

1971

Response set, communicator credibility, pro-counterattitudinal message: a cognitive response analysis of reactions to persuasive communications.

Nuran Hortacsu
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/theses>

Hortacsu, Nuran, "Response set, communicator credibility, pro-counterattitudinal message: a cognitive response analysis of reactions to persuasive communications." (1971). *Masters Theses 1911 - February 2014*. 1625.

<https://doi.org/10.7275/3sbn-g657>

This thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses 1911 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

UMASS/AMHERST



312066013563976

RESPONSE SET, COMMUNICATOR CREDIBILITY, PRO-COUNTERATTITUDINAL
MESSAGE: A COGNITIVE RESPONSE ANALYSIS OF REACTIONS TO PERSUASIVE
COMMUNICATIONS

A Master's Thesis

By

NURAN HORTACSU

Approved as to style and content by:

Juan D. Steiner
(Chairman of Committee)

Richard L. Felt
(Head of Department)

Stephen R. Reissman
(Member)

Seymour M. Berger
(Member)

March
(Month)

1971
(Year)

RESPONSE SET, COMMUNICATOR CREDIBILITY, PRO-COUNTERATTITUDINAL
MESSAGE: A COGNITIVE RESPONSE ANALYSIS OF REACTIONS TO PERSUASIVE
COMMUNICATIONS

A Master's Thesis Presented

By

NURAN HORTACSU

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

<u>March</u>	<u>1971</u>
(month)	(year)
Major Subject	<u>Psychology</u>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Primary acknowledgment is extended to Dr. Ivan Steiner for his constant help and guidance all through the course of the study. I also acknowledge Dr. Stephen Riesman for his constructive comments and criticisms.

My thanks to George Whitehead without whose help the analysis of data would have been most painful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. METHOD	9
Subjects.....	9
Design.....	9
Procedure.....	9
Experimental Booklets.....	10
Distribution of Subjects Among Treatment Categories.....	11
III. RESULTS.....	14
Results Pertaining to Hypotheses.....	14
Results Pertaining to the Greenwald Study....	27
Results Pertaining to Feather's Study.....	32
IV. DISCUSSION.....	41
REFERENCES.....	49
APPENDIX A.....	50
APPENDIX B.....	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of Usable Subjects in Each Experimental Condition	13
2. Subjects' Ratings of Their Own Ideas Concerning Specialized-General Education	16
3. Subjects' Ratings of Their Own Ideas Concerning Specialized-General Education (Anova)	17
4. Proportion of Message-Supporting Ideas Written By Subjects After Reading the Message	16
5. Proportion of Message-Supporting Ideas Written By Subjects After Reading the Message (Anova)	18
6. Amount of Attitude Change in Direction of Message (Anova)	19
7. Attitude Change	20
8. Evaluation of Communication and Communicator	24
9. F Values For Response Set x Credibility Interaction Effects	25
10. Evaluation of Message-Supporting Ideas	28
11. Predisposition Toward Statements Favoring Point of View Advocated By the Message	29
12. Average Judged Validity of General Statements	30
13. Number of Arguments Written By Subjects After Reading the Message	30
14. Several Response Measures Showing Main Effects of Pro-counterattitudinal Message	33
15. Several Response Measures Showing Interaction of Pro-counterattitudinal Message By Message Content	34
16. Per cent of Position Supported By Ten Greenwald Statements	35

Table		Page
17.	Correlations Between Several Response Measures In Pro and Counterattitudinal Message Conditions	37
18.	Multiple Correlations of Several Response Measures By Preattitude and Subjects' Ratings of Their Own Ideas In Pro and Counterattitudinal Message Conditions	38
19.	Partial Correlations	39
20.	Several Significant Triple Interactions of Pro-counterattitudinal Message x Response Set x Message Content	73
21.	Weighted Message Validity	74

C H A P T E R II

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects in this experiment were 172 introductory psychology students at the University of Massachusetts who received course credit for their participation.

Design

The study employed a 3 x 2 x 2 x 2 before-after design involving three response sets (role-playing, communicating and passive reception), proattitudinal vs. counterattitudinal message, high vs. low communicator credibility, and message contents advocating special or general education. All manipulations and measurements were accomplished within a single experimental session. Equal numbers of Ss were randomly assigned to receive the three response sets, high or low credibility sources, and messages advocating special or general education. Because Ss' own positions on the attitudinal issue were not known to the experimenter until the session was completed, the identity and number of Ss for whom the message was pro-and counterattitudinal were not experimentally controlled.

Procedure

Subjects participated in groups ranging in size from 3 to 11. Within a group Ss were randomly selected to receive one of 12 booklets designed to accomplish the experimental manipulations and to elicit responses pertinent to the hypotheses cited above.

Experimental booklets

All booklets contained the following sections:

Premeasure of attitude: Four statements, two favoring special and two favoring general education, were used (see Appendix A). Ss were instructed to rate each item on a 6 point agree-disagree continuum.

Manipulation of communicator credibility: An introduction to the communication followed the pretest of attitude. In the high credibility condition the author of the communication was referred to as Dr. Montgomery, a highly reputed educator from the University of Chicago who had written a report as a result of three years of investigation. In the low credibility condition the author of the communication was referred to as Mr. Montgomery, a high school principal, who had written a report as a request for a grant to start a college.

Manipulation of response set: The introduction to the message told Ss that they were to read the message and do one of the following: In the role-playing condition Ss were told they were to take part in a debate with another student and defend the point of view advocated by the message. In the communicating condition Ss were told that they were to tell another student about the contents of the message. In the passive reception condition Ss were told to read the message and react to it.

Message contents: Messages advocated either special or general education. Each message contained six paragraphs and 400-450 words. All arguments in a message supported a single point of view.

After having 3 minutes to read the message, Ss turned to a section of the booklet designed to elicit responses indicative of their reactions to the communication they had received.

Response measures: Immediately after reading the communication Ss were asked to write down ideas concerning the special vs. general education issue. They were told that such ideas might be supportive and/or critical of one or both sides of the issue. After they listed their thoughts, Ss were asked to rate each of their recorded ideas on a 6 point scale ranging from very favorable to general education to very favorable to special education. After listing and rating their thoughts on the issue, Ss turned to a page containing 10 statements about the issue of special vs. general education. (Statements were taken from the Greenwald study.) Ss' first ratings indicated whether they believed the statement favored special or general education and the second rating indicated the validity Ss attributed to the statement (see Appendix A). After reading the 10 statements, Ss were asked questions pertaining to: 1) the position advocated by the communication; 2) the validity of the arguments in the communication; 3) the worthiness of the recommendations in the message, and; 4) the objectivity of the communicator. They were also asked to rate the communicator on five 6 point semantic differential scales (see Appendix A).

Post measure of attitude: Finally, all Ss responded once more to the attitude scales that had been administered earlier as a pre-measure.

Distribution of subjects among treatment categories

Table I reports the number of usable subjects receiving each of the 24 treatments. Cell frequencies are unequal because the experimenter was unable to determine whether a message would be pro- or counterattitudinal for a specific subject, and because the data for several Ss were eliminated from the analysis. Data for a subject were eliminated if he did not complete the booklet or if he incorrectly reported the point of view advocated by the message.

TABLE I

Number of Usable Subjects in Each Experimental Condition		Special Education Message			General Education Message		
		High Credibility		Low Credibility	High Credibility		Low Credibility
Role-play	Pro-attitudinal	6	5		9		5
	Counter-attitudinal	9	9		7		7
Communicating	Pro-attitudinal	6	9		5		9
	Counter-attitudinal	10	5		11		6
Passive Reception	Pro-attitudinal	5	7		4		10
	Counter-attitudinal	11	7		7		3

C H A P T E R I I I

RESULTS

The data obtained from the questionnaires were analyzed in two ways. First, analysis of variance for unequal cell frequencies was performed. Secondly, several correlation matrices were obtained for all subjects in the experiment, or for all subjects in a specific treatment category.

Three types of results will be reported.

- 1) Results pertaining to the hypotheses advanced in the introduction section.
- 2) Results pertaining to Greenwald's work on role-playing and the openmindedness of the counterattitudinal role-player.
- 3) Results pertaining to Feather's work on selective recall of arguments favoring or opposing one's preferred or nonpreferred point of view.

Results Pertaining to Hypotheses

The first part of Hypothesis One predicts that the content of cognitive responses to communication during and immediately after receiving the communication will be more favorable (pro-communication) under role-playing instructions than under communicating or passive reception conditions. Thus there should be a main effect of "set" on the content of cognitive responses. The content of cognitive responses was measured in two ways. One measure was the average of the ratings subjects gave to the ideas they had written concerning the specialized-general education issue. (A 6 point scale was used with

6 meaning the subject judged the idea to be very favorable to specialized education.) The second measure was the proportion of the ideas written by subjects that they judged to favor the view advocated by the message. The sets (role-playing, communicating, passive reception) received by subjects did not have a main effect on the first of these measures. However, a main effect of set was found on the proportion of message-supporting ideas. The mean proportions for the three conditions were .62, .59, .47 ($F=4.65$; $p<.01$) respectively. The means of role-playing and communicating sets were significantly greater than that of the passive reception set by a t test ($p<.0005$). The means of the role-playing and communicating conditions were not significantly different from one another.

Sets and messages (pro-specialization message vs. pro-general education message) had a significant interaction effect on subjects' ratings of the ideas they had written ($F=5.34$; $p<.01$). These results are reported in Table 2. Under role-playing and communicating sets subjects judged their ideas to favor the view advocated by the message; for both sets the ratings by subjects receiving the specialized message are significantly different from those who received the general message ($t=4.00$; $p<.01$ for the role-playing set and $t=3.18$; $p<.01$ for the communicating set). The mean ratings of subjects with role-playing set were significantly more supportive of the message than were those of subjects with a passive reception set ($t=4.64$; $p<.001$ for special message, $t=6.20$; $p<.001$ for general message). The difference between communicating and passive reception conditions was also significant

TABLE 2

Subjects' Ratings of Their Own Ideas Concerning Specialized-General Education

Sets	Message Received By Subjects	
	Special Education	General Education
Role-play	4.03	2.87
Communicating	4.01	2.99
Passive Reception	3.41	3.52

TABLE 4

Proportion of Message-Supporting Ideas Written By Subjects After Reading the Message

Role-Play	Communicating	Passive Reception
.62	.59	.47

TABLE 3

Subjects Ratings of Their Own Ideas Concerning Specialized-General
Education

<u>Source of Variance</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>F</u>
Response Set	2	0.537
Pro- <u>vs.</u> counterattitudinal Message	1	0.353
High-Low Credibility	1	0.224
Special-General Message	1	17.608*
Response set x Pro-counter- attitudinal Message	2	0.339
Response set x High-Low Credibility	2	1.376
Response set x Special-General Message	2	5.340**
Pro-counterattitudinal Message x High-Low Credibility	1	0.355
Pro-counterattitudinal Message x Special-General Message	1	44.043*
High-Low Credibility x Special- General Message	1	0.230

* $p < .001$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 5

Proportion of Message-Supporting Ideas Written By Subjects After
Reading the Message

<u>Source of Variance</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>F</u>
Response Set	2	4.651*
Pro- <u>vs.</u> counterattitudinal Message	1	44.753**
High-Low Credibility	1	0.047
Special-General Message	1	0.428
Response Set x Pro-counter- attitudinal Message	2	1.085
Response Set x High-Low Credibility	2	0.293
Response Set x Special-General Message	2	0.595
Pro-counterattitudinal Message x High-Low Credibility	1	0.001
Pro-counterattitudinal Message x Special-General Message	1	1.699
High-Low Credibility x Special- General Message	1	0.026

* p .05
** p .001

TABLE 6

Amount of Attitude Change In Direction of Message

<u>Source of Variance</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>F</u>
Response Set	2	0.543
Pro- <u>vs.</u> counterattitudinal Message	1	1.788
High-Low Credibility	1	0.016
Special-General Message	1	0.016
Response Set x Pro-counter- attitudinal Message	2	0.522
Response Set x High-Low Credibility	2	0.105
Response Set x Special-General Message	2	2.342
Pro-counterattitudinal Message x High-Low Credibility	1	0.009
Pro-counterattitudinal Message x Special-General Message	1	0.002
High-Low Credibility x Special- General Message	1	0.623

TABLE 7

Attitude Change

	Role-Play	Communicating	Passive Reception
High Credibility	.28	.11	.11
Low Credibility	.24	.13	.21

($t=1.71$; $p<.05$ for special message and $t=1.60$; $p>.05$ for general message). The results reported above partially support the first part of Hypothesis One.

Analysis indicates that the correlations between subjects' previous attitudes and their ratings of their post-message ideas are .45, .41 and .53 for role-playing, communicating and passive reception sets. All correlations are significantly different from zero at the .01 level, but the differences among the correlations fail to reach significance. As seen in Table 5 there is a strong pro vs. counter-attitudinal message effect on the proportion of message-supporting ideas put down by subjects (.70 and .42 as seen in Table 14). Correlational data also show that the correlations between preattitude and subjects' ratings of their own ideas concerning the issue is higher ($r=.64$) if the message is proattitudinal and lower ($r=.31$) if the message is counterattitudinal. All this evidence seems to indicate that one's own initial opinion concerning an issue is most influential in determining the content of ideas produced about the issue.

The second part of the first hypothesis predicts that the content of cognitive responses will be more supportive of the received communication under counterattitudinal role-playing than under the counterattitudinal passive reception condition; i.e. a subject whose own position is against the one advocated by the message will put down ideas more supportive of the message if he has received role-playing instructions than if he has received passive reception instructions. This prediction would be supported by a significant response

set x pro-counterattitudinal message interaction on the proportion of message-supporting ideas recorded, and by a message x response set x pro-counter interaction on ratings of ideas recorded after reading the communication. Neither of these interactions was significant. Thus, the second part of Hypothesis One was not supported.

The first part of Hypothesis Two predicts that the influence of communicator credibility on attitude change and communicator evaluation will be less under role-playing conditions than under passive reception conditions. This implies a significant interaction effect of response set and communicator credibility on the amount of attitude change, and on each of several measures of communicator evaluation. No significant interaction effects were found on the amount of attitude change as measured by the difference between pre- and post attitude measures. However, analyses of communicator evaluation measures partially support the hypothesis.

Several measures of evaluation were used.

- 1) Evaluation of communicator: This measure was the mean of the ratings given the communicator on five 6-point semantic differential items (see Appendix A).
- 2) Weighted evaluation of communicator: This measure was obtained by multiplying the average evaluation of the communicator on the semantic differential items by the perceived extremity of the message advocated by the communicator. (A message which was perceived to be very much in favor of a position had a weight of 3 and one perceived to be slightly in favor of a position was given a weight

of 1.)*

3) Worthiness of communicator: Subjects answered the question "how seriously should the recommendations of the message be taken" on a six point scale ranging from "very seriously" to "they are not worth paying much attention".

4) Message validity: Subjects answered the question "how valid did you think the arguments used in the message were" on a six point scale ranging from "very valid" to "very invalid".

5) Weighted message validity: This measure was obtained by multiplying the rating of message validity by the perceived extremity of the message advocated by the communicator.*

As can be seen from Tables 8 and 9, similar set x credibility interactions were obtained for each of the above measures. For all measures a low credibility communicator was rated higher than the high credibility communicator in the role-playing condition. In communicating and passive reception conditions the high credibility communicator was rated higher than the low credibility communicator, but the difference between the ratings of the two communicators were not significant for most measures. The high prestige communicator was rated significantly lower on measures 1 and 2 in the communicating than in role-playing condition ($t=2.5$; $p<.01$, $t=2.5$; $p<.01$), while the low credibility communicator was rated significantly lower on measures 1 and 2 in the communicating than in role-playing

*Measures 2 and 5 were obtained because it was felt that the judged extremity of the message was important for the evaluation of the message.

TABLE 8

Evaluation of Communication and Communicator

Measures	Role-Playing		Communicating		Passive Reception	
	High Credibility	Low Credibility	High Credibility	Low Credibility	High Credibility	Low Credibility
Evaluation of Communicator	4.49	4.98	4.99	4.54	4.74	4.64
Weighted Evaluation of Communicator	10.93	13.04	12. 59	11.81	12.62	11.52
Worthiness of Communicator	3.90	4.50	4.25	3.75	4.11	4.18
Message Validity	4.35	4.96	4.41	4.17	4.37	4.52
Weighted Message Validity	10.00	13.19	11.44	11.44	11.63	11.41

TABLE 9
F Values For Response Set x Credibility Interaction Effects

<u>Measures</u>	<u>F</u>
Evaluation of Communicator.....	4.929*
Weighted Evaluation of Communicator.....	4.508**
Worthiness of Communicator.. . . .	3.475**
Message Validity.....	3.541**
Weighted Message Validity....	3.620**

* p < .01
** p < .05

($t=2.78$; $p < .01$, $t=2.70$; $p < .01$). Thus, the results in general show that in the role-play condition the high credibility communicator is not perceived as more effective than the low credibility communicator; if anything, he is perceived as doing a poorer job than the low credibility communicator. In the communicating and passive reception conditions the high credibility communicator is seen in a considerably more favorable light than he is seen in role-playing conditions.

The second part of Hypothesis Two predicts a response set \times credibility of communicator \times pro-counterattitudinal message interaction; i.e. that the influence of communicator credibility will be greatest in counterattitudinal passive reception condition and least under counterattitudinal role-playing condition. No such interaction was found on any of the measures. The only result that was indirectly supportive of the second part of Hypothesis Two was the fact that being pro or con had no effect on the weighted evaluation of the communicator in role-playing and communicating conditions, while the communicator in the pro-message conditions was rated significantly higher than the communicator in passive reception condition ($t=3.14$; $p < .005$). It was found that the ratings of the author of the proattitudinal message were significantly higher in passive reception than in the communicating and role-play conditions ($t=2.07$; $p < .025$). The ratings of the author of the counterattitudinal message were lower in the passive reception condition than in the role-play condition, but the differences did not reach significance ($t=1.5$).

Results Pertaining to the Greenwald Study

Some results were obtained supporting the premise that instructions to role-play predispose the subject to favor statements in a message supporting the view he is to advocate. Two measures were employed to assess the degree to which subjects favored statements supporting the message as opposed to statements opposing the message. Both measures were based on reactions to 10 statements in Greenwald's study:

- 1) Average ratings of the validity of statements favoring the message minus the average ratings of statements opposing the message: This measure was obtained by subtracting the average ratings of statements judged by the subjects to oppose the message from the average ratings of statements judged to favor it.
- 2) Weighted validity of statements favoring the message minus the weighted validity of statements opposing the message: To obtain this measure a value from +3 to -3 was assigned to each statement according to whether the statement was rated by the subject as supporting the point of view advocated by the message. Thus a statement judged as very much in favor of special education had a value of +3 and one judged as very much in favor of general education had a value of -3. A 6-point valid-invalid scale was assigned values of +3 to -3. The algebraic sum of the values obtained by multiplying extremity ratings by validity ratings made up the second measure.

As Table 11 shows, both measures indicate that statements judged as favoring the message were believed to be more valid under role-

TABLE 10

Evaluation of Message Supporting Ideas

Measure	Role-Playing Communicating Passive Reception		
Average Validity of Message-Supporting Ideas - Average Validity of Message-Opposing Ideas	Proattitudinal Message	+1.59	+0.45
	Counterattitudinal Message	-0.27	-0.79
			-0.61
			+0.95
Weighted Validity of Message-Supporting Ideas - Weighted Validity of Message-Opposing Ideas	Proattitudinal Message	25.67	4.74
	Counterattitudinal Message	-4.43	-13.78
			-12.49
			21.77

TABLE 11

Predisposition Toward Statements Favoring Point of View Advocated By the Message			
Measures	Role-Playing	Communicating	Passive Reception
Average Validity of Statements Favoring Message - Average Validity of Statements Favoring Opposing View	.58	.08	.22
Weighted Validity of Statements Favoring Message - Weighted Validity of Statements Favoring Opposing View	9.26	.56	4.87

TABLE 12
Average Judged Validity of General Statements

	Role-Playing	Communicating	Passive Reception
Special Message	3.55	4.07	3.59
General Message	4.23	3.81	3.81

TABLE 13
Number of Arguments Written By Subjects After Reading the Message

	Role-Playing	Communicating	Passive Reception
Pro-attitudinal Message	7.60	5.12	8.46
Counter-attitudinal Message	7.50	7.44	7.18

playing instructions than under communicating and passive reception conditions. The difference between role-play and communicating conditions was significant for both measures ($t_s=1.71$; $p<.05$). The difference between role-play and passive reception, and between communicating and passive reception were not significant.

Another result supportive of the assertion that role-playing instructions predispose subjects to favor statements consistent with the message is seen in Table 12. It was found that the judged validity of statements supporting general education was significantly greater if the message advocated general education than if it advocated special education. No significant differences were found between communicating and passive reception conditions.

One related finding pertaining to cognitive responses to messages after receiving role-playing, communicating or passive reception instructions is seen in Table 13 which reports the number of arguments recorded after reading the message. Table 13 shows that in the role-playing condition there was no significant difference in the number of arguments recorded after receiving a pro- or counterattitudinal message. In the communicating condition however, significantly more arguments were recorded by subjects who expected to communicate a counterattitudinal message than by subjects who expected to communicate a proattitudinal message ($t=2.76$; $p<.01$). In the passive reception condition more arguments were listed after receiving a proattitudinal message, but the difference was not significant.

Results Pertaining to Feather's Study

Table 14 shows the main effects of receiving a pro-or counter-attitudinal message on 1) the content of ideas listed after reading the message, 2) differential reactions to 10 statements favoring both sides of the issue, and 3) evaluation of the communication and communicator. It seems that people tend to list more ideas favoring a message if they agree with the advocated point of view. They also evaluate the message and its author more favorably if they agree with the advocated point of view. Table 15 shows the significant interactions of message content with pro-or counterattitudinal message. It is found that the content of arguments listed by subjects receiving message supporting different sides of the issue are significantly different only if they receive a proattitudinal message ($t=8.00$; $p<.001$). There was no significant difference in the content of arguments listed by subjects receiving different counterattitudinal messages. The same pattern is seen in judgments of statements favoring one's preferred or non-preferred side of the issue. After receiving a proattitudinal message subjects judged statements agreeing with their own point of view to be significantly more valid than those opposing their own point of view. No significant differences in the rated validity of statements was found after a counterattitudinal message. Lastly, the post attitudes of subjects receiving pro-attitudinal messages depended upon whether the message favored specialized or generalized education ($t= 10.50$; $p<.0001$) while those of subjects receiving counterattitudinal messages did not.

TABLE 14

Several Response Measures Showing Main Effects of
Pro-counterattitudinal Message

Measures	Proattitudinal Message	Counterattitudinal Message
Proportion of Message Supporting Ideas Listed	.70	.42
Message Validity	4.76	4.10
Weighted Message Validity	12.87	10.28
Number of Valid Arguments	2.52	2.32
Weighted Number of Valid Arguments	6.66	5.82
Worthiness of Communicator	4.34	3.86
Weighted Worthiness of Communicator	11.75	9.95
Validity of Special Statements	3.85	3.45
Average Validity of Statements Favoring Message - Average Validity Of Statements Opposing Message	1.05	-.59
Weighted Validity of Statements Favoring Message - Weighted Validity of Statements Opposing Message	10.43	-5.80

TABLE 15

Several Response Measures Showing Interaction of Pro-counterattitudinal Message By Message Content				
Measures	Proattitudinal Message		Counterattitudinal Message	
	Special Message	General Message	Special Message	General Message
Subjects' Ratings of Own Ideas Concerning Issue	4.54	2.63	3.48	3.59
Validity of Special Statements	4.35	3.11	3.43	3.85
Validity of General Statements	3.35	4.37	3.87	3.52
Post Attitude	4.35	2.67	3.02	3.93

TABLE 16

Perception of Position Supported By Ten Greenwald Statements*

	Proattitudinal Message	Counterattitudinal Message
Special Message	3.57	3.45
General Message	3.38	3.47

* Six-point scale, 6 meaning very much in favor of special education.

Another finding of interest is seen in Table 16. The content of the message received by subjects seems to have influenced the perception of the position supported by 10 Greenwald statements only when the message was proattitudinal ($t=10.00$; $p .001$). When the message was counterattitudinal, there was no effect of message content on the perception of Greenwald's statements.

Table 17 reports correlations between different measures for subjects who received pro-and counterattitudinal messages. The first three lines of the table show that correlations of preattitude with (a) subjects' ratings of their own ideas concerning the issue, (b) their judgments of ten statements on the special-general continuum and (c) their validity ratings of statements supporting special education are significantly higher when the message is proattitudinal than when the message is counterattitudinal. The difference between correlations of preattitude and the rated validity of general statements in pro-and counterattitudinal conditions reveals the same tendency but fails to reach significance. Following the same pattern, correlations between subjects' ratings of their own ideas and (a) judgments of the 10 statements, (b) perception of message, and, (c) validity of special statements are significantly higher in the proattitudinal message condition. The correlation between subjects' ratings of their own ideas and the judged validity of general statements is also higher in the pro than in the counterattitudinal message condition, but this difference fails to reach significance. The multiple correlations in Table 18 show that when the message is proattitudinal

TABLE 17

Correlations Between Several Response Measures In
Pro and Counterattitudinal Message Conditions

Measures	Proattitudinal Message	Counterattitudinal Message	z Value
Preattitude and Subjects' Ratings of Their Own Ideas	.64	.31	2.93*
Preattitude and Perception Of Position Supported By Ten Greenwald Statements	.28	-.09	1.93**
Preattitude and Validity of Special Statements	.50	.33	2.20***
Preattitude and Validity of General Statements	-.51	-.36	1.37
Subjects' Ratings of Their Own Ideas and Perception of Position Supported By Ten Greenwald Statements	.34	-.07	2.86*
Subjects' Ratings of Their Own Ideas and Validity of Special Statements	.56	.33	1.93**
Subjects' Ratings of Their Own Ideas and Validity of General Statements	-.51	-.36	1.20
Subjects' Ratings of Their Own Ideas and Perception of Position Supported By Message	.69	-.06	2.54***

* $p < .01$

** $p < .06$

*** $p < .05$

TABLE 18

Multiple Correlations of Several Response Measures By Preattitude
and Subjects' Ratings of Their Own Ideas In Pro and Counterattitudinal
Message Conditions

	Proattitudinal Message	Counterattitudinal Message
Perception of Position Supported By Ten Statements	.92	.10
Validity of Special Statements	.91	.15
Validity of General Statements	.88	.17

TABLE 19

Partial Correlations

Measures	Proattitudinal Message	Counterattitudinal Message
Validity of Special Statements By Subjects' Ratings of Their Own Ideas with Preattitude Partialed Out	.33	.26
Validity of Special Statements By Preattitude With Subjects' Ratings of Their Own Ideas Partialed Out	.22	.26
Preattitude By Ratings of Ideas With Validity of Special Statements Partialed Out	.50	.23
Validity of General Statements With Ratings of Own Ideas with Preattitude Partialed Out	.27	.28
Validity of General Statements By Preattitude with Ratings of Own Ideas Partialed Out	.27	.28
Preattitude By Ratings of Ideas with Validity of General Statements Partialed Out	.51	.21
Judgment of Ten Statements By Ratings of Ideas with Preattitude Partialed Out	.30	-.04
Judgment of Ten Statements By Preattitude With Ratings of Own Ideas Partialed Out	.08	-.07
Preattitude By Ratings of Own Ideas With Judgments Partialed Out	.83	.32

subjects' perception of the positions supported by Greenwald's statements and their judgments of validities of statements can be predicted quite accurately from knowledge of the preattitude and their ratings of their own ideas. But when the message is counterattitudinal this is not the case.

Table 19 shows partial correlations between measures in Tables 17 and 18. It is seen that in the case of validity judgment of special and general statements the partial correlations between preattitude and subjects' ratings of their own ideas are not significantly different in pro-and counterattitudinal message conditions. In the case of perception of the position supported by 10 Greenwald statements the correlation of perception of statements with subjects' ratings of their own ideas with the effects of preattitude partialled out is significantly greater in pro than in counterattitudinal condition. Partial correlations of preattitude and subjects' ratings of their own arguments are consistently greater in proattitudinal than in counterattitudinal condition on all three measures.

C H A P T E R IV

DISCUSSION

The primary aim of the study was to test two hypotheses derived as an extension of Greenwald's work on cognitive response analysis of attitude change in role-playing situations. The secondary aim of the study was to collect data pertaining to Greenwald's work on role-playing and Feather's work on selective recall of pro and counterattitudinal arguments.

Hypothesis One stated: 1) given that attitude change is mediated by the content of cognitive responses to communication, the content of these cognitive responses will be more favorable (pro-communication) under role-playing conditions than under communicating and passive reception conditions, and that 2) the difference between the content of cognitive responses will be most marked for subjects assigned to counterattitudinal message conditions. The data confirmed the first part of Hypothesis One and did not support the second part. Evidence supporting the first part of the hypothesis comes from two kinds of findings. Firstly it was found that the proportion of message supporting ideas written by subjects in role-playing and communicating conditions was significantly greater than that in the passive reception condition. Secondly, subjects' ratings of their own ideas concerning special-general education were significantly more in favor of the message received in role-playing and communicating conditions than in the passive reception condition. In both cases role-playing and communicating conditions were similar with respect to the content

of cognitive responses produced and significantly different from passive reception condition.

Hypothesis Two stated: 1) the influence of communicator credibility on attitude change and on evaluation of the communicator will be less under role-playing and communicating conditions than under passive reception conditions, and that 2) these effects will be least under counterattitudinal role-playing conditions. The data provided partial confirmation for the first part of the hypothesis. The second part of the hypothesis was not supported. In the role-playing condition the high credibility communicator was evaluated less favorably than the low credibility communicator. In the communicating and passive reception conditions there was a slight tendency to evaluate the high credibility communicator more favorably than the low credibility communicator. The hypothesis had predicted that the high credibility communicator would be rated significantly higher than the low credibility communicator in passive reception condition but not in role-playing condition. Thus the findings are opposite in direction to the hypothesis.

Greenwald had found that counterattitudinal role-players evaluated statements favoring their preferred and nonpreferred side of an issue as equally valid, while passive recipients evaluated statements favoring their own point of view more favorably. Proattitudinal role-players tended to evaluate statements favoring the preferred side of the issue more favorably than those supporting the nonpreferred side of the issue. Our results failed to show the interaction effect

of response set by pro vs. counterattitudinal message on evaluation of statements. However, our results showed that subjects in the role-playing condition judged message-supporting statements to be more valid than message-opposing statements. This trend was significantly greater for subjects in the role-playing condition than for subjects in the communicating condition; the difference between role-playing and passive reception conditions was not significant. These results seem to oppose Greenwald's findings in that they show no interaction, the only significant difference in tendency to favor message-supporting ideas being that between role-playing and communicating conditions.

Data on reactions to pro vs. counterattitudinal message support Feather's finding of greater listing of proattitudinal vs. counterattitudinal arguments. Ratings of message and evaluations of the communicator were consistently more correlated with message content when the message was proattitudinal than when it was counterattitudinal. Some results of interest were found in relation to pro and counterattitudinal message. It was also found that subjects perceived the 10 Greenwald statements as more supportive of their own point of view if they had previously been exposed to a proattitudinal message. A counterattitudinal message had no effect on subjects' perceptions of the position supported by 10 statements. Correlational data tended also to indicate that the pro vs. counterattitudinal character of the message mediated ratings of subjects' own ideas and their perceptions of the position supported by 10 greenwald statements.

There are two kinds of findings in this study which were not predicted and need to be explained. One such finding is the fact that under role-playing instructions the high credibility communicator was evaluated less favorably than low credibility communicator. This finding can be explained by essentially the same arguments that were used to derive the first part of the second hypothesis. It was argued that under role-playing conditions subjects primarily paid attention to content and evaluated the content as being equally mediocre for both high and low credibility sources. A high credibility source would be seen as doing a poor job and a low credibility source would be seen as doing a better job by presenting the same content. In other words, subjects probably expect a high credibility source to produce a stronger message than a low credibility source. When a high credibility source produces a mediocre message he is evaluated adversely, whereas a low credibility source would not be.

It was argued that under passive reception conditions the credibility of the communicator would influence subjects' evaluations of the message, and under passive reception conditions subjects would not try to be objective and separate the content from the source. Consequently the usual effect of communicator credibility should be manifested under the passive reception conditions. As can be seen from the above discussion two different kinds of responsivity seems to be operating under role-playing and passive reception conditions: content oriented and source oriented.

The second set of findings that deviate from expectations concern

the fact that no response set x pro-counterattitudinal message interaction was found, and also the fact that subjects in the passive reception condition were not significantly less receptive to message-supporting ideas than subjects in role-playing condition. The above were failures to replicate Greenwald's findings. The reasons for these findings can be sought in the different procedures employed in the two studies. Greenwald's study involved evaluating 10 statements immediately after being assigned to a role-playing position or not being so assigned. In the present study subjects received a persuasive message and were asked to list counterarguments before they were asked to evaluate the 10 Greenwald statements. The difference between role-playing and passive reception conditions in evaluating message-supporting ideas may have been decreased by this change in procedure. The difference in evaluation of message-supporting statements in the two conditions of this study does show the same tendency as seen in Greenwald study, but fails to reach significance.

Table 10 indicates that there is a tendency to evaluate message-supporting statements more positively in the role-playing proattitudinal message condition, as was suggested by Greenwald findings. In counterattitudinal message conditions more negative evaluation of message-supporting ideas was seen in passive reception than in role-playing condition. These results show a tendency for the counterattitudinal role-player to be more supportive of message supporting statements than the counterattitudinal passive recipient. Failure to obtain a significant response set by pro-counterattitudinal message interaction

was probably due to the fact that subjects in the counterattitudinal passive recipient condition of this experiment were more favorable to counterattitudinal statements than subjects in Greenwald's experiment; the additional acts they performed might have induced this greater favorability.

In the introduction it was argued that role-playing involves 1) communicating, and 2) trying to be convincing. If the fact that one has to communicate produced results similar to those obtained from role-playing it might be concluded that the role-playing effect can be explained by a mental set to communicate. It is unfortunate that the attitude change measure in this experiment produced no significant results. Other data suggest that the communicating condition had effects similar to those of the role-playing condition on measures related to the task of communicating (i.e. proportion of message-supporting ideas, and subjects' ratings of their own ideas concerning the issue). On the other hand, on measures of message and communicator evaluation of message-supporting ideas and message validity, the communicating condition is the one in which the most negative evaluations were obtained. Attitude change data also show a tendency for communicating condition to cause the least attitude change.

Interpretation of this differential effect of the communicating condition on different kinds of responses is highly speculative. A tentative explanation is presented here in the following way. It

is assumed that subjects will derive more pleasure out of taking part in a debate than in regurgitating the contents of a rather dull message to a fellow student. Since the situation in this experiment is one in which subjects had no choice in their assigned roles those subjects who feel they got a bad deal (subjects in communicating condition) will feel free to show their frustration by derogating the message they have to relate. In the passive reception condition subjects were merely asked to give their reactions to the message. Since showing reactions about a message is less boring than giving a verbal report of the message, passive recipients had less reason to feel frustrated and derogated the message less.

The finding that the content of ideas put down by subjects in role-playing and communicating conditions were similar is easily explained in view of the fact that subjects in the two conditions are asked to perform essentially the same task of giving arguments supporting one point of view and that putting down ideas supporting the point of view they are to present helps them to be prepared for the task.

The higher correlations between preattitude and subjects' ratings of their own ideas concerning the issue in proattitudinal than counterattitudinal condition can be explained in the following manner. Temporally, the persuasive message precedes the writing of ideas by subjects, so, it probably has some kind of influence on the content of ideas put down. The influence of the message on the content of ideas might be one of simply supplying material to be

written down, or it might lead to a reorganization of subjects' ideas. In the case of the proattitudinal message the arguments supplied by the message are probably more similar to those the subjects' own biases might prompt them to write than in the counterattitudinal message condition where the arguments supplied by the message oppose the subjects' own biases.. If we assume that subjects make use of both their own thoughts and those suggested by the message, greater variability in content of ideas put down will occur in the case of the counterattitudinal message condition, and thus the correlation between the perception of the position supported by the ten statements and subjects' ratings of their own ideas about the issue will be lower. It might be said that subjects tend to assimilate the position taken by statements to that by the message, which is reflected more by ideas subjects put down in proattitudinal condition than in counterattitudinal condition.

REFERENCES

- Cohen, A.R. Cognitive tuning as a factor affecting impression formation. Journal of Personality, 1961, 29, 235-245.
- Feather, N. T. Attention and selective recall. Journal of Personality and Social Personality, 1969, 12, 310-319.
- Greenwald, A. G. Cognitive learning, cognitive response to persuasion, and attitude change. In A. G. Greenwald, T. C. Brock, and T. M. Ostrom (eds.), Psychological foundations of attitudes. New youk; Academic Press, 1968. Pp. 147-170.
- Greenwald, A. G. The open-mindedness of the counterattitudinal role player. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1969, 5, 375-388.
- Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., and Kelley, H. H. Communication and persuasion. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Zajonc, R. B. The process of cognitive tuning in communication. Journal of abnormal and social psychology, 1960, 61, 159-168.

APPENDIX A

OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE SPECIALIZED VS. GENERAL EDUCATION ISSUE

Section I

The purpose of this study is to survey student opinions on the issue of specialized vs. general college education. Recently there has been much discussion of the issue and the university is interested in finding student opinions and reactions to arguments in favor of either side of the issue. We believe the student opinions collected in this study will be of value in future discussions concerning policy on the issue. Now let us define the positions supporting the two sides of the issue.

A position supporting specialized college education would favor an emphasis in the student's chosen field of study very early in the college career, with a corresponding narrow exposure to other fields of study. The aim is to train the student as comprehensively as possible in his chosen field of study during his four years in college. A position supporting general college education would stress the concept of liberal arts education where the aim is to provide the student with a broad exposure to many fields of study. In an educational system based on the principle of general education a student might or might not have a major area. In any case, a high concentration of courses in one area would be discouraged, especially during the early years of the college career.

First, we would like you to complete a brief questionnaire below. Read each of the statements below and respond by indicating the extent of your agreement with each. Do this by checking one of the blank spaces below each statements; check the one that best indicates the extent of your agreement with the statement.

1. Without specialization starting early in college education, it will be impossible to train the average student to fit into the highly specialized positions of the future American society.

/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/
I strongly agree	Agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree

2. Without a general education in his college years, the average citizen is neither a contributor to nor a beneficiary of the rich cultural opportunities of modern society.

/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/
I strongly agree	Agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree

3. A specialized college education is to be preferred to a general one.

/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/
I strongly agree	Agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree

4. The proper course of higher education should be four years of universal general education followed by specialization in graduate or professional school.*

/____/	/____/	/____/	/____/	/____/	/____/
I strongly	Agree	Slightly	Slightly	Disagree	Slightly

* This item was dropped from the analysis due to low correlations with the other three items.

Section II*

The following communication was prepared by Dr. Montgomery, a highly reputed educator from the university of Chicago, as a result of his investigation of the specialized vs. general education issue. It was submitted to the national committee on education. The recommendations in this report are based on three years of field research on various university campuses with varying systems. Please read the report carefully paying attention to main points. Read it once. Do not take notes. You will be asked for your reactions to the report later on. After the written part of the experiment is over, you will be asked to participate in a debate on the specialized vs. general education issue with another student taking part in the experiment. Each student will defend the point of view he is assigned to. You will be defending specialized education. The point of view you are assigned to defend may or may not be your own point of view. Do your best in defending it. The student you are going to be debating with will be told that you, like himself, were arbitrarily assigned to the point of view you will be defending, rather than having a choice in the matter. The reason for having you take part in a debate is to see how the point of view will be received by your debating partner.

Stop, wait for signal to go on to next page.

* This is the introduction to the message in conditions role-playing, high credibility, specialized education message.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that colleges must provide specialized vocational education for their students in place of the traditional general education. A specialized education is a service both to the students and to the society to which they will eventually contribute.

For several decades, the proportion of all college students enrolled in specialized training has mounted steadily. In 1901, of all college degrees awarded, only 4.1 % of the total were for education in some specialized curriculum. In 1951-53, the corresponding figure had risen to 46.4 % or almost half the total college degrees awarded. Obviously, students of today want specialized vocational or professional training.

Moreover, in 1960, there were 2200 occupational categories requiring highly trained manpower; this number is increasing every year. As valuable as the general arts and humanities education may be, it cannot provide the specialized training required by those employed in these new vocations.

There is increasing concern among citizens and parents about the rising cost of higher education in money and time. Medical education is the extreme example of the steady lengthening of the course of formal study and the consequent increase of the financial burden of specialized training. As late as 1900, a young student could enter medical school with no more than a secondary school background and complete the medical course in two academic years. Now the average for premedical and medical education is eight years, to which are added

varying but usually long periods of internship and residency.

In some schools of education, nursing, pharmacy and commerce, and in other professional fields also, formal education has been extended to five or six years. Serious social problems are involved in the steady extension of pre-employment education. There are curtailments of earning capacity, maladjustments in personal and family life, and often unrecognized selection of individuals whose parents are in the social and economic groups that can afford the necessary financial investment in such education. Some way must be found to reduce the time and expense involved in obtaining specialized training. The most logical is to eliminate non-essential courses which are not directly a part of the vocational or professional education.

Finally, it is often stated that arts and humanities courses are necessary for the development of the "total" person and thus must be included in any sound curriculum. However, the steadily expanding extension and adult education branches of institutions of higher learning can provide this training to the individual who desires it after he has completed his specialized training and is productively employed.

Section III

Now that you have read a message on the issue of specialized vs. general education we would like to find out your thoughts on the issue. The thoughts listed may either originate from the message you just read or from your own mind. Please list as many as you can. The contents of the thoughts listed may be: a) information favorable to one or either viewpoint; b) personal values of yours that are favorable to one or the other viewpoint; c) features of either viewpoint that you perceive as good; d) features of either viewpoint that you perceive as bad or harmful; e) any other thoughts you feel to be pertinent.

In writing down those thoughts, please separate your thoughts into individual ideas to be written down separately. An "individual idea" is one that, to the best of your judgment, expresses only a single fact, value, good or bad feature, or thought.

6

Now that you are finished with writing your thoughts down, go back and judge them on the scale below. Put a number beside each thought.

- 1) very favorable to specialized education
- 2) moderately favorable to specialized education
- 3) slightly favorable to specialized education
- 4) slightly favorable to general education
- 5) moderately favorable to general education
- 6) very favorable to general education

Section IV

The statements below are related to the topic of specialized versus general undergraduate education. Your task for these statements will be to evaluate each, to the best of your ability, in terms of its objective merits. Try to judge each statement on the valid-invalid continuum on the six point scale. A valid statement is one that should be taken into account in forming an intelligent opinion on this topic, while an invalid statement is one that need not be given detailed consideration. Also, indicate the stand taken by each statement on the specialized-general education issue on the six-point scale.

In the modern professional world, one cannot hope to succeed financially without first becoming specialized in one's interests and skills.

Supports: Specialized :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ : general
Statement is: Valid :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ : invalid

A general college education equips the graduate with a strong foundation upon which to build a variety of careers.

Supports: Specialized :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ : general
Statement is: Valid :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ : invalid

To make any significant achievement in a field, one must first attain a level of knowledge comparable to that gained in a specialized education.

Supports: Specialized :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ : general
Statement is: Valid :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ :__ : invalid

One cannot hope to be an educated, informed person unless he is well versed in many fields.

Supports: specialized :__:__:__:__:__: general

Statement is: valid :__:__:__:__:__: invalid

Specialization during college years gives the student direction and purpose which increases his motivation to succeed.

Supports: specialized :__:__:__:__:__: general

Statement is: valid :__:__:__:__:__: invalid

The student who has the opportunity to attend a variety of courses in college is in a better position to decide which area is best suited to his needs and abilities.

Supports: specialized :__:__:__:__:__: general

Statement is: valid :__:__:__:__:__: invalid

One must learn broadly about the world before one can hope to adjust satisfactorily to it.

Supports: specialized :__:__:__:__:__: general

Statement is: valid :__:__:__:__:__: invalid

A person should have a firm career choice well before he graduates from college.

Supports: specialized :__:__:__:__:__: general

Statement is: valid :__:__:__:__:__: invalid

Early specialization enables one to begin devoting himself to a particular area rather than losing valuable time on subjects which will eventually be useless.

Suppoers: specialized :__:__:__:__:__: general

Statoment is: valid :__:__:__:__:__: invalid

Section V

We are interested in your reactions to the message you read.

Please answer the following questions by checking one of the positions along the scales below.

1) What was the stand of the communication on the issue of specialized vs. general education.

very favorable to :___:___:___:___:___:___: very favorable to
specialized education general education

2) In general, how valid did you think the arguments used in the message were?

very valid :___:___:___:___:___:___: very invalid

3) So far as you can remember how many good___, mediocre___, poor___ arguments were presented in the message? Insert numbers in the spaces.

4) How objective did you think the recommendations of the author of the message were?

very objective :___:___:___:___:___:___: subjective; partial to
impartial to his his personal interests
personal interests

5) How disinterested was the author of the message in advocating the viewpoint presented in the message?

completely disinterested :___:___:___:___:___:___: he was serving his
personal interests

6) How seriously should the recommendations of the message be taken?

very seriously :___:___:___:___:___:___: they are not worth much
attention

7) Please rate the author of the communication in the scales below.

Reputable	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	disreputable
Honest	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	dishonest
Worthwhile	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	worthless
Educated	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	ignorant
Wise	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	foolish

Section VI

Now that you have given the issue considerable attention please answer the following questions, indicating your stand on the issue.

1. Without specialization starting early in college education it will be impossible to train the average student to fit into the highly specialized positions of the future American economy.

/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/
I strongly	Agree	Slightly	Slightly	Disagree	Strongly
agree		agree	disagree		disagree

2. Without a general education in his college years, the average citizen is neither a contributor to nor a beneficiary of the rich cultural opportunities of modern society.

/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/
I strongly	Agree	Slightly	Slightly	Disagree	Strongly
agree		agree	disagree		disagree

3. A specialized college education is to be preferred to a general one.

/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/
I strongly	Agree	Slightly	Slightly	Disagree	Strongly
agree		agree	disagree		disagree

4. The proper course of higher education should be four years of universal general education followed by specialization or professional school.

/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/	/___/
I strongly	Agree	Slightly	Slightly	Disagree	Strongly
agree		agree	disagree		disagree

Section II*

The following communication was prepared by Mr. Montgomery as part of a request for a grant of money to start a college based on the educational principles espoused in the report. Mr. Montgomery is a high school principal with five years of high school teaching experience. He has said that he has always wanted to start a college based on the principles he believes to be right. Please read the report carefully paying attention to main points. Read it once. Do not take notes. You will be asked for your reactions to the report later on. After the written part of the experiment is over, you will be asked to participate in a debate on the specialized vs. general education issue with another student taking part in the experiment. Each student will defend the point of view he is assigned to. You will be defending specialized education. The point of view you are assigned to defend may or may not be your own point of view. Do your best in defending it. The student you are going to be debating with will be told that you, like himself, were arbitrarily assigned to the point of view you will be defending, rather having a choice in the matter. The reason for having you take part in a debate is to see how the point of view will be perceived by your debating partner.

Stop, wait for signal to go on to next page.

* Introduction to the message for role-playing, low credibility , special message condition.

Section II*

The following communication was prepared by Dr. Montgomery, a highly reputed educator from the University of Chicago, as a result of his investigation of the specialized vs. general education issue. It was submitted to the national committee on education. The recommendations in this report are based on three years of field research on various university campuses with varying systems. Please read the report carefully paying attention to main points. Read it once. Do not take notes. You will be asked for your reactions to the report later on. After the written part of the experiment is over, you will be asked to participate in a debate on the specialized vs. general education issue with another student taking part in the experiment. Each student will defend the point of view he is assigned to. You will be defending general education. The point of view you are assigned to defend may or may not be your own point of view. Do your best in defending it. The student you are going to be debating with will be told that you, like himself, were arbitrarily assigned to the point of view you will be defending, rather than having a choice in the matter. The reason for having you take part in a debate is to see how the point of view will be received by your debating partner.

Stop, wait for signal to go on to next page.

* Introduction to the message for role-playing, high credibility, general message condition.

Section II*

The following communication was prepared by Mr. Montgomery as a part of a request for a grant of money to start a college based on the educational principles espoused in the report. Mr. Montgomery is a high school principal with five years of high school teaching experience. He has said that he has always wanted to start a college based on the principles he believes to be right. Please read the report carefully paying attention to main points. Read it once. Do not take notes. You will be asked for your reactions to the report later on. After the written part of the experiment is over, you will be asked to participate in a debate on the specialized vs. general education issue with another student taking part in the experiment. Each student will defend the point of view he is assigned to. You will be defending general education. The point of view you are assigned to defend may or may not be your own point of view. Do your best in defending it. The student you are going to be debating with will be told that you, like himself, were arbitrarily assigned to the point of view you are defending rather than having a choice in the matter. The reason for having you take part in a debate is to see how the point of view will be perceived by your debating partner

Stop, wait for signal to go on to the next page.

* Introduction to the message for role-playing, low credibility, general message condition.

Section II*

The following communication was prepared by Dr. Montgomery, a highly reputed educator from the University of Chicago, as a result of his investigations of specialized vs. general education issue. It was submitted to the national committee on education. The recommendations made in this report are based on three years of field research on various university campuses with varying systems. Please read the report carefully paying attention to main points. Read it once. Do not take notes. You will be asked to communicate the contents of the report to another student. It need not be a verbatim report but try to make it as clear as possible. The student to whom you will be communicating will be told that you were assigned to communicate the contents of a report to him or her. The purpose of having you communicate the contents of the message is to see the differences in students' reactions to the message when the issue is presented by a live fellow student as opposed to written material.

Stop, wait for signal to go on to the next page.

* Introduction to the message for communicating, high credibility general and specialized education message conditions.

Section II*

The following communication was prepared by Mr. Montgomery as part of a request for grant of money to start a college based on the educational principles espoused in the report. Mr. Montgomery is a high school principal with five years of high school teaching experience. He has said that he always wanted to start a college based on the principles he believes to be right. Please read the report carefully paying attention to main points. Read it once. Do not take notes. You will be asked for your reactions to the report later on. After the written part of the experiment is over you will also be asked to communicate the contents of the report to another student. It need not be a verbatim report but try to make it as clear as possible. The student to whom you will be communicating will be told that you were assigned to communicate the contents of the message to him or her. The purpose of having you communicate the contents of the message is to see the differences in students' reactions to the message when the issue is presented by a live fellow student as opposed to written material.

Stop, wait for signal to go on to the next page.

* Introduction to the message for communicating, low credibility special and general message conditions.

Section II*

The following communication was prepared by Dr. Montgomery, a highly reputed educator from the University of Chicago, as a report of his investigations of the specialized vs. general education issue. It was submitted to national committee on education. The recommendations made in this report are based on three years of field research on various university campuses with varying systems. Please read the report carefully paying attention to the main points. Read it once. Do not take notes. You will be asked for reactions to the report later on.

Stop, wait for signal to go on to the next page.

* Introduction to the message for passive reception, high credibility special and general education message conditions.

Section II*

The following communication was prepared by Mr. Montgomery as part of a request for a grant of money to start a college based on the educational principles espoused in the report. Mr. Montgomery is a high school principle with five years of high school teaching experience. He has said that he has always wanted to start a college based on the principles he believes to be right. Please read the report carefully paying attention to main points. Read it once. Do not take notes. You will be asked for your reactions to the report later on.

Stop, wait for signal to go on to the next page.

* Introduction to the message for passive reception, low credibility, special and general education message conditions.

General Education Message

One argument offered in favor of retention of general education is that it is considered essential for the student who is undecided as to a future career or profession. A sampling of various courses helps the student in making his decision. Being able to sample various areas before settling on a major area saves the student from making hasty decisions based on introductory courses which in many cases are misleading in terms of the kinds of topics emphasized in the fields.

It is found that in the case of students who have made their decision about a career prior to enrolling in college a general education enables the student to see his chosen field in relation to other fields and venture creative solutions to problems in the student's chosen field. It has been discovered that students who take courses outside their area come up with original ideas in their field of specialization more often than students who take courses exclusively in their area of specialization.

Another point raised in favor of general education is that it is necessary for the development of the "total person" - without a sampling of, and exposure to, numerous disciplines, the individual cannot adequately understand and communicate with people from other walks of life. Although it has been pointed out that this extra knowledge can be acquired outside the classroom, statistics show that the proportion of who actually do educate themselves in their weak areas is very low compared to those who express a wish to do so but admit that they never get around to doing it.

An increased emphasis on specialized education might lead to the problem of scientific discoveries being made without consideration of how they might effect the way of life or even the existence of the general public. Thus, science, instead of being the servant of humanity might end up leading humanity to an unknown and uncontrollable end.

It has been shown that people with liberal education are less dogmatic, i.e. less prejuduced, more humanitarian and more understanding. With our society in its present state of turmoil and crisis we need men and women to construct a society where understanding and open minds will bridge the gap between conflicting elements.

A national survey of educational institutions show that the majority of college students plan to teach at one time or another in the future. Since teaching involves interaction with people coming from different backgrounds and holding different philosophies of life a person with flexibility and sensibility is better able to meet diverse needs in the classroom than a person who has only been trained in the subject matter he taught.

APPENDIX B

UNPREDICTED AND UNINTERPRETED FINDINGS

Significant triple interactions of response set x pro-counter-attitudinal message x message contents were found on measures 1) perception of position supported by message, 2) validity of special statements, 3) validity of general statements. These interactions (reported in Table 20) were not predicted and did not seem to fit with the reasoning behind the study. There was also a significant pro-counterattitudinal message x message contents interaction on one of several highly correlated measures and like the above triple interactions did not have any theoretical bearing.

TABLE 20

Several Significant Triple Interactions of Pro-counterattitudinal Message
x Response Set x Message Content

Measures	High Credible		Low Credible	
	Special Message	General Message	Special Message	General Message
Perception of Position Supported By Message	3.69	3.34	3.52	3.38
Validity of Special Statements	4.25	3.02	4.26	3.59
Validity of General Statements	4.58	4.50	4.95	5.00
Perception of Position Supported By Message	3.41	3.36	3.48	3.57
Validity of Special Statements	3.44	3.84	3.68	3.78
Validity of General Statements	4.27	4.03	3.85	4.31

TABLE 21
Weighted Message Validity

	Special Message	General Message
Proattitudinal Message	11.82	13.82
Counterattitudinal Message	10.72	9.86

