

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG ATTITUDE EXTREMITY,  
POLARITY, AND INTENSITY

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the  
North Texas State University in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

BY

Patrick J. Hébert, B. A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1973

Hébert, Patrick J., Relationships Among Attitude Extremity, Polarity, and Intensity. Master of Arts (Speech and Drama), August, 1973, 58 pp., 7 tables, bibliography, 17 titles.

Is the addition of a separate attitude-intensity measuring instrument warranted when using the semantic differential? Essentially, that is the question which this study seeks to answer. This research attempt further analyzes implications of statistical correlations regarding specific relationships between the extremity-intensity variables, as defined by the social judgment instrument, and the polarity variable, as defined by the semantic differential scale.

Data were collected on the attitudes of 821 persons during the 1972 presidential campaign. The instrument package consisted chiefly of the social judgment and semantic differential instruments. The accuracy of the semantic differential as an attitude-intensity measuring device was tested with an instrument known to measure intensity, the social judgment.

Five chapters form the body of this thesis. The first chapter is concerned with explicating the need for attitude research. Also, the problem, purpose, and all relevant definitions of this study are outlined. The following hypotheses are tested: (1) There will be a statistical correlation between extremity on the social judgment and

polarity on the semantic differential, and (2) there will be a statistical correlation between intensity on the social judgment and polarity on the semantic differential at each level of extremity on the social judgment scale.

The second chapter reviews related literature on the design and use of the semantic differential. Also a study dealing with a synthesis of both instruments is explored.

The third chapter delves into the programming procedure of the study. This section reveals how various positions on the social judgment were grouped and how their responses on the semantic differential were scored. Extreme and intense (ego-involved) subjects were tested for correlation of high polarity marks on fourteen evaluative response sets. This was done at each level of extremity on the social judgment. Also, noninvolved groups at each level were tested for proportionate, significant scores.

The results of the experiment are shown in the fourth chapter, confirming both hypotheses. The majority of chi-squares (statistical test) were significant at the .01 level. However, a good portion of noninvolved persons existed at polarized ends of the semantic differential, suggesting that subjects did not have to be intense to be extreme or vice versa.

Concluding remarks are found in this final chapter. As concerned the first hypothesis, evidence substantiated the prediction that the semantic differential was an

accurate indicator of directional attitude change. Regarding the second hypothesis, using involved and noninvolved subjects meant that intensity was not only a matter of extremity, or polarity, but of moderation. That is, subjects did not always have to be extreme to be intense. So that while the semantic differential appeared to measure adequately attitude intensity, its utility in measuring intensity "variance" was questionable. In light of this latter revelation, the addition of a separate intensity measure seems warranted to probe the nature and depth of attitude intensity.

Other research efforts must follow, duplicating this one in design but using other issues, circumstances, and populations. In the final analysis, the answer might lie in the successful fusion of these two instruments--not to deal only with the issue of intensity--but with intensity variance.

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG ATTITUDE EXTREMITY,  
POLARITY, AND INTENSITY

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the  
North Texas State University in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

BY

Patrick J. Hébert, B. A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1973

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purpose of the Study	
Definitions	
Statement of Hypotheses	
II. SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	8
Conflict-Resolution and Diab's Synthesis	
III. PROCEDURE . . . . .	21
Context of the Study	
Programming Layout	
IV. RESULTS . . . . .	28
Primary Analysis	
Supplementary Analysis	
V. CONCLUSION . . . . .	32
APPENDIX . . . . .	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	57

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Program Layout--Extremity vs. Polarity, First Hypothesis . . . . .	25
II. Nixon Data--Groups 1-4 . . . . .	51
III. McGovern Data--Groups 1-4 . . . . .	52
IV. Nixon Data--Groups 5, 7, 9, and 11 . . . . .	53
V. McGovern Data--Groups 5, 7, 9, and 11 . . . . .	54
VI. Nixon Data--Groups 6, 8, 10, and 12 . . . . .	55
VII. McGovern Data--Groups 6, 8, 10, and 12 . . . . .	56

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Without fear of overstatement, it can be said that there is an urgency today for major breakthroughs in the frontiers of knowledge about human relationships. Emerging from this justifiable concern has been an ever-increasing flow of needed material on the subject of attitudes. However, granting the all-importance of attitude study is one thing; doing something about it is another. Constructive action toward that goal has already begun in many ways. The first, natural step in that direction comes by simply explicating the value of attitude measurement to society. Here, the thought of "What is an attitude?" comes to the foreground. In a very practical manner, an attitude resembles a way of life. Sherif offers a cogent description of an attitude when he writes of it as

how various groups of people conceive their ways of life, their ways of doing things, their stands on the family and on social, religious, economic, and political issues and how they conceive the ways and stands of others. When we talk of these things we are, at the same time, also talking about attitudes (3, p. 1).

In short, it is how and why one acts as he does in relation to any given issue or event.



An attitude encompasses values, interests, beliefs, and goals. Political and social decisions of vital human significance are influenced by attitudes. In turn, these decisions potentially affect the lives of people on the local, state, national, and international levels.

All of these things must be understood in light of the fact that human differences--personal, cultural, and otherwise--abound to form inevitable human conflict. More importantly, because these differences are frequently revealed in actual or potential conflict, problems of attitude and attitude change are among the most vital and timely in this age of rapid change. There must be a universal realization that societal change does not have to be painstakingly difficult if, through attitude research, human behavior can be accurately predicted. On this note, Remmers concludes that attitudes "are probably more determinative of behavior than mere cognitive understanding of this world" (1, p. 15).

Obviously, the importance of attitude theory depends upon accurate and precise attitude measurement. Once this crucial, necessary groundwork has been established, then progress can be made to add credence to attitude theory, attitude prediction, and attitude influence. From this information, the awesome but challenging task of accurate behavior prediction should become less formidable to all

persons concerned with the action or inaction of their fellow man.

Sherif's social judgment-involvement approach (4) has received wide attention in the field of attitude research. Basically, this method questions the utility of a single-point indicator as an effective representation of a person's attitude. Instead, he supports the contention that it is effective only in relation to other positions that a person accepts, rejects, or elects neither to accept nor reject. Briefly speaking, Sherif maintains that, in addition to a most acceptable position (the only position identifiable by a single-score measure), attitudes are composed of ranges of acceptance, rejections, and non-commitment of positions on an issue. Sherif has made use of the range of rejection as an indicator of ego-involvement or intensity; the larger the latitude of rejection, the greater the amount of ego-involvement and the less susceptible that person will be to attitude change.

One of the central issues within this paper is to determine whether the semantic differential instrument is also an accurate indicator of attitude intensity. The second chapter in this paper deals with the structure and design of this instrument.

### Statement of the Problem

For some time now, considerable disagreement has existed as to the best (valid/reliable) method to use in attitude measurement. The semantic differential has often been associated with measuring direction of attitude change. Uncertainty exists as to whether or not this instrument also accurately measures the intensity factor. Sherif's social judgment-involvement approach is one method devised for measuring intensity or ego-involvement. Contentions have been made that highly ego-involved subjects, as shown by the social judgment, will tend to respond in a polarized manner on the semantic differential, thus indicating that the semantic differential is also accurately reflective of the intensity component. At this point, one might ask the question, "Have we been measuring what we say we have been measuring?" Is a person's extreme position on an issue also, at all times, an indication of his intense stand? Is it possible for a person in a moderate position to be also as ego-involved as his extreme cohort (who may be suspected of not being always intense)? Some writers have answered in the affirmative (2, p. 73). In point of fact, does someone always have to be in an extreme position to be intensely involved in an issue? This study examines this entire extremity-polarity-intensity component spectrum, using both the above-mentioned instruments.

### Purpose of the Study

In light of the aforementioned theoretical postulations, a special research effort was undertaken within the context of the 1972 presidential campaign. This study, hopefully, will contribute significantly to the question at hand: is the addition of a separate attitude-intensity measuring instrument warranted when using the semantic differential? This study will analyze observations and statistical correlations regarding specific relationships between the extremity-intensity variables, as defined by the social judgment, and polarity, as defined by the semantic differential perspective. Accordingly, it is necessary that the following special section in this paper be adopted.

### Definitions

Application of operational definitions of the following terms will be necessary for the purpose of clearer understanding of each concept and its particular function within the context of this study:

1. Polarity--consistent interval choice on the semantic differential.

- a. Example:

Deep:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:\_\_\_:Shallow  
 (high polarity--1, 2, 7, and 8 areas)  
 (low polarity--3, 4, 5, and 6 areas)

2. Extremity--distance from center on a linear scale; a single position on the social judgment.

a. Example:

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
				<u>E</u>				

3. Intensity--ego-involvement or the rejection of five or more statements on the social judgment.

#### Statement of Hypotheses

In hopes of fulfilling the stated purpose of this thesis, the following hypotheses are advanced and tested:

- (1) There will be a statistical correlation between extremity on the social judgment instrument and polarity on the semantic differential.
- (2) There will be a statistical correlation between intensity on the social judgment and polarity on the semantic differential at each level of extremity on the social judgment scale.

## CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Remmers, H. H., Introduction to Opinion and Attitude, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1954.
2. Sereno, Kenneth K., "Ego-Involvement: A Neglected Variable in Speech-Communication Research," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 55 (1969), 69-77.
3. Sherif, Muzafer and Carolyn W. Sherif, Attitude, Ego-Involvement, and Change, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.
4. \_\_\_\_\_, and Roger E. Nebergall, Attitude and Attitude Change, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, W. B. Saunders Co., 1965.

## CHAPTER II

### SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

The problem of creating the ideal attitude-measuring instrument is a pressing, difficult one. During the past few years, there has been a steady increase in empirical studies seeking to present the most valid and reliable method for attitude measurement. The semantic differential has unquestionably emerged as one method of gathering impressive results. Several prominent writers in the field of attitude research have made significant contributions utilizing this instrument (7, 13, 2).

The semantic differential consists of a series of bipolarized adjective sets, spaced eight (this number varies in accordance with the context of the experiment) intervals apart according to a particular sign or concept. Osgood has described it as judging a concept against a series of scales from which a point in the semantic space is determined (7). This point has two essential qualities: direction and distance. "Direction of a point in the semantic space will then correspond to what reactions are elicited by the sign, and distance from the origin will correspond to the intensity of the reaction" (7, p. 27). Theoretically,

then, the properties of quality and intensity, respectively, can be obtained from the semantic differential. At any rate, the subject is asked to place a mark in the interval blank that comes nearest to expressing his feeling on the particular response set. An example is as follows:

George McGovern

Evasive: X : \_\_ : \_\_ : \_\_ : \_\_ : \_\_ : \_\_ : Direct

A fair interpretation of the above marking might be that not only is the subject expressing a strong, directional disbelief in the psychological depth of McGovern, but apparently, because of the extreme position, he also intensely believes this judgment to be true. This suspected intensity component of the semantic differential has stirred much interest in the area of empirical research. Evidence, pro and con, has accumulated in regard to this single issue. Only a few studies need be cited to give a general view of the issue.

For example, Mehling used the semantic differential to measure attitude toward prominent world figures (6). The heart of his design resembles the following:

Richard Nixon

Good: \_\_ : \_\_ : \_\_ : \_\_ : \_\_ : \_\_ : Bad 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Weak: \_\_ : \_\_ : \_\_ : \_\_ : \_\_ : \_\_ : Strong 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

(6, p. 577).



Each subject was asked first to place a check on each adjective scale according to how he rated each set. Then he was asked to turn back to the original page and circle one of the numbers on the right of each scale to indicate how strongly he felt about the item he had checked. A scatter diagram was produced in which each participant's rating for the numbered intensity scale was plotted against his rating for the approximate semantic differential scale. What followed was a V-shaped curve, suggesting that the instrument did measure both direction and intensity. However, it must be suggested that possibly the results were misleading because of the obvious ambiguous design of the instrument where the intensity numbers to the right of each scale may have caused some curiosity, contamination, or possible obligation to circle the same spot in accordance with the subject's first checking or the experimenter's expectations.

On the other hand, Weksel and Hennes used a similar design with slight variations to conclude that the semantic differential does not adequately measure attitude intensity (14). Their correlations between the semantic-differential polarization scores and their separate intensity scores for two groups of college students were insignificant to the point that they were led to believe that "polarity scores should not be equated with intensity" (14, p. 91). They suggest that in some cases an additional intensity measure should be provided for use with the semantic differential.

At the same time, Peabody has made the statement that "Extremeness seems to be a very general individual characteristic . . ." (8, p. 72). He explains that there is, among individuals, a consistent tendency to use either extreme or moderate response categories . In this case, "The very generality of extremeness scores seems better interpreted as response set" (8, p. 73). While he does suggest that there is some reason to acknowledge a secondary tendency for polarized scores to reflect intensity, the primary factor seems to lie within the response set.

Arnold, McCroskey, and Prichard challenged the latter two studies with an empirical attempt of their own. They begin their study with some constructive criticism of the above works, arguing that Weksel and Hennes base "their conclusions on correlations uncorrected for attenuation" and that they "provide no reliability data on either of their measures . . ." (1, p. 262). In regard to Peabody's study, the authors seem to suggest that his results are a matter of interpretation. While Peabody interprets his findings as reliability of the response set, the authors of this study suggest instead that reliability of the measurement is a better interpretation of his results. Nevertheless, their research design was similar to that of Weksel and Hennes as well as to Peabody's, but theirs was intended to "maximize possible comparability of results" (1, p. 263).

Eighty-three college students were administered a series of semantic differentials using twenty concepts. Two sets of concepts were administered, each accompanied by an additional intensity variable. In each case, the subjects were told first to complete the semantic-differential scales and then to turn back and complete the intensity measure. Since all of their correlations were significant ( $p < .001$ ), they conclude that "the semantic differential does reflect attitude intensity" (1, p. 266). However, the authors themselves acknowledge the fact that, even if more freedom were granted for corrections of attenuation, a unified correlation would probably not be reached. There still remains the problem of how much intensity variance is predictable from the semantic differential.

The problem is not solved just by proving that a positive correlation exists between polarity and intensity scores on the semantic differential. A much greater problem exists in answering the question, "How strongly intense is the subject in his extreme position?" Perhaps in the debate concerning which instrument best measures intensity, the issue of the degree of ego-involvement has been neglected. The second hypothesis of this thesis will explore this area. Hopefully, the data produced will shed new light on a subject that has often been unintentionally neglected.

Arnold, McCroskey, and Prichard reveal their keen awareness of this problem when they end their article with some searching questions on the topic of attitude intensity and ego-involvement. Perhaps, both of these factors do not measure the same thing. Can a person hold an intense attitude on a topic which does not involve him? The answer might depend on how intensity is defined. If one defines ego-involvement as Sherif does, the rejection of five or more statements on the social judgment, the extreme person who falls short of that criterion would not be intensely involved in his extreme position, only extremely so; therein, lies an important distinction. For if such is the case, then, theoretically, intensity could exist at any interval along the semantic differential as well as at any position on Sherif's nine-point linear scale. It would no longer always be possible to associate extremity with intensity as easily as extremity is related to polarity. (The first hypothesis of this thesis will be examined for further evidence of this latter postulate.) More empirical evidence is needed to indicate if one independent attitude measure is a more valid and reliable test for attitude intensity than the semantic differential. Until then, one must accept the observation that "the conclusion that one measure of attitude intensity is substantially superior to the other is unwarranted" (1, p. 267). Again, this thesis hopes to

Finally, it would be inadequate only to mention the term "ego-involvement," as it relates to the intensity component, by saying that voluminous material has been published on the topic. In truth, of course, there has been an amazingly small amount of even related material published. Except for a few isolated examples, "researchers in speech-communication have neglected Sherif's theoretical construct of ego-involvement and its application to attitude change research" (9, p. 69). Sereno and his associates have maintained a steady interest in this important area. The following section of this paper will illuminate some of their important publications relevant to this overview (9, 10, 11).

#### Conflict Resolution and Diab's Synthesis

Sereno's experiment with conflict resolution based on Sherif's construct of ego-involvement is an excellent example of how a very pertinent theory can be put to much needed use in solving human conflict (11). His results are worth recounting. They help further unfold the extremity-intensity correlation, as it was discussed earlier in this paper, in conjunction with the semantic differential.

Sereno used as his groundwork Sherif's belief that a person who chooses a moderate position in which he is highly involved is less susceptible to attitude change than someone who endorses an extreme position who is not highly involved. This is in discord with most semantic-differential theory

which always correlates extremity with intensity, allowing little or no room for intensity variance. Nevertheless, in using the precept, Sereno was saying that the critical determinative factor in attitude prediction was not extremity of stand but rather "the intensity or involvement underlying such discrepant positions" (11, p. 8). All subjects used in the study endorsed polarized attitudinal positions as determined by the semantic differential. Using a modification of Sherif's Own Categories Procedure (12, p. 121), high or low involvement was determined for each subject.

Dyads consisted of highly involved subjects and opposing lowly involved subjects. Results indicated significant differences in attitude compromise between highly and lowly involved participants. Nine of the ten highly involved dyads failed to attain any "mutually acceptable attitude position," whereas, only three of the eighteen lowly involved dyads failed to attain some "mutually acceptable attitude position" (9, p. 76).

Thus, even though both groups were extremely involved, there was a marked and crucial difference in how intense they were in that extreme position. One obvious implication from this study is that an additional independent intensity measuring instrument is necessary to learn intensity variance because extreme or polarized positions on the semantic differential simply are not adequate enough to reflect accurate intensity data. If this is true, then Sherif's

ego-involvement construct which is derived from the subject's latitude of rejection, which in turn determines how intense the subject is in that position, might be "the best single indicator of high involvement" (10, p. 156).

Sherif's work on ego-involvement helps explain why in some studies, Diab's for example (2, 3, 4), when dealing with the subject of Arab unity, "moderate subjects rejected more items than they accepted, a finding expected only for extreme subjects" (5, p. 127). This was proof, of course, that intensity was not simply a matter of extremity but of moderation as well. However, as Diab has justifiably pointed out, Arab subjects "with extreme stands exhibited greater consistency among their attitude dimensions than did moderate subjects" (12, p. 151). The important point is that often much high ego-involvement exists in moderate-range latitudes though not with as much consistency as in extreme positions. In order that the problem of the so-called "moderates" or "neutrals" could be better understood, Diab proposed a synthesis of both the social judgment instrument and the semantic differential procedure. His rationale for such action is worth mentioning.

In using the social judgment-involvement approach, Diab rejects the notion that a single most-acceptable point is adequate for measuring attitudes. Instead, he writes that using ranges of acceptance, rejection, and noncommitment

increases information about "the subject's stand on an issue reflecting more accurately the realities of life situations" (2, p. 312). On the other hand, the semantic differential makes use of scales representative of not only the evaluative dimension but the potency and activity dimensions as well (2, p. 312). This provides a more exact estimate of a subject's attitude scores and helps in predicting an individual's behavior with the concept which confronts him.

Diab's suggested synthesis model (with the attitude object added by the writer for purposes of greater clarity), as seen by Sereno (9, p. 73), is duplicated to appear as follows:

#### Abortion

subject 1  
good: U :     :     :     :     : A : X : A : bad

subject 2  
good: U : U : U : U : U : A : X : A : bad

The letters in the interval spaces symbolize the following: "'X' = most acceptable position; 'A' = acceptable positions; 'U' = unacceptable positions; and blank spaces = noncommittal positions" (9, p. 73). Both of the above subjects have the same latitude of acceptance, but the second subject is much more ego-involved in the issue, rejecting four of the points on the scale. Sherif might suggest that the second subject seems to have a higher resistance to change than the first participant, even though both have equal extremity profiles. The extreme positions are identical, but the difference is in



their intensity factor, showing that, at least in this case, the two are not related. The observation is made here that the semantic differential might have a greater possibility of being a more precise attitude-intensity measure when it is coalesced with the social judgment in such a manner (though with a different design in mind).

This study will also synthesize the two discussed instruments to determine whether or not the semantic differential is an accurate indicator of attitude intensity. It may be that a separate intensity measure is warranted to reflect more accurately the intensity component in attitude measurement. The procedure to be followed in accomplishing this task is explicated in the next chapter. Areas of primary concern within this study will be limited to predicting statistical correlations between (1) extremity on the social judgment and polarity on the semantic differential and (2) intensity on the social judgment and polarity on the semantic differential at each level of extremity on the social judgment.

## CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Arnold, William E., James C. McCroskey, and Samuel V. C. Prichard, "The Intensity Component of Semantic Differential Scores for Measuring Attitude," Western Speech, 36 (Fall, 1972), 261-268.
2. Diab, Lufty N., "Studies in Social Attitudes: III. Attitude Assessment Through the Semantic Differential Technique," The Journal of Social Psychology, 67 (1965), 303-314.
3. \_\_\_\_\_, "Studies in Social Attitudes: II. Selectivity in Mass Communication Media as a Function of Attitude-Medium Discrepancy," Journal of Social Psychology, 67 (1965), 297-302.
4. \_\_\_\_\_, "Studies in Social Attitudes: I. Variations in Latitudes of Acceptance and Rejection as a Function of Varying Positions on a Controversial Issue," Journal of Social Psychology, 67 (1965), 283-295.
5. McCroskey, James C., "Latitude of Acceptance and the Semantic Differential," Journal of Social Psychology, 74 (1968), 127-132.
6. Mehling, Reuben, "A Simple Test for Measuring Intensity of Attitudes," Public Opinion Quarterly, 23 (1959), 576-578.
7. Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1957.
8. Peabody, Dean, "Two Components in Bipolar Scales: Direction and Extremeness," Psychological Review, 69 (March, 1962), 65-73.
9. Sereno, Kenneth K., "Ego-Involvement: A Neglected Variable in Speech-Communication Research," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 55 (1969), 69-77.
10. \_\_\_\_\_ and Edward M. Bodaken, "Ego-Involvement and Attitude Change: Toward a Reconceptualization of Persuasive Effect," Speech Monographs, 39 (August, 1972), 151-158.

11. \_\_\_\_\_ and C. David Mortensen, "The Effects of Ego-Involved Attitudes on Conflict Negotiation in Dyads," Speech Monographs, 36 (1969), 8-12.
12. Sherif, Muzafer and Carolyn W. Sherif, Attitude, Ego-Involvement and Change, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.
13. Snider, James G. and Charles E. Osgood, Semantic Differential Technique, Chicago, Aldine Publishing Co., 1969.
14. Weksel, William and James D. Hennes, "Attitude Intensity and the Semantic Differential," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2 (July, 1965), 91-94.

## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURE

#### Context of the Study

There were 821 active participants in this study of attitudes during the 1972 presidential campaign. This research experiment was conducted by the Communication Research and Training Center at North Texas State University.

The instrument package consisted chiefly of the social judgment and semantic differential instruments of attitude measurement. (See the Appendix for a complete replica of the testing package.)

On the social judgment instrument, nine similarly worded attitudinal statements ranging from extremely "pro" the issue to extremely "anti" the issue were presented in rank-order sequence. The issue was, of course, the 1972 presidential and vice-presidential candidates. This complete set of nine statements was presented on each of four pages within the test booklet. On the first page, the person was asked to indicate which statement came nearest to his point of view (most acceptable position). On the second page, he marked other favorable statements. On the third page, he selected the one statement which was most objectionable; the fourth page asked him to mark other statements which

were also objectionable to the subject. From this information, an attitude profile of each subject was determined whereby all of his acceptable positions formed his latitude of acceptance, all of his objectionable positions formed his latitude of rejection, and all of those positions which he chose not to respond to formed his latitude of noncommitment. Of particular interest to this thesis was ascertaining whether the latitude of rejection, which previously was operationally defined as a measure of ego-involvement or intensity, could be equated with polarity on the semantic differential.

Briefly, the semantic differential, as used in this study, consisted of a series of bipolarized adjective sets, spaced eight intervals apart. Basically, Osgood's procedure was followed (1). The following is an example of the design utilized for this study:

Richard Nixon

Inspiring \_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_:\_\_\_\_ Demoralizing

The participant was asked to place a mark in the blank that came nearest to expressing his immediate feeling on this particular response set. There were twenty-six response sets beneath each of the four concepts (Nixon, McGovern, Shriver, and Agnew). For the purposes of this thesis, only the resulting data on Nixon and McGovern were utilized. Also, this thesis is concerned only with those response sets which are

Suci, and Tannenbaum, the evaluative dimension accounted "for the largest proportion of the total variance," consistently reflecting "high and restricted loadings on this factor" (1, p. 190). It would seem plausible then to identify attitude with the evaluative dimension through the process of computerized factor analysis. This process was instrumental in determining that fourteen of the twenty-six response sets were of an evaluative nature. Therefore, only these fourteen sets were used in conjunction with the social judgment to produce the final results. It is of interest to note which fourteen of the twenty-six response sets were utilized: evasive-direct, deep-shallow, inspiring-demoralizing, reassuring-frightening, qualified to be president-not qualified to be president, calming-agitating, harmful-beneficial, ethical-unethical, artificial image-genuine image, above-board-under-handed, produces conflict-produces harmony, our kind of man-not our kind of man, competent internationally-inept internationally, and represents the interests of the few-represents the interests of the many.

#### Programming Layout

Concerning the first hypothesis, positions were sorted on the social judgment and grouped together in accordance with equal distance from the center ("E" position). For example, subjects who selected positions "A" and "I" as being their most acceptable position were grouped together.

This was feasible because, statistically speaking, both groups were theoretically equally distant from the center in opposing directions. Also this pooling procedure provided the study with a larger number of observations and a better chance at statistical significance. In a similar manner, positions "B" and "H" became group number two; "C" and "G" became group number three; and "D" and "F" became group number four.

The level of polarization on the semantic differential was scored on a numerically gradational basis of one to eight. The score of one was given to the unfavorable poles, while the score of eight was given to the favorable side of the bipolar adjective sets (1, p. 191). Polarity levels were assigned in the one, two, and seven, eight areas. If the first hypothesis proved correct, the extreme group "A"+"I", should have their extreme positions reflected in a high polarized correlative score on the semantic differential. The same procedure was followed for the remaining three groups.

Furthermore, it should be stated that each time a respondent marked in the one, two, seven, or eight areas, the value number of "1" was assigned. Similarly, the value number of "2" was given to responses in the three, four, five, and six areas along the semantic differential spaces.

Confirmation of this first hypothesis would give evidence that there is a direct correlation between extremity on the social judgment and polarity on the semantic differential. Accordingly, the closer the groups move toward extremely moderate positions, the less polarized their scores should be, with a resulting increase in moderate-range responses as the "D"+"F" group approaches. A programming table was then constructed from which the chi-square statistical procedure was used to formulate results. The programming table constructed below, Table I, was drawn as a basic format from which chi-square scores were determined.

TABLE I  
PROGRAM LAYOUT--EXTREMITY VS. POLARITY  
FIRST HYPOTHESIS

Social Judgment	Semantic	Differential
Group Composite	1, 2, 7, 8	3, 4, 5, 6
Group #1		
"A"+"I"	. . . .	. . . .
Group #2		
"B"+"H"	. . . .	. . . .
Group #3		
"C"+"G"	. . . .	. . . .
Group #4		
"D"+"F"	. . . .	. . . .

Regarding the second hypothesis, all subjects who rejected five or more statements on the social judgment (within the same group pairings as depicted above) were classified as



highly ego-involved. All persons who rejected four or less statements were listed as lowly ego-involved. The programming table construct was almost identical to the one shown above. The only variance was under the "Group Composite" column. Groups five, seven, nine, and eleven formed the lowly-involved (rejecting four or less statements). Groups six, eight, ten, and twelve formed the highly-involved (rejecting five or more statements). If the semantic differential proved to be an accurate measure of attitude intensity, levels of significance, as determined by the chi-square's of each table, should result between the highly involved on the social judgment and the polarity score on the semantic differential. A unique feature about this procedure is that the program is designed to look at the varying degrees of intensity at each level of extremity on the social judgment and study the proportionate polarized or nonpolarized relationship on the semantic differential instrument. The results of this research attempt will be found in the next chapter.

## CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1957.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

The .01 level of significance was used for all tests. The Critical Values of Chi Square Table used was furnished by Runyon and Haber (1, p. 252). The chi-square test of independence was the appropriate statistical test. For the convenience of future researchers wishing to duplicate this study, they are referred to the computer program entitled, "Cross Tabulation with Variable Stacking-Health Sciences Computing Facility, UCLA."

#### Primary Analysis

Tables II-III (See Appendix.) reveal how each of the fourteen evaluative (attitude) response sets was cross tabulated with the "most acceptable position" variable. Chi-squares were performed to determine how each group (Refer to Table I in text for group formulations.) numerically responded to the semantic differential. It was hypothesized that there would be a statistical correlation between extremity on the social judgment instrument and polarity on the semantic differential. Data were produced that substantiated this first prediction (all obtained  $\chi^2$ 's were  $\geq 9.84$ ;  $df = 3$ , one-tail test). The level of significance was obtained on all response sets.

Tables VI-VII (See Appendix.) reflect how each of the fourteen bipolar adjective sets was cross tabulated with the "latitude of rejection" variable. Only those members of the population study whose range of rejection was five or more statements on the social judgment (ego-involved) were used to produce this particular set of data. This selected population formed the "intense" group. Chi-squares were also administered to determine how each intense group responded to the fourteen response sets.

The second hypothesis stated that there would be a statistical correlation between intensity on the social judgment and polarity on the semantic differential at each level of extremity on the social judgment. There was sufficient evidence to confirm that, as far as this particular sample was concerned, intensity and polarity on the semantic differential were proportionately correlated at each level of extremity on the social judgment. That is to say, as intense subjects' responses moved toward extreme positions, the more polarized their semantic differential scores seemed to be. It is important to note, however, that not all intense subjects reflected polarized scores. Similarly, not all extreme persons were intense. This observation will be further elaborated on in the concluding chapter. At any rate, of the twenty-eight resulting chi-squares, all but six were significant at the .01 level. Since these six were also in the hypothesized direction, the second hypothesis proved true.

### Supplementary Analysis

Tables IV-V (See Appendix.) show almost identical structure as that of Tables VI-VII. The latter depict only those subjects who were intense or ego-involved. This new set of tables gives a similar breakdown of data as that of Tables VI-VII except these subjects were lowly-involved. They rejected only one to four statements on Sherif's social judgment. Again, all obtained chi-squares were significant at the .01 level. Obviously, what this data conclusively said, among other things, was that noninvolved subjects existed at all levels of the continuum--from extreme to moderate to neutral on one end to synonomous positions on the other end. Therefore, not all extreme persons were intense.

A pertinent note from this new data is that, at times, not only were there more noninvolved than involved persons in extreme positions, but these lowly-involved persons reflected polarity scores as extreme as did their involved cohorts. This showed that the subject did not have to be intense to be extreme or polarized in his semantic differential responses. It also should be re-emphasized that these noninvolved persons were found at all levels of polarity on the semantic differential. However, in accordance with prediction, as these extreme noninvolved positions surfaced, there was a greater quantity of polarized responses.

## CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Runyon, Richard P. and Audrey Haber, Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics, Reading, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1968.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

One of the contentions underlying this study is that a statistical correlation exists between extremity (as defined by the social judgment) and polarity on the semantic differential. This first hypothesis is supported by the data. The semantic differential appears to represent an accurate indication of directional change of attitude. The selection of a semantic space (point along the continuum), or the "alternative polar terms selected," does indeed seem to indicate what Osgood referred to as the "quality" (2, p. 26)--favorable or unfavorable--of a subject's pole selection. Thus, polarity and extremity on the semantic differential seem to be one and the same attitude component.

A far more important and complex research problem is dealt with in the second major postulation of this study. Does the semantic differential accurately reflect attitude intensity? If so, there will be a statistical correlation between intensity on the social judgment and polarity on the semantic differential at each level of extremity on the social judgment. Since the majority of obtained chi-squares did reach the .01 level of significance, the hypothesis is adopted. In doing so, several observations, implications, and suggestions present themselves.

Data supporting this second hypothesis showed that not only was there a statistical correlation between intensity and polarity on the semantic differential but that a thorough analysis revealed this same correlation at each level of extremity. This means that intensity is not only a matter of extremity or polarity but of moderation as well. Subjects do not always have to be extreme to be intense. Nor do their polarized scores always reflect high involvement as defined by their latitude of rejection. Tables IV-V reflect the veracity of this statement. For example, a closer look at the data reveals that the lowly-involved subjects showed a considerable amount of polarized selections. Consequently, although they were extreme in their positions, polarized in their responses, they were not of an intense nature in an ego-involved sense.

This latter discovery encourages several questions, some of which were raised by Arnold, McCroskey, and Prichard (1). First, do attitude intensity and ego-involvement measure the same thing? In light of this data, speaking from a semantic differential perspective, the answer appears to be in the negative. The received data showed a distinctive positive correlation between extremity and intensity; simultaneously, the data also showed that not every person is intense. In other words, if the subject were not intense, then ego-involvement was questionable, or at least its supposed positive relationship to intensity was questionable. This means that it would not "always"



be appropriate, when using the semantic differential, to equate extremity with intensity unless the nature of the intensity--high or low involvement--can be ascertained. Here, an additional separate intensity measure is advisable. Now the issue is not whether the semantic differential reflects attitude intensity but whether it reflects intensity variance.

A second question raised by attitude researchers is also relevant to this discussion. "We do not know whether a person can hold an intense attitude on a topic which is not involving to him" (1, p. 267). The question is a delicate one. The answer might well depend on how "intensity" were defined. This data has shown a direct correlation between intense subjects on the social judgment (defined by their rejecting five or more statements) and their extreme or polarized responses on the semantic differential. Concurrently, Tables IV-V reflect a notable portion of that population who were not "intense" as responding in polarized areas or extreme positions. Would it be fair then to say that, because these noninvolved subjects were found in an extreme position, they also must be intense; after all, extremity and intensity appear to be interchangeable attitude components. Apparently, the crux of the problem lies within the intensity variable itself, not with its apparent correlation to extremity. It no longer seems satisfactory simply to say that, when a subject is extreme, he is also

intense without accurately differentiating his level of intensity. The subject may be deeply involved or superficially so in his extreme position. Once again, it must be the assessment of this study that precision in obtaining the varying degrees of intensity (which existed at all levels of extremity in this study) appears to warrant the inclusion of a separate attitude-intensity measure. Otherwise, relating extremity with intensity at all times with the same intensity variance for each subject might be misleading. A distinction should be made between the two variables.

Nevertheless, this thesis suggests that the semantic differential does reflect the intensity factor of attitudes. However, in reflecting this factor at all levels of extremity, the extreme factor alone does not represent intensity. Intensity appears to be a characteristic of moderate positions as well. Also, extremity cannot always be associated with high-involvement only, but it must include the low-involvement variation; in this case intensity (as defined by Sherif) does not seem to apply.

Other research efforts must follow, duplicating this one and using other issues, circumstances, and populations. Perhaps, in the last analysis, the answer will lie in the successful fusion of these two instruments, dealing not only with the issue of intensity but with that of intensity variance.

## CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Arnold, William E., James C. McCroskey, and Samuel V. O. Prichard, "The Intensity Component of Semantic Differential Scores for Measuring Attitude," Western Speech, 36 (Fall, 1972), 261-268.
2. Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1957.

## APPENDIX

This political attitude study of the 1972 Presidential Campaign is being conducted through the *Communication Research and Training Center at North Texas State University*, Denton, Texas. It is *not* a *commercial survey* or a *partisan poll* and the results will not be used by any political party, candidate, or interest group.

We invite your participation in the study with the assurance that your response will be strictly confidential. Our purpose in conducting this academic research project is to better understand the relationships between political campaigns and voter attitudes.

Thank you very much for your assistance. It is only through your cooperation that this sort of study becomes meaningful.

Communication Research and Training Center

Don Edward Beck, Director

Christopher C. Cowan, Research Associate



The Communication Research and Training Center  
North Texas State University  
N.T. Box 13336

## Questionnaire Number 1

38

### *Instructions—Please Read Carefully*

Each of the following four pages contains a set of nine statements which reflect different positions on the 1972 Presidential Campaign. Although the four sets of nine-statements are identical, the instructions at the top of each page are different.

Please read the instructions carefully before you respond to the statements.

The information requested in this section will be used for sorting the questionnaires and for scientific analysis. In this way, your responses may be matched with those of persons of similar age, party affiliation, etc. for tabulation. Please fill in or check each of these items.

Last name (or initials): \_\_\_\_\_

Sex:    ☐ Male    ☐ Female

Age (check one):

18-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	Over 60
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Day and month of birth: \_\_\_\_\_

Are you a registered voter?    ☐ Yes    ☐ No

Please indicate your political party preference by checking one of the following:

☐ Democrat

☐ Republican

☐ American Independent Party

☐ Independent

☐ \_\_\_\_\_

(Put name of party if not above)

The statements below represent positions concerning the 1972 Presidential Election.

Please read all of the statements carefully before making any marks on this page.

Now that you have read all the statements carefully, *draw a line under the one statement that comes closest to your point of view on this matter.* Underline only one statement on this page.

---

- A. The election of McGovern and Shriver is *absolutely essential* in the interests of the nation.
- B. On the whole, the interests of the nation will be *served best* by the election of McGovern and Shriver.
- C. It appears that the interests of the nation would be *better served* if McGovern and Shriver were elected in November.
- D. Although it is hard to decide, there would be a *slight advantage* in the election of McGovern and Shriver.
- E. It is difficult to decide between McGovern/Shriver and Nixon/Agnew in the November Presidential election.
- F. Although it is hard to decide, there would be a *slight advantage* in the election of Nixon and Agnew.
- G. It appears that the interests of the nation would be *better served* if Nixon and Agnew were elected in November.
- H. On the whole, the interests of the nation will be *served best* by the election of Nixon and Agnew.
- I. The election of Nixon and Agnew is *absolutely essential* in the interests of the nation.

The statements below are the same statements as on the preceding page.

Please read all statements once more before making any marks on the page.

There may be another statement or other statements which are also acceptable from your point of view. If there are, put a circle around the letter (Z) in front of such a statement or statements which are also acceptable.

---

- A. The election of McGovern and Shriver is *absolutely essential* in the interests of the nation.
- B. On the whole, the interests of the nation will be *served best* by the election of McGovern and Shriver.
- C. It appears that the interests of the nation would be *better served* if McGovern and Shriver were elected in November.
- D. Although it is hard to decide, there would be a *slight* advantage in the election of McGovern and Shriver.
- E. It is difficult to decide between McGovern/Shriver and Nixon/Agnew in the November Presidential election.
- F. Although it is hard to decide, there would be a *slight advantage* in the election of Nixon and Agnew.
- G. It appears that the interests of the nation would be *better served* if Nixon and Agnew were elected in November.
- H. On the whole, the interests of the nation will be *served best* by the election of Nixon and Agnew.
- I. The election of Nixon and Agnew is *absolutely essential* in the interests of the nation.



The statements below are the same as those on the two preceding pages.

Please read the statements again and select the one statement which is *most objectionable* from your point of view. ~~Circle one of the two statements which is most objectionable.~~

- 
- A. The election of McGovern and Shriver is *absolutely essential* in the interests of the nation.
  - B. On the whole, the interests of the nation will be *served best* by the election of McGovern and Shriver.
  - C. It appears that the interests of the nation would be *better served* if McGovern and Shriver were elected in November.
  - D. Although it is hard to decide, there would be a *slight advantage* in the election of McGovern and Shriver.
  - E. It is difficult to decide between McGovern/Shriver and Nixon/Agnew in the November Presidential election.
  - F. Although it is hard to decide, there would be a *slight advantage* in the election of Nixon and Agnew.
  - G. It appears that the interests of the nation would be *better served* if Nixon and Agnew were elected in November.
  - H. On the whole, the interests of the nation will be *served best* by the election of Nixon and Agnew.
  - I. The election of Nixon and Agnew is *absolutely essential* in the interests of the nation.

The statements below are the same as those on the three preceding pages.

43

Please look over the statements again before making any marks on this page.

There may be another statement or other statements which you find *objectionable* from your point of view. If there are, show which are objectionable by *crossing out the letter* in front of such a statement or statements (~~X~~).

---

- A. The election of McGovern and Shriver is *absolutely essential* in the interests of the nation.
- B. On the whole, the interests of the nation will be *served best* by the election of McGovern and Shriver.
- C. It appears that the interests of the nation would be *better served* if McGovern and Shriver were elected in November.
- D. Although it is hard to decide, there would be a *slight advantage* in the election of McGovern and Shriver.
- E. It is difficult to decide between McGovern/Shriver and Nixon/Agnew in the November Presidential election.
- F. Although it is hard to decide, there would be a *slight advantage* in the election of Nixon and Agnew.
- G. It appears that the interests of the nation would be *better served* if Nixon and Agnew were elected in November.
- H. On the whole, the interests of the nation will be *served best* by the election of Nixon and Agnew.
- I. The election of Nixon and Agnew is *absolutely essential* in the interests of the nation.

## Questionnaire Number 2

44

### INSTRUCTIONS—Please Read Carefully

We would like to know how you *feel* about the presidential and vice-presidential candidates. Please judge the four candidates in terms of what the descriptive scales *mean to you*. There are, of course, no "right" or "wrong" answers and we urge you to be as accurate as possible in your ratings.

For purposes of illustration, suppose you were asked to evaluate John Doe using the "fair-unfair" scale. If you judged him to be extremely "unfair," you would fill in the box as follows:

UNFAIR ☒ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ FAIR

If you judged him to be substantially "fair," you would fill in the box as follows:

UNFAIR ☐ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ — ☒ — ☐ FAIR

If you judged him to be moderately "unfair," you would fill in the box as follows:

UNFAIR ☐ — ☐ — ☒ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ FAIR

If you judged him to be slightly "fair," you would fill in the box as follows:

UNFAIR ☐ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ — ☒ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ — ☐ FAIR

In summary. . . .

1. Be sure you mark *every* adjective-pair for all four candidates. Never fill in more than *one* box on a single scale.
2. Make each item a separate and independent judgment.
3. Work at a fairly high speed through this survey; we want your first impressions—the way you actually feel at the present time toward the candidates.

## Richard Nixon

Evasive	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Direct
Deep	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Shallow
Indecisive	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Decisive
Inspiring	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Demoralizing
Reassuring	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Frightening
Qualified to be President	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Qualified to be President
Radical	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Traditional
Difficult to Understand	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Easy to Understand
Naive	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Sophisticated
Intimate	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Remote
Attractive	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Ugly
Calming	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Agitating
Known	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
Dovish	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Hawkish
Harmful	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Beneficial
Ethical	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Unethical
Powerful	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Powerless
Artificial Image	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Genuine Image
Rigid	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Flexible
Above-board	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Under-handed
Produces Conflict	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Produces Harmony
Right Political Party	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Wrong Political Party
Experienced	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Inexperienced
Our Kind of Man	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Our Kind of Man
Competent	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Inept
Internationally	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Internationally
Represents the Interests of the Few	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Represents the Interests of the Many

# George McGovern

90

Evasive	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Direct
Deep	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Shallow
Indecisive	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Decisive
Inspiring	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Demoralizing
Reassuring	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Frightening
Qualified to be President	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Qualified to be President
Radical	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Traditional
Difficult to Understand	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Easy to Understand
Naive	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Sophisticated
Intimate	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Remote
Attractive	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Ugly
Calming	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Agitating
Known	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
Dovish	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Hawkish
Harmful	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Beneficial
Ethical	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Unethical
Powerful	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Powerless
Artificial Image	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Genuine Image
Rigid	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Flexible
Above-board	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Under-handed
Produces Conflict	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Produces Harmony
Right Political Party	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Wrong Political Party
Experienced	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Inexperienced
Our Kind of Man	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Our Kind of Man
Competent Internationally	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Inept Internationally
Represents the Interests of the Few	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Represents the Interests of the Many

Evasive	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Direct
Deep	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Shallow
Indecisive	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Decisive
Inspiring	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Demoralizing
Reassuring	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Frightening
Qualified to be President	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Qualified to be President
Radical	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Traditional
Difficult to Understand	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Easy to Understand
Naive	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Sophisticated
Intimate	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Remote
Attractive	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Ugly
Calming	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Agitating
Known	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
Dovish	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Hawkish
Harmful	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Beneficial
Ethical	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Unethical
Powerful	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Powerless
Artificial Image	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Genuine Image
Rigid	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Flexible
Above-board	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Under-handed
Produces Conflict	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Produces Harmony
Right Political Party	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Wrong Political Party
Experienced	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Inexperienced
Our Kind of Man	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Our Kind of Man
Competent	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Inept
Internationally	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Internationally
Represents the Interests of the Few	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Represents the Interests of the Many

# Spike Agnew

Evasive	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Direct
Deep	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Shallow
Indecisive	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Decisive
Inspiring	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Demoralizing
Reassuring	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Frightening
Qualified to be President	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Qualified to be President
Radical	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Traditional
Difficult to Understand	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Easy to Understand
Naive	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Sophisticated
Intimate	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Remote
Attractive	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Ugly
Calm	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Agitating
Known	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
Dovish	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Hawkish
Harmful	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Beneficial
Ethical	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Unethical
Powerful	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Powerless
Artificial Image	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Genuine Image
Rigid	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Flexible
Above-board	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Under-handed
Produces Conflict	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Produces Harmony
Right Political Party	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Wrong Political Party
Experienced	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Inexperienced
Our Kind of Man	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Our Kind of Man
Competent	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Inept
Internationally	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Internationally
Represents the Interests of the Few	<input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/> — <input type="checkbox"/>	Represents the Interests of the Many

# 1972 Campaign Issues

49

Below you will find a list of some of the issues relevant in the Presidential Campaign. To the left of the statement you will see two boxes, one for Nixon and one for McGovern. Check the box of the candidate who you feel could more effectively deal with the issue. To the right of the statement is a set of spaces in which you are asked to indicate the relative priority you feel the issue deserves.

Nixon	McGovern	Issue/Problem	Priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. Ending the conflict in Southeast Asia.	High <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Low
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. Protecting the environment	High <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Low
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. Planning our national defense.	High <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Low
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. Creating an effective and efficient welfare program.	High <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Low
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. Providing moral leadership for the country.	High <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Low
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6. Improve race relations in this country.	High <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Low
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. Providing economic opportunities (jobs and housing) for all citizens.	High <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Low
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8. Promoting U.S. interests abroad.	High <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Low
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9. Effective management of the economy.	High <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Low
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10. Rekindle the national spirit.	High <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Low
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	11. Bring government close to the people.	High <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Low
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	12. Promote equal opportunities for all groups.	High <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Low
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	13. Other: _____	High <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Low



# Perception of Political Philosophy

50

Indicate by crossing the line below the way you view your own political philosophy on the basis of the contemporary "liberal" versus "conservative" distinction.

(Example:                     /                    )

Very Liberal	_____	_____	Very Conservative
		Middle of the Road	

Now, by intersecting each of the lines below, indicate the way you view the political philosophy of each of the four candidates listed.

Spiro T. Agnew			
Very Liberal	_____	_____	Very Conservative
		Middle of the Road	

George McGovern			
Very Liberal	_____	_____	Very Conservative
		Middle of the Road	

Richard M. Nixon			
Very Liberal	_____	_____	Very Conservative
		Middle of the Road	

R. Sargent Shriver			
Very Liberal	_____	_____	Very Conservative
		Middle of the Road	

Prior to the primary elections, which one of the following candidates did you most strongly favor?

☐Humphrey ☐Nixon ☐McGovern ☐Schmitz ☐Jackson

☐Wallace ☐Muskie ☐Chisolm ☐Spock ☐Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
(name)

TABLE II  
NIXON DATA--GROUPS 1-4

Variables--"Most Favored Position" Is Cross Tabulated with Following Variables:	df	$\chi^2$ *	Level of Significance
Evasive-Direct	3	55.85	.01
Deep-Shallow	3	37.30	.01
Inspiring-Demoralizing	3	99.98	.01
Reassuring-Frightening	3	91.78	.01
Qualified to be President-Not Qualified to be President	3	35.16	.01
Calming-Agitating	3	73.19	.01
Harmful-Beneficial	3	122.64	.01
Ethical-Unethical	3	123.17	.01
Artificial Image-Genuine Image	3	52.35	.01
Above-board-Under-handed	3	69.96	.01
Produces Conflict-Produces Harmony	3	67.81	.01
Our Kind of Man-Not Our Kind of Man	3	118.73	.01
Competent Internationally-Inept Internationally	3	30.45	.01
Represents the Interests of the Few-Represents the Interests of the Many	3	73.73	.01

\*R:  $\chi^2 \geq 9.84$ ; one-tail test.

TABLE III  
MCGOVERN DATA--GROUPS 1-4

Variables--"Most Favored Position" Is Cross Tabulated with Following Variables:	df	$\chi^2$ *	Level of Significance
Evasive-Direct	3	35.52	.01
Deep-Shallow	3	59.32	.01
Inspiring-Demoralizing	3	64.15	.01
Reassuring-Frightening	3	91.11	.01
Qualified to be President-Not Qualified to be President	3	99.58	.01
Calming-Agitating	3	93.28	.01
Harmful-Beneficial	3	119.93	.01
Ethical-Unethical	3	42.67	.01
Artificial Image-Genuine Image	3	31.21	.01
Above-board-Under-handed	3	48.32	.01
Produces Conflict-Produces Harmony	3	77.22	.01
Our Kind of Man-Not Our Kind of Man	3	93.46	.01
Competent Internationally-Inept Internationally	3	65.86	.01
Represents the Interests of the Few-Represents the Interests of the Many	3	31.84	.01

\*R:  $\chi^2 \geq 9.84$ ; one-tail test.

TABLE IV  
NIXON DATA - GROUPS 5, 7, 9, AND 11

Variables--"Latitude of Rejection" (1-4)* Is Cross Tabulated with Following Variables:	df	$\chi^2$ **	Level of Significance
Evasive-Direct	3	43.87	.01
Deep-Shallow	3	35.49	.01
Inspiring-Demoralizing	3	77.65	.01
Reassuring-Frightening	3	72.63	.01
Qualified to be President-Not Qualified to be President	3	20.37	.01
Calming-Agitating	3	56.30	.01
Harmful-Beneficial	3	87.92	.01
Ethical-Unethical	3	93.87	.01
Artificial Image-Genuine Image	3	35.91	.01
Above-board-Under-handed	3	51.14	.01
Produces Conflict-Produces Harmony	3	46.82	.01
Our Kind of Man-Not Our Kind of Man	3	83.02	.01
Competent Internationally-Inept Internationally	3	19.60	.01
Represents the Interests of the Few-Represents the Interests of the Many	3	49.83	.01

\*The number of statements rejected on the social judgment instrument.

TABLE V  
MCGOVERN DATA--GROUPS 5, 7, 9, AND 11

Variables--"Latitude of Rejection" (1-4)* Is Cross Tabulated with Following Variables:	df	$\chi^2$ **	Level of Significance
Evasive-Direct	3	25.46	.01
Deep-Shallow	3	45.93	.01
Inspiring-Demoralizing	3	54.88	.01
Reassuring-Frightening	3	67.18	.01
Qualified to be President-Not Qualified to be President	3	62.76	.01
Calming-Agitating	3	64.31	.01
Harmful-Beneficial	3	85.53	.01
Ethical-Unethical	3	29.87	.01
Artificial Image-Genuine Image	3	20.97	.01
Above-board-Under-handed	3	34.16	.01
Produces Conflict-Produces Harmony	3	63.58	.01
Our Kind of Man-Not Our Kind of Man	3	69.97	.01
Competent Internationally-Inept Internationally	3	60.24	.01
Represents the Interests of the Few-Represents the Interests of the Many	3	26.72	.01

\*The number of statements rejected on the social judgment instrument.

\*\*R:  $\chi^2 \geq 9.84$ ; one-tail test.

TABLE VI

NIXON DATA- GROUPS 6, 8, 10, AND 12

Variables--"Latitude of Rejection" (5-8)* Is Cross Tabulated with Following Variables	df	$\chi^2$ **	Level of Significance
Evasive-Direct	3	9.61	<.01
Deep-Shallow	3	3.06	<.01
Inspiring-Demoralizing	3	21.89	.01
Reassuring-Frightening	3	27.02	.01
Qualified to be President-Not Qualified to be President	3	14.47	.01
Calming-Agitating	3	15.99	.01
Harmful-Beneficial	3	24.38	.01
Ethical-Unethical	3	20.24	.01
Artificial Image-Genuine Image	3	15.82	.01
Above-board-Under-handed	3	14.80	.01
Produces Conflict-Produces Harmony	3	26.24	.01
Our Kind of Man-Not Our Kind of Man	3	26.00	.01
Competent Internationally-Inept Internationally	3	10.58	.01
Represents the Interests of the Few-Represents the Interests of the Many	3	20.93	.01

\*The number of statements rejected on the social judgment instrument.

\*\*R:  $\chi^2 \geq 9.84$ ; one-tail test.

TABLE VII  
MCGOVERN DATA - GROUPS 5, 8, 10, AND 12

Variables--"Latitude of Rejection" (5-8)* Is Cross Tabulated with Following Variables	df	$\chi^2$ **	Level of Significance
Evasive-Direct	3	11.78	.01
Deep-Shallow	3	12.38	.01
Inspiring-Demoralizing	3	14.16	.01
Reassuring-Frightening	3	23.23	.01
Qualified to be President-Not Qualified to be President	3	32.30	.01
Calming-Agitating	3	28.83	.01
Harmful-Beneficial	3	28.14	.01
Ethical-Unethical	3	9.40	<.01
Artificial Image-Genuine Image	3	9.78	<.01
Above-board-Under-handed	3	14.77	.01
Produces Conflict-Produces Harmony	3	12.16	.01
Our Kind of Man-Not Our Kind of Man	3	17.07	.01
Competent Internationally-Inept Internationally	3	8.89	<.01
Represents the Interests of the Few-Represents the Interests of the Many	3	7.86	<.01

\*The number of statements rejected on the social judgment instrument.

\*\*R:  $\chi^2 \geq 9.84$ ; one-tail test.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Remmers, H. H., Introduction to Opinion and Attitude, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1954.

Runyon, Richard P. and Aubrey Haber, Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics, Reading, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1968.

Sherif, Muzafer and Carolyn W. Sherif, Attitude, Ego-Involvement, and Change, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.

\_\_\_\_\_, and Roger E. Nebergall, Attitude and Attitude Change, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, W. B. Saunders Co., 1965.

Snider, James G. and Charles E. Osgood, Semantic Differential Technique, Chicago, Aldine Publishing Co., 1969.

### Articles

Arnold, William E., James C. McCroskey, and Samuel V. O. Prichard, "The Intensity Component of Semantic Differential Scores for Measuring Attitude," Western Speech, 36 (Fall, 1972), 261-268.

Diab, Lufty N., "Studies in Social Attitudes: III. Attitude Assessment Through the Semantic Differential Technique," Journal of Social Psychology, 67 (1965), 303-314.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Studies in Social Attitudes: II. Selectivity in Mass Communication Media as a Function of Attitude-Medium Discrepancy," Journal of Social Psychology, 67 (1965), 297-302.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Studies in Social Attitudes: I. Variations in Latitudes of Acceptance and Rejection as a Function of Varying Positions on a Controversial Issue," Journal of Social Psychology, 67 (1965), 283-295.



- McCroskey, James G., "Latitude of Acceptance and the Semantic Differential," Journal of Social Psychology, 71 (1963), 127-132.
- Mehling, Reuben, "A Simple Test for Measuring Intensity of Attitudes," Public Opinion Quarterly, 23 (1959), 576-578.
- Peabody, Dean, "Two Components in Bipolar Scales: Direction and Extremeness," Psychological Review, 69 (March, 1962), 65-73.
- Sereno, Kenneth K., "Ego-Involvement: A Neglected Variable in Speech-Communication Research," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 55 (1969), 69-77.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and C. David Mortensen, "The Effects of Ego-Involved Attitudes on Conflict Negotiations in Dyads," Speech Monographs, 36 (1969), 8-12.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Edward M. Bodaken, "Ego-Involvement and Attitude Change: Toward a Reconceptualization of Persuasive Effect," Speech Monographs, 39 (August, 1972), 151-158.
- Weksel, William and James D. Hennes, "Attitude Intensity and the Semantic Differential," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2 (July, 1965), 91-94.