



1968

Some Effects of Participation and Discrepancy Level on Opinion Conformity

Allen Norton Shub
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Shub, Allen Norton, "Some Effects of Participation and Discrepancy Level on Opinion Conformity" (1968). *Master's Theses*. 2335.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/2335

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1968 Allen Norton Shub

SOME EFFECTS OF PARTICIPATION AND DISCREPANCY LEVEL
ON OPINION CONFORMITY

by

Allen N. Shub

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

February

1968

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his gratitude to Dr. Homer H. Johnson for his interest, suggestions, and use of his classes for research purposes. The author also wishes to thank Drs. Patrick R. Laughlin, Richard A. Maier, Robert C. Nicolay, and Paul J. von Ebers and Mr. William E. Davis, Mr. Paul Hettich, Miss Mary Ann Poprick, and Mr. James M. Torcivia for providing time in their classes for the author's research. Finally, the author wishes to express his appreciation to Miss Susan C. Barasch for editing and typing many of the materials used in this study and thesis.

LIFE

Allen Norton Shub was born in Chicago, Illinois, June 7, 1943. He attended elementary schools in Chicago from 1949-1957. He was graduated from South Shore High School in June, 1961. In the same year, he enrolled at the University of Illinois (Urbana), as an Edmund J. James Scholar, where he majored in psychology and minored in chemistry and zoology. He received a B.S. in June, 1965.

He entered Loyola University in September, 1965 to pursue graduate study in psychology. In the summer of 1966, he was a research associate at Science Research Associates, Inc., Chicago. In September, 1967, he joined the Psychometric Laboratory of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to continue his graduate study in quantitative psychology.

He is a member of the American Psychological Association, the Psychometric Society, the Midwestern Psychological Association, American Sociological Association, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Psi Chi, and Mensa. His interests lie in psychometrics and in social psychology.

CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIFE	iii
CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM	1
Participation	
Discrepancy Level	
Hypotheses	
METHOD	14
Subjects	
Procedure	
RESULTS	24
DISCUSSION	32
REFERENCES	37
APPENDICES	41

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Mean Opinion of Issue	27
2. Analysis of Variance of Opinion Scores	28
3. Analysis of Variance of Opinion Scores for Class Level	28
4. Mean Opinion of Issue for Dose	29
5. Analysis of Variance of Opinion Scores for Dose	29
6. Mean Evaluations of Arguments	30
7. Analysis of Variance of Evaluation Scores	31

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was to improve and expand upon past methodology in the area of active versus passive participation, discrepancy level, and opinion conformity. Subjects were randomly assigned to 1 of 18 conditions (6 levels of participation, 3 levels of discrepancy) or a control group. It was hypothesized that passive participation yields more conformity than active participation when the initial skills of the subjects are low; given additional information about the issue, active participation--through improvisation of knowledge obtained--yields more opinion conformity than passive participation. Results revealed a significant participation effect ($p < .05$) for opinion conformity but no significant discrepancy level effect; in addition, a significant class effect (introductory vs. advanced psychology students) was found ($p < .001$). Results for argument evaluations revealed a significant discrepancy level effect ($p < .001$), with higher evaluations in lower discrepancy levels. Opinion conformity was found to be positively correlated with evaluation of arguments.

SOME EFFECTS OF PARTICIPATION AND DISCREPANCY LEVEL
ON OPINION CONFORMITY

Allen N. Shub

Loyola University, Chicago

During the past 10-15 years, a controversy has arisen in the use of active versus passive participation in persuasive communications to induce opinion change. Because many of the studies have been limited in scope and on occasion lacking in the proper controls, it is sometimes difficult to make meaningful conclusions. Another research problem, that of discrepancy level (between the subject's initial position and that advocated by a communication), is not generally considered in active participation research. The purpose of this thesis, then, was to improve and expand upon past methodology in these areas and to study the effects of six levels of participation and of three levels of discrepancy on opinion conformity.

Participation

Harvey and Beverly (1961) compared the effects of role playing (active participation) versus no role playing (passive participation) to change opinions about alcohol. Subjects were students whose religious beliefs opposed the sale and drinking

of alcohol. Both groups were exposed to a 2500-word speech advocating the sale of alcohol under prescribed conditions. The role playing group was asked in addition to generate the best possible arguments favoring the sale and use of alcohol. The investigators found that "role playing . . . had a significantly greater positive effect on opinion change than did no role playing."

Because proper controls were not present, the findings of Harvey and Beverly cannot be unambiguously interpreted. The role playing group actually had two doses of communication--passive and active--while the no role playing group had only one dose of communication--the passive reading of a speech. Hence, all that can be concluded from this study is that two doses are better than one. Two other groups that could have been used in this study are: (a) an active-only group to compare with the passive-only group; and (b) a passive-then-passive group to compare with the passive-then-active group. The latter group--passive-then-passive--is necessary to interpret the effects of the second dose of communication. Both the passive-active group and the passive-passive group are equated, in a sense, after the first passive reading condition. Then, after one group receives a second speech and the other group actively writes arguments, it can be determined whether active participation is actually more effective than passive participation in inducing opinion change under these set of circumstan-

ces.

McGuire (1964) reviewed (somewhat analogous) research on the effects of active and passive participation in inducing resistance to persuasive communications. Typically, McGuire's subjects read or wrote essays, in the "inoculation" phase, that supported their own position on an issue or that refuted counterarguments to their own position. The purpose of this inoculation phase was to strengthen the subject's opinion position on the issue. McGuire found that the inoculation procedure was effective in inducing resistance to subsequent change when inoculation groups were compared to subjects who had no prior exposure to arguments about the issue.

In one study, McGuire (1961b) compared four levels of participation in inducing resistance to persuasive communications: (a) active-only; (b) passive-only; (c) active-then-passive; and (d) passive-then-active. When subjects received the same counterarguments in the attack message that they had already defended in the inoculation phase, the passive defense was superior to the active defense; and the active-passive and the passive-active defenses were equal and both superior to the passive-only and the active-only defenses. When subjects received counterarguments different from those that they had already defended in the inoculation phase, active-only was superior to passive-only defenses, with the double defenses lying in between (active-passive superior to passive-active).

In line with the Harvey and Beverly study, the passive-active defense--whether the counterarguments were same or refutational--was superior to the passive-only defense.

McGuire might have included two additional groups in the inoculation phase as controls: (a) a passive-passive group; and (b) an active-active group. Hence, it could be determined what process might be taking place in the second defense in the double defense conditions.

Caution should perhaps be exercised in applying McGuire's work to that of Harvey and Beverly and other investigators studying the effects of participation on opinion change, for McGuire's studies are concerned with resistance to change while Harvey and Beverly's study is concerned with inducing change. Actually, it is quite possible that the dynamics involved are fundamentally the same for both types of research. If a given procedure is effective in inducing resistance to change, why should it not also be effective in inducing change itself? One method (the former) involves the strengthening of the subject's own position; the other method involves the strengthening of a position counter to the subject's initial position.

A number of other studies have viewed the comparative effects of active participation (or role playing, or self-persuasion) and passive participation on opinion change (e.g., Janis & King, 1954; Kelman, 1953; King & Janis, 1956; Hovland et al., 1953).

Janis and King (1954) compared the resulting opinion change of two treatment groups: (a) subjects required to present a speech from a prepared outline; and (b) subjects required merely to listen to such a speech from another student. The investigators found more opinion change in the direction of the position advocated in the speech for those subjects who had actively presented the speech. In addition, more opinion change was found for those subjects who had done more improvisation and who were more satisfied with their performances.

To compare the effects (in producing opinion change) of improvisation versus satisfaction, King and Janis (1956) required subjects either (a) to read a prepared speech silently; or (b) to read a prepared speech aloud; or (c) to read a prepared speech silently and then to present it aloud in an impromptu fashion. Those who had read the speech aloud were more satisfied with their individual performances than those required to present an impromptu talk. However, those who had presented an impromptu talk showed more opinion change in the direction of the position advocated in the speech than did subjects in the other two conditions. Hence, improvisation emerged as a factor in producing internalized attitude change.

Hovland et al. (1953), after reviewing some of the literature on active participation, argued that the most important characteristic of the role played by improvisation in producing opinion change was the "spontaneous additions and elabor-

ations of the arguments contained in the original communication." If Hovland et al. are correct, then active participation should be most effective when the subject is first presented with information concerning the issue. In fact, McGuire (1961a) pointed out that active participation may have negative effects on learning--which has been shown (e.g., Hovland et al., 1953) to be related to opinion change--when introduced at a time when the subject does not have enough skill or familiarity to handle it.

Research comparing the effects of active versus passive participation is often confounded with the amount of time allowed the subjects to read or write a communication. In studies where the times allowed are stated, frequently more time is allowed for subjects to write an essay than for those to read an essay. For example, McGuire and Papageorgis (1961) allowed subjects 5 minutes to read a 1000-word essay (passive participation) but 20 minutes to write an essay (active participation) during the inoculation phase of inducing resistance to opinion change. Although writing an essay will generally require more time than will reading one already written, an equating of time parameters is, nevertheless, desirable. One solution is not to require subjects to write an entire essay but instead to generate and develop a single argument during a 6-minute interval, given that 6 minutes are allowed other subjects to read an essay. Watts (1967), in a study of the persistence of opinion

change as a function of participation, allowed subjects 8 minutes whether they were to read a 600-word essay or to write an argument. That initial opinion change was equal for both groups was attributed, however, to prestudy modifications of the written communication to produce initial equating.

Discrepancy Level

Another source of controversy in the opinion change area involves the effects of discrepancy level on opinion change. Discrepancy is defined as the difference between the position endorsed by a subject and the position advocated by a communication. A number of studies (e.g., Zimbardo, 1960; Hovland & Pritzker, 1957; Goldberg, 1954) have demonstrated a linear relationship between discrepancy level and amount of conformity, while others (e.g., Whittaker, 1963, 1964a, 1964b; Sherif & Hovland, 1961) have found a curvilinear relationship with intermediate discrepancies producing the most conformity to the communication. Sherif and Hovland (1961) suggested that under conditions of high ego-involvement in the initial position, extreme discrepancies may yield less conformity than moderate discrepancies--hence accounting for the curvilinear function. Freedman (1964) studied the conditions of high and low involvement and discrepancy level and found that high involvement led to a linear relationship between discrepancy level and opinion change and that low involvement led to a curvilinear relationship.

Although discrepancy level research has explored the effects with already-written communications on opinion change, there is a lack of exploration on the effects of active participation and discrepancy level on opinion change. The present thesis study was designed to compare the conformity curves of passively-read arguments and actively-written arguments.

Equal-interval scales (e.g., Hovland, Harvey, & Sherif, 1957; Johnson et al., 1966) are ideal for the purpose of varying discrepancy level. Given the subject's initial opinion position on such a scale, the subject can be presented with already-written communications that advocate a position which is discrepant from his initial position by a predetermined amount or the subject can be required to write arguments in support of a position which is discrepant by a predetermined amount.

The obtaining of the subject's initial opinion, however, ordinarily involves the administration of a pretest. While recent evidence (e.g., Lana & King, 1960) suggests that there is no interaction between pretesting and the treatment variables, the fact that some studies have, nevertheless, found a main effect of pretesting (e.g., Entwistle, 1961; Hicks & Spaner, 1962; Lana & King, 1960) demonstrates the necessity of exercising caution in the use of pretests. A solution is to find an issue about which subjects are in general agreement initially. Such is the strategy used in

McGuire's inoculation studies where cultural truisms (e.g., "Everyone should brush his teeth after every meal if at all possible") are used. This type of issue, however, does not lend itself to varying the discrepancy level; nor does Cohen's (Brehm & Cohen, 1962, p. 73) study where subjects were asked to write essays "in favor of the actions of the New Haven police" after students had charged police brutality at a 1959 Yale University demonstration.

For the present thesis study, it was necessary to find an equal-interval scale where most subjects held the same initial opinion. Such a scale is one developed by Johnson et al. (1966) and modified by the present investigator--Immigration from South America to the United States. The Immigration Scale is a nine-step equal-appearing-interval scale, ranging from "Under no conditions should we allow anyone from South America to immigrate to the United States except for purposes of transitory travel and tourism" (position 1) through "We should allow unlimited and unrestricted immigration from South America to the United States" (position 9). Pretesting of this issue with 452 subjects showed that 350 of them (77.4%) chose position 7 ("We should allow anyone from South America to immigrate to the United States except those with criminal or anti-U.S. political records. This immigration, however, should be on a quota system, allowing only so many immigrants per year on a first-come first-served basis"). The mean initial position was 7.02, with

a standard deviation of .80. Only 38 of the subjects (8.4%) held opinion positions of 6 or below. Hence, by assuming the initial opinion position to be position 7, discrepancy level could be varied without the necessity for a pretest. This assumption could then be cross-validated by use of a control group in this thesis study.

With an initial opinion position at 7, the maximum discrepancy level that could be used for the Immigration issue was a discrepancy of 6 (where subjects read or wrote arguments for position 1). Like Johnson et al. (1966), the present thesis study explored discrepancy levels of 2, 4, and 6; i.e., subjects were required to read or write arguments for positions 5 ("We should allow no one from South America to immigrate to the United States except political exiles, scientists, musicians, artists, and those with immediate families in the United States—all within quota limits"), 3 ("We should allow ~~no one~~ from South America to immigrate to the United States except political exiles friendly to the United States, and scientists"), and 1 (mentioned above), respectively, on the 9-position Immigration Scale.

Hypotheses

As has been suggested during the review of the literature on the effects of level of participation, the author recommended that at least six such levels be considered: (a) active-only; (b) passive-only; (c) active, then passive; (d) ac-

tive, then active; (e) passive, then active; and (f) passive, then passive.

In general, it is expected that there is more opinion conformity for subjects who receive double participation treatments than for those who receive single treatments.

Of the single dose conditions, it is hypothesized that the passive-only group exhibits more opinion conformity than the active-only group. This hypothesis is based partially on McGuire's (1961a) finding that active participation can have a negative effect on learning--which is related to subsequent opinion change--when the subject does not have the skills to handle it.

Given equal skills and familiarity, an active participation group would be expected to show more conformity than a passive group. The assumption of equal familiarity, however, can be made only in the double dose conditions where a passive treatment is first presented. Hence, it is hypothesized that more opinion conformity occurs in the passive-active group than in the passive-passive group. To elaborate, both these groups will have essentially the same background on the issue through the already written communication presented first; that the passive-active group must then improvise during the second phase while the passive-passive group merely reads a second written communication should be the critical factor in producing more opinion conformity in the former.

In the other double dose conditions, it is hypothesized that the active-passive group exhibits more conformity than the active-active group. The key to this reasoning lies in the written communication presented to the former group. Both groups may have some difficulty in writing the first argument, but the subjects in the active-passive condition have the advantage of obtaining information from the already-written communication in the second phase while the subjects in the active-active group instead must write a second argument without being presented with any information about the topic. It is expected, then, that the active-active group yields only slightly more opinion conformity than the single dose groups.

The following hypotheses are relevant with regard to discrepancy level in the Immigration Scale (pretesting revealed it to measure a moderately ego-involving issue). First, it is hypothesized that the opinion conformity function is curvilinear in both single dose conditions--the active-only and the passive-only groups. The reasoning here is that in the active condition subjects will be hard-pressed to think of arguments for discrepancy 6 (position 1); in the passive condition, it is felt that one communication advocating virtually no immigration will hardly make an impression on the subjects.

Similarly, it is hypothesized that the conformity function in the active-active condition is curvilinear. As pointed out before, the active-active condition is hardly any more effec-

tive than the single dose groups.

It is further hypothesized that the opinion conformity functions are linear in the other treatments (active-passive, passive-active, and passive-passive), with extreme discrepancies yielding the most conformity. It is felt that the additional dose of communication in these groups is sufficient to lower the response strength of opinion position 7 and raise the response strengths of positions 3 and 1 so that a positive relationship results.

Thus, it is also hypothesized that there is a significant participation-by-discrepancy level interaction effect.

In summary, then, passive participation yields more conformity than active participation when the initial skills of the subjects are low. Given additional information about the issue, active participation, through improvisation of knowledge obtained, yields more opinion conformity than passive participation.

For the six levels of participation considered in the present thesis study, the following decreasing order of effectiveness (with type of conformity function in parentheses) is predicted: (a) passive-active (linear); (b) passive-passive (linear); (c) active-passive (linear); (d) active-active (curvilinear); (e) passive-only (curvilinear); and (f) active-only (curvilinear).

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 341 students enrolled in summer session psychology courses at Loyola University. Subjects served during their regular class periods; all treatments were run in each class period. Data obtained from 26 subjects were discarded for failure to follow instructions; data from 9 randomly selected subjects were discarded in order to equalize the Ns in each treatment. Final N was 306 (16 subjects in each of 18 conditions plus 18 subjects in the control group).

Procedure

Subjects were told that the investigator was interested in standardizing some materials for use in research for the following semester. Subjects were told that the future research involved the comparison of how persons of different personality structures evaluated the same arguments about a specific issue.

The subjects were told that in the standardization process they would not be required to take a personality test but merely to evaluate arguments already written and/or generate some ideas for other arguments that could be used for the particular issue involved. The purpose of the standardization process, subjects were told, was to see what range of evaluations would be obtained from the various

arguments so that certain arguments could be chosen for the future research project.

The research booklets were then passed out to the subjects. To achieve random assignment, the booklets for the 19 treatments (three levels of discrepancy, six levels of participation, plus a control group) had been stacked in random order.

Subjects were instructed to fill out the required information on the cover of the booklet (name, age, and year in school). Subjects were told that the research was confidential and that all names would be changed to code numbers at the study's conclusion; names would be used only for identification, especially to check for duplications. Subjects were further told that the only reason that age and year in school were requested was for the investigator to see whether age and educational level were factors in the evaluations of arguments.

The general directions printed on the cover sheet of the research booklet indicated to each subject which task (i.e., read or write) he would work on.

The cover sheet for a passive participation condition read as follows:

"The general purpose of this study is to get your impressions of an argument that has been raised concerning the extent to which there should be immigration from South America to the United States. You will read an argument. Please read

it carefully. You will be asked a series of questions concerning your impressions of the argument."

The cover sheet for an active participation condition had the following directions:

"The general purpose of this study is to obtain a series of arguments concerning the extent to which there should be immigration from South America to the United States. Your task is to think of a convincing argument that could be used to support a particular position. Specific instructions are on the following pages."

Subjects were told by the investigator that a number of different topics were being used in the research but that it was easier to work with only one issue (i.e., Immigration) in a given classroom.

Before opening the research booklet, subjects were asked to pull out an insert located under the cover sheet. The purpose of this insert was to ascertain how much knowledge the subjects had about the issue of the extent to which there should be immigration from South America to the United States. Subjects were asked to check the appropriate space on a 5-point scale that ranged from "I don't know anything about this area" (position 1) to "I consider myself as expert as anyone in the area" (position 5). Subjects were told that the knowledge scale would help the investigator to evaluate the subjects' responses in the rest of the booklet and were asked to be

honest.

Subjects were then instructed to put aside the knowledge scale and to turn to page 2 of the research booklet. Page 2 contained, for the subject's reference, the opinion scale for the issue of Immigration from South America to the United States. The commentary at the top of the page informed the subjects that " in the past various people have been given this scale and asked either to comment on certain positions or to state the arguments for their favored positions." Subjects were orally told that the scale did not include every position that a person could hold for that topic but that the scale was a progressive scale in that as it progressed from position 1 to position 9 something was added each step along the way until unlimited and unrestricted immigration was reached in position 9. The subjects were then told to familiarize themselves with the scale by reading its nine positions.

The subjects were then directed to turn to the next page, where they would find more directions at the top of the page.

Subjects in the passive condition received directions stating that "on the next page is the argument that you will be asked to evaluate. The passage has been shortened slightly, but the argument has not been altered. Read the argument as carefully as possible during the time allowed." These subjects received messages that advocated the support of Immigration

position 1, 3, or 5. Two messages were constructed for each position (necessary for the passive-passive group); messages were counterbalanced in conditions where only one passive treatment existed (i.e., passive-only, passive-active, and active-passive). Essentially one theme was used in each of the two messages for each position: (a) the labor problems that would result if too much South American immigration were allowed; and (b) the intergroup conflicts that would arise from South American immigration. Each theme was modified to suit the particular opinion position that the message was to support. In the first part of the message, the scale position advocated was made explicit, and brief reasons were given for holding this position. The supportive reasons were derived from discussions in history books. The messages varied from 324-347 words for the labor theme and 256-328 for the group conflict theme, depending on which position the argument advocated.

Subjects in the active condition received directions on the third page as follows: "On this page, write a convincing argument that could be used in support of Position 1 [or 3, or 5] on the Immigration issue. Choose a single theme and develop it as much as possible during the time allowed. If you need more space, use the next page (which is blank)."

After the subjects in both the passive and the active groups read their specific directions, the experimenter con-

tinued with oral instructions: "I want you to spend 5 minutes on this page. Please do not go on to the next page until I say to. Those of you who are reading an argument may finish early. You may go back and read the passage again, but do not go on in the booklet. Those of you who are writing an argument may be a bit pressed for time; but in the 5 minutes I am not expecting you to write a well-developed essay. Just try to get some ideas down on paper."

After 5 minutes had passed, subjects were told: "Please take one more minute to finish up this page." Hence, subjects were actually allowed 6 minutes for their tasks.

After the 6 minutes had elapsed, subjects were told: "If you are writing, please finish the sentence that you are now working on, and then all of you turn to page 4."

Page 4 contained scales for the evaluation of the argument that each subject had just read or written. Ten 7-point semantic differential-type items were used: (a) unclear-clear; (b) conclusive-inconclusive; (c) fair-biased; (d) bad-good; (e) informative-uninformative; (f) boring-interesting; (g) unknowledgeable-knowledgeable; (h) persuasive-unpersuasive; (i) relevant-irrelevant; and (j) invalid-valid. After reading a set of directions, subjects were told to evaluate the argument that they had just worked on and were cautioned not to skip any items. They were told to work quickly, marking their first impressions. After marking their

evaluations, subjects were told to turn to the fifth page, where more directions would be found. These directions varied, depending upon which condition the subject was participating in.

Single dose conditions. Subjects in the single dose conditions (i.e., active-only or passive-only) received the following directions on page 5 of their booklets: "Please disregard the directions that are now being given to the rest of the class. Instead, we would like you to work on the next two pages of this booklet. Your responses to the following two pages will enable us to evaluate your evaluations of the argument. On the next page we would like your opinion on the general issue of Immigration from South America to the United States. Please be honest. Do not necessarily choose the socially acceptable position unless it is actually your own opinion. . . ."

On the sixth page was an opinion scale for the Immigration issue (the same 9-step scale as the one which was used for reference on page 2 of the booklet). The directions called for each subject to "check the one statement that best expresses your feelings about this topic."

The last (seventh) page for the single dose conditions contained certainty and importance scales (equal-appearing intervals) developed by Johnson et al. (1966). Subjects were first asked how certain they were that the opinion they ex-

pressed on the preceding page was the "best" or "correct" opinion. The scale ranged from "I have no faith at all in my opinion on this subject" (position 1) to "I am absolutely positive of the correctness of my opinion" (position 9). Subjects were asked to "check the one statement that best expresses your certainty."

The importance scale contained nine statements referring to the importance of the topic, ranging from "The subject matter discussed is of no importance at all" (position 1) to "I am convinced this subject is of the greatest concern" (position 9). Subjects were asked to "check the one statement that best expresses your feelings."

Double dose conditions. Subjects in the double dose conditions (i.e., active-active, active-passive, passive-active, and passive-passive) were required to work on a second argument after they had finished evaluating the first argument. The directions on the fifth page indicated to these subjects whether they would read again, write again, or do just the opposite of what they did for the first argument.

The sixth page contained a reference scale for the Immigration Scale, the same reference scale that appeared on page 2 of the booklet.

The seventh page gave more specific instructions (i.e., assigning the position number to write on or informing the subjects that they were about to read an argument). Irregard-

less of what treatment the subject was assigned to, he was assigned the same opinion position to read about or to write on as the one he worked on earlier in the booklet. Subjects were told that if they were writing an argument this time, they could draw upon the same ideas that they used before in writing the first argument or that they came across in reading the first argument; however, they were told, it would be better to think of new ideas to use in this argument.

Subjects were again given 6 minutes for this task. They were told to spend 5 minutes on this page but told to take one more minute after the 5 minutes had elapsed.

The subjects then evaluated the second argument on the eighth page, using the same 7-point semantic differential items used in the evaluation of the first argument.

The subjects checked their own opinion position on the issue, on the ninth page, after having been told that their opinion would help the investigator to assess their evaluations of the arguments, that they should be honest in checking their opinion, and that they should not necessarily choose the socially acceptable position unless it was actually their own position.

Subjects checked their certainty of opinion and importance of the issue on the last (tenth) page.

Control group. The purpose of a control group was to obtain the average opinion on the Immigration issue, given no preceding treatments. The control group booklets were ran-

domly located in the pile of research booklets.

The cover sheet of the control group booklet gave the following directions: "Please disregard the directions that are being given to the rest of the class. Instead, we would like to obtain your feelings concerning a variety of discussion topics. Please read the directions carefully. And please be honest. Do not necessarily choose the socially acceptable position unless it is actually your own opinion. . . . "

An opinion scale for the Immigration issue was presented on page 2 of the booklet; the certainty and importance scales were on page 3. The rest of the booklet for the control group contained filler opinion scales.

At the end of the experimental session, which lasted about 30 minutes, the test booklets were collected; and the true nature of the experiment was explained to the subjects.

RESULTS

A 3 x 6 (discrepancy-by-participation) factorial-with-single-control-group analysis of variance (Winer, 1962) was performed with final opinion on the Immigration issue as the dependent variable. The mean opinion for each treatment is presented in Table 1. Table 2 reports the results of the analysis of variance. The analysis revealed a significant control-versus-all-others effect ($F = 4.21$, $df = 1/287$, $p < .05$) and a significant participation effect ($F = 2.22$, $df = 5/287$, $p < .05$). Neither a discrepancy level effect nor an interaction effect were found, however. An inspection of the means showed the active-passive group with the greatest opinion conformity, followed in order by the active-active, passive-active, passive-passive, passive-only, and active-only groups. A Duncan new multiple range test (Edwards, 1960) at $\alpha = .05$ revealed that the active-passive group was significantly greater than the passive-only and the active-only conditions. No adjacent means were significantly different from each other.

Of the 16 subjects in each of the 18 cells, 10 were subjects who were enrolled in at least their second psychology course and 6 were subjects who were enrolled in introductory psychology courses. A 3 x 6 x 2 analysis of variance with unequal cell frequencies (Winer, 1962) was performed on the final opinion scores with class level (i.e., introductory versus advanced psychology courses) as the third factor. Table 3 re-

ports the results of this analysis. The analysis revealed a highly significant class effect ($F = 20.11$, $df = 1/252$, $p < .001$), with introductory psychology students showing more opinion conformity than advanced psychology students. The average opinion position for 108 introductory psychology subjects was 5.97; the average opinion position for 180 advanced psychology subjects was 6.78. In addition to the class effect, a significant participation effect was found ($F = 2.54$, $df = 5/252$, $p < .05$).

As was pointed out in an earlier section, the average opinion position on the Immigration issue for 452 pretested subjects was 7.02, with a standard deviation of .80. The mean opinion position of the 18 subjects (8 introductory psychology and 10 advanced psychology students) of the control group of the present thesis study was 7.28, with a standard deviation of 1.04. The mean opinion position for introductory psychology subjects was 7.25, for advanced psychology subjects 7.30.

A 2×3 factorial analysis of variance was performed on opinion scores for one dose versus two doses of participation and the three discrepancy levels. The means for this analysis are presented in Table 4. Table 5 reports the results of the analysis of variance performed on these data. The analysis revealed a significant dose effect ($F = 7.97$, $df = 1/282$, $p < .005$). An inspection of the means showed that the double dose participation groups yielded more opinion conformity than did the single dose participation groups. No significant dis-

crepancy level effect was found.

A 3 x 6 (discrepancy-by-participation) factorial analysis of variance was performed with average evaluation of arguments as the dependent variable. Table 6 reports the means for each treatment; for double dose treatments where each subject had two arguments to evaluate, the average of the two evaluations for each subject was used. As can be seen in Table 7, where the results of the analysis of variance are presented, a significant discrepancy level effect was found ($F = 11.55$, $df = 2/270$, $p < .001$), with the highest average evaluation contained in the lowest discrepancy level (Discrepancy 2). A significant participation-by-discrepancy level interaction was also found ($F = 2.29$, $df = 10/270$, $p < .025$). The participation level effect was not significant. A Duncan new multiple range test at $\alpha = .001$ revealed that the evaluations in Discrepancy 2 were significantly greater than those in Discrepancies 4 and 6, although the values in Discrepancy 4 and Discrepancy 6 were not significantly different from each other.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed between average evaluation of arguments and opinion conformity. The coefficient obtained was .34, significant beyond the .0001 level, indicating that the higher the evaluation obtained by the arguments the greater the subsequent opinion conformity.

TABLE 1
Mean Opinion of Issue^a

Level of Participation		Discrepancy Level			Ave.
		2	4	6	
Active-only	M	7.13	7.00	6.69	6.94
	SD	.86	.79	.77	
Passive-only	M	6.81	7.00	6.44	6.75
	SD	1.29	.61	1.54	
Passive-Passive	M	6.69	6.94	5.81	6.48
	SD	1.16	..56	2.01	
Passive-Active	M	6.44	6.19	6.44	6.35
	SD	1.66	1.43	1.62	
Active-Active	M	6.00	6.25	6.75	6.33
	SD	1.62	2.11	1.15	
Active-Passive	M	6.63	5.69	5.75	6.02
	SD	1.22	2.17	2.44	
Average		6.61	6.51	6.31	6.48

Note.--Control group M = 7.28, SD = 1.04, N = 18.

^aN = 16 in each cell.

TABLE 2

Analysis of Variance of Opinion Scores

Source	df	MS	F
Control vs. all others	1	9.67	4.21*
Discrepancy level (A)	2	2.26	< 1
Participation level (B)	5	5.09	2.22*
A X B	10	2.50	1.09
Error (within cell)	287	2.29	

* $p < .05$

TABLE 3

Analysis of Variance of Opinion Scores for Class Level

Source	df	MS	F
Discrepancy level (A)	2	3.67	1.66
Participation level (B)	5	5.61	2.54*
Class level (C)	1	44.35	20.11**
A X B	10	2.86	1.29
A X C	2	4.10	1.86
B X C	5	1.65	< 1
A X B X C	10	2.21	1.00
Error (within cell)	252	2.21	

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

TABLE 4

Mean Opinion of Issue for Dose

Dose		Discrepancy Level			Ave.
		2	4	6	
Single ^a	M	6.97	7.00	6.56	6.84
	SD	1.10	.71	1.22	
Double ^b	M	6.44	6.27	6.19	6.30
	SD	1.46	1.75	1.91	
Average		6.71	6.64	6.38	6.57

^aN = 32 in each cell.

^bN = 64 in each cell.

TABLE 5

Analysis of Variance of Opinion Scores for Dose

Source	df	MS	F
Dose (A)	1	18.89	7.97*
Discrepancy level (B)	2	2.58	1.09
A X B	2	.69	< 1
Error (within cell)	282	2.37	

*p < .005

TABLE 6
Mean Evaluations of Arguments^a

Level of Participation		Discrepancy Level			Ave.
		2	4	6	
Active-only	M	4.36	3.29	3.72	3.79
	SD	.82	1.30	.84	
Passive-only	M	4.94	3.32	4.21	4.16
	SD	.87	1.12	.79	
Passive-Passive	M	4.65	3.71	4.00	4.12
	SD	.87	.75	1.18	
Passive-Active	M	3.98	4.33	3.81	4.04
	SD	.90	.87	.85	
Active-Active	M	4.63	4.26	3.83	4.24
	SD	.84	1.30	1.22	
Active-Passive	M	4.37	4.08	4.24	4.23
	SD	.58	.82	1.13	
Average		4.49	3.83	3.97	4.10

^aN = 16 in each cell.

TABLE 7

Analysis of Variance of Evaluation Scores

Source	df	MS	F
Discrepancy level (A)	2	11.55	11.55**
Participation level (B)	5	1.33	1.33
A X B	10	2.29	2.29*
Error (within cell)	270	1.00	

* $p < .025$

** $p < .001$

DISCUSSION

It was originally felt that the value of the present thesis study lay in the two treatment groups which are generally omitted in studies which compare the effects of active versus passive participation on opinion conformity. The two additional conditions compared in this study were: (a) passive-passive, and (b) active-active. By comparing the results of the passive-active condition with the passive-passive condition, it could be determined if the active participation was the critical factor in inducing opinion conformity or whether a double dose of participation, either active or passive, would yield the same results. Similarly, by comparing the effects of the active-passive condition with the active-active condition, it could be determined what process might be occurring in the second participation.

The first question to be answered, however, is if the one underlying assumption is valid. In order to manipulate discrepancy level, it was assumed that the initial opinion position for all subjects was position 7. A pretest would have made any assumptions unnecessary, but the investigator preferred to avoid its influences, if any. That the control group yielded a mean opinion position of 7.28 seems to justify the assumption. It should be noted that no subject was asked to read or write arguments for positions 8 or 9. Hence the fact that subjects tended to hold initial positions at this end of the scale (as

indicated by a mean opinion position greater than 7.0) would not bias the results.

It was hypothesized that there is more opinion conformity for subjects who receive double participation treatments than for those who receive single treatments. Analysis of variance confirmed this hypothesis ($p < .005$).

Other hypotheses were made concerning the order in which opinion conformity would occur as a function of level-of-participation. Analysis of variance revealed a significant participation effect ($p < .05$) and a significant control-vs.-all-others effect ($p < .05$), but adjacent means were not significantly different from each other. Nevertheless, the individual hypotheses and trends are noted below.

Of the single dose conditions, it was hypothesized that the passive-only group exhibits more opinion conformity than the active-only group. The means were in the direction of this hypothesis, with the passive-only group yielding a mean of 6.75, the active-only group 6.94.

It was hypothesized that more opinion conformity occurs in the passive-active group than in the passive-passive group. The mean opinion for the former was 6.35, for the latter 6.48; again the means were in the direction of the hypothesis.

It was hypothesized that the active-passive group exhibits more conformity than the active-active group. Here, too, the means were in the expected direction--6.02 for the active-passive condition, 6.33 for the active-active condition.

One predicted trend that did not materialize was the overall ordering of the six participation treatments. It was predicted that the passive-active and the passive-passive would yield the most conformity, followed next by the active-passive and the active-active treatments. Results of the study revealed one reversal in the predicted order: the active-passive and the active-active treatments yielded the most conformity, followed next by the passive-active and the passive-passive. As predicted, passive-only and active-only yielded the least conformity. The reversal at the top is difficult to explain. It was thought the passive-active would rank first because these subjects would benefit both from knowledge gained in the passive phase and the improvisation in the active phase. That the active-passive actually yielded the most conformity can perhaps be explained by calling the second or passive phase as reinforcing to whatever the subject wrote in the first active phase.

A number of predictions were made in regard to discrepancy level. That there was no significant discrepancy effect for opinion is surprising in light of much research in this area. It is possible that the immigration issue is one in which persons hold more strongly onto their opinions, and if they are going to change, will do so irregardless of the amount advocated. Also, it must be remembered that the messages for each position were modified from the same basic themes; however, this explanation is not valid for active conditions. The only discrepancy

effect that was found was for average evaluations of arguments. Not surprisingly, the lowest discrepancy level contained the highest average evaluation. Also not surprising, but seemingly in conflict with the preceding statement, was the significant relationship found between evaluations and opinion conformity; the higher the evaluation the greater the opinion conformity. Although the highest evaluations were found in discrepancy 2, the greatest average conformity was found in discrepancy 6.

An interesting finding was revealed when the data were separated by introductory psychology students and beyond-introductory psychology students. That this class effect was highly significant ($p < .001$), indicating that introductory students conform more than advanced students, seems to limit the generalizability of studies employing the conventional introductory psychology students. Certainly the class effect is a variable that will have to be reckoned with in future research.

Although the study described in this thesis was designed to answer a number of questions in the controversies of levels of participation and discrepancy, certainly there still remains much to be determined in this area. The hypothesis that passive participation yields more conformity than active participation when the initial skills of the subjects are low and that given additional information about the issue active participation--through improvisation of knowledge obtained--yields more opinion conformity than passive participation needs additional support.

Future research in this area might compare, for example, different types of messages. Messages that attack the subject's initial position and then advocate an alternative position might be compared with messages that merely advocate an alternative position. It is hypothesized that subjects who receive arguments attacking their own position before the advocacy of another position will show more opinion change than subjects presented only with arguments supporting another position. Similarly, subjects could be asked to write arguments that first attacked their initial position and then that advocated a particular alternative position. The six levels of participation could also be compared on the effects of high versus low sources of the written communications. In addition, other issues could be studied.

In conclusion: Which method, active or passive participation, yields the most opinion conformity? It depends!

REFERENCES

- Brehm, J. W., & Cohen, A. R. Explorations in cognitive dissonance. New York: Wiley, 1962.
- Edwards, A. L. Experimental design in psychological research. (Rev. ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.
- Entwistle, D. R. Interactive effects of pretesting. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1961, 21, 607-620.
- Freedman, J. L. Involvement, discrepancy, and change. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 69, 290-295.
- Goldberg, S. C. Three situational determinants of conformity to social norms. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 325-329.
- Harvey, O. J., & Beverly, G. D. Some personality correlates of concept change through role playing. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 125-130.
- Hicks, J. M., & Spaner, F. E. Attitude change and mental hospital experience. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 65, 112-120.
- Hovland, C. I., Harvey, O. J., & Sherif, M. Assimilation and contrast effects in reactions to communication

and attitude change. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 244-252.

Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. Communication and persuasion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

Hovland, C. I., & Pritzker, H. A. Extent of opinion change as a function of amount of change advocated. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1957, 54, 257-261.

Janis, I. L., & King, B. T. The influence of role playing on opinion change. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 211-218.

Johnson, H. H., Torcivia, J. M., Shub, A. N., & Linn, R. L. Some effects of source, issue, and discrepancy level on responses to interpersonal disagreement. Technical Report No. 1, August 1966, Loyola University, Chicago, GS-932, National Science Foundation.

Kelman, H. C. Attitude change as a function of response restriction. Human Relations, 1953, 6, 185-214.

King, B. T., & Janis, I. L. Comparison of the effectiveness of improvised versus non-improvised role playing in producing opinion changes. Human Relations, 1956, 9, 177-186.

Lana, R. E., & King, D. J. Learning factors as determiners of pretest sensitization. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1960, 44, 189-191.

- McGuire, W. J. Audience participation and audio-visual instructions: overt-covert responding and rate of presentation. In A. A. Lumsdaine (Ed.), Student response in programmed instruction. Washington: National Academy of Sciences, 1961. Pp. 417-426. Cited by W. J. McGuire, Attitudes and opinions. Annual Review of Psychology, 1966, 17, 475-514. (a)
- McGuire, W. J. Resistance to persuasion conferred by active and passive prior refutation of the same and alternative counterarguments. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 326-332. (b)
- McGuire, W. J. Inducing resistance to persuasion. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (vol. 1). New York: Academic Press, 1964.
- McGuire, W. J., & Papageorgis, D. The relative efficacy of various types of prior belief-defense in producing immunity against persuasion. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 327-337.
- Sherif, M., & Hovland, C. I. Social judgment. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.
- Watts, W. A. Relative persistence of opinion change induced by active compared to passive participation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 4-15.
- Whittaker, J. O. Opinion change as a function of commu-

nication-attitude discrepancy. Psychological Reports, 1963, 13, 763-772.

Whittaker, J. O. Cognitive dissonance and the effectiveness of persuasive communications. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1964, 28, 547-555. (a)

Whittaker, J. O. Parameters of social influence in the autokinetic situation. Sociometry, 1964, 27, 88-95. (b)

Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Zimbardo, P. G. Involvement and communication discrepancy as determinants of opinion conformity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 60, 86-94.

APPENDIX I-1

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY

Research Form # P-

General Directions

The general purpose of this study is to get your impressions of an argument that has been raised concerning the extent to which there should be immigration from South America to the United States.

You will read an argument. Please read it carefully. You will be asked a series of questions concerning your impressions of the argument.

For your reference, a scale for the Immigration issue is included in this booklet (see next page).

NAME (print): _____

AGE: _____

YEAR IN SCHOOL: _____

APPENDIX I-2

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY

Research Form # A-

General Directions

The general purpose of this study is to obtain a series of arguments concerning the extent to which there should be immigration from South America to the United States.

Your task is to think of a convincing argument that could be used to support a particular position. Specific instructions are on the following pages.

For your reference, a scale for the Immigration issue is included in this booklet (see next page).

NAME (print): _____

AGE: _____

YEAR IN SCHOOL: _____

42

APPENDIX I-3

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY

Research Form # CM

General Directions

Please disregard the directions that are being given to the rest of the class.

Instead, we would like to obtain your feelings concerning a variety of discussion topics. Please read the directions carefully. And, please be honest. Do not necessarily choose the socially acceptable position unless it is actually your own opinion.

When you are finished with this booklet, you may read a book, review your class notes, etc. until the others have finished their booklets.

Remember to disregard all other instructions that will be given to the rest of the class.

NAME (print): _____

AGE: _____

YEAR IN SCHOOL: _____

43

APPENDIX II

Name: _____

How much do you know about the issue of "the extent to which there should be immigration from South America to the United States"? Check the space that best represents your knowledge.

- _____ I don't know anything about this area
- _____ I have very little knowledge about this area
- _____ I have some knowledge about the area
- _____ I am fairly well versed in the area
- _____ I consider myself as expert as anyone in the area

44

APPENDIX III

SCALE: IMMIGRATION FROM SOUTH AMERICA TO THE UNITED STATES

Below are listed (for your reference) nine statements that range in order from no immigration at all to unlimited immigration.

In the past, various people have been given this scale and asked either to comment on certain positions or to state the arguments for their favored positions.

Do not make any marks on this page.

1. Under no conditions should we allow anyone from South America to immigrate to the United States except for purposes of transitory travel and tourism.
2. We should allow no one from South America to immigrate to the United States except those who have been political personalities recently ousted from their positions because of their pro-U.S. sentiments.
3. We should allow no one from South America to immigrate to the United States except political exiles friendly to the United States, and scientists.
4. We should allow no one from South America to immigrate to the United States except political exiles, scientists, musicians, and artists—all within quota limits.
5. We should allow no one from South America to immigrate to the United States except political exiles, scientists, musicians, artists, and those with immediate families in the United States—all within quota limits.
6. We should allow no one from South America to immigrate to the United States except political exiles, scientists, musicians, artists, and those with immediate families or any other relatives in the United States—all within quota limits.
7. We should allow anyone from South America to immigrate to the United States except those with criminal or anti-U.S. political records. This immigration, however, should be on a quota system, allowing only so many immigrants per year on a first-come first-served basis.
8. We should allow anyone from South America to immigrate to the United States, regardless of his previous history. A quota system should be enforced, however, to limit the number of immigrants in any one year.
9. We should allow unlimited and unrestricted immigration from South America to the United States.

APPENDIX IV-1
DIRECTIONS FOR PAGE 3

On the next page is the argument that you will be asked to evaluate.

The passage has been shortened slightly, but the argument has not been altered. Read the argument as carefully as possible during the time allowed.

You may turn now to Page 3.

4/6

APPENDIX IV-2
DIRECTIONS FOR WRITING AN ARGUMENT

On this page, write a convincing argument that could be used in support of Position ____ on the Immigration issue.

Choose a single theme and develop it as much as possible during the time allowed.

If you need more space, use the next page (which is blank).

47

APPENDIX V-1
IMMIGRATION FROM SOUTH AMERICA (Argument in Support of Position 1)

Recent developments of the last 20 years now make it necessary for the United States to re-examine its immigration policies, especially those relating to South America. Because the United States has been flooded with South American immigrants in recent years, threatening serious overcrowding in the future, immigration screening procedures must be initiated so that no one from South America be allowed to immigrate to the U.S. except for purposes of transitory travel and tourism.

There was a time in our history when we could welcome one and all. This was a time when the United States was underpopulated; we were growing rapidly and were greatly in need of a labor force both on the farms and in the factories. There were plenty of job opportunities even (or especially) for the uneducated; however, things have changed.

For example, we do not need the abundance of farm workers that we used to. Our own small farmers are flocking to the city because they are unable to succeed in farming. Farming is big business and highly mechanized, and there is no room for the immigrant farmer.

The same thing can be said about work in the industrial centers. Our native workers are losing jobs due to automation. The number of railroad yard and road workers has been drastically reduced, and whole payroll office staffs are being replaced by computers. We have had to initiate federal programs for retraining, Job Corps, and poverty programs. The majority of immigrants from South America are uneducated; there would be tremendous difficulty placing them in jobs. We do not have enough positions available; if the immigrants got jobs, they would be taking them away from our own needy citizens.

The United States was once a country that was able to welcome everyone, but the facts now make it essential to start limiting immigration. We must not admit immigrants from South America to the United States and allow only transitory travel and tourism.

APPENDIX V-2
IMMIGRATION FROM SOUTH AMERICA (Argument in Support of Position 1)

Immigration from South America has become an increasing problem. Opposition to immigration has become stronger as the facts become known. The informed public is beginning to demand restrictive legislation that would permit no immigration from South America to the United States except for purposes of transitory travel and tourism.

The bedrock of a democracy is based largely upon the cooperative work of many groups and individuals within the group. Although we consider the United States a democracy in every sense of the word, there is, unfortunately, some group conflict. Conflict appears to be inevitable whenever people of different traditions and cultures come together.

With the increased number of immigrants struggling for a living, for power, for position, and for prestige, there has developed within the U.S. population a feeling that the culture and prestige of the American people is being threatened. Why? Because new immigrants are difficult to Americanize. In general, these immigrants have had little formal education. Their customs, traditions, and languages are different from the Americans already here. They settle in large cities, in sections of their own, where they feel no need to learn American ways. Furthermore, some of them come here merely to earn money and then to return to their native lands.

Because allowing immigration from South America to the United States has not produced the democracy that in theory was expected, and because these immigrants have so often abused their privileges, it is absolutely necessary to restrict (in the future) South American immigration and allow only transitory travel and tourism.

APPENDIX V-3
IMMIGRATION FROM SOUTH AMERICA (Argument in Support of Position 3)

Recent developments of the last 20 years now make it necessary for the United States to re-examine its immigration policies, especially those relating to South America. Because the United States has been flooded with South American immigrants in recent years, threatening serious overcrowding in the future, immigration screening procedures must be initiated so that only scientists and political exiles friendly to the United States are admitted.

There was a time in our history when we could welcome one and all. This was a time when the United States was underpopulated; we were growing rapidly and were greatly in need of a labor force both on the farms and in the factories. There were plenty of job opportunities even (or especially) for the uneducated; however, things have changed.

For example, we do not need the abundance of farm workers that we used to. Our own small farmers are flocking to the city because they are unable to succeed in farming. Farming is big business and highly mechanized, and there is no room for the immigrant farmer.

The same thing can be said about work in the industrial centers. Our native workers are losing jobs due to automation. The number of railroad yard and road workers has been drastically reduced, and now whole payroll office staffs are being replaced by computers. We have had to initiate federal programs for retraining, Job Corps, and poverty programs. The majority of immigrants from South America are uneducated; there would be tremendous difficulty placing them in jobs. We do not have enough positions available; if the immigrants got jobs, they would be taking them away from our own needy citizens.

The United States was once a country that was able to welcome everyone, but the facts now make it essential to start limiting immigration. We should admit only the scientists (who as highly educated men will make a definite contribution to the U.S.) and the political exiles friendly to the U.S. (whose loyalty merits their admission).

APPENDIX V-4
IMMIGRATION FROM SOUTH AMERICA (Argument in Support of Position 3)

Immigration from South America has become an increasing problem. Opposition to immigration has become stronger as the facts become known. The informed public is beginning to demand restrictive legislation that would permit only scientists and ousted pro-U.S. politicians to immigrate to the United States.

The bedrock of a democracy is based largely upon the cooperative work of many groups and individuals within the group. Although we consider the United States a democracy in every sense of the word, there is, unfortunately, some group conflict. Conflict appears to be inevitable whenever people of different traditions and cultures come together.

With the increased number of immigrants struggling for a living, for power, for position, and for prestige, there has developed within the U.S. population a feeling that the culture and prestige of the American people is being threatened. Why? Because new immigrants are difficult to Americanize. In general, these immigrants have had little formal education. Their customs, traditions, and languages are different from the Americans already here. They settle in large cities, in sections of their own, where they feel no need to learn American ways. Furthermore, some of them come here merely to earn money and then to return to their native lands.

Such is not the case with scientists or ousted pro-U.S. politicians, both of whom have been known to assimilate into and contribute to our culture, rather than merely take from it.

Because allowing immigration from South America to the United States has not produced the democracy that in theory was expected, and because these immigrants have so often abused their privileges, it is absolutely necessary to restrict (in the future) South American immigration and admit only those who have proved to be deserving—namely, scientists and political exiles friendly to the U.S.

APPENDIX V-5
IMMIGRATION FROM SOUTH AMERICA (Argument in Support of Position 5)

Recent developments of the last 20 years now make it necessary for the United States to re-examine its immigration policies, especially those relating to South America. Because the United States has been flooded with South American immigrants in recent years, threatening serious overcrowding in the future, immigration screening procedures must be initiated so that only scientists, political exiles friendly to the U.S., musicians, artists, and those with immediate families in the U.S. are admitted.

There was a time in our history when we could welcome one and all. This was a time when the United States was underpopulated; we were growing rapidly and were greatly in need of a labor force both on the farms and in the factories. There were plenty of job opportunities even (or especially) for the uneducated; however, things have changed.

For example, we do not need the abundance of farm workers that we used to. Our own small farmers are flocking to the city because they are unable to succeed in farming. Farming is big business and highly mechanized, and there is no room for the immigrant farmer.

The same thing can be said about work in the industrial centers. Our native workers are losing jobs due to automation. The number of railroad yard and road workers has been drastically reduced, and now whole payroll office staffs are being replaced by computers. We have had to initiate federal programs for retraining, Job Corps, and poverty programs. The majority of immigrants from South America are uneducated; there would be tremendous difficulty placing them in jobs. We do not have enough positions available; if the immigrants got jobs, they would be taking them away from our own needy citizens.

The United States was once a country that was able to welcome everyone, but the facts now make it essential to start limiting immigration. We should admit only the scientists, musicians, and artists (who as highly talented men will make a definite contribution to the U.S.), political exiles friendly to the U.S. (whose loyalty merits their admission), and those with immediate families in the U.S.

APPENDIX V-6
IMMIGRATION FROM SOUTH AMERICA (Argument in Support of Position 5)

Immigration from South America has become an increasing problem. Opposition to immigration has become stronger as the facts become known. The informed public is beginning to demand restrictive legislation that would permit only scientists, ousted pro-U.S. politicians, musicians, artists, and those with immediate families in the U.S. to immigrate to this country.

The bedrock of a democracy is based largely upon the cooperative work of many groups and individuals within the group. Although we consider the United States a democracy in every sense of the word, there is, unfortunately, some group conflict. Conflict appears to be inevitable whenever people of different traditions and cultures come together.

With the increased number of immigrants struggling for a living, for power, for position, and for prestige, there has developed within the U.S. population a feeling that the culture and prestige of the American people is being threatened. Why? Because new immigrants are difficult to Americanize. In general, these immigrants have had little formal education. Their customs, traditions, and languages are different from the Americans already here. They settle in large cities, in sections of their own, where they feel no need to learn American ways. Furthermore, some of them come here merely to earn money and then to return to their native lands.

Such is not the case with scientists, ousted pro-U.S. politicians, musicians, and artists—all of whom have been known to assimilate into and contribute to our culture, rather than merely take from it. And surely we cannot deny admission to those with immediate families already here.

Because allowing immigration from South America to the United States has not produced the democracy that in theory was expected, and because these immigrants have so often abused their privileges, it is absolutely necessary to restrict (in the future) South American immigration and admit only those who have proved to be deserving—namely, scientists, political exiles friendly to the U.S., musicians, artists, and those with immediate families in the U.S.

53
53
53

bad : very : neutral : very : good

bad : X : _____ : _____ : neutral : _____ : _____ : very : good

Or you might feel that the evaluation should be somewhere in between, and you should place your "X" somewhere between the above "X's". Now please give us your true feelings on these ten characteristics.

unclear : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : clear

conclusive : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : inconclusive

fair : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : biased

bad : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : good

informative : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : uninformative

boring : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : interesting

unknowledgeable : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : knowledgeable

persuasive : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : unpersuasive

relevant : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : irrelevant

invalid : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : valid

APPENDIX VII
DIRECTIONS

Please disregard the directions that are now being given to the rest of the class.

Instead, we would like you to work on the next two pages of this booklet. Your responses to the following two pages will enable us to evaluate your evaluations of the argument.

On the next page we would like your opinion on the general issue of Immigration from South America to the United States. Please be honest. Do not necessarily choose the socially acceptable position unless it is actually your own opinion.

When you are finished with the next two pages, you may read a book, review your class notes, etc. until the others have finished their booklets.

Remember to disregard all other instructions that will be given to the rest of the class.

55

APPENDIX VIII

On this page we would like to obtain your opinion on the general issue of Immigration from South America to the United States. Below are listed nine statements that range in order from no immigration at all to unlimited immigration. Check the one statement that best expresses your feelings about this topic.

- ☐ 1. Under no conditions should we allow anyone from South America to immigrate to the United States except for purposes of transitory travel and tourism.
 - ☐ 2. We should allow no one from South America to immigrate to the United States except those who have been political personalities recently ousted from their positions because of their pro-U.S. sentiments.
 - ☐ 3. We should allow no one from South America to immigrate to the United States except political exiles friendly to the United States, and scientists.
 - ☐ 4. We should allow no one from South America to immigrate to the United States except political exiles, scientists, musicians, and artists--all within quota limits.
 - ☐ 5. We should allow no one from South America to immigrate to the United States except political exiles, scientists, musicians, artists, and those with immediate families in the United States--all within quota limits.
 - ☐ 6. We should allow no one from South America to immigrate to the United States except political exiles, scientists, musicians, artists, and those with immediate families or any other relatives in the United States--all within quota limits.
 - ☐ 7. We should allow anyone from South America to immigrate to the United States except those with criminal or anti-U.S. political records. This immigration, however, should be on a quota system, allowing only so many immigrants per year on a first-come first-served basis.
 - ☐ 8. We should allow anyone from South America to immigrate to the United States, regardless of his previous history. A quota system should be enforced, however, to limit the number of immigrants in any one year.
 - ☐ 9. We should allow unlimited and unrestricted immigration from South America to the United States.
- 25

APPENDIX IX

On this page indicate how certain you are that the opinion you expressed on the preceding page was the "best" or "correct" opinion. Below are listed nine statements that range from completely uncertain to completely certain. Check the one statement that best expresses your certainty.

- ☐ 1. I have no faith at all in my opinion on this subject.
- ☐ 2. I would be quite doubtful as to the validity of my opinion.
- ☐ 3. I have only a little reason to believe myself accurate.
- ☐ 4. I have some doubts concerning my opinion.
- ☐ 5. Advantages and disadvantages of my opinion can be pointed out.
- ☐ 6. I would consider my opinion as having some value.
- ☐ 7. There is little doubt that my opinions on this matter are correct.
- ☐ 8. I am highly confident of my judgment in this area.
- ☐ 9. I am absolutely positive of the correctness of my opinion.

Below indicate your feelings as to the importance of the topic about which you gave your opinion on the previous page. Below are nine statements that range in order from extremely unimportant to extremely important. Check the one statement that best expresses your feelings.

- ☐ 1. The subject matter discussed is of no importance at all.
- ☐ 2. The subject scarcely seems worth the fuss and bother.
- ☐ 3. The issue seems to be of little importance.
- ☐ 4. This issue is only of slight importance.
- ☐ 5. This issue is important only in certain circumstances.
- ☐ 6. I consider this issue somewhat important.
- ☐ 7. I think the issue is of considerable importance.
- ☐ 8. This is a very important issue.
- ☐ 9. I am convinced this subject is of the greatest concern.

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Allen N. Shub has been read and approved by the director of the thesis. Furthermore, the final copies have been examined by the director and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated, and that the thesis is now given final approval with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Jan 11 1968
Date

James H. Hansen Th.D.
Signature of Adviser