude survey, was the "riskiness" associated with asking the question of another student.

Not at all  True
Completely
6. I was able to play a direct part in the final choice of questions
to be actually asked of students on campus.

Not at all Completely True
(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) True

7. I realize that I will actually be conducting interviews with
students on campus the week of February 21st.

Not at all Completely True
______________________________ True

8. The final choice of questions to be actually asked of students
on campus was based on my group's decisions.

Not at all Completely True
______________________________ True

9. My own decision preferences were generally "risky."

Not at all Completely True
______________________________ True

10. I was able to evaluate the items which were selected on a
preliminary basis.

Not at all Completely True
______________________________ True

11. The final choice of questions to be actually asked of students on
campus was based on my own preferences.

Not at all Completely True
______________________________ True

12. The other members of my group preferred questions which "were
riskier" than I would prefer.

Not at all Completely True
______________________________ True
APPENDIX H

FEEDBACK FORM: PART II

You have 100 points to distribute among the three members of your group and any other "decision-making" groups. These points represent the total amount of influence. You are to distribute these influence-points according to the degree of influence you think each member and any other groups had over the final choices (the final questions chosen to be actually asked of students on campus). For example, if you think you exercised all of the influence, while the two other members of your group, and any other "decision-making" groups, exercised none, you would give yourself 100 and the other members of your group, and any other "decision-making" groups, each zero. You may assign these points in any amounts. However, the sum of the points you assign to I, II, and III must add to 100, and the sum of II (a) and II (b) must add to II. Do not use fractional values. Now, assign these 100 points according to how much influence each person and any other groups had.

POINTS

I. MYSELF

II. THE OTHER TWO MEMBERS OF MY GROUP

II(a) Participant #

II(b) Participant #

III. ANY OTHER "DECISION-MAKING" GROUPS

III. __________

SUM OF I, II, AND III = 100
In this part of the questionnaire, you are to indicate how satisfied you are with several features of the group discussion period you just completed. For each item, mark the appropriate space on the line below that item which indicates the degree of your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the aspect. Read each item carefully and check to see which end of the line represents satisfaction, since this will be different for some items.

For example, the item might read "The room we used." Below this would be:

Completely Dissatisfied: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Completely Satisfied

If you are completely satisfied with the room you would check the last space to the right; if completely dissatisfied, check the extreme left space. Check any one space which best describes your degree of satisfaction with the aspect listed in the item. Reading from left to right in the above example, the spaces would indicate: Completely dissatisfied: Very dissatisfied: Moderately dissatisfied: Slightly dissatisfied: Neutral - not satisfied or dissatisfied: Slightly satisfied: Moderately satisfied: Very satisfied: Completely satisfied. For some items, these spaces will be exactly reversed, with "Completely satisfied" at the far left of the line. Be sure to read each item and look at the ends of the scale before marking the space which best describes your satisfaction with that aspect of the experiment.
1. The decisions reached by our group.

**Completely Satisfied:** (9) : (8) : (7) : (6) : (5) : (4) : (3) : (2) : (1) : Dissatisfied

2. The final questions chosen to be actually asked of students on campus.

**Completely Satisfied:** (9) : (8) : (7) : (6) : (5) : (4) : (3) : (2) : (1) : Dissatisfied

3. The way we went about making a decision.

**Completely Satisfied:** (9) : (8) : (7) : (6) : (5) : (4) : (3) : (2) : (1) : Dissatisfied

4. The task on which we worked.

**Completely Satisfied:** (9) : (8) : (7) : (6) : (5) : (4) : (3) : (2) : (1) : Dissatisfied

5. The relationships between the group members.

**Completely Satisfied:** (9) : (8) : (7) : (6) : (5) : (4) : (3) : (2) : (1) : Dissatisfied

6. My part in the group discussion.

**Completely Satisfied:** (9) : (8) : (7) : (6) : (5) : (4) : (3) : (2) : (1) : Dissatisfied

7. The method of decision-making we used.

**Completely Satisfied:** (9) : (8) : (7) : (6) : (5) : (4) : (3) : (2) : (1) : Dissatisfied

8. The feeling of togetherness between myself and the other members.

**Completely Satisfied:** (9) : (8) : (7) : (6) : (5) : (4) : (3) : (2) : (1) : Dissatisfied
9. The influence I had over the group and its actions.

Completely
Dissatisfied : (1) : (2) : (3) : (4) : (5) : (6) : (7) : (8) : (9) : Satisfied

10. The accomplishments of our group.

Completely
Satisfied : (9) : (8) : (7) : (6) : (5) : (4) : (3) : (2) : (1) : Dissatisfied

11. My own contribution to the outcome of our discussion.

Completely
Satisfied : (9) : (8) : (7) : (6) : (5) : (4) : (3) : (2) : (1) : Dissatisfied

12. The whole experimental session, in general.

Completely
Dissatisfied : (1) : (2) : (3) : (4) : (5) : (6) : (7) : (8) : (9) : Satisfied
APPENDIX J

FEEDBACK FORM: PART IV

1. Do you believe that a major survey of student attitudes is (or can be) important and should be conducted? Check one:

(2) Yes (1) No

2. If O.S.U. decides to conduct another survey next quarter, would you like to participate by serving as an interviewer actually asking questions of students on campus? Check one:

(2) Yes (1) No

(a) How much of your time would you "donate" in one quarter to the survey? (Circle one)

| 0 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

HOURS

(b) How much financial payment would you expect in return for 10 hours of interviewing students on campus? (Circle one)

| 0 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

DOLLARS ($)

(c) What would be your minimum acceptable payment in return for 10 hours of interviewing students on campus? (Circle one)

| 0 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

DOLLARS($)

3. If O.S.U. decides to conduct another survey next quarter, would you like to participate in these decision-making groups again? Check one:

(2) Yes (1) No
APPENDIX K

EVALUATION FORM

Evaluate each of the following 18 items (3 topics with 6 items for each) by placing a checkmark above the one____, for each set of opposing descriptions, which best places the item along each descriptive continuum (i.e., there should be a total of three checkmarks for each item).

(I) **TOPIC** - - - - -

(a) Item # - - - - -

extremely relevant (+2): (+1): (-1): (-2): not at all relevant
extremely important (+2): (+1): (-1): (-2): not at all important
extremely informative (+2): (+1): (-1): (-2): not at all informative

(b) Item #

extremely relevant ___: ___: ___: ___: not at all relevant
extremely important ___: ___: ___: ___: not at all important
extremely informative ___: ___: ___: ___: not at all informative

(c) Item #

extremely relevant ___: ___: ___: ___: not at all relevant
extremely important ___: ___: ___: ___: not at all important
extremely informative ___: ___: ___: ___: not at all informative

(d) Item #

extremely relevant ___: ___: ___: ___: not at all relevant
extremely important ___: ___: ___: ___: not at all important
extremely informative ___: ___: ___: ___: not at all informative

(e) Item #

extremely relevant ___: ___: ___: ___: not at all relevant
extremely important ___: ___: ___: ___: not at all important
extremely informative ___: ___: ___: ___: not at all informative

(f) Item #

extremely relevant ___: ___: ___: ___: not at all relevant
extremely important ___: ___: ___: ___: not at all important
extremely informative ___: ___: ___: ___: not at all informative
APPENDIX L

FINAL CHOICE FORM

Choose 2 topics with 3 items for each. These are the actual questions to be presented to students on campus.

(I) TOPIC_____________________

(a) Item #_____________________
(b) Item #_____________________
(c) Item #_____________________

(II) TOPIC_____________________

(a) Item #_____________________
(b) Item #_____________________
(c) Item #_____________________
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