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ABSTRACT

The social judgment model of attitude change predicts a systematic displacement of judgment as a function of one's own position and degree of involvement. The model predicts that as involvement is increased the number of categories used to order a stimulus domain will decrease. The model predicts that as involvement is increased the individual will become more resistant to efforts to change his position. As involvement is increased the individual will perceive fewer positions as similar to his own and more as opposed to his own position. In an attempt to test these predictions, subjects were divided into groups of high and low involvement. The groups were formed on the basis of the subjects' performance on a Likert scale involving civil disobedience. The subjects' responses on an own categories scale were compared for number and size of categories utilized. No meaningful differences were found between groups in number of categories used nor in widths of the latitudes of acceptance, rejection, and noncommitment. No significant differences were found between the high and low involvement groups in amount of attitude change incurred as a result of a discussion of the issue. The results do not support the social judgment model.
INTRODUCTION

Hunt and Volkmann (1937) reported similarities of judgment between psychophysics and affectivity. They further reported that these similarities were due to the "operation of general principles of judgment in both fields." The findings of Hunt and Volkmann (1937) were given added emphasis when Hovland and Sherif (1952), while investigating certain facets of the Thurstone scales, concluded that, "even though judges are not asked to state their own attitudes, the position of the judge on the issue does influence in a significant way his categorization of the items." Prior to the findings of Hovland and Sherif it had been assumed that the same general laws did apply in both the scaling of physical objects and in the scaling of subjective items. The findings of Hovland and Sherif, however, indicated that while there were strong similarities, there also existed significant differences between the two areas.

A comparison of the two areas by Sherif and Hovland (1961, pp. 19-21) indicated that the psychophysical approach has dealt primarily with the problem of constant error. An error of judgment of this type has tended to be of approximately the same magnitude and direction for all
observers. These errors have been attributed primarily to the manner in which the stimulus patterns were presented and the relevant instructions to the observer. The judgment of nonphysical items, referred to as the cognitive approach by Sherif and Hovland (1961), produced different results for different observers. These variations in judgment were assumed to be the result of motivational, personality, or social factors.

From their original results, Hovland and Sherif (1952) concluded that there was the possibility of creating a "behavioral 'projective' method of attitude assessment through the study of the way an individual sorts statements on an issue." This meant that it would be possible to measure a person's attitude toward an issue without asking him about the issue directly, with the consequent risk of biasing his report.

Hovland and Sherif (1952) concluded that further refinement of the technique was possible. They stated that, "one may even carry this technique a step further by not using a fixed number of categories, but by deliberately letting the individual establish a scale of his own with whatever number of categories he sees fit." This addition would allow the subject to structure the area under consideration in any manner he chose. It would further reduce
the problem of imposing artificial categories upon the observer with its concommitant distortion of results.

This technique provides an indirect method of inferring attitudes. With this technique, attitudes are inferred from the consistent manner in which a person categorizes the relevant objects or statements. Attitude change is inferred from systematic differences in the categorizing of statements into acceptable or non-acceptable groups (Sherif and Sherif, 1967, p. 112).

Sherif and Sherif (1967, p. 112) pointed out that, "the relationship between person and object is not neutral but has motivational-affective properties." The introduction of the factor of personal involvement in the judgment of a stimulus configuration means that information on personal involvement and attitude is present in the results of the categorization of a stimulus domain.

The Sherifian model of attitude holds that the latitude of acceptance, which includes, one's own position, is that range of positions which one will perceive as acceptable to himself. It further states that the latitude of noncommitment is that range of positions concerning which the person has no definite opinion. The latitudes of rejection contain all those positions on an issue which a person perceives as opposed to his own views. The Sherifian model also holds that the relative widths of
these latitudes are a function of several factors: situational structure, personal position, degree of involvement, and internal reference scale.

The placement and evaluation of items are not separate processes. Rather, the placement of a communication and the evaluation of same occur as systematic components of one process, which is controlled by the relationship between the communication and the individual's latitudes of acceptance, rejection, and noncommitment (Sherif and Sherif, 1967, p. 130). The person is unable, unless forced by the methodology involved, to separate the two aspects of the same process. This then provides an indirect measure of attitude, in that the attitude can be inferred on the basis of the person's categorization of items, ostensibly for other purposes.

To the extent that he is highly-involved in an issue, an individual uses his "own" position, as his standard for judging other related items (Hovland, Harvey, and Sherif, 1957; Sherif and Sherif, 1967, p. 127). The own position of an individual is a critical factor in determining his probable reaction to a stimulus item. According to Sherif and Sherif (1967, p. 129), "the basic information for predicting a person's reaction to a communication is where he places its position and communicator relative to himself." The own position is the person's
anchor within his latitude of acceptance; it is the position which he endorses.

A knowledge of only a person's own position, a discrete point on a continuum, is not sufficient to predict his response to a stimulus item. Sherif and Sherif (1967, p. 116) reported that, "individuals finding the same position as most acceptable do differ in their tolerance for other positions." It is, therefore, important to know the range of possible positions that a person will perceive as acceptable to himself. The degree of personal involvement is important in determining the relative sizes of the latitudes of acceptance, rejection, and noncommitment (Sherif and Sherif, 1967, p. 116). Knowledge of one's own position and degree of involvement are salient factors in predicting his reaction to a communication. The degree of involvement of an individual has been found to vary directly with extremity of position (Cantril, 1946).

The internal reference scales of the individual may be all important in determining his response to stimulation. They are the result of the person's previous experience with not only the social aspects of his environment, but also of his interaction with the objective or inert physical features of his environment (Sherif, 1936, p. 46). The internal reference scale interacts with the objective qualities of the stimulus situation to determine
the person's response. Sherif and Hoyland (1961, p. 80) state that, "to the extent that both objective standards and a graded series of stimuli are lacking, the contributions of internal factors (including set) and social influences (including instructions) to the formation of a judgment scale are increased." As the objective cues in the environment are reduced, the impact of the internal reference scale is increased. It is concluded that the situation, which involved a great deal of ambiguity, is the one which will lead to an optimal display of the internal reference scale, the source from which an attitude is inferred.

The interaction between the latitudes of acceptance, rejection, and noncommitment is a function of the person's own stand, the distance of the communication from his own stand and the extent to which the person is involved in the issue. Each of the three latitudes has its own peculiar characteristics and response to variations in one's own position and involvement.

The latitude of acceptance has been found to vary with the degree of involvement of the holder. As the degree of involvement increases the latitude of acceptance tends to become narrower and the number of categories used to describe an area is reduced.
Sherif and Hovland (1961, p. 196) state that, "for issues which are not the objects of intensely held attitudes, we would expect this broad latitude of acceptance no matter what position the individual finds most acceptable." The range of acceptable positions is broader for a person who is not highly-involved in an issue. Sherif and Hovland (1953) state that, "intensely involved individuals with an extreme position are more likely to adopt a constricted scale (with few categories). Correspondingly, individuals not so intensely involved in an issue are more likely to choose an extended scale (with many categories)."

When a communication falls near one's own position it tends to be assimilated. That is, it appears subjectively to be nearer one's own position than it objectively is (Hovland, Harvey, and Sherif, 1957). Manis (1961) stated, "when responding to messages that they essentially agreed with, subjects tended to displace the communications toward their own position." This range within which items are moved toward the own position is referred to as the range of assimilation.

As the degree of objective structure in a situation decreases and as the person's internal norms have a greater impact on one's judgment, the range of assimilation will increase. At the same time, however, the degree of involvement by the individual will determine the extent to
which the range of assimilation can change. With high levels of involvement, one expects little assimilation.

The latitude of rejection is that range of positions which the person perceives as clearly opposed to his views on an issue. Sherif and Hovland (1953) found that, "there was . . . a marked tendency for the intensely involved . . . Ss to place a disproportionate number of items at the end of the scale removed from their own position." It was reported by Eagly and Manis (1966) that, "involved subjects react more negatively than uninvolved when presented with a persuasive communication that contradicts their beliefs."

Hovland, Harvey, and Sherif (1957) found that subjects whose own position was far removed from the position presented tended to see those positions as even more removed than they actually were. This effect is referred to as the contrast effect. With greater degrees of involvement and distance from own position there is less assimilation of a communication and more contrast effect. When the subject matter is highly ego-involving the person tends to rate it more critically, indeed to perceive it as being further removed from his position than it actually is.

The latitude of noncommitment contains those positions about which the individual has not been able to make a judgment. Statements in this category have been described as ambiguous and subject to more than one interpretation.
These statements have been shown to be highly susceptible to movement or displacement as the degree of involvement is altered. Hoyland and Sherif (1952) pointed out that "the degree of displacement is greatest for the items in the middle of the scale in line with the hypothesis that 'neutral' items are more ambiguous and less well structured, and hence are more readily subject to the personal interpretation of the judges." The region of noncommitment tends to narrow as the degree of involvement is increased. Manis (1960) found that those subjects who were in favor of a pro-fraternity position considered statements which were ostensibly neutral on the issue as being more in favor of fraternities than did those subjects who favored an anti-fraternity position. It was found by Sherif and Hoyland (1961, p. 194) that "even a moderate communication may be placed in an extreme category if it is sufficiently ambiguous."

The effects of involvement and the content of the latitude of noncommitment are not yet clear. Zavalloni and Cook (1965) concluded that it was those items which have both positive and negative components that are most susceptible to displacement, not necessarily those that are ambiguous or unstructured. Manis (1960) found that ambiguous statements were displaced to a neutral point and suggested that it might be due to an experimental emphasis
on accuracy of response. Ward (1966) failed to find a significantly greater effect of involvement on midrange items than on the supposedly less ambiguous items at the two extremes.

Conflicting data has been reported by several other investigators. Sherif and Hovland (1961, pp. 196-197) commented on the problem by stating that there is a serious methodological problem in specifying the involvement of the subject. It is one thing to increase attention and interest in a task but quite another to arouse involvement that strikes at the ego of the person in the test situation. A comparison of two groups of judges, one highly involved and one non-involved in the issue of the 1960 presidential debates, found that not only did the highly involved group bias their judgments, but that nearly all of the subjects did so (Rosnow, 1965). Indeed, Manis (1960) found that the supposedly neutral subjects used a more constricted scale of categorization than the more involved subjects. It may be that true involvement was missing in some of these studies as suggested by Sherif and Hovland (1961). They further stated that "to the extent that ego-involvement is lacking, increased contact with a range of stimulation or more information could be expected to result in more finely differentiated categories." (p. 200) This may explain, in part, the findings of Manis (1960). Sherif and
Sherif (1967, p. 131) report that statements of extreme position are less subject to systematic displacement than are more moderate statements. This may be due to the fact that they often are stated in unequivocal terms and to the tendency of the holder of the position to simplify the issue.

In summary, the latitudes of acceptance, rejection, and noncommitment provide a complex pattern of interaction from which attitude and degree of involvement may be inferred. The latitude of acceptance, which includes one's own position, is broad when ego-involvement is low. Conversely, it tends to narrow as the involvement level is raised. It is not, however, a dependable indicator of degree of involvement (Sherif and Sherif, 1967, p. 120). The latitude of rejection increases in width as the degree of involvement increases. The latitude of noncommitment has generally been shown to decrease in width as the degree of involvement is increased, but there are exceptions. The problems of specifying which statements are ambiguous and what constitutes involvement in an experimental situation have prevented clear results in this area.

The purpose of the present research was to verify certain of the ramifications of the social judgment model as put forth by Sherif and Hovland. More specifically, an attempt was made to predict a person's performance on an
indirect measure of attitude as a result of his responses on a direct scaling technique. The relationship between involvement and the latitudes of acceptance, rejection, and noncommitment was of primary concern.

A second concern was the study of the effects of group discussion on the subjects' categorization of a stimulus domain. An attempt was made to determine the effects of extremity of original position and the necessity of dealing seriously with an issue on the subjects' later differentiation of the issues in the area.

The specific hypotheses made were, (1) that the number of categories utilized in the own categories sort would decrease as a function of increased extremity of position as measured on a Likert scale; (2) that the width of the latitude of rejection would increase as a function of increased extremity of position; (3) that the latitude of noncommitment would decrease as a function of increased extremity of position; (4) that the latitude of acceptance would decrease in width as a function of increased extremity of position of the subject; (5) it was further predicted that in the experimental discussion groups, the subjects most likely to change their attitudes would be those of the lowest involvement level as indicated by extremity of position on the Likert scale.
Testing for the hypothesized relationships involved two distinct phases. One phase of the study involved administering two attitude scaling devices, one direct and the other indirect, to a large number of subjects. The second phase of the investigation involved the study of attitude change in a small group discussion situation.
METHOD: EXPERIMENT I

Subjects

The attitude scales were administered to 100 advanced students in a government class at The University of Arizona. This group was chosen on the rationale that by virtue of their membership in a government class they would have a better than average chance of being involved in the subject of civil disobedience, a subject relevant to the study. This was deemed likely in that the 1968 presidential campaign was nearing its final phase at the time, and in that "law and order" was a campaign issue. Another reason for using the advanced government class was that, being advanced students, they probably had some prior experience with and sophistication in the pertinent issues.

Apparatus and Materials

The attitude measures which were administered to the class were of two types. One scale was of a Likert type whereas the other was an indirect own categories scale. Both scales were on the same issue, civil disobedience, and contained the same items. (See Appendix I for a list of these statements.)

A form with 31 statements concerning civil disobedience was utilized for both scales. The items on the
form were designed to cover the continuum from an extreme pro-civil disobedience position to extreme anti-civil disobedience. The statements were arranged in a random order.

The Likert scale used seven values. The values ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. There was a neutral category between the two extremes. The own categories scale allowed the subject to utilize as many categories as he felt necessary.

**Procedures**

The subjects were all tested at one time for a period of one hour. The instructions for the first scale were given to each student. (See Appendix I for a list of the relevant instructions.) Each was asked, on the indirect measure, to organize the statements into as many or as few categories as he felt were necessary to accurately define the area of civil disobedience, as represented by the 31 statements. More specifically, they were asked to organize the statements in terms of their degree of favorableness to the person who would engage in a civilly-disobedient act. All subjects were given as much time as they required to finish the task, and accuracy was stressed.

The own categories technique is considered as indirect method in this situation in that the subjects were not asked to present their views, but rather were to
categorize the items in terms of their favorability to the civilly-disobedient person. The Likert-type scale, on the other hand, required the subjects to express their degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement and is, therefore, considered a direct method of attitude assessment.

The subjects were divided into discrete groups for purposes of comparison. The groups were formed on the basis of direction and degree of involvement. The degree of involvement was inferred from the extremity of the subject's position as measured by his responses on the Likert scale.

On the basis of their responses on the Likert scale, the subjects were distributed along a continuum ranging from strongly pro-civil disobedience to strongly anti-civil disobedience. This continuum was used as the basis for all further categorization of the subjects.

The Likert scale, the direct measure of the subject's attitude, served as a means of categorizing the subjects so that they might be compared on the basis of their responses on the own categories scale.

All of the subjects who had taken part were then invited to participate in the experimental discussion sessions. The identity of the subjects remained concealed at all times. The response sheets were coded to allow the
Design

The subjects were divided into three groups. The first group was comprised of the 26 subjects having the most extreme responses on the strongly pro-civil disobedience end of the continuum. The second group was formed from the one-fourth of the subjects from the most extremely anti-civil disobedience position. The third group was made up of the 27 subjects from the midrange of the continuum. The subjects who did not fall into one of these three areas were not utilized further. The between group comparisons were made on the basis of the widths of the latitudes of acceptance, rejection, and noncommitment.
RESULTS: EXPERIMENT I

The predicted interactions between the various latitudes of acceptance, noncommitment, and rejection as a function of degree of involvement were analyzed by use of individual F-tests between groups. Only one of the predicted comparisons was significant, and that was not in the predicted direction. (See Table 1 for a list of comparisons performed.)

The comparison of the strongly pro-civil disobedience group with the midrange group on the relative size of the latitude of acceptance was significant ($F = 4.59, df = 51$) at the .05 level. It was, however, in the opposite direction from that predicted.

An individual F-test comparison of the relative size of the latitudes of rejection and noncommitment for the same two groups did not reach significance. The proposed comparisons involving the strongly anti-civil disobedience group with the midrange group was not possible due to the small number of cases which occurred in the strongly anti-civil disobedience group.

An individual F-test comparison of the number of categories utilized by the strongly pro-civil disobedience
Table 1
F-Ratio Significance Summary for Latitude Width and Own Position Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Pro-Civil Disobedience x Midrange</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latitude of Acceptance</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude of Rejection</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude of Noncommitment</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Government Class Volunteers x Midrange   |                |                |                |
| Latitude of Acceptance                   | N.S.           |                |                |
| Latitude of Rejection                    | N.S.           |                |                |
| Latitude of Noncommitment                | N.S.           |                |                |

| Strongly Pro-Civil Disobedience x Midrange |                |                |                |
| Number of Categories Utilized             | N.S.           |                |                |

\(^a\)Not Significant.
group as opposed to the midrange group did not reach significance.

A further comparison of the experimental group subjects who had volunteered from the government class with the remainder of the class was performed. An individual F-test comparison was used. No significant difference was found between the relative widths of the latitudes of acceptance, rejection, and noncommitment between the two groups.
METHOD: EXPERIMENT II

Subjects

The subjects for this study were drawn from two sources, campus political organizations and the previously mentioned government class. Again, in this situation, there was a strong emphasis on achieving a valid measure of involvement. To insure the involvement of the subjects, the criterion of current membership in an organized political party or enrollment in the advanced government class was adapted.

A second measure of involvement was the voluntary appearance of the subject at the testing facility. The subjects were not known to the experimenters and committed themselves to the task entirely voluntarily. By virtue of being unknown to the experimenters, they could easily avoid the testing situation. In view of the time requirements involved, approximately three hours, of which the subjects were forewarned, the task could be construed as requiring a major effort from the subjects. The prospective subjects were told that if they took part they would have an opportunity to discuss an issue of current political and social concern. They were also told that the discussion would be with other subjects with similar interests but
not necessarily with similar positions on the issue. The total number of subjects utilized was 17.

**Apparatus and Materials**

The experimental discussion took place within the confines of individual cubicles. The cubicles were interconnected by an intercom system which allowed all possible combinations of speaking or listening, not only among the subjects but also to a control room from which the experimenters monitored the discussion. The intercom also served to minimize the effects of individual differences in voice characteristics.

There were five such cubicles plus that of the control room from where the experimenters controlled the discussion and administered the attitude scales. The experimenters had complete potential control of all communications. This factor allowed for the control of any subject who might have attempted to monopolize the discussion or direct it to issues other than those under consideration.

**Procedures**

Each subject was assigned to a separate cubicle, and at no time prior to nor during the session did they confront one-another visually. This precaution was taken to remove the possible effect of an imposing physical presence on the conduct of the discussion. It was an
attempt to focus attention on the issue rather than on personalities. The ideal situation involved five subjects, each being of a different political persuasion. Ideally, they described a continuum from the extreme conservative to the extreme liberal.

The subjects, upon arriving at their respective rooms, were asked to complete both the indirect and direct measures of attitude measurement which were described in the Apparatus and Materials section of Experiment I. This was done prior to the actual discussion of the issue. Following the completion of the measurement scales the subjects entered into the controlled discussion and were instructed to reach a consensus on two facets of the issue presented. (See Appendix II for a description of the relevant instructions and issues.) The subjects were instructed to remain until the consensus was attained and told that no breaks would be permitted. After reaching consensus the subjects were again asked to complete the attitude assessment forms described previously.

**Design**

The subjects' responses on the pre-discussion Likert scale were used to divide the subjects into two groups, one high involvement and one low involvement. The two groups were then compared for amount of change on the own categories scale as a result of the experimental discussion.
The comparisons were made on the amount of change in the widths of the latitudes of acceptance, rejection, and noncommitment.
RESULTS: EXPERIMENT II

The high versus low involvement subjects were compared for degree of change from the before ratings to the after ratings on the own categories scale. As in Experiment I, extremity of position on the Likert scale was equated with involvement. The analysis was accomplished with the use of chi-square. No significant difference was found between the latitudes of acceptance, rejection, and noncommitment of either group as a function of the experimental situation. (See Table 2 for a list of the comparisons performed.)

Table 2

Chi-Square Ratio of Significance Summary for Attitude Change and Own Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Involvement x Low Involvement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latitude of Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude of Rejection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude of Noncommitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Not Significant.
DISCUSSION

The results do not support the predicted relationships. Only a single relationship achieved significance and that was in the nonpredicted direction. The social judgment model of Sherif and Hovland would predict that the area of acceptance of the more highly involved group would be narrower than that of the less involved group. This was not found. In view of the number of individual comparisons made it is doubtful that this one has any real significance.

The failure of the various latitudes to vary as a systematic function of degree of involvement, as measured by extremity of position on the Likert scale, may have been due to several factors. The first, and most obvious, is that perhaps involvement was not varied. The assumption in the present study was that involvement varied directly with extremity of own position, as reported by Cantril (1946). This may not be a valid assumption.

If it is assumed that involvement does vary directly with extremity of position, another explanation is required. Ward (1965) found that there was no greater effect of involvement on the more ambiguous items than on the more precisely stated end statements. The effects of involvement
and ambiguity alone on the latitudes of acceptance, rejection, and noncommitment may not be sufficient to explain the displacement which usually occurs.

Another possible explanation is suggested by Sherif and Hovland (1961, pp. 196-197), who state that increasing attention and interest in a situation are not the same as arousing ego-involvement. It may be that the initial portion of the present study aroused interest rather than involvement in the issue of civil disobedience.

The possibility of the present study having aroused increased interest as opposed to involvement is entirely plausible. The subjects for Experiment I were advanced students from a government class at The University of Arizona. As previously mentioned in the Methods section, they were chosen on the basis of presumed prior interest in the area. Also they supposedly had a certain degree of sophistication in addressing themselves to problems of the nature of civil disobedience. Additionally, by virtue of being advanced university students, they supposedly had learned to use an objective approach to problems, as opposed to dealing with issues on the basis of emotion. Since the social judgment model depends upon stimulus ambiguity and lack of objectivity for its effect, any factor that would increase objectivity in the situation would tend to reduce the expected effects of displacement of judgment. In short,
a subject population drawn from an advanced government class may not be the ideal group on which to observe the effects of ambiguity and internal reference scales.

The effects of involvement on the number of categories used to describe an area were not significant. Similarly, there was no significant difference in categorization between the seven subjects who volunteered from the government class and the non-volunteers. This finding might be expected if involvement in the issue were low. That this may have been the case is suggested by the fact that only seven out of 100 subjects volunteered to take part in the second phase of the experiment.

The argument that the issue was low in involvement value and that the subjects were relatively sophisticated in objectively studying a situation may, in part, be applied to the volunteers who took part in the experimental discussion sessions. This would be true only to the extent that the subjects were also drawn from a college population similar to that utilized in Experiment I.

Manis (1960) reported that subjects who were relatively neutral on an issue used a more constricted set of ratings than did the more involved subjects. Sherif and Hovland (1961, p. 200) reported that, "to the extent that ego-involvement is lacking, increased contact with a range of stimulation or more information could be expected to
result in more finely differentiated categories." It may be that the low involvement subjects, from the experimental discussions, fit into the category of Manis's neutral subjects and, as such, initially used a restricted scale of categories. If this were true, then it may be that as a result of increased contact with the relevant issue during the discussion, the subjects were able to make more precise ratings of the area after the discussion than before. If ego-involvement were present, it would be predicted that fewer categories would be used in the second rating.

If a degree of involvement were present, as might be expected from the fact that they had indeed appeared for the session, then it may be that the two factors of slight ego-involvement and increased knowledge of the area were operating in opposite directions. The result would be no discernible change in the before-after attitude of the low involvement subjects. This is a tenuous assumption and is put forward only as a tentative explanation of the results.

An additional, although not explicit, purpose of the present study was to investigate the feasibility of conducting research of this nature within a relatively plausible setting. An attempt was made to utilize an ongoing event of interest without interfering with the normal course of the event as suggested by Weick (1967, pp. 51-75).
In keeping with this principle, use was made of the ongoing 1968 presidential campaign and its concomitant controversy over the issue of law and order.

A number of tentative conclusions are drawn from the present investigation. The first conclusion is that a more specific measure of involvement is needed. Careful study must go into the identification of issues which have a high degree of inherent interest. Additionally, the subjects themselves must be scrutinized as to the range and type of motivations present. The problem of obtaining true volunteers is a serious one. In research of the nature described here, a five-fold over-subscription of subjects is a prudent precaution to insure sufficient subjects. The technique is workable, but will require a great deal of sophistication in the process of sampling the behavior without affecting the behavior.
APPENDIX I

MATERIALS AND INSTRUCTIONS UTILIZED IN EXPERIMENT I
1. Civil disobedience is legitimate insofar as the individuals involved are willing to accept the consequences of their acts.

2. Laws sometimes lag behind social progress.

3. Civil disobedience should be met with more stringent laws.

4. Civil disobedience is sometimes justifiable.

5. Civil disobedience is usually practiced by those who are unwilling to accept the consequences of their actions.

6. The campus disorders at Berkeley and Columbia are understandable, if not justifiable, considering the legitimate student grievances which sparked them.

7. The only reasonable approach to law and order is anarchy.

8. People who disrupt Selective Service procedures should be drafted, provided that they are eligible.

9. Civil disobedience should be treated like any other crime.

10. Civil disobedience is being actively promoted by the enemies of this nation.

11. No permanent good can result from illegal beginnings.

12. Law and order must be preserved at all costs.

13. Civil disobedience is often justifiable.

14. Civil disobedience is never justifiable.

15. People must sometimes resort to illegal means in order to correct social injustices.

16. The motives of the civilly disobedient person should be taken into account when he is dealt with by the courts.

17. All laws must be observed, whether they are right or wrong.

18. Civil disobedience is seldom justifiable.
19. Many of our most cherished social changes were brought about through civil disobedience.

20. The only appropriate way of dealing with unjust laws is to work through congressmen and other officials responsible for changing the laws.

21. Civil disobedience borders on treason.

22. Civil disobedience is justified when the laws are wrong.

23. Those who engage in civil disobedience are wrong, but they should not be dealt with too harshly.

24. When a minority is denied access to the usual governmental channels of social change, it should resort to those languages which society understands most clearly: boycotts, strikes, and physical violence.

25. Civil disobedience is usually justifiable.

26. Civil disobedience is more serious than other illegal acts.

27. Civil disobedience is an act of patriotism.

28. Civil disobedience leads to improved laws.

29. Such demonstrations, strikes and protests as have occurred in recent years should be met with strict counter-measures, including the use of police and military force.

30. While much of the civil disobedience in this country is initiated by Communist and anarchistic agitators, there are a few acts of civil disobedience which arise from legitimate concerns.

31. People who repeatedly engage in acts of civil disobedience should be executed.
DIRECTIONS

The statements on this form concern the topic of civil disobedience. By civil disobedience is meant breaking a law or set of laws in order to bring about some legal or social change.

PART A: Please sort the statements according to how favorable or unfavorable you think the statement would be to the civilly disobedient person. Of each statement, ask this question: To what extent would the attitude or behavior suggested by this statement benefit the civilly disobedient. First, read through all of the statements. After finishing begin sorting them by labelling (on the answer sheet) with the number 1, all statements which are, in your estimation, most favorable to the civilly disobedient. Use successive numbers for lesser degrees of favorableness. You are free to use as many or as few numerals as you feel are necessary in order to deal adequately with the statements. If, as you proceed, you feel that you need more categories (numbers) than you originally thought, please feel free to go back and change your sorted items.

When you are finished you will have labelled with the number 1 those statements which you feel are most favorable to the civilly disobedient person, 2 for those
which are to some degree less favorable, and so on. The highest number used will be used for the statements which are least favorable to society.

After completing the categorization please list the numbers which you used on the back of the answer sheet and write a word or phrase after each number to describe the degree of favorableness which you had in mind for each number. In other words, define the numbers according to what you meant by them. Please place the numbers on the answer sheet provided for PART A.
DIRECTIONS

PART B: It is now requested that you rate the statements in terms of the degree to which you, personally, agree or disagree with them. Please use the following rating system to judge each item.

1 - strongly agree
2 - moderately agree
3 - slightly agree
4 - neither agree nor disagree
5 - slightly disagree
6 - moderately disagree
7 - strongly disagree

Please place your responses on the answer sheet provided for PART B,
APPENDIX II

MATERIALS AND INSTRUCTIONS UTILIZED IN EXPERIMENT II
1. Civil disobedience is legitimate insofar as the individuals involved are willing to accept the consequences of their acts.

2. Laws sometimes lag behind social progress.

3. Civil disobedience should be met with more stringent laws.

4. Civil disobedience is sometimes justifiable.

5. Civil disobedience is usually practiced by those who are unwilling to accept the consequences of their actions.

6. The campus disorders at Berkeley and Columbia are understandable, if not justifiable, considering the legitimate student grievances which sparked them.

7. The only reasonable approach to law and order is anarchy.

8. People who disrupt Selective Service procedures should be drafted, provided that they are eligible.

9. Civil disobedience should be treated like any other crime.

10. Civil disobedience is being actively promoted by the enemies of this nation.

11. No permanent good can result from illegal beginnings.

12. Law and order must be preserved at all costs.

13. Civil disobedience is often justifiable.

14. Civil disobedience is never justifiable.

15. People must sometimes resort to illegal means in order to correct social injustices.

16. The motives of the civilly disobedient person should be taken into account when he is dealt with by the courts.

17. All laws must be observed, whether they are right or wrong.

18. Civil disobedience is seldom justifiable.
19. Many of our most cherished social changes were brought about through civil disobedience.

20. The only appropriate way of dealing with unjust laws is to work through congressmen and other officials responsible for changing the laws.

21. Civil disobedience borders on treason.

22. Civil disobedience is justified when the laws are wrong.

23. Those who engage in civil disobedience are wrong, but they should not be dealt with too harshly.

24. When a minority is denied access to the usual governmental channels of social change, it should resort to those languages which society understands most clearly: boycotts, strikes, and physical violence.

25. Civil disobedience is usually justifiable.

26. Civil disobedience is more serious than other illegal acts.

27. Civil disobedience is an act of patriotism.

28. Civil disobedience leads to improved laws.

29. Such demonstrations, strikes and protests as have occurred in recent years should be met with strict counter-measures, including the use of police and military force.

30. While much of the civil disobedience in this country is initiated by Communistic and anarchistic agitators, there are a few acts of civil disobedience which arise from legitimate concerns.

31. People who repeatedly engage in acts of civil disobedience should be executed.
DIRECTIONS

The statements on this form concern the topic of civil disobedience. By civil disobedience is meant breaking a law or set of laws in order to bring about some legal or social change.

PART A: Please sort the statements according to how favorable or unfavorable you think the statement would be to the civilly disobedient person. Of each statement, ask this question: To what extent would the attitude or behavior suggested by this statement benefit the civilly disobedient. First, read through all of the statements. After finishing begin sorting them by labelling (on the answer sheet) with the number 1, all statements which are, in your estimation, most favorable to the civilly disobedient. Use successive numbers for lesser degrees of favorableness. You are free to use as many or as few numerals as you feel are necessary in order to deal adequately with the statements. If, as you proceed, you feel that you need more categories (numbers) than you originally thought, please feel free to go back and change your sorted items.

When you are finished you will have labelled with the number 1 those statements which you feel are most favorable to the civilly disobedient person, 2 for those
which are to some degree less favorable, and so on. The highest number used will be used for the statements which are least favorable to society.

After completing the categorization please list the numbers which you used on the back of the answer sheet and write a word or phrase after each number to describe the degree of favorableness which you had in mind for each number. In other words, define the numbers according to what you meant by them. Please place the numbers on the answer sheet provided for PART A.
PART B: It is now requested that you rate the statements in terms of the degree to which you, personally, agree or disagree with them. Please use the following rating system to judge each item.

1 - strongly agree
2 - moderately agree
3 - slightly agree
4 - neither agree nor disagree
5 - slightly disagree
6 - moderately disagree
7 - strongly disagree

Please place your responses on the answer sheet provided for PART B.
PART D: During this part of the experiment you are to discuss as a group the issues of (1) when, if ever, is civil disobedience justified in the present society, and (2) what, if any, should be the response of the present government to civil disobedience?

You are asked to form a group consensus statement on each of the issues. This statement is to include within it one of the 31 statements from the previous sections (A, B, C).

The discussion will begin with each of you giving a statement of his views on the issue which is not to exceed three minutes. Number 1 will begin and the rest will proceed in order. Following the introductory statements you will have an open format for discussion and may communicate with the other group members over the intercom system. It is requested that the members restrict their use of the intercom so that all members may have an equal opportunity to participate.

When you have achieved consensus on an issue you are asked to select one member to write out the statement and notify the experimentors. You may begin.
REFERENCES


Hovland, C. I., Harvey, O. J., and Sherif, M. Assimilation and contrast effects in reactions to communications and attitude change. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 244-252.


