

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

1-1-1971

Attitude change across different media as related to internal-external control.

Sandra G. Jones
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Jones, Sandra G., "Attitude change across different media as related to internal-external control." (1971). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 6684.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/6684>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

Attitude Change Across
Different Media as
Related to Internal-External Control

by

Sandra G. Jones
B.A., University of Windsor, 1969

A Masters Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies through the
Department of Psychology in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts at the University
of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada
1971

UMI Number: EC53082

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI®

UMI Microform EC53082

Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABD 7464

APPROVED BY:

Henry L. Weston

Frank Auld

Wm. H. Crowell

George H. Crowell

371551

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to extend her sincerest gratitude to Dr. H. Minton for his counsel and guidance throughout the course of this study. Gratitude is also expressed to Mr. M. Starr for his invaluable help in the statistical analysis of this study. Dr. F. Auld also contributed guidance which steered the course of this project. Thanks are also extended to those students who gave so generously of their time in participating in the study.

ABSTRACT

The question of how to influence people most effectively has been a virtually untapped area of scientific research. It has been suggested (Rotter, 1954) that people who believe they can control the events which happen to them (internal control) are less persuasible than those individuals who believe they have little or no control over their destiny (external control).

It was the purpose of this study to determine how internally-oriented subjects and externally-oriented subjects responded to an influence attempt using different forms of the media, a written communication and a videotaped communication.

It was predicted that (a) attitude change would be greater with television than with the written communication, and (b) external subjects would change their attitudes more than internal subjects. Additionally it was predicted that the following, with respect to time, would occur: (a) external subjects would exhibit a decrease in the effect of the communication after a rest of several days and hence exhibit less attitude change on a second retest than on a first retest regardless of media; and (b) internal Ss would show greater attitude change on a second retest than immediately after the communication in both conditions.

Multiple analyses of variance and t-tests were employed in the data analysis. While the actual results tended in the predicted direction none of the hypotheses were statistically significant. Numerically, however, externals did change more than internals in both conditions and they did tend to exhibit less attitude change on

the second retest as predicted. Further, attitude change did tend to be greater in the television condition than in the written condition.

It was noted, however, that there were large discrepancies in cell-size samples and a large within-cell variability which may have confounded the actual results. Although treatment significance was not obtained, there were significant differences between the control and experimental subjects with the experimental subjects tending to support the direction of the influence attempt. This finding, while not conclusive, does suggest that the media did influence the experimental subjects although the predictions were not achieved statistically.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
I Background and Introduction	1
Effects of Television on Attitude Change	8
Chapter	
II Method	10
Subjects	10
Materials	10
Procedure	14
Chapter	
III Results	21
Chapter	
IV Discussion and Conclusions	28
REFERENCES	34
APPENDIX A	38
APPENDIX B	42
APPENDIX C	47
APPENDIX D	52
VITA AUCTORIS	54

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1 Cell means indicating attitude change using.. the difference scores for the initial..... administration of the attitude survey and the first retest.....	21
2 Summary table of ANOVA using the difference.. scores of the manipulated subjects for the... first administration of the attitude survey.. and the first retest	22
3 Cell means for attitude change using the..... difference scores of the 17 manipulate subj- ects for retest one and retest two.....	24
4 Summary table of ANOVA using the difference.. scores of the manipulated subjects for the... first retest and the second retest..... administered eight days later.....	25

Chapter I

Background and Introduction

How attitudes evolve, what personality factors are related to attitudes, and how we can produce attitude change most effectively is a virtually untapped field of scientific investigation.

It is understood that in any communication there is a source, a receiver, a message, and a channel by which we transmit that message.

Research (Gelfand, 1962, Rotter, 1954) indicates that personality factors of the receiver affect how the message is received, that is, whether it is accepted or rejected. Little research, however, has been done to examine what are the most effective channels of communicating a message. McLuhan (1970) has suggested that receivers respond in a different way to a communication delivered by radio than to the same communication delivered by television or by newspaper. It will be the purpose of this study to investigate attitude change as a function of the interaction of receiver personality variables and channels of message transmission, in this case, television and the written medium.

A review of the research in these areas will include studies on attitude change, individual differences in persuasibility, and the effects of television in provoking attitude change.

STUDIES OF ATTITUDE CHANGE

Many studies have been directed to the issue of attitude change. The presentation of the communication, the status of the communicator, and

the predisposition of the individual receiving the communication are among the variables involved in effecting attitude change of any type.

In the presentation of an argument favouring a change of attitude Abelson (1959) found that one-sided arguments can be more effective if the goal is to accomplish immediate but temporary opinion change. Hovland, Lumsdaine, and Sheffield (1967) concluded that the effects of presenting one side rather than both sides of an argument on a controversial issue is less effective in changing opinions of well-educated subjects opposed to the point of view being presented. A one-sided argument is more effective, however, among those who are not well educated. After thirty days the influence of a communication is weaker than immediately after its presentation, but there is still some influence (Abelson, 1959). The stronger the immediate effectiveness of the message the greater will be its influence after thirty days. There is more opinion change in favour of the particular communication if conclusions are stated explicitly rather than if the subjects are allowed to draw their own conclusions. According to Hovland and Janis (1959) rational factual arguments must be used if a communication is to produce a maximum amount of attitude change.

In studies concerned with the effect of communicator status on attitude change Rosenow and Robinson (1967) and Leberinger and Sullivan (1965) have suggested that if communicator credibility is established opposed subjects consider the arguments presented more readily and hence are more susceptible to express a change of opinion. Others (Hovland & Weiss, 1967) report that subjects change their opinion more when the communicator is perceived as trustworthy. This change, however, decreases over time which seems to remove recall of the source as a mediating cue thereby leading to resumption of the earlier opinion. Rosenow suggests

that the communicator must sound as if he is an expert in his field. He must exude self-confidence and authority. More change of opinion is expressed if the subject can identify with the communicator who is perceived as having his self-interest in mind. The subjects appear to respond favourably to a communicator with credentials (e.g., a Ph.D.). Messages are accepted more readily from friendly rather than hostile speakers (Albert & Dabbs, 1970).

In addition Mehrabian and Martin (1969) demonstrated that on videotaped recordings designed to measure communicator factors, the effectiveness of the communicator was dependent on speech rate, volume, and intonation. Further, the communicator was more effective if he appeared to be moderate in manner rather than fanatically committed to the issue about which he was speaking.

Subject predisposition must also be considered in an influence attempt. Freedman (1967) found that when a subject experiences high emotional involvement with the topic of communication extremely discrepant information is rejected. In fact, negative attitude change can occur. Others (Edwards & Ostrom, 1969) report that attitudes concerning important values are significantly more resistant to change by discrepant information than attitudes regarding unimportant values. It is interesting to note that some research (Johnson & Scileppi, 1969) suggests that communicator credibility is a factor in producing attitude change only when there is relatively low ego-involvement conditions on the part of the subjects. Vohs and Garrett (1970) found that in a tape-recorded presentation of a communication to subjects initially opposed to the topic of communication, the subjects high in ego-involvement were more resistant to change than those subjects low in ego-involvement. It was suggested that such

subjects were familiar with refutations to the communication while subjects low in ego-involvement were not.

Personality factors are also relevant when attempting to produce attitude change. Evidence suggests that a persuasibility factor is involved in the relative ease or difficulty of producing attitude change. For example, Gelfand (1962) found that subjects high in self-esteem as indicated by a 100 item questionnaire based on ten areas of personal competence were less persuasible than subjects low in self-esteem.

Witkin (1954) has also done much work in establishing that certain individuals (field dependent) are much more dependent on cues from the environment in making a decision than others (field independent). This is very similar to the work of J. B. Rotter on internal-external control, where internals are thought to be much less dependent on cues from the environment than externals who are thought to believe that their control over what happens to them is minimal.

INTERNAL-EXTERNAL CONTROL AS RELATED TO PERSUASABILITY

Some of the most promising research on the predisposition to persuasability has been initiated by Rotter (1954) in his Social Learning Theory. According to Rotter social behaviour is a function of the individual's expectancy for reinforcement in a given situation and the value of the reinforcement. Rotter (1966) has designed a forced-choice paper-and-pencil scale (the Internal-External Control Scale) to measure the expectancy of a person's control of reinforcement, that is whether the locus of control is internal or external. Those who score in the direction of internal control believe they can control their reinforcement. They tend to rely on their own resources and see their accomplishments as a function of their own initiative. The person who scores in the external direction perceives events which occur as beyond the realm of his control, that is they are the result of fate, luck, or chance. He

is more dependent on the environment as a behavioural cue.

Evidence indicates that externally oriented individuals tend to conform more than internally oriented persons. Gore (1962) found in subtle attempts to influence subjects in a given direction that internal subjects show less response to influence attempts than external subjects. Further, internals tend to respond more in the opposite direction of the subtle suggestion than control subjects. In extended research Gore and Rotter (1963) report that black students high in internal control tended to commit themselves to more personal and decisive social action than black external subjects. This suggests the desire of internals to challenge a system of racial inequality while externals tended to passively conform to the system in the belief that they had no power or ability to change it. Other studies involving conformity (Crowne & Liverant, 1963) found that in a betting situation externals tended to bet less and were less confident in their choices than the internals. Strickland (1970) in an experiment concerned with verbal conditioning found that externals were more amenable to influence than internals. Also, during the extinction phase internals tended to exhibit latent conditioning of the key words and were more resistant to extinction than the externals. She concludes that perhaps internals will not show the extent of conditioning influence until retested several days later. Her results also suggest that it is of crucial importance to have the co-operation of the internal control subjects if attempting overt control of their behaviour since they tend to resist subtle influence attempts.

Ritchie and Phares (1969) have suggested that the key to the acceptance of influence by internals is whether the attempted influence is perceived as subtle or overt. This factor doesn't appear to affect

externals' acceptance of the influence since they appear to be influenced in either condition. They hypothesized that externals would display more attitude change when receiving information from a high status than from a low status communicator while internals were not expected to differ significantly in either condition. It was expected that internals would look primarily at communication content. They also predicted that externals would display greater attitude change after an influence attempt by a high status communicator than internals. Subjects, after answering the Internal-External Control questionnaire received an attitude pretest¹ on the economic budget policies of the American government. From this pro and con subjects were selected who then received written arguments contrary to their positions. Two communicator status conditions were used -- one, in which subjects were told that the author of the communication was extremely prestigious having worked with a president of the U.S. In the other condition subjects were told that the author of the communication was a fellow college student. Immediately after reading the communication subjects answered the attitude survey again. Results indicated that externals tend to be influenced more by a high status communicator regardless of their previous opinion or communication content. Internals, however, responded more to the content of the communication. Externals also changed more than internals under the high status communicator. No difference was found between internals and externals in the low status communicator condition. Hence, the literature indicates that externals

¹Lana (1967) found that the length, complexity, and obviousness of intent of a pretest might produce less opinion change after a communication than when a pretest is relatively simple, short, and disguised. Ritchie and Phares (1969) presented their subjects with a disguised pre-test. A single unidirectional argument was used as well. Afterwards, none of the subjects expressed awareness that an influence attempt had occurred.

are more influenceable than internals especially with a high status communicator and low or moderate ego-involvement with the issue.

Recently there has been some controversy regarding just what the I-E Scale is actually measuring. Mirels (1969) using a sample of white college students found two factors in the scale. One factor consisted of items concerned with one's perceived ability to control the environment. Another factor included statements which examine one's perceptions of the average person's ability to control political and world affairs. In this factor the social system is the target of control. Thus, a person's score may reflect the social norms of the group with which he identifies. A study by Gurin, Gurin, Lao, and Beattie (1969) with black college students tends to support this factorial breakdown. They labelled perceived ability statements as "personal control" and social system statements as "system modifiability."

Thomas' study (1970) with left- and right- wing student activists also suggests a confounding of factors in the I-E Scale. Left-wing activists scored more externally than nonactivists who in turn scored more externally than right-wing activists. He interprets these results as representing a politically conservative bias on the I-E Scale. Such a bias may be a reflection of the System Modifiability factor. Here, the system is not the source of social problems. Students of the left, however, generally believe that the social system is at fault for the existence of such maladies as racism, the Viet Nam war, etc. With these attitudes an individual may reject third-person statements such as, "Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, laziness, ignorance, or all three."

Lao (1970) found that the score of subjects who were high in the

direction of internal Personal Control was unrelated to measures of collective social action in a study of black college students. The Personal Control factor, then, does not appear to be a predictor of social action. On the other hand System Modifiability was related to social action. Those who saw a need for the system to be modified were more involved in social action. Consideration of the two control factors should be taken into account when using the I-E scale, otherwise, the results will be ambiguous.

EFFECTS OF TELEVISION ON ATTITUDE CHANGE

Little scientific research has been conducted on the effects of the media in producing attitude change; however, Hovland and Weiss (1967) suggest that the mass media, especially television, tend to confer a sense of legitimacy on people and events. Television "seems" to have the trust of the people. They often tend to accept what is said on television. It lends an air of credibility to a communication so that one may be more easily influenced (Lerbinger, 1965). Levonian (1967), however, reports that while opinion change is increased immediately after exposure to an audience-tailored film such influence dissipates within a week.

Ritchie and Phares (1969) found that the externals' initial opinion on an issue did not affect the amount of attitude change after reading a written communication contrary to their views. Strickland (1970) found that internal subjects tended to exhibit latent conditioning after a rest of several days, perhaps the result of mentally "working through" the material while external subjects did not display this behaviour.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Based on Lerbinger's (1965) and Hovland & Weiss' (1967) suggestion

that television adds an air of credibility to a communication the present study attempted to investigate the possibility that more attitude change occurs with a videotaped communication than with a written communication. The independent variable involved the manipulation of the medium of communication, that is, a videotaped and a written communication. It has been suggested that television lends an air of credibility to a communication and external subjects have been shown to be more influenced by credibility factors than internals (Gore, 1962; Ritchie & Phares, 1969; Strickland, 1970).

On the basis of the evidence it is specifically predicted that two main effects will occur: (1) attitude change will be greater with television than with the written communication, and (2) external subjects will change their attitudes more than internal subjects. Thirdly, there will be an interaction effect. It is anticipated that internally-oriented subjects and externally-oriented subjects will change differentially under the written and videotaped conditions but what changes will occur is not predictable at present because there is insufficient evidence relating personality factors to type of media influence. With respect to the time at which attitude change is measured it is predicted that: 4) external subjects will show a decrease in the effect of the communication after a rest of several days and hence exhibit less attitude change on a second retest than on a first retest, 5) internal subjects will show greater attitude change on a second retest than immediately after the communication in both conditions as a result of "working with" the material for several days.

CHAPTER II

Method

SUBJECTS

Subjects were drawn from a sample of 200 male and female students in introductory classes at the University of Windsor. They were contacted by telephone and thirty subjects were scheduled for one experimental condition and twenty-nine were scheduled for the other condition. There were not enough eligible Ss to act as additional Ss in case of possible attrition.

MATERIALS

The I-E Scale and a twenty-item attitude survey concerned with the seditious conspiracy laws of Canada were administered separately.

The Attitude Survey: Each item on the survey was placed by the student along a six point Likert-type scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." There was a paragraph on the first page of the survey stating the laws regarding seditious conspiracy, seditious intention, exceptions, and punishments quoted from the Criminal Code of Canada. Students were directed to read this very carefully before reading the rest of the survey which was said to consist of a series of quotes regarding seditious conspiracy taken from various politicians and journalists over the "last several weeks." They were then told to place the degree of their agreement or disagreement with each quote along the scale. Each supportive item had a negative counterpart item to test for reliability. There were to be ten supportive and ten non-supportive statements. (See Appendix A)

The degree of agreement on a supportive item was assessed under a positive (+) sign to indicate a favourable attitude towards the issue. Thus +5 meant "agree strongly" (- 1), +3 meant "agree moderately" (- 2), and +1 meant "agree slightly" (- 3). If an individual circled 4, 5, or 6 on a negative (non-supportive) item this was interpreted as maintaining a supportive attitude and the response was scored as +1 meant "slightly disagree" (- 4), +3 meant "moderately disagree" (-5) +5 meant "strongly disagree" (- 6.) On the negative items (i.e. expressing an unfavourable attitude towards the issue) the degree of agreement was assessed under a negative (-) sign. Hence

- 1 - "strongly agree" meant -5
- 2 - "moderately agree" meant -3
- 3 - "slightly agree" meant -1.

If an individual circled 4, 5, or 6 on a supportive item this was interpreted as maintaining an unsupportive attitude and the response was scored as

- 4 "slightly disagree" meant -1
- 5 "moderately disagree" meant -3
- 6 "strongly disagree" meant -5.

Thus a score of +1 to +5 on a question suggested support for the issue while a score of -1 to -5 indicated varying degree of non-support.

The supportive items were #1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, and 18.

The non-supportive items were #2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17, 19, and 20.

The arithmetic sum of the scores on the 20 items was calculated for each person with a possible range of +100 suggesting "strong agreement with or support for the laws regarding seditious conspiracy to -100 suggesting "strong disagreement" with or lack of support for those laws.

Opinion change scores were computed by comparing the difference score of the first administration of the survey with the scores of the first retest for the manipulated and control Ss and of the second retest for 17 of the manipulated Ss.

If an individual was less in favour of the law on the first retest a + (positive) sign was used to calculate the difference score. For example if a S scored +28 on the first administration and +13 on the retest he received a score of +15 meaning he was that many points less favourable towards the seditious conspiracy laws. If a S scored -4 on the first administration and +4 on the retest the difference score was -8 suggesting that he was now more in favour of the laws.

Then, a Pearson r reliability correlation coefficient was carried out using the difference scores of the 63 control Ss for the first administration and the only retest they took approximately three weeks later. r had a value of .87 suggesting that the survey was reliable and that the control Ss maintained relatively consistent attitudes which were tapped by the survey. (See Appendix B).

The I-E Scale: The I-E Scale was administered by a male graduate student of psychology in October and November, 1970, disguised as the Social Reaction Inventory. Because of the conflict regarding the two factors, Personal Control and System Modifiability on the I-E Scale, a factor analysis was carried out by Minton and Hrycenko (1971). As in Mirels' study (1970), two factors were found. Nine items had loadings on the Personal Control factor. (See Appendix D). On the basis of these items Ss scored on a nine-point scale. Using a median split the population was categorized in the internal and external ends of the Personal Control factor which was used because it appears to be concerned with the individual's own perceived ability to control

his environment which corresponds to Rotter's initial concept of what the I-E scale was originally designed to measure.

A point-biserial correlation was conducted on the Personal Control factor consisting of items #2, 5, 11, 15, 16, 18, 23, 25, and 28. (See Appendix D for the actual correlations.) This correlation was used to provide a measure of the internal consistency of Personal Control factor. There was a sample of 321 students. The point biserial correlation coefficient on each of the items concerning the Personal Control factor is a measure of each item's capacity to discriminate between the internal and external Ss. To calculate the degrees of freedom the formula $N-2$ (319) was used (Ferguson, 1959). All items were significant at the .01 level suggesting that these items were highly reliable when used for the Personality Control factor. (See Appendix D for the item coefficients).

Since there were nine items, Ss who scored high were listed as externals and Ss who scored low (i.e. below 50%) were listed as internals. A score of nine suggested a high external locus of control. A score of zero suggested a high internal locus of control. Ss who scored four or below out of the possible nine were listed as internals while those who scored five or above were listed as externals. A median split was used.

COMMUNICATION MATERIALS

Based on the items used in the attitude survey on seditious conspiracy a short, video-taped, black and white presentation of

approximately twelve minutes duration was taped. In it the speaker, Mr. Douglas Sanders, a professor of law at the University of Windsor, cited the possible misuses of the seditious conspiracy laws in general, as applied to the French-Canadians in Quebec, and as applied to supporters of the Fronte de Liberation du Quebec (FLQ). The same communication was also written and presented as the second condition. (See Appendix C)

PROCEDURE

A situation was developed where an influence attempt unfavourable to Canada's seditious conspiracy laws could take place and attitude measures could be taken before and after the attempt. The investigation was concerned with the degree of change among the manipulated internal and external Ss in each media condition. To maximize the likelihood of attitude change regardless of condition a high status communicator was employed. Mr. Douglas Sanders is a faculty member of the University of Windsor School of Law. He has worked for the Native Peoples Development Fund, published a paper on Native Rights in Canada in 1970, held a private law practice for five years and is an expert in the area of Canadian civil liberties. The content of the communication was written by Mr. Sanders and was very factual containing the relevant points of law regarding seditious conspiracy.

Only Ss with a generally low level of involvement, either for or against the laws, i.e. from +30 to -30, on the initial administration of the attitude survey were selected because they were thought to be more susceptible to opinion change than those high in involvement (Johnson & Scileppi, 1969, Vohs & Garret, 1968). On the basis of research (Lana, 1967; Ritchie & Phares, 1969), Ss regardless of their

initial opinion were presented with a single unidirectional argument unfavourable to the seditious conspiracy laws.

The Ss were those who scored above and below the median split on the distribution for the I-E Scale while at the same time expressing a slightly favourable or unfavourable opinion towards the seditious conspiracy laws (+30 to -30) as found in the survey on seditious conspiracy. Of the 59 possible Ss half of the I's and E's were randomly assigned to the videotaped condition and half to the written condition. An attempt was made to balance each condition for sex. After the selection of possible Ss there were no Ss left to add to each condition to control for possible attrition.

The influence attempts occurred eight days and thirteen days respectively after the attitude survey was originally administered. Upon first administration of the attitude survey by three undergraduate students in political science on the same day students received the following instructions:

"This is a survey to obtain your views on the seditious conspiracy laws presently existing in Canada. We would like you to fill out this survey to help us learn your views. This is part of a normative study being administered to several Canadian universities. On the survey are quotes from politicians and journalists recorded during the last several weeks. There is also a six-point scale ranging from one, strongly agree, to six, strongly disagree. Please circle the number of the scale which most accurately expresses the degree of your agreement or disagreement beside each quote.

We would appreciate it if you would put your name, student ID number, phone number, and citizenship on the top right-hand corner of the first page. We would like to stress that your replies will be kept in the strictest of confidence and destroyed after we have compiled the data.

Please read the entire opening paragraph on seditious conspiracy before you begin to read the quotes. Do not

circle the appropriate number beside each quote until you have read this opening paragraph.

Some of you will be randomly asked to participate in several extensions of this study within the next two weeks. We would appreciate your cooperation at that time.

In any event, we shall return within the next three weeks to administer this survey again. It is extremely important that those of you who fill it out today be here then. We would appreciate your time and attendance. Thank you for your time and cooperation."

The I-E Scale, administered several months earlier, was computer scored by Minton & Hrycenko. Out of a possible score of nine, the students who scored four or below on the Personal Control factor were classified as having an internal locus of control of events which happened to them and those who scored five or above indicated an external locus of control.

Then, the scores on the attitude survey on the seditious conspiracy laws were calculated by hand. The scores ranged from -85 to +78 with the majority of students scoring between +30 and -30. Those students who scored in the latter range on the seditious conspiracy survey and internally or externally on the I-E Scale were listed as possible subjects. There were 59 eligible Ss with 30 falling in the internal category and 29 falling within the external range. They were randomly assigned to the experimental condition with 15 internals in the videotaped and written condition while 15 externals were randomly assigned to the videotaped condition and 14 externals to the written condition. Then four students majoring in psychology but unassociated with the experiment per se were selected to telephone the possible Ss two nights before the influence attempts occurred.

The male and female phoning the students for the written

condition were asked to call an internal S and then an external S etc.

for balance. They read the following:

For Written

"A short time ago you participated in a survey which obtained your views on the seditious conspiracy laws presently existing in Canada. On Thursday, March 18 there will be an extension of that survey. We have selected you at random. We would appreciate your attendance so that you can help us learn more about college students' views on these laws.

If you can attend, please go to room 301, Memorial Hall at 4:30 p.m. At the door there will be a male assistant to whom you will give your name. Your attendance will be required for no longer than 30 minutes so you should be out by five o'clock.

We would certainly appreciate your co-operation as this survey is being conducted at several Canadian universities. We will inform you of the purpose within two weeks if you are interested.

Thank you very much and please be on time."

The male and female calling the eligible students for the videotaped condition were also asked to balance their calls and read the following to their Ss.

For TV

"A short time ago you participated in a survey which obtained your views on the seditious conspiracy laws presently existing in Canada. On Thursday, March 18 there will be an extension of that survey. We have selected you at random. We would appreciate your attendance so that you can help us learn more about college students' views on these laws.

If you can attend please go to room 201, Memorial Hall at 4:30 p.m. At the door there will be a male assistant to whom you will give your name. Your attendance will be required for no longer than 30 minutes so you should be out by five o'clock.

We would certainly appreciate your co-operation as this is a survey being conducted at several Canadian universities. We will inform you of the purpose within two weeks if you are interested.

Thank you very much and please be on time."

The first influence attempt in both conditions occurred at the same time, at 4:30 p.m. Thursday, March 18, 1971. A male student at the University of Windsor passed out the written communication, read the instructions, and passed out and collected the attitude surveys in the written condition located in room 301, Memorial Hall. Another male student read the instructions in the videotaped condition, passed out the attitude surveys at the end of the tape and collected them when the Ss finished in room 201, Memorial Hall.

Instructions were read in both conditions as follows:

"A short time ago you participated in a survey which obtained your views on the seditious conspiracy laws presently existing in Canada. This is an extension of that survey. At this time we would like to collect some additional data which will help us to understand your views more precisely."

At this point instructions differed. For the videotaped condition they continued:

"Today we are presenting a videotape of another person's views on the same topic."

The written condition received the following:

"Today we are going to ask you to read another person's views on the same topic."

After these statements all Ss received the same additional information:

"Douglas Sanders is presently a professor on the teaching faculty of the University of Windsor Law School. He has a Bachelor of Laws degree from the University of Alberta and a Master of Laws degree from the University of California.

Mr. Sanders had a private practice in Vancouver for five years. At this time he established himself as an authority on civil liberties in Canada writing treatises on the Minority Rights of the Hutterites. He has also worked tirelessly for the Native People's Development Organization in Ontario and was involved in the formation of a report called "Native Rights in

Canada" published in 1970. Presently he is teaching Criminal Law, Constitutional Law, and Civil Liberties in the Law School at this University."

Again, the instructions differed slightly.

"After seeing his tape," or "after reading his statements,"
"I would like you to again rate all the statements on the survey according to your views. Thank you for your co-operation."

After the instructions were read the Ss in room 201 received the videotaped communication and the Ss in room 301 received the same communication in written form. Then Ss filled out the survey on the seditious conspiracy laws again. The Ss in the videotaped communication condition received the survey after the tape was completed. The Ss in the written condition received the survey after all had finished reading the communication and had looked up at the assistant. Both groups gave the surveys to the assistants on finishing and then left.

Because only 4 internal subjects and 3 external subjects came to the videotaped condition and 4 internals and 6 externals attended the written condition, another influence attempt was scheduled for and occurred in the same rooms on Tuesday, March 23 at 4:30 p.m. The same four people phoned the Ss who had not come and read the same instructions the night before the second influence attempt occurred. Two different male students read the instructions to avoid biasing and the influence attempt was conducted as before. This time only one internal subject and one external subject attended the videotaped condition while two internals and two externals attended the written condition.

At this point it was decided to use the data of the 23 Ss who did attend the influence attempt since it would not appear to the Ss who didn't attend that they were selected "at random" if telephoned a third time.

Eight days after the second influence attempt occurred the four students who administered the survey the first time administered the survey again to determine whether or not the attitudes of the control Ss and manipulated Ss remained uniform. It was the second retest for the manipulated Ss and the first retest for the control Ss. They received the following instructions:

"Several weeks ago you filled out a survey regarding the seditious conspiracy laws in Canada. We have returned at this time to determine if any changes of opinion have occurred. We would appreciate it if you would fill out the survey as you did before placing your name, etc. in the appropriate spaces.

Once again, we ask you to read the legal definition of seditious conspiracy before you begin.

Thank you for your time and co-operation."

The surveys were then analyzed to determine if any significant attitude changes regarding the seditious conspiracy laws had occurred. Of the 23 manipulated Ss only 17 were present for their second retest. Of the controls who filled out the survey the first time 63 filled out the first and only retest for the control Ss. Hence there were 63 control Ss and 23 manipulated Ss with 17 answering the second retest.

Chapter III

Results

The hypotheses of the study in terms of main effects were that a) attitude change would be greater in the videotaped condition than in the written condition, and that b) externals would show more change than internals in either condition. Further it was predicted that c) internal and external Ss would respond differentially to the type of media used but due to the lack of research the direction of the responses was not predictable. Additionally d) internals would display an increase in attitude change after a rest of several days, while e) externals would tend to revert to their former opinion after the same rest period.

The cell means for each of the manipulated conditions was computed. The difference scores of the manipulated Ss for the first administration of the attitude survey and the first retest with the same survey taken immediately after the influence attempt were used as shown in Table I.

TABLE I

Cell means indicating attitude change using the difference scores for the initial administration of the attitude survey and the first retest.

	Written	Videotaped	Total
Internal	5.16	21	26.16
External	<u>28.87</u>	<u>17.25</u>	46.12
Total	34.03	38.25	

To determine if the hypotheses were borne out at a statistically significant level two analyses of variance were used. In the first ANOVA the difference scores of the 23 manipulated Ss for the first administration of the attitude survey and the first retest administered immediately after the influence attempt were used.

As illustrated in Table 2 the main effects of both I-E and medium of communication were not significant.

TABLE 2

Summary table of ANOVA using the difference scores of the manipulated subjects for the first administration of the attitude survey and the first retest.

Source of Variation	Ss	df	MS	F	P
A (internal-external)	537.84	1	537.84	1.21	
B (media)	24.03	1	24.03		
AB	1018.01	1	1018.01	2.2	> .05
Within Cell	8213.47	19	456.30		

Thus, the ANOVA in Table 2 revealed that the internal and external Ss did not change their opinions from each other significantly when summed over videotaped and written communication conditions. Similarly, opinion change was not significant in the videotaped and written communication conditions when summed across Internals and Externals. The I-E x communication condition was not significant as well, but it can be seen in Table 2 that there was a trend towards significance in this interaction suggesting that the internal and external Ss may have responded differentially to the type of communication employed, though not to the point

of significance as originally predicted. Thus, although significance was not reached it is necessary to consider the raw cell means based on the difference scores of the 23 manipulated Ss for the initial test and the first retest as shown in Table 1.

Numerically, the internals had a much lower attitude change score (26.16) than the externals (46.12). In light of the large within-cell variance (456.30) the mean differences between the internals and externals, though not statistically significant, are supportive of the hypothesis that externals will be more influenceable, overall, than the internals. Numerically, the internals in the written condition changed their attitudes less than the internals who received the videotaped condition. This was expected to occur as predicted in the hypotheses. Numerically those Ss receiving the videotaped condition changed more than Ss receiving the written condition as predicted although this difference was not statistically significant as revealed by the ANOVA in Table 2. It is important to realize that fourteen Ss received the written communication while only nine Ss received the videotaped condition and yet attitude change was greater for the nine in the video condition than for the fourteen Ss in the written condition suggesting that a videotaped communication may be a more potent form of inducing attitude change than a written communication.

A Student *t*-test was conducted on the attitude scores of the internal and external Ss in the written communication condition because the difference between the cell means (5.16 and 28.87 respectively) was quite large. This suggested that perhaps internal and external Ss were responding to the method of communication employed in a differential manner as predicted. The internals appeared to have been influenced less by the written condition than by the videotaped condition while

externals appeared to be more influenced by the written condition than the internals. The t-test on this latter condition indicated a trend towards significance at the .10 level ($t = 2.13$, $df = 13$). Thus, it appeared that there was a differential effect exerted by the written communication on the attitudes of the I's and E's such that externals tend to change their attitude in favour of the written communication to a greater extent than the internals. Six of the 23 manipulated Ss did not fill out the second retest.

The cell means using the difference scores of the 17 manipulated Ss who answered the first retest immediately after the influence attempt and the second retest after a rest of eight days was computed as shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3

Cell means for attitude change using the difference scores of the 17 manipulate subjects for retest one and retest two.

	Written	Videotaped	Total
Internal	.8	1.0	1.8
External	<u>-7.33</u>	<u>-7.50</u>	-14.83
Total	-6.53	-6.50	

An ANOVA shown in Table 4, using these difference scores also was computed to determine if the externals had reverted to their earlier opinion, and, if the internals had tended to change their attitude further after the rest interval (i.e. Strickland's latency effect) as predicted in the hypotheses.

TABLE 4

Summary table of ANOVA using the difference scores of the manipulated subjects for the first retest and the second retest administered eight days later.

Source of Variation	Ss	df	MS	F	P
A (internal-external)	237.84	1	237.84	1.82	>.05
B (media)	0	1			
AB	.12	1			
Within Cell	1696.6	13	130.5		

The ANOVA as shown in Table 5 revealed that the internal and external Ss in both communication conditions had not changed their opinions significantly after a rest interval as predicted in the hypotheses.

The cell means in Table 3 reveal that, numerically, the internal Ss in both conditions maintained a consistent change of attitude relative to the external Ss who displayed a reversal to their earlier opinion as predicted although this reversal was not statistically significant.

The ANOVA in Table 4 reveals a trend towards significance among the I's and E's, and it must be assumed that the large within cell variance as well as the very small sample size contributed to the failure to achieve statistical significance. Numerically, the hypothesis that E's would revert to their earlier position after a rest interval was borne out. It appears, numerically at least that the I's were stable in their opinion change which does not support Strickland's proposal of a latency effect among internal Ss.

A two-tailed t-test comparing the difference scores of 23 randomly selected control Ss on the initial survey and their only retest with the difference scores of the manipulated Ss on the first test and the first

retest, whose means were +8.9 and -.06 respectively, taken immediately after the influence attempt was computed and found to be statistically significant at the .005 level ($t = 4.28$, $df = 3/23$). Hence, although personality type and medium of communication did not reach significance within the samples of manipulated Ss the influence attempt per se did affect the attitudes of the manipulated Ss in the direction of the influence attempt so that they were significantly less supportive of the seditious conspiracy laws than the control Ss who, of course, received no experimental manipulation.

Another two-tailed t-test compared the difference scores of 17 randomly selected control Ss on the initial survey and their only retest with the difference scores of the 17 manipulated Ss on the first administration of the survey and second retest taken with the control Ss eight days after the influence attempt. The means for attitude change between the 17 manipulated Ss and 17 control Ss were 16.71 and -1.59 respectively suggesting that the controls had become slightly less supportive while the manipulated Ss were considerably more supportive now than at the time of the first administration. The t-test was significant at the .005 level ($t = .291$, $df = 3/17$) suggesting that the attitude change regarding the seditious conspiracy laws was still stable among the manipulated Ss after an eight day lapse thereby contradicting the findings of Levonian (1967).

As shown earlier in Table I it appears that internal Ss were influenced more by the videotaped than by the written communication while the externals appeared to be influenced under both communication conditions.

The results of this study were, however, markedly affected by the within cell variance, a situation probably created by the very small samples used in each condition which could not be adequately controlled beforehand.

Thus, the hypotheses were not borne out at a statistical level of significance, though four of the predictions were borne out numerically.

Numerically, attitude change was greater in the videotaped condition than in the written condition as predicted but this did not reach statistical significance. As well, external Ss appeared to be more influenceable overall than internal Ss was once again not statistically significant.

The external Ss did not maintain a consistent change of attitude but tended to revert to their earlier opinion numerically after a rest interval as predicted. Contrary to expectation the internal Ss appeared to maintain a consistent attitude after the same rest period.

A statistical trend at the .10 level suggest that internal and external Ss respond differentially to the same medium of communication. Although this did not achieve significance in the ANOVA in Table 3 a t-test revealed that Internal Ss tended to resist an influence attempt via a written communication to a greater degree than external Ss receiving the same written communication.

Thus, I's and E's appear to respond differentially to the same medium of communication as well as to different media of communication. As Table 1 suggests it appears that both I's and E's respond favourably to an influence attempt delivered in a videotape while only E's respond favourably to the same communication delivered in a written form.

CHAPTER IV

Discussion and Conclusions

The statistical analysis of the results did not generally support the hypotheses of the study. This can be attributed in part to the large within cell variance created by the small sample size employed. It is possible that due to the very small sample size the results, or sample itself, was not representative of the general population. A smaller attrition rate might have produced different results. The question also arises as to whether those Ss who did participate were already in favour of the issue discussed, albeit not strongly.

The numerical results, however, do suggest that external Ss are more influenceable than internal Ss especially in the written communication condition (28.87 and 5.16 respectively). The hypothesis that internal and external Ss respond differentially to the type of media used received some support. Internals tended to be more resistant to a change of attitude via a written condition than externals (.10 level of significance). Both I's and E's, however, appear to be influenced by a videotaped communication.

The results also provided support, numerically at least, for the hypothesis that externals do not maintain a consistent change of attitude after an influence attempt but tend to revert to their earlier opinion as suggested by Levonian (1967). Contrary to both Strickland's (1970) finding of a latency effect among internals and Levonian's (1967) findings that Ss revert to their initial opinion after a time lapse the internal Ss tended to display a consistent change of attitude. Further, Internals appeared to be much more influenced by the videotaped

communication than by the written condition suggesting that videotape may be a more potent medium for influencing individuals than a written communication such as a newspaper. This would tend to support Hovland and Weiss' (1967) and Levinger and Sullivan's (1965) contention that television lends an air of credibility to a message and possesses a personalizing effect that a written communication does not have. It does appear that E's are influenceable under both types of communication conditions while internals respond more to videotaped than to written communications supporting the hypothesis that I's and E's respond differentially to media. Further, externals may need constant information or they will revert to their earlier opinion as found in this study who I's who change their attitude tend to maintain this change even without further information to support this change. Thus it appears that I's respond discriminatively and consistently while E's tend to respond to new information quickly but tend to forget quickly as well.

Another important fact also emerged. An influence attempt regardless of communication condition, i.e. channel of message transmission and receiver personality traits, does produce a change of attitude in the direction of the influence attempt that differs significantly from individuals who receive no influence attempt. This, of course, is in line with the work of Hovland, Lumsdaine, and Sheffield (1967), Rosenow (1967), and Abelson (1959). That a fact-filled message and a high-prestige communicator produced attitude change among the receivers would tend to support the findings of Ritchie and Phares (1969).

The fact that internal Ss appeared to maintain a consistent change of attitude while external Ss tended to revert to their previous opinions could possibly be applied to Abelson's findings (1959) that

one-sided arguments accomplish only temporary opinion change. If in similar studies Ss are determined to be internally or externally oriented in advance it is possible that only externally oriented Ss would tend to revert to their earlier opinion after a time lapse while internal Ss would tend to maintain a relatively consistent change of attitude as a result of the one-sided presentation as this study suggests.

The results of the study also reinforce the findings of Abelson (1959) and Hovland and Janis (1959) that conclusions stated most explicitly and rational factual arguments are the most effective in producing a change of attitude.

The Ss available for this study were determined to be of low or moderate ego-involvement regarding the topic for attitude change. The highly significant change of attitude in favour of both forms of the communication compared to the control Ss (.005) lends strong support to the findings of Vohs and Garrett (1970) that Ss less involved with a topic are less resistant to change. These findings might have been more definitive had subjects high in ego-involvement been used. This was not possible due to the difficulties in matching attitudes with the I-E personality factor. Thus, a larger sample of approximately 600 to 750 persons might have been advantageous to this study.

In line with the work of Ritchie & Phares (1969) the fact that a high-status communicator perceived as an expert in his field was used may have contributed quite heavily to the extent of attitude change among the manipulated Ss but this cannot be determined in any clear-cut fashion. To assess how effective the communicator actually was would necessitate the use of a high-status communicator transmitting a message via the two media (written and television) and a low-status communicator as well. This may be very important in determining how

messages are received across media and has tremendous import for the work of McLuhan (1970) who suggests that the same communicators are received differently depending on the media used.

The results of this study do not support the suggestion by Strickland (1970) that I's tend to exhibit a latency effect resulting in greater attitude change after a rest interval as a result of "working with" the material. Rather, I's tend to respond discriminatively to the material presented and then maintain attitude changes which may occur despite a rest interval. This suggests that internals may require less continuous information from the environment to maintain a change of attitude than externals. As well, the results suggest that internals are more discriminative of media in terms of their responses than are externally-oriented individuals who appear to be influenced by all types of media.

The findings of Levonian (1967) concerned with the temporary opinion change of Ss receiving tailor-made films are also challenged. Whereas he finds that Ss receiving a film designed to influence their attitudes tend to revert to their previous opinion after a rest interval this study suggests that if Ss are selected as internally or externally-oriented it will be found that only E's revert to their previous opinion while I's maintain a consistent change of attitude.

There was also support for the work of Ritchie & Phares (1969) in that externals respond favourably to a communication written by a high-status communicator to a significantly greater degree (.10) than internal Ss.

If this study were to be run under ideal conditions and the hypotheses were verified one might be able to generate further hypotheses

regarding how much television especially in the form of a newcast commentary can sway the attitudes of the general public. It is especially important to realize that even with the difficulties encountered in this experiment, the manipulated Ss responded favourably to the communication and changed their attitudes rather dramatically relative to the control Ss. How much then is the attitude of the general public regarding present-day events swayed by the newspapers they read and the television newscasts and documentaries they watch? How do the conflicting viewpoints taken by the newspapers and television networks influence the average man who must select from among these? Could this possibly be a contributing cause to the increasing neurotic and psychotic breaks within our society.

These are questions basically unanswered and yet we must search to understand and deal with the tremendous potency of the television, radio, and written media that today shape men's minds.

The question of how individuals respond to the media has been largely untapped. It seems that personality factors are emerged suggesting that individuals respond differentially to the same media.

Future studies should deal in developing and exploring these personality factors such as internal and external orientation.

If this study were to be replicated it would be essential that larger treatment cell sizes be employed, preferably 15 Ss per cell with 3 extra Ss per cell to account for possible attrition. It is quite possible that the hypotheses of this study would then be verified. If the hypotheses were borne out it would then be logical to expand this study to include the effects of radio as well as television and a written communication on internal and external Ss. The field of media

influence on different personality types is still an untapped source of scientific research which has much to contribute to man's knowledge of himself.

In summary, factual communications which were identical but which were communicated either by videotape or in written form by a high prestige communicator were presented to groups of internally and externally oriented Ss in order to influence their attitudes. There was no statistical significance but numerically, external Ss changed more in response to the communications overall than did internal Ss. As well, external Ss receiving the written communication tended to change their attitudes to a greater degree (.10) than internals receiving the same written communication.

Further, the external Ss' attitude tended to revert to their earlier opinion while I's remained stable after a rest interval of eight days. Videotape appears to be a more potent method of communicating a message than a written communication. It would also appear that E's are more persuasable than I's but that their changes of attitude tend to dissipate over time while I's remain stable. It also appears as predicted, that I's and E's respond differentially to media. Both I's and E's respond favourably to a videotaped communication but only E's respond favourably to a written communication while I's tend to resist suggesting that videotape is a more potent medium of communication.

The failure to achieve statistical significance for most of the hypotheses was attributed to large within cell variance created by the small sample size. Furthermore, the small sample size may also have made the sample unrepresentative of the general population.

REFERENCES

- Abelson, H. I. Persuasion: how opinions and attitudes are changed. Springer Publishing Co., New York, 1959.
- Albert, S., & Dabbs, J. M. Physical distance and persuasion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15 (3), 265-270.
- Crowne, D., & Liverant, S. Conformity under varying conditions of commitment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 547-555.
- Edwards, A. L. Techniques of attitude scale construction. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York, 1957.
- Ferguson, G. Statistical analysis in psychology and education. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1959.
- Freedman, J. L. Involvement, discrepancy, and change. In R. L. Rosnow & M. J. Robinson (Eds.), Experiments in persuasion. Academic Press, New York, 1967.
- Freund, J. E. Modern elementary statistics. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Gelfand, D. The influence of self-esteem on rate of verbal conditioning and social matching behaviour. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 65, 259-265.
- Gore, P. Individual differences in the prediction of subject compliance to experimenter bias. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962.
- Gore, P. & Rotter, J. A personality correlate of social action. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 58-64.

- Gurin, P., Gurin, G., Lao, R., & Beattie, M. Internal-external control in the motivational dynamics of Negro youth. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25 (3), 29-53.
- Hays, W. Statistics for psychologists. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1965.
- Hovland, C. I., & Janis, I. (Eds.). Personality and persuasibility. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1959.
- Hovland, C. I., Lumsdaine, A., & Sheffield, F. The effects of presenting one side versus both sides in changing opinions on a controversial issue. In R. L. Rosnow & E. J. Robinson (Eds.), Experiments in persuasion. Academic Press, New York, 1967.
- Hovland, C. I., & Weiss, W. The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness. In R. L. Rosnow & E. J. Robinson (Eds.), Experiments in persuasion, Academic Press, New York, 1967.
- Johnson, H., & Scilleppi, J. Effects of ego-involvement conditions on attitude change to high and low credibility communicators. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1963, 31-36.
- Lana, R. E. Inhibitory effects of a pretest on opinion change. In R. L. Rosnow & E. J. Robinson (Eds.), Experiments in persuasion. Academic Press, New York, 1967.
- Lao, R. Internal-external control and competent and innovative behaviour among Negro college students. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 14, 263-270.
- Lerbinger, O., & Sullivan, A. (Eds.). Information, influence, and communication. Basic Books, Inc., New York, 1965.
- Levonian, E. Opinion change as mediated by an audience-tailored film. In R. L. Rosnow & E. J. Robinson (Eds.), Experiments in persuasion. Academic Press, New York, 1967.

- McLuhan, M. Statements recorded from the Dick Cavett Show, December 27, 1970.
- Mehrabian, A., & Martin, W. Nonverbal concomitance of perceived and intended persuasiveness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 37-58.
- Minton, H. L., & Hrycenko, I. A factor analysis of the I-E Scale. Unpublished Study, University of Windsor, 1971.
- Mirels, H. L. Dimensions of internal vs. external control. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 24, 226-228.
- Popple, A. Crankshaw's criminal code of Canada. Carswell Co. Ltd., Law Publishers, Toronto, 1959.
- Ritchie, E. & Phares, E. J. Attitude change as a function of internal-external control and communicator status. Journal of Personality, 1969, 37, 429-443.
- Rosnow, R. L., & Robinson, E. J. (Eds.). Experiments in persuasion. Academic Press, New York, 1967.
- Rotter, J. B. Social learning and clinical psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1954.
- Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80 (1), (Whole No. 609).
- Shaw, M. E., & Wright, J. M. Scales for the measurement of attitudes. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1967.
- Strickland, B. Individual differences in Verbal conditioning, extinction, and awareness. Journal of Personality, 1970, 38, 364-378.
- Thomas, L. The I-E scale, ideological bias, and political participation. Journal of Personality, 1970, 38, 272-286.

Vohs, J., & Garrett, R. Resistance to persuasion: an integrative framework. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1968, 32, 445-452.

Witkin, H. A. Personality through perception. Harper Publishing Co., New York, 1954.

APPENDIX A
MINTON-STARR SURVEY
ON SEDITIOUS CONSPIRACY

THE MINTON-STARR SURVEY ON SEDITIOUS CONSPIRACY

NAME:
 STUDENT ID NUMBER:
 PHONE:
 NATIONALITY:

The following is an excerpt on "sedition" from the Criminal code of Canada. Please read it very carefully:

S. 60(3) A "seditious conspiracy" is an agreement between two or more persons to carry out a "seditious intention."

S. 60(4) Without limiting the generality of the meaning of the expression "seditious intention", everyone shall be presumed to have a seditious intention who a) teaches or advocates, or
 b) publishes or circulates any writing that advocates the use without the authority of law, of force as a means of accomplishing a government change within Canada.

S. 61 Exception..... No person shall be deemed to have a seditious intention by reason only that he intends....

- a) to show that Her Majesty has been misled or mistaken in her measures
- b) to point out errors or defects in
 - i) the government or constitution of Canada or a province
 - ii) the Parliament of Canada or the legislature of a province, or
 - iii) the administration of justice in Canada
- c) to procure, by lawful means, the alteration of any matter of government in Canada
- d) to point out, for the purpose of removal, matters that produce or tend to produce feelings of hostility and ill-will between the different classes of persons in Canada.

S. 62 Punishment.....Everyone who

- a) speaks seditious words
- b) publishes a seditious libel, or
- c) is a party to a seditious conspiracy is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for fourteen years.

Please read each statement and decide how much you agree or disagree according to the scale below. Circle the number that most corresponds to your feeling beside each statement.

strongly agree	moderately agree	slightly agree	slightly disagree	moderately disagree	strongly disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6

- 1) Only those who have openly tried to destroy Canada are being charged with seditious conspiracy. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 2) French-Canadians in Quebec have been exploited by English domination for decades. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 3) The seditious conspiracy laws are too vague to charge anyone with such a crime. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 4) The seditious conspiracy laws provide our democratic society with a last-ditch tool to preserve freedom against anarchists who might try to destroy us. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 5) French-Canadians should be forced to carry special identity cards so their whereabouts can be checked at all times. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 6) The Canadian government uses the seditious conspiracy law as a political weapon. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 7) Because the FLQ is an outlaw organization without aims, without guidance, and without any reasonable ideas whatsoever, it ought to be abolished in the most expedient manner possible. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 8) One can sympathize with the FLQ when one understands the discrimination, illegal arrests, and illegal prison confinements they have suffered under the Quebec government. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 9) The charge of seditious conspiracy against supporters of the FLQ was an attempt to remove them from the public eye so that they wouldn't gain support. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 10) I think the solicitor-general of Canada should use the seditious conspiracy laws against the French in Quebec. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 11) If we continue to use the seditious conspiracy laws against French-Canadians we are taking a major step towards a fascistic state in Canada. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- 12) I believe that the government is justified in charging supporters of the FLQ with seditious conspiracy. 1 2 3 4 5 6

APPENDIX B
THE INTERNAL-EXTERNAL
SCALE OF CONTROL

SOCIAL REACTION INVENTORY

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief. Obviously there are no right or wrong answers.

Your answers to the items on this inventory are to be recorded on the separate answer sheet which has been passed out. **FILL OUT THIS ANSWER SHEET NOW.** Print your identification number on the answer sheet, then finish reading these directions. Do not open the booklet until you are told to do so.

Please answer these items carefully but do not spend too much time on any one item. Be sure to find an answer for every choice. Find the number of the item on the answer sheet and blacken the space under the letter which corresponds to the statement you choose as most true.

In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Also try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be influenced by your previous choices.

REMEMBER

Select that alternative which you personally believe to be more true.

I more strongly believe that:

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too each with them.
2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.
4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.
6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
7. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
b. People who can't get others to like them, don't understand how to get along with others.
8. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.
9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

I more strongly believe that:

10. a. In the case of the well-prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work, that studying is really useless.
11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.
14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
b. There is some good in everybody.
15. a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
b. There really is no such thing as "luck".
19. a. One should always be willing to admit his mistakes.
b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

I more strongly believe that:

20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.
21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.
24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.
25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.
27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.
28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

APPENDIX C
WRITTEN COMMUNICATION
OF THE INFLUENCE
ATTEMPT UNFAVOURABLE TO
THE SEDITIOUS CONSPIRACY
LAWS OF CANADA

COMMENTARY ON THE SEDITIOUS CONSPIRACY LAWS INCANADA

On February 13th Mr. Justice Roger Ouimet quashed the charges of seditious conspiracy which were laid against Michel Chartrand, Robert Lemieux, Jacque Larue-Langlois, Pierre Vallieres and Charles Gagnon. To many this action may seem a vindication of the legal system. The charges were extremely broad. The court acted to protect the rights of the 5 in the face of disturbingly imprecise charges. Moreover this action followed the acquittal of a young separatist on a charge of publishing a seditious libel. The young man had written in a school notebook some rather elaborate plans for reconstituting the political order in Quebec. He gave the notebook to a friend of his to read. The act of handing it over to somebody else to read was the "publishing" and the words in the notebook were alleged to be seditious. That charge was thrown out. The notes were held to be the fanciful and utopian projections of a young radical. They could hardly be taken at face value.

I suggest that these two incidents do not represent a vindication of the legal system, but demonstrate rather graphically how the vague laws relating to sedition can be used to inhibit political advocacy. The fact that Chartrand, Gagnon, Vallieres and the others had the charges dismissed does not erase the fact that they were charged, and were put in jeopardy. They have been subjected to detention and at least the beginnings of a trial. The charge that was laid against the five was that they had been guilty of seditious conspiracy between January 1st, 1968 and October 16th, 1970. Michel Chartrand mockingly

responded that the charge should have read between 1938 and 1970. This was a grab-bag kind of charge. The Crown prosecutor could attempt to throw in everything that he can find about the political activity of the 5 over a period of almost 3 years. The Crown prosecutor would try to convince the court that there was a pattern involving some collaboration by the five, and that the end goal of this activity was to carry out a seditious intention. Curiously the Criminal Code of Canada never defines what seditious intention means. It simply states that everyone shall be presumed to have a seditious intention who either teaches or advocates, or publishes or circulates any writing that advocates the use of force as a means of accomplishing a governmental change in Canada. A conspiracy is a plotting or planning to commit a crime. One person cannot be guilty of conspiracy. The conspiracy laws themselves have been often criticised on the basis that one person may plan an activity which would be illegal, but if the person never carries out the plan he is not subject to criminal prosecution. However, if two people do the very same thing, and also never carry out the criminal activity they are guilty of a criminal offence, the offence of conspiracy. Conspiracy is a group offence. Conspiracy is a rather anomalous section of our criminal law. With seditious conspiracy we see the vagueness of the conspiracy section tied into the vagueness of the seditious intention portions of the code. It, therefore, becomes an offence for two or more persons to plan the carrying out of a seditious intention (and it will be presumed that they have a seditious intention if they advocate the use of force as a means of accomplishing governmental change within Canada). If two people plan to espouse the political philosophy of the American Declaration of Independence they are guilty

of seditious conspiracy. They have planned together a teaching or advocacy of the use of force as a means of accomplishing a governmental change within Canada. Note that they don't have to teach or advocate sedition - only plan to. They don't have to attempt or try to teach or advocate seditious thoughts - only to plan. Note that the offence is complete without any actual use of force. One does not have to blow up a government building to be guilty of seditious conspiracy. The law is very clear that blowing up buildings is against the law. The law is very clear that inciting public disorder is an offence. We are not here concerned with the law in relation to public disorder or disruption, seditious or treasonous acts, or attempts to do any of these things. What we are concerned with is the law which says it is an offence in and of itself for two or more people to plan to teach or advocate a certain point of view about political change.

The debate came up in this country at the end of the second world war, as to whether we should continue to make membership in the communist party a criminal offence. Among those who advocated that the criminal prohibition should be dropped was John Diefenbaker, a man who has frequently indicated a strong anti-communist bias. Diefenbaker argued very simply, that the law should not penalize belief - it should only prohibit acts. It was wrong to make it an offence to believe certain things, though it was quite proper to retain criminal prohibitions of actions which would be consistent with those beliefs. Do we want to make talking about revolution or planning to talk about revolution a criminal offence? Is our society that fragile?

The seditious conspiracy charges against the five in Quebec have been quashed. One wonders whether the highly charged atmosphere and the

widespread questioning of Mr. Justice Ouimet personally did not lead to the dismissal. Would the court have been so scrupulous in situations where the accused's had fewer sympathizers, and where the judge had not been involved before in "F.L.Q." trials. The court, in all fairness, did check a rather gross abuse of the sedition laws in the trial of the 5. But it seems to me that a large part of our laws on seditious conspiracy are only capable of abuse, and do not serve a healthy purpose within our political and social system. These charges have had polarizing results. They are seen, by many, as repressive. Should not the legal system have focused on the clear instances of criminal activity in Quebec? The bombings and the kidnappings, and the murder were all criminal actions, and the common law tradition has never regarded political motivation as being a defence. With seditious conspiracy not only is political motive not a defence, it is the only substance of the charge. There is a danger in using the legal system so politically. The courts are vulnerable. Their role can be discredited. They should be protected from purely political trials and the criminal law should be confined to prohibiting acts not thoughts.

APPENDIX D
POINT BISERIAL CORRELATION
COEFFICIENTS FOR THE PERSONALITY
CONTROL ITEMS ON THE INTERNAL-
EXTERNAL SCALE OF CONTROL

Point-biserials for the nine items used on the
internal-external scale of control

Item number	Point biserial
2	0.45
5	0.39
11	0.55
15	0.52
16	0.50
18	0.54
23	0.45
25	0.59
28	0.50