THE EFFECTS OF INFORMATION ON THE ASSESSMENT OF ATTITUDES BY
AUTHORITARIANS AND NONAUTHORITARIANS

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the
Graduate School of The Ohio State
University

By

Milton Edward Lipetz, B.A., M.A.

The Ohio State University
1958

Approved by:

Adviser
Department of Psychology

To
Marilyn

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude and indebtedness to Dr. Alvin Scodel for his encouragement and stimulating criticisms during the entire course of this work.

My appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Julian B. Rotter for his helpful suggestions both before and after the study was completed, to Dr. Lauren G. Wispe for his reading of the manuscript, and to Dr. Philburn Ratoosh for his time in discussing the statistical analyses.

Many thanks are due Mr. Leroy H. Ford, Jr., Mr. Richard Fulk, Mr. Gary E. Galbraith, and Mr. Kenneth B. Holden for their cooperation in making the role recordings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. Introduction.	1
II. Review of the Literature	5
III. Hypotheses	11
IV. Method	15
V. Results	19
VI. Discussion	35
VII. Summary and Conclusions	41
Appendix	
A	44
B	61
C	66
D	70
E	75
Bibliography	80
Autobiography	84

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Estimated Mean Scores of High Role and Low Role. .	20
2. Estimated Mean Difference Scores between High Role and Low Role	22
3. Estimated Mean Scores of High F Subjects and Low F Subjects	24
4. Estimated Means of Information Session I and Information Session II	25
5. Amount of Improvement in Estimated Mean Scores after Information Session II Relative to Possible Improvement after Information Session I	26
6. Median Test of Self-Rankings of Values between High and Low Groups	27
7. Mean of Sum of Differences between Self-Rankings of Values and Rankings of Values for Recordings. .	29
8. Mean of Absolute Differences between Self Height and Estimated Height (in inches)	31
9. Mean of Absolute Differences between the Cube Root of Self Weight and Cube Root of Estimated Weight .	33
10. Correlations of O.S.P.E., Predicted F Score- Information Session I, and Self F Score	76
11. Homogeneity of Variance between Recordings	77
12. Analysis of Variance of Differences among Records within Roles	78

13. Median Test of Value Discrepancies Attributed to High and Low Roles by Low F Subjects	79
--	----

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In recent years the California F Scale of Adorno et al. (1) has stimulated considerable research. Evidence for the proliferation of studies in this area is provided by the summary article of Titus and Hollander (26). Attempts have been made to relate authoritarianism to such varied topics as prejudice, political attitudes, family ideology, teacher attitudes, social perception, rigidity, neuroticism, leadership, and group behavior. Of direct concern in this study is the area of social perception and, in particular, the work stemming from the study by Scodel and Mussen (25). In order to test the hypothesis that "...authoritarians, because of their lack of insight into others and their need to consider themselves members of the ingroup, would perceive nonauthoritarian peers to have attitudes and personality characteristics similar to their own" (25, p. 184), these authors had 27 pairs of subjects, each pair consisting of an authoritarian and a nonauthoritarian as defined by F scores, discuss the neutral topics of radio, television and movies. It was found that authoritarians (high F subjects) perceived nonauthoritarians (low F subjects) as authoritarians. Low F subjects, however, judged high F subjects as higher than themselves but lower

than the high F subjects actually were. The hypothesis was supported. Following a suggestion by Crutchfield (8) that nonauthoritarians may have the stereotype that others are more authoritarian than themselves, Scodel and Freedman (24) paired high F subjects with high F subjects and low F subjects with low F subjects. It was thought that the reactions of low F subjects, because of a lesser need to perceive similarity, would be more highly individualized and more objective. The results tended to support Crutchfield's hypothesis, with low F subjects' attributing middle scores to their low F partners. This finding combined with that obtained from the pairing of low F subjects with high F subjects in the Scodel and Mussen study (25) reveals a tendency for low F subjects to attribute middle scores to others regardless of the others' self-scorings. High F subjects continued to perceive others as high, which in this instance led to accurate prediction.

In a replication of the Scodel-Mussen and Scodel-Freedman studies, Crockett and Meidinger (7) found that the mean estimate by high F subjects was similar to the mean of their own scores regardless of their partner's actual position on the F scale. For low F subjects, the mean of the estimates was significantly higher than the mean of the low F subjects' own scores, regardless of their partners' actual positions. These findings closely replicate those previously obtained. The authors also noted that there was much greater variability in the estimates by low F subjects.

Rabinowitz (21) had subjects predict F scale responses as a "typical" member of their college group would respond to them and found that subjects estimate higher F scale scores for the typical college student than they themselves possess. This tendency is more marked among nonauthoritarians. Again, the greater variability of the nonauthoritarians is found.

In an attempt to interpret their results, Scodel and Freedman (24) proposed, among others, the following explanation.

Conceivably many persons are reluctant to make judgments of others in the absence of detailed information, even though cues for the making of such judgments are available. Many lows may prefer to err on the side of caution, and the safest guess under such circumstances is to place the person at or near the mean of whatever is being judged (24, p. 94).

The greater variability of the low F subjects could be a reflection of their uncertainty. In previous studies the topics discussed by the subjects were relatively innocuous. Without relevant information it is quite possible that many low F subjects, in effect, "reserved judgment." The present study was concerned with the effects of direct and relevant information on the social perceptions of authoritarians and nonauthoritarians. If, in fact, high F subjects are governed by a "same-stereotype," whereas low F subjects are not characterized by stereotyped thinking when given a relevant basis for judgment, then the supplying of relevant

information should result in significantly greater accuracy for the nonauthoritarian than for the authoritarian group. An attempt was made to put this hypothesis to test.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature contains some slight evidence bearing on the utilization of information by authoritarians and non-authoritarians. Juul (16) hypothesized that

many of the concepts and attitudes expressed by teachers and textbooks in courses in child psychology and mental hygiene constitute a serious threat to the equilibrium of the inner world of the authoritarian individual. In organizing his experiences, he is therefore forced to exclude, distort, repress or otherwise fit every situation, event, and person into his framework and need structure (16, p. 17).

The author found a negative correlation between F scale scores and scores on an inventory called "How I Teach." He further found that authoritarian students earned lower scores than nonauthoritarian students on a test of knowledge of child psychology, teaching attitudes, and opinion teaching practices. This suggests that authoritarians do not benefit from information that is contrary to held beliefs. They either distort it to fit previously held concepts or forget it.

Another study of some relevance is that by Kogan (18). By using noise-masked sentences, he found F scores significantly related to the perception of sentences in both sexual and aggressive areas, with the more authoritarian men demonstrating poorer recognition accuracy. Again, relevant information was distorted more by authoritarians than by nonauthoritarians.

Rosen (22) has demonstrated that volunteers evidence significantly lower scores on the F scale than do non-volunteers. Furthermore, volunteers take a significantly longer time to complete his questionnaire. A possible interpretation of this finding is that low F scale subjects are more evaluative.

Before proceeding with a discussion of the hypothesis testing, two variables seem to merit analysis. One of these is acquiescence, a concept that has received much attention in the literature (2,3,6,12,14,15,19,20). Since all F scale items are worded in one direction, so that agreement always constitutes the "authoritarian" response, some have argued that the scale is contaminated with a response set to acquiesce. Bass hypothesized that "...performance on the F scale has less to do with content validity of the items than with the response set to acquiesce to any generalizations about social issues--authoritarian or equalitarian" (2, p. 616). He constructed two scales, each composed of half new items (opposites of the originals) and half original items. A greater tendency toward acquiescence was found as the items became more ambivalent. Furthermore, a factor analysis indicated that about three-fourths of the reliable variance of the F scale could be accounted for in terms of this response set. Although a subsequent reanalysis of the data (20) revealed that too much variance had been attributed to

acquiescence because of a computational error, acquiescence still remained an important factor.

Cohn (6) found that the F scale significantly correlated with the number of times an individual responded "true" to 33 MMPI items that were presumably innocuous ($r=+.41$). Another study (15) found a correlation of $+.35$ between agreement with the original and reversed F scale items.

Leavitt, Hax, and Roche (19) reversed half the items on the F scale and found that low scoring people scored about the same as when items were not reversed, but negative wording reduced the scores of high scoring people. Replies shifted in such a way that it became apparent that part of authoritarianism consisted of agreement with a strong positive statement. This seems to indicate that the acquiescence phenomenon is not found to the same degree in all people but, rather, is much stronger for those with high F scores; i.e., acquiescence is part of the authoritarian syndrome.

Chapman and Campbell (3), using a different measure of acquiescence, found a correlation between it and the F scale of $+.43$, between it and the F scale reversed of $-.06$ and a correlation of $+.32$ between it and the total of the oppositely worded scales combined. One would expect the magnitude of correlation to be as high for the reversed F scale as for the F scale although with the opposite sign. It therefore seems necessary to consider that acquiescence variance is correlated positively with the item-content variance of the F scale.

Evidence for this is the correlation of $+0.32$ between the pure acquiescence measure and the total F measure in which acquiescence is presumably canceled out by the combination of items worded in both directions. It appears that here, too, there is evidence that acquiescence is part of the authoritarian syndrome.

Gage, Leavitt, and Stone (12) directed their paper against the argument that the California F scale and similar inventories have their validity lowered by their loading with acquiescence set. In a corroborative study these authors obtained data which supported previous findings concerning the acquiescence set's internal consistency, generality, and effect on test intercorrelations. It is their interpretation of the result that differs. (Part of the corroborative study revealed that most of Cohn's (6) 33 items when answered "true" constituted an unfavorable self-description.) Rather than saying that acquiescence is psychologically irrelevant to the authoritarian attitude measured by the F scale and, hence, contaminates findings attributable to the content of the F scale, these authors adopted the position that acquiescence is part of the authoritarian attitude. They proceeded to test the hypothesis that negative items (items stated so as to express the authoritarian viewpoint) have greater validity than positive items for the measurement of authoritarianism. When both item content and acquiescence are considered, only negative items have unequivocal meaning for authoritarianism.

By using an external criterion of authoritarianism unconfounded with the subject's acquiescence, they found that negative items were more valid than positive items. In view of the above discussion, the retention of the F scale items in their original form for the present study seemed warranted. It is possible that the relationship between authoritarianism and acquiescence holds only for paper and pencil tasks of the F scale type, for in a study by Scodel and Austrin (23) it was shown that high F subjects, when asked to point out from a large group of photographs those men who were businessmen, gave significantly fewer affirmative responses than low F subjects.

The other variable that will be discussed is that of intelligence. In the original work by Adorno et al. (1, pp. 282 & 283) correlations of $-.20$ and $-.48$ were obtained between the F scale and the AGCT and Otis respectively. Christie (4) found a correlation of $-.48$ with army recruits between the F scale and a test called Aptitude Area I. Other studies, too, have found negative correlations between the F scale and various measures of intelligence and scholastic average (5,9,10,11,13). It also seems probable that a more intelligent individual would be better able to utilize information, to perceive stimuli, and to make discriminations. Intelligence tests such as the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, the Stanford-Binet, and the Grace Arthur tap these abilities. Furthermore, Kerrick (17) has shown that intelligence relates

significantly to discrimination. Subjects in the lowest IQ quartile as measured by an Otis IQ used extreme scale values of +3 and -3 on a seven-scale rating much more than subjects in the highest IQ quartile. High IQ subjects made much more use of the whole scale.

It therefore seems possible that results which indicate that relevant information adds more accuracy to the social perception of lows than highs may be contaminated by the intelligence factor. Hence, the Ohio State Psychological Examination (O.S.P.E.) will be used to investigate a possible difference in intelligence between the high and low F scale groups in this study. If a significant difference is found, the size of the relationship will be determined. If, after other related variables are partialled out, the correlation is significant, then two groups equated for intelligence, taking into account regression effects, will be selected and subjected to the various analyses.

CHAPTER III

HYPOTHESES

In order to test the main hypothesis that given relevant information, low F scale subjects become more accurate in predicting the F scale scores of others than high F scale subjects, the two extremes of a F scale distribution for university students were chosen. Relevant information was supplied through the use of mock interview recordings, the content of which was derived from the theoretical clusters stated in Adorno et al.(1,p.255). All the information that comprised the high F role was consistent with these clusters, whereas none of the information that comprised the low F role was consistent with these same clusters. An attempt was made to cover all clusters, but in the absence of empirical data there was necessarily some subjectivity involved in determining the comprehensiveness of each role. To obtain a more representative design, four recordings of each role were made with variations in respondents and spontaneous and nonrelevant comments. (Examples of recordings for the high and low roles can be found in Appendix A.) It was not believed that the recordings for any one role differed among themselves with respect to relevant information. This assumption was easily checked by a subsequent analysis of the data for the various recordings within each role. The recordings were played in two sections, hereafter designated as information session I

and information session II. Any one subject was exposed to only one of the eight recordings. Each of the recordings was heard by an equal number of subjects, half of whom were high F scale subjects and half low F scale subjects. The subjects were requested to fill out the F scale for the person on the recording, following information session I and then again following information session II. In this way the high and low F scale groups were compared for accuracy of prediction following two quantities of relevant information. By appropriate analysis, the hypothesis that there is no difference in predicted F scale scores between the high F role and low F role for high F scale subjects after information sessions I or II was tested. So, too, was the hypothesis that higher F scale scores are given high F role recordings than low F role recordings by low F scale subjects after both information sessions I and II. If the criterion of "no difference versus difference" proved too stringent, an analysis of the data would be made for the hypothesis that the algebraic difference between high F role and low F role is greater for low F scale subjects than for high F scale subjects after both information sessions I and II. This analysis might be especially necessary following information session II. It was recognized that the amount of information revealed by that time might have been so great as to lead to differences, so that high F recordings were given higher F scale scores than low F role recordings by high F scale subjects.

As a further part of this study the following question was posed: If high F scale subjects perceive others to be like themselves on the F scale despite contrary information, whereas low F scale subjects do not behave in this way, would measures other than the F scale reflect the same phenomenon? A scale of values seemed like an appropriate measure. The information offered the subjects would have some relevance for the values held by the respondents on the recordings although the information would be less pertinent to values than the F scale items for which the information was designed. A group of six values that seemed satisfactory for this purpose was found in a paper by Wertheimer (28). These can be found in Appendix B. Subjects were requested to rank-order the values according to their own feelings before the interviews were played. Then, following each prediction of F scale responses, they were asked to rank-order the values according to how important they felt the values were to the person on the recording. It was hypothesized that low F scale subjects differentiate others from themselves where appropriate, in their rank-ordering of values, whereas high F scale subjects do not. The data were also analyzed to determine whether high F and low F scale subjects can be differentiated by any of the values with respect to their self-rankings of the values.

Finally, would the need for high F scale subjects to perceive others like themselves be so great as to affect variables where no relevant information was available? More

specifically, would high F scale subjects judge the height and weight of the person on the recording more similar to their own than would low F scale subjects? This was tested by analyzing differences between the actual height and weight of those judging and the judged height and weight for the two groups of subjects after each information session. The question was exploratory and no hypothesis was ventured. The formal statements of the hypotheses follow:

1. There is no difference in predicted F scale scores between the high role and the low role for high F scale subjects after either information session I or II.
2. Higher F scale scores are given the high role than the low role by low F scale subjects after both information sessions I and II.

Should the above hypotheses prove too stringent:

3. The algebraic difference between high role and low role is greater for low F scale subjects than for high F scale subjects after both information sessions I and II.
4. There is no difference in the discrepancy scores between self-values and predicted values between high role and low role for high F scale subjects following either information session I or II.
5. The discrepancy score between self-values and predicted values for low F scale subjects is greater for the high role than the low role following both information sessions I and II.

CHAPTER IV

METHOD

Subjects:

The California F scale was administered to 358 male students enrolled in an introductory psychology course at The Ohio State University. The completed forms of 28 items were scored as in the Scodel-Mussen study (a constant of four was added to each response) and the top and bottom 20 per cent of the entire group was designated as eligible to participate in this study. The lower limit for the high F scale group was a score of 121, whereas the upper limit for the low F scale group was a score of 85. Ninety-six male subjects, 48 in the high group and 48 in the low group, participated in the experiment proper. No restrictions were placed on the sample with respect to such factors as age, race, or religious affiliation.

Test materials:

The materials used in this study were 28 items of the form 40-45 California F scale (see Appendix B), the six values of Wertheimer's study typed separately on 3 x 5 cards (Appendix B), and eight tape recordings, four of each role. The four persons who served as respondents in the high recordings also served as respondents in the low role recordings. (For a sample of each role see Appendix A.) Subjects responded to the F scale by placing a +3 next to

the item if there was strong agreement, +2 for moderate agreement, +1 for mild agreement, -1 for mild disagreement, -2 for moderate disagreement, and -3 for strong disagreement. Hence, by adding a constant of 4, scores could range from 28 to 196. The subject's height and weight were also obtained. The six values were handled through a rank-ordering procedure. These values are Approval (A), Authoritarianism (F), Hedonism (H), Integrity (I), Other-direction (O) and Status (S). Whether or not the value statements were given the best possible titles may be questioned, but since they were taken in entirety from the Wertheimer article it was felt that the original titles should be retained.

Procedure:

The subjects participated in the experiment in groups up to seven. Certain subjects because of scheduling difficulties were seen individually. After the group which attended any particular session had assembled, they were informed that they had been selected to participate in a study investigating the value of recordings for determining the nature of social interactions. They were asked to withhold any questions until the end of the experiment and not to communicate with one another in any manner. The experimenter was present to see that these directions were followed. The cards containing the values were then passed out and the subjects were requested to rank-order them in accord with their own feelings. A

form was provided on which these rankings were noted. (The subjects' F scale scores had, of course, been already obtained.) One of the recordings was then played to a point that has been designated as information session I. (The recordings were used in a varied order, but as the remaining number of subjects needed became smaller, the nature of the group present and the number of high F scale subjects and low F scale subjects, still needed to reach the required number for each record, dictated the choice of the recording used.) The subjects then filled out the F scale the way they thought the person on the recording might have filled it out for himself. Then the values were ranked for the person on the recording and finally estimates of the height and weight of the person on the recording were obtained. The recording was then played from the end of information session I to the end of information session II, which was the end of the interview. The information presented during the second session was stronger and more direct than that presented during the first session. Subjects again filled out the F scale, ranked the values, and judged the height and weight for the person on the recording.

Questions of the subjects were answered and the subjects were requested not to discuss the experiment, since other people were to participate. The entire procedure was completed within one hour. The verbatim instructions are in Appendix C.

In summary, 96 subjects participated in the experiment. There were 48 F scale highs and 48 lows. Twenty-four highs listened to a high recording and 24 highs listened to a low recording. There were eight records with four different respondents. The four persons who served as respondents in the high recordings also served as respondents in the low recordings. Six subjects listened to each recording. The same procedure was followed for the low group.

At the beginning of the experimental session each subject ranked the six values for himself. He had previously given his height and weight when he took the F scale for himself. Following information sessions I and II the subject estimated the F scale responses, the ranking of values and the height and weight of the person who was being interviewed on the recording.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

Intelligence and F Score Predictions

A comparison of mean O.S.P.E. scores for high and low F scale subjects yielded a t test value of 4.62 ($p < .001$). Low F scale subjects had a mean O.S.P.E. score of 69.30, whereas high F scale subjects had a lower mean of 40.77. Since the groups differed significantly in intelligence, intercorrelations among O.S.P.E., predicted F score for information session I, and self F score were calculated (Appendix E). A correlation between O.S.P.E. and predicted F score for the high role yielded a value of $-.06$. However, a correlation between O.S.P.E. and predicted F score for the low role resulted in a value of $-.35$ ($p < .05$). Therefore a partial correlation was computed between O.S.P.E. and predicted F score for the low role with the effects of predicted F score and self F score, and O.S.P.E. and self F score partialled out. This resulted in a partial correlation value of $-.12$. It appears that intelligence is not a crucial factor for the prediction of F scores of other people.

Analysis of Variance of Differences among Records within Roles

Before proceeding with an analysis of variance, a test for homogeneity of variance between recordings was done (see Appendix E). Out of 48 possible F ratios three were significant at the .05 level of confidence. Since two significant F ratios could be expected on the basis of chance, it is assumed that heterogeneity of variance was not established.

An analysis of variance of differences among records within each role resulted in F ratios whose values failed to reach the .05 level of significance (see Appendix E). Data from the four recordings within each role were therefore combined and statistically analyzed as a unit in further computations.

Estimated Mean Scores of High Role and Low Role

The estimated mean scores of the high role and the low role are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Estimated Mean Scores of High Role and Low Role

Role on Record	Subject Group	Information Session	N	Mean	Sigma	t	d.f.*	p
High	Total	I	48	155.1	12.60			
Low	Total	I	48	110.8	21.43	12.38	77	<.001
High	Total	II	48	168.4	12.37			
Low	Total	II	48	103.0	12.81	18.17	74	<.001
High	High	I	24	157.7	11.94			
Low	High	I	24	123.6	12.67	9.39		<.001
High	High	II	24	167.8	11.64			
Low	High	II	24	117.8	12.94	13.77		<.001
High	Low	I	24	152.4	12.69			
Low	Low	I	24	98.0	20.79	10.73	39	<.001
High	Low	II	24	168.9	13.04			
Low	Low	II	24	88.3	18.67	16.97	43	<.001

* Degrees of freedom equal $N_1 + N_2 - 2$. Where variances are unequal (from Walker and Lev 27, p. 158)

$$d.f. = \frac{n(\frac{s_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{N_2})^2}{\frac{(\frac{s_1^2}{N_1})^2}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_1+1} + \frac{(\frac{s_2^2}{N_2})^2}{N_2} + \frac{1}{N_2+1}} - 2$$

In order to verify the assumption that the high role recordings would be perceived as higher than the low role recordings, the roles were compared for the total subject group for each information session. A t test yielded values of 12.36 and 18.17 ($p < .001$) for information sessions I and II respectively. Clearly, the high role was differentiated from the low role by all subjects.

A comparison of high F subjects judging the high role and high F subjects judging the low role yielded a t test value of 9.39 ($p < .001$) for information session I, and a t test value of 13.77 ($p < .001$) for information session II. In both cases the high role was accurately perceived as higher than the low role which indicates that high F scale subjects are able to differentiate between high and low roles when given sufficient information. While this was not the predicted finding, the possibility of such results had been foreseen. A similar comparison for low F subjects yields a t test value of 10.73 ($p < .001$) for information I, and a value of 16.97 ($p < .001$) for information II, with the high role accurately perceived as higher than the low role. Hence, hypothesis 1 must be rejected, whereas hypothesis 2 is supported.

Estimated Mean Difference Scores between High Role and Low Role

In the event that both high and low F subjects differentiated between the two roles, hypothesis 3 was formulated.

This hypothesis stated that the algebraic difference between high role and low role is greater for low F subjects than for high F subjects after both information sessions I and II. The results of this comparison are presented in Table 2.

The mean difference between the high role prediction and the low role prediction for high F subjects was compared with that for low F subjects. A t test value of 3.25 ($p < .01$) was obtained for information session I. Following information session II, a t test yields a value of 5.12 ($p < .001$). In both instances the low F subjects perceived greater differentiation between the two roles. Hypothesis 3 is supported.

Table 2
Estimated Mean Difference Scores between
High Role and Low Role

Role on Record	Subject Group	Inf. Session	N	Mean Diff.	σ diff.	t	d.f.	p
High-Low	High	I	24	34.1	3.63	3.25		<.01
High-Low	Low	I	24	54.4	5.07			
High-Low	High	II	24	50.0	3.63	5.12		<.001
High-Low	Low	II	24	80.6	4.75			

Comparison of Mean Scores for High Subjects and Low Subjects

The comparison of the two roles within a group have been discussed. The comparison of the two groups within a role will follow. In Table 3 the estimated mean scores of high F subjects and low F subjects are presented.

High F subjects and low F subjects do not differ significantly in their predictions of high role recordings following information session I ($t=1.46$). On low role recordings, however, low F subjects perceive the role as significantly lower than do high F subjects following information session I. A t test yields the value of 5.05 ($p<.001$). The difference between high and low F subjects' predictions for the low role is significantly greater than that for the high role. A t test yields the value of 3.25 ($p<.01$). Similar results obtain for the same comparisons following information session II. High and low F subjects do not differ in their predictions of the high role ($t=.30$), whereas a t test between the estimated means of high F subjects and low F subjects for the low role yields a value of 6.24 ($p<.001$). The difference between high and low F subjects' predictions for the low role is significantly greater than that for the high role following information session II. A t test produces the value of 4.75 ($p<.001$). These findings indicate that following both information sessions, low F subjects more accurately perceive the low role than do high F subjects. The two groups of subjects do not differ in their perceptions of the High role. These results are in concordance with the general predictions made.

Table 3

Estimated Mean Scores of High F Subjects and Low F Subjects

Role on Record	Subject Group	Inf. Session	N	Mean	Sigma	t	d.f.	p
High	High	I	24	157.7	11.94	1.46		--
High	Low	I	24	152.4	12.69			
Low	High	I	24	123.6	12.67	5.05	39	<.001
Low	Low	I	24	98.0	20.79			
High	High-Low	I	24	5.3	3.63	3.25	43	<.01**
Low	High-Low	I	24	25.6	5.07			
High	High	II	24	167.8	11.64	.30		--
High	Low	II	24	168.9	13.04			
Low	High	II	24	117.8	12.94	6.24	35	<.001
Low	Low	II	24	88.3	18.67			
High	High-Low	II	24	1.1	3.65	4.75		<.001**
Low	High-Low	II	24	29.5	4.73			

** As in Table 2 these two tests represent a difference between differences.

Estimated Means of Information Session I and Information Session II

The estimated means of information session I and information session II are presented in Table 4.

A comparison of information session I and information session II for high F subjects who judged the high role reveals that predictions are significantly more accurate following information session II. A t test yields the value of 2.90 ($p < .01$). For the low role, high F subjects are not significantly more accurate after information session II ($t = 1.53$). Similar results were obtained for low

Table 4
Estimated Means of Information Session I and
Information Session II

Role on Record	Subject Group	Inf. Session	N	Mean	Sigma	t	d.f.	p
High	High	I	24	157.7	11.94	2.90		<.01
High	High	II	24	167.8	11.64			
Low	High	I	24	123.6	12.67	1.53		--
Low	High	II	24	117.8	12.94			
High	Low	I	24	152.4	12.69	4.35		<.001
High	Low	II	24	168.9	13.04			
Low	Low	I	24	98.0	20.79	1.67		--
Low	Low	II	24	88.3	18.67			

F subjects. The high role is perceived more accurately after information session II than after information session I. The t test value is 4.35 ($p < .001$). Low F subjects, like high F subjects, do not judge the low role significantly lower following information session II ($t = 1.67$). The predictions of both groups of subjects for the low role are more accurate following information session II than after information session I, but not significantly so. These results are somewhat unexpected. It would have been predicted that low F subjects would show greater accuracy after information session II than after information session I with both roles. High F subjects would not have been expected to benefit from the additional information with either role.

The Amount of Improvement in Estimated Mean Scores after
Information Session II Relative to the Amount of Possible
Improvement after Information Session I

The amount of improvement in estimated mean scores after information session II relative to the amount of possible improvement after information session I is presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Amount of Improvement in Estimated Mean Scores after
Information Session II Relative to Possible Improvement
after Information Session I

Role on Record	Subject Group	Inf. Session	N	Mean	Sigma	t	d.f.	p
High	High	II-I	24	27.0	16.20	2.14		<.05
High	Low	II-I	24	38.3	19.44			
Low	High	II-I	24	4.8	16.73	1.07		--
Low	Low	II-I	24	10.8	21.20			

Some explanation of these comparisons may be warranted. The highest prediction one could make for the high role was a score of 196. The lowest prediction one could offer for the low role was a score of 28. The more accurate a prediction was after information session I, the less it could be improved after information session II because of these set limits. To remove this inequity, improvement was rated relative to the possible improvement that could have occurred between the end of information session I and the end of

information session II. Improvement was greater for low F subjects than for high F subjects for the high role. A t test value of 2.14 ($p < .05$) was obtained. Improvement on the low role was not significantly greater for low F subjects than for high F subjects ($t = 1.07$). It would have been predicted that low F subjects would have shown significantly greater improvement than high F subjects for both roles.

Self-Rankings of Values

The median tests of self-rankings of values between high and low F groups are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Median Test of Self-Rankings of Values between

High and Low Groups

Value	Subject Group	1st	2nd	Chi-square	p
Hedonism	High	10	38	.89	--
	Low	14	34		
Integrity	High	12	36	7.43	<.01
	Low	25	23		
Other-Direction	High	41	7	.08	--
	Low	40	8		
Authoritarianism	High	34	14	7.19	<.01
	Low	21	27		
Approval	High	20	28	.17	--
	Low	18	30		
Status	High	27	21	.04	--
	Low	26	22		

The numbers in the cells refer to the frequency with which a value ascribed to the self was placed among the

first three values and the second three values by high and low F scale subjects. The chi-square test applied to the obtained frequencies for Integrity (I) yields a chi-square value of 7.43 which is significant ($p < .01$) and indicates that as a group, low F subjects rank Integrity higher than do high F subjects. The chi-square test for Authoritarianism (F) yields a chi-square value of 7.19, which is significant ($p < .01$) and indicates that high F subjects rank authoritarianism higher than do low F subjects. The remaining four chi-square values do not approach significance.

Mean of the Sum of Differences between Self-Rankings of Values and Ranking of Values for the Recordings

The means of the sum of the differences between self-rankings of values and rankings of values for the recordings are presented in Table 7.

Perhaps some comment on this procedure is in order. The sum of the differences between self-rankings and rankings of the recording for any individual has a possible range of 0-18. If an individual ranked the values for himself H,I,O,F,A,S and ranked the values for the recording I,F,H,O,S,A, the sum of the differences would be 8 ($2+1+1+2+1+1$). Another example would be that of the person who ranked the values for himself, I,S,O,A,H,F and ranked the values for the recording F,I,H,A,O,S. In this case the sum of the differences is 14 ($1+4+2+0+2+5$).

Table 7

Mean of Sum of Differences between Self-Rankings of Values
and Ranking of Values for Recordings

Role on Record	Subject Group	Inf. Session	N	Mean	Sigma	t	d.f.	p
High	High	I	24	8.0	4.04	4.85	36	<.001
High	Low	I	24	12.8	2.44			
Low	High	I	24	10.1	4.98	.51		--
Low	Low	I	24	9.4	3.76			
High	High	I	24	8.0	4.04	1.55		--
Low	High	I	24	10.1	4.98			
High	Low	I	24	12.8	2.44	3.58	40	<.001
Low	Low	I	24	9.4	3.76			
High	High	II	24	9.6	4.16	4.00	38	<.001
High	Low	II	24	13.6	2.38			
Low	High	II	24	8.0	3.74	.55		--
Low	Low	II	24	8.7	4.42			
High	High	II	24	9.6	4.16	1.35		--
Low	High	II	24	8.0	3.74			
High	Low	II	24	13.6	2.38	4.68	37	<.001
Low	Low	II	24	8.7	4.42			

A t test between high F subjects and low F subjects for the high role after information session I yields a value of 4.85 ($p < .001$). This indicates that low F subjects see a greater discrepancy between their own values and those of the high role than do high F subjects.

A t test between high F subjects and low F subjects for the low role after information session I yields a value of .51 which is not significant.

A t test between high and low roles after information session I for high F subjects yields a value of 1.55, which is not significant. High F subjects do not discriminate between ascribed values for the high and low roles. A t test between high and low roles after information session I for low F subjects yields a value of 3.58 ($p < .001$). This reveals that low F subjects see a greater discrepancy between self-values and the values of high roles than between self-values and values ascribed to the low role.

The results for the identical comparisons following information session II are similar. Low F subjects judge the high role as more discrepant than do the high F subjects. A t test value of 4.00 ($p < .001$) is obtained. High and low F subjects do not differ in discrepancy scores for the low role ($t = .55$). High F subjects do not differentiate between high and low roles ($t = 1.35$). Low F subjects judge the high role as more discrepant from their own values than they do the low role. A t test yields a value of 4.68 ($p < .001$).

All these findings are consistent with the predictions, and hypotheses 4 and 5 are supported. It might be noted in passing that the differences in values attributed to the high and low roles by the low F subjects were attributable largely to four of the six values - Other-direction, Hedonism, Authoritarianism, and Integrity. For the other two values, Approval and Status, discrepancies between self-rankings and rankings of others were not significantly

different for the two roles. The chi-square values for the discrepancies between roles are presented in Appendix E.

Self Height and Estimated Height

The means of the absolute differences between self-height and estimated height are presented in Table 8. It should be noted that high and low F subjects did not differ with respect to self height ($t=.31$).

Table 8

Mean of Absolute Differences between Self Height and
Estimated Height (in inches)

Role on Record	Subject Group	Inf. Session	N	Mean	Sigma	t	d.f.	p
High	High	I	24	2.4	2.14	.91	43	--
High	Low	I	24	3.1	3.33			
Low	High	I	24	2.6	1.95	1.04		--
Low	Low	I	24	2.0	1.86			
High	High	I	24	2.4	2.14	.32		--
Low	High	I	24	2.6	1.95			
High	Low	I	24	3.1	3.33	1.38	38	--
Low	Low	I	24	2.0	1.86			
High	High	II	24	3.0	2.19	1.39		--
High	Low	II	24	4.0	2.71			
Low	High	II	24	2.2	1.59	.15		--
Low	Low	II	24	2.3	1.97			
High	High	II	24	3.0	2.19	1.25		--
Low	High	II	24	2.3	1.59			
High	Low	II	24	4.0	2.71	2.36		4.05
Low	Low	II	24	2.3	1.97			

Of the various analyses made, only one comparison yields a significant difference. Low F subjects judge the low role as more similar to themselves in height than the high role after information session II. A t test yields a value of 2.36 ($p < .05$). This finding has definite implications which will be discussed below, since there are no realistic reasons for such a discrimination to be made. The data were also analyzed to determine if low F subjects after information session II judge the high role and low differently in terms of taller versus shorter than themselves. (This is in contrast to absolute height differences.) That they do not is evidenced by a chi-square value of 1.45.

Self-Weight and Estimated Weight

The means of the absolute differences between the cube root of self-weight and cube root of the estimated weight are presented in Table 9.

Since in the population, weights are positively skewed, their cube roots were used for statistical analysis so that the distribution would be normal. It should be emphasized that high and low F subjects did not differ with respect to the cube root of self-weight ($t = .10$). Of the various analyses made, no differences are significant but one is marginally significant. Low F subjects judge the low role as more similar to themselves in weight than the high role after information session II. A t test yields a value of 1.95

Table 9

Mean of Absolute Differences between the Cube Root of Self Weight and Cube Root of Estimated Weight

Role on Record	Subject Group	Inf. Session	N	Mean	Sigma	t	d.f.	p
High	High	I	24	23.5	18.78	.77	42	--
High	Low	I	24	28.8	27.19			
Low	High	I	24	23.9	13.91	.90		--
Low	Low	I	24	20.1	14.54			
High	High	I	24	23.5	18.78	1.00		--
Low	High	I	24	23.9	13.91			
High	Low	I	24	28.8	27.19	1.36	36	
Low	Low	I	24	20.1	14.54			
High	High	II	24	24.9	19.66	.85		--
High	Low	II	24	30.3	23.30			
Low	High	II	24	21.7	13.19	.65		--
Low	Low	II	24	19.0	15.59			
High	High	II	24	24.9	19.66	.65	41	--
Low	High	II	24	21.7	13.19			
High	Low	II	24	30.3	23.30	1.95	42	<.07
Low	Low	II	24	19.0	15.59			

($p < .07$). Since this comparison is identical with the one for heights where significance was obtained, more credence might be placed in the inference that it is a true difference. The implications of this finding would be similar to those for height discrepancies. As in the height comparison, the data were also analyzed to determine if low F subjects after information session II judge the high role and low role differently in terms of heavier versus lighter

than themselves. (This is in contrast to absolute weight differences). The low F subjects do not differentiate the two roles with respect to direction of weight discrepancies. A chi-square yields the value of .35.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

The results of analyses of F scale predictions reveal that high F subjects are able to make discriminations when information is sufficiently direct and relevant. Previous studies have offered evidence that high F subjects have a need to see others like themselves and that they distort information to satisfy this need. It is not believed that the present finding represents contradictory evidence. It does seem to indicate that there are definite limits within which distortion can occur. When information is as direct and obvious as in this study, high F subjects respond to the reality factors. However, their ability to discriminate is not as great as that of the low subjects. The low subjects' advantage is due to their ability to perceive the low role more accurately. Stated in another way, high F subjects judge the low role as more similar to themselves than the role actually is. (Since an attempt was made to write both the high and low role in the extreme, it is assumed that the higher a predicted score is for the high role and the lower a predicted score is for the low role, the greater is the accuracy.) Hence, even when information is extremely relevant, the high F subjects' need to see others like themselves persists to some degree.

Low F subjects are also able to differentiate accurately between the two roles. As stated above, their

differentiation is even greater than that of the high F subjects. In previous studies low F subjects tended to place others in a middle category. One of the proposed explanations of the Scodel-Freedman study was that low F subjects might have been reluctant to make judgments in the absence of detailed information. The results obtained here support this explanation. Low F subjects, given direct and relevant information are accurately able to judge the high and low roles. Yet, Crutchfield's suggestion that low F subjects may have an "other-stereotype" (rather than the "same stereotype" of high F subjects) still seems like a valuable one. An inspection of the raw data (Appendix D) reveals that it is a rare low F subject who judges the scores for the low role as lower than his own. This finding may have more meaning after the results of height and weight comparisons are discussed below.

The results indicate that both high and low F subjects judge the high role more accurately after information session II than after information session I. There are no significant differences between information sessions I and II of the low role for either high or low F subjects. Perhaps the most parsimonious explanation for these findings involves the roles themselves. It is conceivable that information session II added more vital information to that already obtained during information session I in the high role than in the low role. Low F subjects did, however, benefit more

from additional information than did high F subjects for the high role. The inability of low F subjects to benefit from the additional information of session II of the low role could also be due to their own irrational stereotypes. If, for the most part, they see others as having higher F scale attitudes than their own, they have already set an irrational lower limit for the low role; hence, they are unable to make use of the additional information.

In a comparison of high and low F groups for values attributed to the self, Authoritarianism (F) was valued more highly by the former group, whereas Integrity (I) was rated higher by the latter group. Some reliability is offered by the fact that the value more favored by the high F group is one that is consistent with the theoretical structure of the Adorno work. In a sense, the Integrity value expresses the converse of the Authoritarianism value. Integrity involves following one's own dictates, whereas authoritarianism involves following the dictates of others.

The analyses involving value discrepancies between self and judgments offer some interesting findings. There can be little doubt that the information on the recordings was relevant for the rankings of values. The relevance was not as blatant as for the F scale judgments. With reality factors less compelling, high F subjects fail to differentiate the high role from the low role after either information session. Low F subjects accurately perceive a greater

discrepancy between self-values and the values of the high role than between self-values and values ascribed to the low role. This was true after both information sessions. Furthermore, the low F subjects see a greater discrepancy between their own values and those of the high role than do the high F subjects. The fact that the two groups do not differentiate for the low role follows from the high F subjects' inability to attribute great enough differences to the low role. These data are consistent with the Scodel-Mussen assertion that the high F individual maintains his security by assuming that the values of others are similar to his own. Low F subjects are sensitive to differences; in this case, accurately so.

In the analyses of height and weight, one significant finding appears. Low F subjects judge the low role as more similar to themselves in height and weight than the high role, following information session II. This discrimination must have been based on extrarational considerations. Rationally, there is no reason for the belief that people who differ in attitudes and values also differ in physical attributes. Beyond this, there is the objective fact that the four respondents on the high role recordings were the very same persons as those on the low role recordings. The finding suggests some mild paranoid sensitivity on the part of the low F subjects. In the attitude and value judgments, this sensitivity leads to greater accuracy.

Differences do exist, the cues are there, and the low F subjects are aware of them and use them. However, even under these conditions, some mistrust is evidenced by their unwillingness to see others as lower than themselves. (This, in spite of the fact that the low role, as the high role, was written in the extreme.) Their oversensitivity to differences appears in the height-weight discriminations. Here their sensitivity to cues evolves into an "awareness" of cues when no such cues actually exist. Another explanation offered in the Scodel-Freedman study follows.

One possible explanation of the lows' estimates is that many low scoring Ss take on mildly paranoid attitudes as a result of the contemporary Zeitgeist. Such lows may perceive themselves to be part of a distinct minority whose "liberalism" is unpopular and the object of considerable attack and derision. If so, all strangers with whom one has had only brief and casual contact would be viewed as potential threats until guarantees of the "rightness" of their attitudes were provided (24,p.94).

The "information" explanation and the "mild paranoia" explanation are not in conflict. Low F subjects see others as different from themselves, but when relevant information is available they are sensitive to it and can use it to make accurate predictions. However, when no information is available, they react to cues generated by their own needs and make discriminations when no basis for them exists in fact. It should be emphasized that the magnitude of the low F subjects' differentiations is not independent of the amount of relevant information available. The greater the

degree of relevance, the greater is the magnitude of the differentiation. Hence, the greatest differentiation between the high and low roles occurred in the F scale predictions, for which the information was most relevant. A somewhat smaller differentiation was made in the value judgments for which the information was less relevant. The smallest differentiations were made in the height and weight predictions for which the information was totally irrelevant.

It therefore seems that both high and low F subjects are governed by stereotyped thinking, albeit different types.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study attempted to test the hypothesis that given relevant information, low F scale subjects become more accurate in predicting the F scale scores of others than high F scale subjects. As a further part of the study, the following question was posed: If high F scale subjects perceive others to be like themselves on the F scale despite contrary information, whereas low F subjects do not behave in this way, would a scale of values reflect the same phenomenon? And finally, would the need for high F scale subjects to perceive others like themselves be so great as to affect judgments of height and weight where no relevant information was available?

The California F scale was administered to 358 male students. Ninety-six subjects from among the top and bottom 20 per cent of the entire group participated in the study. There were 48 F scale highs and 48 lows. Twenty-four highs listened to a high recording and 24 highs listened to a low recording. There were eight recordings with four different respondents. Each of these respondents recorded one high and one low role. Six high subjects heard each recording. The same procedure was followed for the low group. Since no differences among the records within a role were found, the data were combined and analyzed as a unit.

At the beginning of the experimental session, every subject ranked the values for himself. He had previously given his height and weight during the original F scale administration. Following each information session (the recordings were played in two successive parts), the subject estimated the F scale responses, the ranking of values, and the height and weight of the person who was being interviewed on the recording.

The results from analyses of F scale predictions reveal that both high and low F subjects are able to discriminate between high and low roles when information is relevant. However, low F subjects are able to discriminate to a greater degree. The low subjects' advantage lies in their greater ability to perceive the low role more accurately. Most low F subjects, however, judge the scores for the low role as higher than their own.

The analyses involving value discrepancies between self and judgments reveal that high F subjects fail to differentiate the high role from the low role. Low F subjects accurately perceive a greater discrepancy between self-values and the values of the high role than between self-values and values ascribed to the low role.

In the analyses of height and weight, one significant finding appears. Low F subjects judge the low role as more similar to themselves in height and weight than the high

role, following the second information session. There is no rational reason for such a discrimination to be made.

The findings suggest that high F subjects do have a need to assume that the attitudes and values of their peers are similar to their own. However, when information is extremely relevant, as for the F scale predictions, high F subjects can make discriminations. Low F subjects see others as different from themselves, but when relevant information is available they are sensitive to it and can use it to make accurate predictions. When no information is available, they react to cues generated by self-needs and make discriminations when no basis for them exists in fact. However, the greater the degree of relevance of information, the greater is their magnitude of differentiation between the two roles. It therefore seems that both high and low subjects are governed by stereotyped thinking, although of different types.

Appendix A

Sample High Role Recording

- I. Does this recorder bother you at all?
- S. No, it's O.K.
- I. I don't think I've introduced myself. I'm Mr. Johnson. Let's see, your name is Pearson, isn't it?
- S. Yeah. Say, is it all right to smoke?
- I. Sure. Well, I'll tell you what this is all about, Mr. Pearson. I'm doing some research for an advanced degree in the psychology department here. Part of my research is to get the attitudes of college students on a number of different issues. So I may ask you to give me your opinions on a number of things, and maybe you haven't expressed yourself to anybody on these topics before. I don't think I'll ask you anything embarrassing, but, if for one reason or another, you don't want to answer, let me know. O.K.?
- S. It sounds O.K. What do you want to know?
- I. Well, as I said, I'd like to get your ideas on a number of topics. Let's start with juvenile delinquency. That's something you read about a lot and hear quite a bit about these days. What do you think causes it?
- S. Well (laughs abashedly), I'll tell you what I think.
- I. Of course. I'd like to know what you think.
- S. Well, it seems to me that kids are being coddled or pampered or something. I mean, by their parents and

their teachers, practically everybody. In my home my parents are the boss and that's all there is to it.

I. Anything else?

S. Another thing is that kids nowadays are going off half-cocked all the time. They don't realize that other people, especially older people, have had a lot of experience and they can profit from this experience. Another thing is that a lot of kids or even young people my own age, you might say, are always trying to blame somebody else for their troubles. I think they should show a little more intestinal fortitude or something. I guess the good old-fashioned word I was looking for is guts. Nowadays, if people get upset about something or other, it seems like they go to a psychologist or psychiatrist to straighten them out.

I. You don't believe in that?

S. It's O.K. in its place, but, as I said, people should try to do more to help themselves.

I. I see. How does this tie into juvenile delinquency, Mr. Pearson.

S. Well, I think it's the same principle. These kids who get into trouble act as if society owes them a living or has a duty to help them out. I don't believe in that. I believe that God helps those who help themselves. There's another aspect to this too. I think that if people shouldered their own responsibilities they

wouldn't spend as much time in worrying about everybody else.

I. Good. That leads me to another area I wanted to ask you about. Do you think, in general, people should try to change the country or should leave things alone?

S. That's complicated. Well, it ties in to what I said. If people did what I suggested, they wouldn't have to listen to all these radicals who are trying to change the country. I mean, I'm not against progress or anything like that. But I think people should leave well enough alone. There are quite a few people around, it seems to me, who are always trying to stir up dissatisfaction and they're usually a low class of people. It's been my experience that these people who are trying to stir up trouble are not the kind of people you would like to have living next door to you in a nice respectable neighborhood.

(End of information session I)

I. How do you think, in general, things are going in this country?

S. That's sort of hard to answer because there are a lot of things that people like you and me just don't understand. I mean, there are some ways in which people can foresee the future, but you can't get that out of books. There are quite a few mysterious things in the world, but it isn't given to us to understand

them. Like miracles, for instance. A person just has to accept what happens whether it's for better or for worse.

- I. O.K. That's find, Mr. Pearson. Now you touched on something before that I wanted to ask you more about. You mentioned the radicals. What other sorts of people do you think might be doing harm to the country?
- S. Well . . . Do you mind if I open the window a little bit. It's sort of stuffy in here.
- I. I'll get it. Let's see, where were we?
- S. You asked me about other kinds of people I didn't care for. Well, I think, in general, there are too many odd-ball characters around like--
- I. Odd-balls?
- S. Yes, people who are different in one way or another. I don't mean that it isn't all right for people to be different, and there are two sides to every question but I think that everybody in this country should fit into the American Way of Life.
- I. Could you tell me what you mean by the American Way of Life?
- S. Oh, I think everybody knows what it means to be a good American. We certainly don't need any professors to tell us that. I mean we shouldn't have so many people who are lazy and shiftless and uneducated and commit so many crimes. You can pick up the paper practically any

day and read about some sex crime. I can't figure out what would make any person a sex maniac. These characters must really be nutty. By the way, you said you were studying for an advanced degree in psychology.

Could you tell me something about that?

I. Well, I'll be more than happy to talk about it after the interview is over. Right now, I'm more interested in finding out what you think, O.K.?

S. Sure, you're the Doctor (big laugh on both sides). Well, I don't know if we study that stuff in 401 or not, but there certainly are a lot of people in this country off their rockers. Something ought to be done about it, I think.

I. What do you think should be done?

S. I'm not sure exactly. But what I see as the big problem is that you really can't change human nature. I mean these people aren't going to change or anything so why should we try to help them or change them when there are a lot more worthwhile things we could concern ourselves with. I know, in psychology they put a lot of emphasis on a person's environment and what it does to him. I guess there's something to that, but I think a person's heredity is more important. It's like breeding race horses--class will tell. Anyway, I don't see why all these inferior people should drag us down to their level. If we're really better than they are, we

should try to control them, not be controlled by them.
That's just simple logic.

I. Do you think anything can be done about it?

S. I can't make up my mind about it. Sometimes I think we can keep our country free of these bad elements if the right people maintain control. Other times, I feel, what's the use. There are people who are out to spoil things, and there's very little you can do about it. Anyway, I'm not going to worry about it.

I. What do you plan to major in, Mr. Pearson?

S. Business administration, I think. I'm not sure yet, but I'd like to major in accounting.

I. Could you tell me what you'd like to be doing about 10 years from now?

S. Everything I'd like to be doing?

I. Well, as much as you can.

S. Well, I plan eventually to take over my father's business in Dayton. I expect to be married then. Maybe I'll be in the country club my father's in. They got a pretty good group of people there and you have to stand pretty high in the community to get in. I mean, just one black-ball, and you're out. But it's worth it if you can get in and with my father sponsoring me, I don't think I'll have any problems.

I. What organization would you like to belong to?

S. I'm not sure, I already belong to the American Legion.
I joined that as soon as I got out of the Navy.

I. Oh, I didn't know that you had been in the service. Do
you think that any of the experiences you had in the
service had anything to do with your present beliefs?

S. Quite a bit, I think.

I. Could you tell me how?

S. To get back to what we were talkin' about before, one of
the things I saw I didn't care too much about was inter-
mingling of the races. I saw quite a bit of that when I
was on shore leave in Europe. I mean, Europe was inter-
esting in a way, but I don't think the majority of the
people there have as high standards as we do in their
dealings with people.

I. Did you notice anything else while you were there?

S. Well, I mean it was very interesting to see the way they
live in other countries. It's a lot of fun when you're
there because there are a lot of women who go for
Americans, and their moral standards aren't like American
girls, if you know what I mean (mild laughter). But I
wouldn't want to live there on account of the general
backwardness. These low moral standards aren't the
only thing, their trains are never on time, the telephones
hardly ever work and you should see the pig-stys some of
'em live in.

I. Uh-huh. Well, let's take a brief break, Mr. Pearson.
Then I'd like to ask you some more questions, if you
don't mind.

S. O.K. I like to have this kind of a talk with a person
who's intelligent.

Sample Low Role Recording

- I. Does this recorder bother you at all?
- S. No, it's O.K.
- I. I don't think I've introduced myself. I'm Mr. Johnson. Let's see . . . you're name is Pearson, isn't it?
- S. Yeah. Say, is it all right to smoke?
- I. Sure. Well, I'll tell you what this is all about, Mr. Pearson. I'm doing some research for an advanced degree in the psychology department here. Part of my research is to get the attitudes of college students on a number of different issues. So I may ask you to give me your opinions on a number of things, and maybe you haven't expressed yourself to anybody on these topics before. I don't think I'll ask you anything embarrassing, but, if for one reason or another you don't want to answer let me know. O.K.?
- S. It sounds O.K. What do you want to know?
- I. Well, as I said, I'd like to get your ideas on a number of topics. Let's start with juvenile delinquency. That's something you read a lot about and hear quite a bit about these days. What do you think causes it?
- S. Well (laughs abashedly), I'll tell you what I think.
- I. Of course. I'd like to know what you think.
- S. Well to tell you the truth, it's a very complicated problem. I mean, I don't think there's any one simple answer to it.
- I. How do you mean, Mr. Pearson?

- S. Well, from the reading and thinking I've done about it, it seems to me that there are possibly some economic reasons. I mean, some delinquents do come from wealthy homes, but on the whole there does seem to be a connection between poverty and juvenile delinquency.
- I. Anything else?
- S. Well, then there are the reasons that are more related to psychology and sociology. I mean, when you have an unstable society, this shows itself in individual families. I mean, kids may be more confused because there aren't as many stable standards to live by and they aren't able to accept the traditional standards that people lived by in this country. I know that's all too simple, but I think that a person would have to know a lot more about all the different features of the country in order to give a good answer to it. I think that maybe research work in all the social sciences will help find out some of the causes. (Laughs) Why don't you ask me the same question in five or six years? Maybe I'll be able to give you a better answer.
- I. O.K. If I'm still around maybe I will. Tell me, do you have any ideas how you would go about abolishing juvenile delinquency?
- S. Oh man, that's really tough. I mean, it's tough to suggest a cure when you're not sure of the cause. But I will say one thing. I disagree with people who think

that severe punishment is the answer.

I. Why is that, Mr. Pearson?

S. Well, I think it can be shown with pretty good evidence that severe punishment doesn't reduce crime. I can give you an example of that--capital punishment. The states that don't have it don't have any more murders than the states that do. Look at England for another kind of example. The policemen there don't even carry guns. You would think that would almost be an invitation to a lot of serious crime. Well, they have crimes there, sure, but violent crimes there don't happen too often.

I. I see. You mentioned a moment ago, Mr. Pearson, that some states have capital punishment and some don't. That leads me to another question. Do you think, in general, that people should try to change the laws of the country or should they let things alone?

S. (Laughs) You don't ask anything easy, do you? (Pause) Well, I'd put it this way. I think the constitution laid down pretty good guiding lines for the way the country should be run. I mean, I don't think we should do anything to ever change the Bill of Rights, because if we did, we might have to give up some of our liberties, and I think that would be a bad thing. But the other side of that is that I think the constitution and the way our country is run gives us a chance to pass new laws or change old ones when social conditions in the

country change.

I. Could you give me an example?

S. Well yeah. The depression was a pretty serious situation. Of course, I wasn't born until it was almost over, but I've heard my parents talk about it enough. Well, there was a lot of legislation passed then, like social security and minimum wages. A lot of people thought that was pretty radical, but I think most people today would agree that they're pretty good laws, and I don't think they interfered with anybody's basic freedoms. I mean, they're things we sort of take for granted now and it's easy to forget that there was a lot of opposition to them once.

(End of information session I)

I. I see. Well, how do you think, in general, things are going in this country?

S. Well, (pauses)-- I would say that I'm pretty well satisfied with some things and not too well satisfied with others.

I. Could you elaborate on that?

S. Well for one thing we're living in a period of prosperity and I'm pretty happy about that. I mean, it seems to me that people in general are enjoying a pretty high standard of living, and I think it's nice when people don't have to worry too much about where the next month's rent is going to come from.

- I. I see. How about some of the things that you're not satisfied with?
- S. Well, I could talk about that for hours. For one thing I don't think we're paying enough attention to our social problems. I have the impression that most people really don't have too much of an interest in these problems. Take our problems with Russia. The thing that seems to bother most people about all these scientific advances the Russians have made is that our national pride has been hurt. In fact, a lot of people just sort of assume that there's going to be a war and the important thing is to be able to exterminate more Russians than they can exterminate Americans. I mean, I think we should spend our time in thinking about the results of a war because if everybody or practically everybody is going to be blown up, I don't think you can say that either side is going to win.
- I. Can you think of anything else that bothers you?
- S. Well I felt a little upset about the things that happened in Little Rock, Arkansas some time back. I know that desegregation is not a simple problem and that people in the South who are against it might have some good talking points, but it still bothers me that there should have to be any problem. I mean, I don't think it's right that a person's color should have anything to do with whether he goes to a particular school or not.

- I. I see. Would you say that your opinions are shared by your friends and your family?
- S. Not necessarily. Some of them might disagree. Like my father. We disagree about this question of the Negroes all the time. He says they should be kept in their place. I say all Americans should have equal rights. Well, we argue about it a lot. I mean, I can accept my father's experience in some things, but I don't think that necessarily makes him too much of an expert in social problems. That reminds me that when I was overseas you would see pretty often a Negro G.I. with a white girl. If my father saw that, it would drive him crazy. In fact, I know a lot of guys in my outfit who used to get sore about that.
- I. I gather that it didn't make you sore.
- S. I don't think so. I just think that people are free to go out with or even marry anybody they please. If we talk about Americans really being free, we should live up to that ideal as much as we can. I know that a lot of people would disagree with some of my ideas, but I wouldn't want to change them just for that reason. I guess, in a way, everybody has to decide for himself what he thinks is right.
- I. I see. You mentioned that you were overseas, Mr. Pearson. Did you come away with any other impressions?
- S. Well the study of different societies is something I'm

interested in. I think you can always learn something from watching how other people live. That doesn't mean I would want to live in any other country necessarily. I would say that one impression I formed is that some of our ideas about Europeans are too simple and maybe too general, but that works both ways. I mean, I think many Europeans have a wrong idea of Americans too. Some of them think that we're interested only in whiskey and women and trying to make a lot of money just so we can have a bigger car than our neighbor. My opinion is that there's plenty of room for understanding on both sides.

I. I see. Tell me Mr. Pearson, do you have any idea of what you might be doing in ten years.

S. Wow. That's another toughie. I guess I could tell you what I would like to be doing.

I. Sure, go ahead.

S. Well, I'm only a sophomore now, but I've become sort of interested in sociology and anthropology, and if my grades are good enough, I'd like to go on to graduate school and specialize in one of those. Then if I can get a graduate degree, I'd like to get into college teaching. At least that's my ambition. What I would like to do I guess, is some research in this field of social problems because I think that right now too many of our ideas, and that includes mine, are not supported by very good evidence. I mean, I'm not sure that we can

solve our social problems just by getting a lot of facts, but I still think it would be better if the ideas we did have about these things could be based on something besides our own particular feelings. That must sound pretty vague, I guess, and I think I'd need more time to make it any more clear.

- I. Uh-huh. Well, maybe we could talk more about it later. Anything else you would expect to be doing in ten years?
- S. Well, I don't have a steady girl friend yet, but I certainly expect to get married and raise a family. You might say that I just want to lead a happy useful life although maybe (laughs) I'm not really as sure as I like to think I am about what sort of life that would be.
- I. O.K. Thank you Mr. Pearson.

Appendix B

The F Scale

It is important that all data are filled in accurately.

Name _____ Age _____ College Major _____ Sex _____

Religious Affiliation _____ Height _____ Weight _____

Student Opinion Questionnaire

The following statements refer to opinions regarding a number of issues. You are asked to indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each item. Whatever you may feel about a particular item, you can be sure that a lot of other people feel the same way you do.

The items are to be answered in this way:

Strong Agreement +3
Moderate Agreement +2
Mild Agreement +1
Mild Disagreement -1
Moderate Disagreement -2
Strong Disagreement -3

Do not leave any items blank. Please answer every item.

- _____ 1. Nobody ever learned anything really important except through suffering.
- _____ 2. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.
- _____ 3. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
- _____ 4. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.
- _____ 5. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.
- _____ 6. Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked, and feeble-minded people.
- _____ 7. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
- _____ 8. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this

country, even in places where people might least expect it.

- _____ 9. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.
- _____ 10. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
- _____ 11. Familiarity breeds contempt.
- _____ 12. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.
- _____ 13. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.
- _____ 14. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.
- _____ 15. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places.
- _____ 16. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around and mix together so much, a person has to protect himself especially carefully against catching an infection or disease from them.
- _____ 17. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.
- _____ 18. Someday it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.
- _____ 19. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
- _____ 20. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.
- _____ 21. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.
- _____ 22. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.

- _____ 23. Wars and social troubles may someday be ended by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world.
- _____ 24. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
- _____ 25. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
- _____ 26. An insult to our honor should always be punished.
- _____ 27. When a person has a worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.
- _____ 28. The business man and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.

The Values

Approval (A) One should act in such a way that people will like one, so that one makes friends wherever one goes.

Hedonism (H) One should act in such a way as to get as much pleasure and satisfaction out of life as possible.

Other-direction (O)

One should be kind to others, respecting the dignity and worth of every individual, and acting in a warm and helpful way towards others.

Authoritarianism (F)

One should follow the advice of wiser and more experienced people, who have led worthwhile lives.

Integrity (I) One should satisfy one's own conscience, and make decisions one believes are right, regardless of whether one hurts oneself or others.

Status (S) One should act in such a way as to make the most of oneself, in order to earn the respect of others.

Appendix C

Instructions

You have been selected to participate in a study investigating the value of recordings for determining the nature of social interactions. But before we get into that, I'd like you to take these six cards and shuffle them as you would a deck of cards. That's fine. Now, please write your name at the top of this sheet of paper. (Hand out sheet for ranking values.) Now, place the cards in the order of how important you feel the various values are to you. At the top of each card is a letter. Put the letter heading the card with the value that is most important to you next to number 1 on the sheet where it says most important. Put the letter heading the card with the value that is of next importance to you next to number 2 on the sheet, and so on, so that the letter heading the value you feel is least important to you is beside number 6 on the sheet. Are there any questions? Go ahead. Thank you.

Now I'd like you to listen carefully to this recording which I'm going to play. In it, another student from this university is being interviewed about his feelings on a number of topics. By the way, it was important that the recordings were clear so they could be understood. We selected this one for that reason. It may sound funny at times because we were always motioning for the person to speak clearly. When it's finished I'll ask you to do some other things for me. O.K.? (Play recording to end of Information I.)

This is an opinion questionnaire. (Hand out F-scale)
Put your name at the top and read the instructions. Then, fill it out the way you think the person who was interviewed on the record would fill it out. In other words if that person on the record was to fill out this questionnaire how do you think he would respond to these items. Do you have any questions? All right, go ahead and fill it out for that person. Thank you.

Now, take these six cards again and shuffle them. Place the cards in the order of how important you feel the various values are to the person who was interviewed in that recording. Put the letter of the value you feel is most important to him next to number 1 on this sheet where it says most important. Put the letter heading the card with the value that you think is of next importance to him next to number 2 on the sheet, and so on, so that the letter heading the value you feel is least important to the person on the recording is beside number 6 on the sheet. Please don't forget to write your name at the top of the sheet.

How tall do you think the person interviewed on the record is? Write it down near the bottom of the sheet. How much do you think he weighs? Write that down too, near the bottom of the sheet.

Okay, now let's listen to some more of that interview. (Play recording to end of Information II.) Now that you've heard more of the record I'd like you to fill out this

questionnaire again for the person being interviewed. Fill it out the way you think the person on the record would fill it out. Don't forget to put your name at the top of the sheet.

Please shuffle these six cards. Now that you've heard more of the recording, place the cards in the order of how important you feel the various values are to the person who was interviewed. Once more, put the letter of the value you feel most important to him next to number 1 on this sheet, and so on, with the letter of the value least important to him beside number 6 on the sheet. Please put your name at the top of the sheet..

Now how tall do you think the person interviewed on the record is? Put your estimate near the bottom of the sheet. How much does he weigh? Write that down too.

That's all there is to do, and thank you very much for your cooperation. Since other people in Psychology 401 are going to participate, it's important that you don't talk about the study until the end of the quarter. Will you do that for me? Thank you. Good-bye.

Appendix D

Raw Data

High F Subjects Responding to High Role

Subj. #	F Scale Self	Inf. I	Inf. II	Values Self	Values Inf. I	Values Inf. II	Height Self	Height Inf. I	Height Inf. II	Weight Self	Weight Inf. I	Weight Inf. II	O.S.P.E.
1	123	151	149	IFOHSA	FOASIH	AFSOIH	72	70	66	180	160	150	77
2	121	145	145	SAFIOH	IFOSAH	FSIOAH	70	68	68	195	140	145	60
3	127	153	170	OSFLAH	SFOIAH	SFIOAH	73	70	69	165	160	160	42
4	128	173	177	OFSAIH	FOSIHA	HISAFI	63	70	72	134	178	195	70
5	131	166	169	HFOASI	FSOAIH	OFHSAI	69	68	68	170	140	170	11
6	148	168	179	ISFAOH	FSIOHA	FIHSAI	71	71	70	178	165	155	21
7	124	180	184	OSAFIH	FOSAIH	FOASHI	77	75	75	220	180	180	97
8	121	132	145	OSFAHI	FOASIH	SFIHOA	70	73	73	173	175	175	76
9	130	163	167	OFSHIA	FHISAO	SFAHIO	65	69	67	120	130	135	63
10	124	173	182	AFOISH	ISHFOA	HISFAO	71	71	71	180	185	185	37
11	135	157	168	OFSAIH	FOSIHA	FASIHO	72	75	75	196	197	197	26
12	123	162	162	HIOSAF	FOSAIH	FSHAIO	74	72	69	172	180	155	36
13	138	156	173	OAHFSI	OFASHI	OSFAHI	65	70	70	138	160	160	5
14	139	174	183	FSIOAH	FSOIAH	FASHIO	69	69	68	170	160	160	7
15	121	154	164	OSFAHI	OFSAIH	OFSAIH	72	74	72	165	185	165	26
16	142	150	159	OFASIH	FSOIAH	FSHIOA	74	72	76	175	165	210	6
17	127	139	148	OAFSHI	AFSOIH	SHFOAI	72	72	70	160	170	145	--
18	141	165	176	OISFAH	IFAHSI	HFSOAI	71	71	72	155	180	170	35
19	128	171	177	OAFHSI	OAFSHI	OAFSHI	65	68	68	180	140	140	--
20	133	156	168	FOSIAH	FSOIAH	FSIAOH	70	71	73	170	175	200	19
21	137	144	166	OFSAIH	FOSIAH	SEHAI	72	72	70	160	195	175	45
22	128	154	174	OSFAHI	FSHOAI	OHASFI	77	69	70	203	175	180	29
23	129	156	181	OISFAH	FOSAIH	FOSIAH	66	71	71	125	185	185	11
24	129	143	162	AOFSHI	FOASIH	FSAOIH	74	72	72	156	165	184	9

Raw Data

High F Subjects Responding to Low Role

Subj. #	F Scale Self	Inf. I	Inf. II	Values Self	Values Inf. I	Values Inf. II	Height Self	Height Inf. I	Height Inf. II	Weight Self	Weight Inf. I	Weight Inf. II	O.S.P.E.
1	146	132	109	OSFAHI	OSAFHI	OSFAHI	72	73	73	150	175	175	84
2	127	117	111	OAFISH	FOSAIH	OSFAIH	69	72	72	145	175	175	79
3	126	125	126	SOFahi	OASFHI	HOSAFI	67	70	68	150	170	150	36
4	125	135	116	IFSAOH	OAFHSI	ISAHFO	71	69	69	160	160	180	22
5	125	151	118	OSAFIH	HIASFO	IFOSAH	72	72	72	155	170	170	—
6	122	121	124	OFASHI	OFSIAH	OHSFAI	73	71	71	170	160	165	29
7	122	100	126	IOFSHA	IOSFAH	IOASFH	68	70	70	150	180	180	77
8	122	119	122	FOAHSI	FSOAHl	OSIHFA	70	73	70	168	190	175	60
9	123	106	97	OIAFSH	OIAFSH	OISAFH	71	70	70	172	170	160	11
10	121	101	130	AHFIOS	IFSHAO	SHFAIO	73	71	70	165	168	185	2
11	126	130	121	AOHFSI	OAFSHI	HOASIF	71	70	73	173	165	198	6
12	131	110	107	SOHAFI	OASIHf	OHASIF	71	70	72	140	170	180	87
13	134	131	113	HSAOFI	FOIHAS	IHASOF	67	70	70	170	160	170	36
14	146	119	90	OISAHF	SFIOHA	HSIAOF	71	66	71	172	142	164	18
15	142	147	138	IOSAFH	OFSAHl	OHISAF	74	71	71	220	185	185	5
16	140	125	119	FOASHI	FAOISH	FAOSHI	70	71	71	230	190	180	56
17	125	122	117	OFHASI	IOFSAH	FIOSAH	68	75	68	145	170	170	61
18	123	116	103	OSAIHF	FIHASO	HIASOF	66	69	69	145	163	163	—
19	125	124	122	OFHSAI	OFAlHS	OFHSIA	69	72	72	148	175	165	40
20	122	127	116	SHIOAF	SFOAHl	IHOASF	72	73	67	145	193	137	33
21	123	109	104	OFASHI	FISOAH	HFOSAI	74	72	70	178	185	165	69
22	145	128	148	FOASHI	FSOAHl	IOFSAH	67	76	72	135	180	160	54
23	137	139	138	FOSIAH	HIFOSA	ISHOFA	69	72	74	170	155	160	40
24	130	131	112	OSFAIH	FSIHOA	OSFAHI	72	74	76	168	190	205	81

Raw Data

Low F Subjects Responding to High Role

Subj. #	F Scale Self	Inf. I	Inf. II	Values Self	Values Inf. I	Values Inf. II	Height Self	Height Inf. I	Height Inf. II	Weight Self	Weight Inf. I	Weight Inf. II	O.S.P.E.
1	61	143	147	OAHSFI	FOASIH	FASOHI	68	70	70	145	195	195	96
2	55	153	178	IOAFSH	SFOAHI	FIHSAO	72	70	69	180	140	130	98
3	83	144	143	OSIAHF	IFOSAH	FAISOH	73	70	68	170	145	145	—
4	76	167	180	OHSATF	IHOFAS	HISAFO	56	72	66	100	200	165	26
5	78	161	162	HAOFSI	FISOHA	SAIFHO	75	68	65	180	155	140	—
6	60	159	177	OHASIF	FSHAIO	FHSIAO	69	71	74	165	160	160	81
7	62	159	183	OSAFIH	FSIAHO	FHISAO	71	72	74	160	170	190	74
8	71	144	168	OASFHI	PHASOI	SHIOAF	68	70	70	148	165	165	14
9	71	170	184	OFSAHI	FISOAH	SFIAHO	74	66	66	228	150	140	17
10	84	176	184	IFSOHA	AFOSHI	AFHSOI	71	71	66	160	190	145	—
11	77	124	162	OAFSHI	FSIOAH	FSAIOH	72	69	69	145	145	145	81
12	68	148	169	FOSHAI	FISHOA	HASFIO	72	69	64	170	155	165	42
13	82	148	174	ASHIOF	FOASHI	FSAOHI	65	70	70	145	150	150	26
14	64	157	172	OASHIF	ISFOAH	ISFHAO	70	67	67	150	160	160	94
15	82	156	174	ISOHFA	FIOSAH	FSHAOI	70	69	66	165	160	140	70
16	79	131	140	OHSIFA	SIFHOA	ISHFAO	70	72	70	150	200	185	42
17	61	165	183	OIFSAH	FIHASO	HISAFO	69	71	71	195	180	180	94
18	61	153	177	SHOAIF	FOSIAH	FSIHAO	63	68	68	144	165	165	82
19	57	153	171	IOSAHF	FSAOHI	FASIOH	67	67	68	158	170	170	—
20	81	129	147	OSIHFA	FIOSAH	SFHOAI	69	72	72	158	165	165	39
21	80	161	159	OATFSH	FISAOH	FSHIAO	70	70	70	160	195	190	78
22	54	139	165	SOIAFH	IFSOAH	FSAIOH	71	72	72	135	170	170	65
23	83	161	174	SAHFOI	FSOHIA	FSIHOA	70	73	73	172	200	200	93
24	81	157	180	ISCHAF	FAHSOI	FAHSIO	69	68	73	160	155	195	99

Raw Data

Low F Subjects Responding to Low Role

Subj. #	F Scale Self	Inf. I	Inf. II	Values Self	Values Inf. I	Values Inf. II	Height Self	Height Inf. I	Height Inf. II	Weight Self	Weight Inf. I	Weight Inf. II	O.S.P.E.
1	54	118	90	IHFSA	OSFIAH	OASHFI	72	73	70	195	170	170	97
2	70	94	69	OSIAHF	OAIFSH	IOAHSF	72	70	69	165	155	140	96
3	59	61	60	OSFHAI	OSFAHI	OSFAHI	71	70	70	165	160	160	96
4	83	108	107	IHOSAF	OHFSAI	IOHSAF	72	72	72	175	177	177	24
5	75	73	73	IFOSAH	FSIOAH	HOSFAI	69	70	68	145	160	140	99
6	74	102	99	FHIOSA	FOIASH	OISHFA	71	71	70	160	174	175	76
7	79	84	91	SFOAIH	FOSAIH	IFOSAH	71	70	69	143	160	153	--
8	74	116	77	OAFHSI	FHIOSA	OSAHFI	70	71	71	145	160	160	--
9	67	85	61	FASOHI	IFOASH	IOHASF	73	69	69	200	160	160	67
10	67	68	77	OIFASH	ASOFIH	OISFAH	70	71	71	170	180	170	84
11	78	126	127	SIOHFA	AHFSOI	IFHAOS	72	71	73	200	175	175	21
12	55	57	50	IFOSHA	OFSAH	OFSIAH	74	74	74	200	190	190	--
13	82	98	76	HIAOSF	OISHAF	IAHOSF	71	73	73	176	170	180	63
14	82	94	85	OASHFI	OAFSHI	OSAFIH	70	72	73	150	186	190	--
15	85	84	96	IOFASH	OAISFH	OIASFH	74	72	72	160	185	185	89
16	83	125	113	AOFHSI	AOSFIH	ASHOFI	74	70	71	200	180	185	91
17	60	129	75	HFSIAO	SFHAOI	HOISAF	74	69	69	200	150	150	89
18	76	88	89	OFIHSA	FOISHA	OFIHAS	72	70	70	175	165	170	8
19	74	121	111	IOHASF	OFSAIH	OSIFAH	72	72	73	175	170	180	99
20	78	91	109	IOFSHA	OAFSIH	OIASFH	69	70	67	150	175	155	73
21	84	103	105	OSAIHF	IOFSAH	IOSFHA	73	67	67	205	155	165	91
22	76	105	98	OASHFI	FOASIH	AOFSIH	69	71	71	175	175	185	14
23	31	131	100	FIOASH	SOAFIH	OASIFH	64	71	73	126	140	160	91
24	74	91	81	OIFHSA	ISFOAH	IOSFAH	68	71	70	155	170	160	93

Appendix E

Table 10

Correlations of O.S.P.E., Predicted F Score - Information
Session I and Self F Score

Variables	N	r	p
O.S.P.E. & Predicted F Score - High Role	42	-.06	---
r_{12} O.S.P.E. & Predicted F Score - Low Role	42	-.35	<.05
r_{23} Predicted F Score & Self F Score Low Role	48	+.57	<.01
r_{13} O.S.P.E. & Self F Score - Low Role	42	-.47	<.01
$r_{12.3}$		-.12	---

Table 11

Homogeneity of Variance between Recordings

Subject Group	Inf. Session	F ratios*		High Role			
		A-B	A-C	A-D	B-C	B-D	C-D
High	I	2.20	1.18	1.20	1.86	2.64	1.42
High	II	1.02	1.29	4.00	1.26	3.93	3.12
Low	I	3.84	1.44	1.86	2.67	2.06	1.29
Low	II	2.81	1.17	2.33	2.40	1.21	1.99
		F ratios*		Low Role			
		E-F	E-G	E-H	F-G	F-H	G-H
High	I	1.11	1.18	1.52	1.07	1.37	1.28
High	II	3.42	5.65	5.98	1.65	1.75	1.06
Low	I	1.53	1.27	1.81	1.95	2.76	1.42
Low	II	2.11	1.70	2.90	3.59	6.12	1.71

* With 5X5 degrees of freedom an F ratio of 5.05 is significant at the .05 level of confidence

Table 12
Analysis of Variance of Differences Among
Records within Roles

Subject Group	Source of Variation	d.f.	Sum of Squares	Variance	F ratio	p
High Role						
High I	Between	3	213.0	71.0	.41	---
	Within	20	3452.5	172.6		
	Total	23	3665.5			
High II	Between	3	264.6	88.2	.52	---
	Within	20	3385.6	169.3		
	Total	23	3650.2			
Low I	Between	3	132.5	44.2	.23	---
	Within	20	3924.8	196.2		
	Total	23	4057.3			
Low II	Between	3	295.8	98.6	.50	---
	Within	20	3979.3	199.0		
	Total	23	4275.1			
Low Role						
High I	Between	3	1139.5	379.8	2.07	---
	Within	20	3677.0	183.9		
	Total	23	4816.5			
High II	Between	3	283.6	94.5	.47	---
	Within	20	3992.4	199.6		
	Total	23	4276.0			
Low I	Between	3	1257.3	419.1	.81	---
	Within	20	10372.0	518.6		
	Total	23	11629.3			
Low II	Between	3	1436.5	478.8	1.15	---
	Within	20	8345.3	417.3		
	Total	23	9781.8			

Table 13

Median Test of Value Discrepancies Attributed to
High and Low Roles by Low F Subjects

Value	Role on Record	Same	Other	Chi-square	p
Information I					
Other-direction	High Low	7 16	17 8	6.76	<.01
Approval	High Low	13 14	11 10	.08	---
Hedonism	High Low	15 18	9 6	.87	---
Status	High Low	11 9	13 15	.34	---
Authoritarianism	High Low	6 14	18 10	5.49	<.05
Integrity	High Low	12 13	12 11	.08	---
Information II					
Other-direction	High Low	3 18	21 6	19.05	<.01
Approval	High Low	11 17	13 7	3.09	---
Hedonism	High Low	9 17	15 7	5.37	<.05
Status	High Low	14 8	10 16	3.02	---
Authoritarianism	High Low	7 10	17 14	.82	---
Integrity	High Low	8 16	16 8	5.33	<.05

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

1. Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, Else, Levinson, D.J., & Sanford, R.N. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper, 1950.
2. Bass, B.M. Authoritarianism or acquiescence? J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1955, 51, 616-623.
3. Chapman, L.J. & Campbell, D.T. Response set in the F scale. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1957, 54, 129-132.
4. Christie, R. Some determinants of the accuracy of social judgments among army recruits. Unpublished paper read before the Eastern Psychological Association, March, 1952.
5. Cohn, T.S. Is the F scale indirect? J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1952, 47, 732.
6. Cohn, T.S. The relation of the F scale to a response set to answer positively. Amer. Psychologist, 1953, 8, 335. (Abstract)
7. Crockett, W.H. & Meidinger, T. Authoritarianism and interpersonal perception. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1956, 53, 378-380.
8. Crutchfield, R.S. Social psychology and group processes. In C.P. Stone & Q. McNemar (Eds) Annu. Rev. Psychol., 1954, 5, 171-202.
9. Davids, A. Some personality and intellectual correlates of intolerance of ambiguity. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1955, 51, 415-420.
10. Davids, A. The influence of ego-involvement on relations between authoritarianism and intolerance of ambiguity. J. consult. Psychol., 1956, 20, 179-184.
11. Davids, A. & Eriksen, C.W. Some social and cultural factors determining relations between authoritarianism and measures of neuroticism. J. consult. Psychol., 1957, 21, 155-159.
12. Gage, N.L., Leavitt, G.S., & Stone, G.C. The psychological meaning of acquiescence set for authoritarianism. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1957, 55, 98-103.

13. Gough, H.G. Studies of social intolerance: I. Some psychological and sociological correlates of anti-Semitism. J. soc. Psychol., 1951, 33, 237-246.
14. Jackson, D.N. & Messick, S.J. A note on "ethnocentrism" and acquiescent response sets. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1957, 54, 132-134.
15. Jackson, D.N., Messick, S.J. & Solley, C.M. How "rigid" is the "authoritarian"? J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1957, 54, 137-140.
16. Juul, K.D. Authoritarian personality in relation to teachers' attitudes toward child behavior. Unpublished doctor's dissertation, Wayne Univer., 1953.
17. Kerrick, Jean S. The effects of manifest anxiety and IQ on discrimination. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1956, 52, 136-138.
18. Kogan, N. Authoritarianism and repression. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1956, 53, 34-37.
19. Leavitt, H.J., Hax, H. & Roche, J.H. "Authoritarianism" and agreement with things authoritative. J. Psychol., 1955, 40, 215-221.
20. Messick, S. & Jackson, D.N. Authoritarianism or acquiescence in Bass's data. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1957, 54, 424-426.
21. Rabinowitz, W. A note on the social perceptions of authoritarians and nonauthoritarians. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1956, 53, 384-386.
22. Rosen, E. Differences between volunteers and non-volunteers for psychological study. J. appl. Psychol., 1951, 35, 185-193.
23. Scodel, A. & Austrin, H. The perception of Jewish photographs by non-Jews and Jews. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1957, 54, 278-280.
24. Scodel, A. & Freedman, Maria L. Additional observations on the social perceptions of authoritarians and non-authoritarians. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1956, 52, 92-95.
25. Scodel, A. & Mussen, P. Social perceptions of authoritarians and nonauthoritarians. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1956, 48, 181-184.

26. Titus, H.E. & Hollander, E.P. The California F scale in psychological research: 1950-1955. Psychol. Bull., 1957, 54, 47-64.
27. Walker, Helen M. & Lev, J. Statistical Inference. New York: Holt, 1953.
28. Wertheimer, M. Values in person cognition. Unpublished manuscript, Univer. of Colorado, 1957.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

I, Milton Edward Lipetz, was born in Brooklyn, New York, March 10, 1930. I received my secondary education in the public schools of Brooklyn, New York, and my undergraduate training at New York University, which granted me the Bachelor of Arts degree in 1951. From Brooklyn College, I received the Master of Arts degree in 1953. While in residence there, I was a Fellow during the year 1952-53. In 1954 I entered The Ohio State University and received the degree Doctor of Philosophy in 1958. During my graduate training at The Ohio State University I held the following positions:

Research assistant during the 1954-55 academic year;
Psychology trainee in the Veterans Administration clinical psychology training program between 1954 and 1958; Clinical psychologist during the Autumn of 1955 at the Columbus State School; Assistant instructor at The Ohio State University during the Autumn of 1956 and during the 1957-58 academic year; Research assistant during the Spring of 1958.