
Student Work

12-1972

A study of relationships between Machiavellianism, dogmatism and perceived persuasiveness of messages

Marilyn Henderson Ihle
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

 Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Ihle, Marilyn Henderson, "A study of relationships between Machiavellianism, dogmatism and perceived persuasiveness of messages" (1972). *Student Work*. 230.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/230>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

A STUDY OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MACHIAVELLIANISM,
DOGMATISM AND PERCEIVED PERSUASIVENESS
OF MESSAGES

A Thesis
Presented to the
Department of Speech
and the
Faculty of the Graduate College
University of Nebraska at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Marilyn Henderson Ihle
December, 1972

UMI Number: EP72866

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

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



UMI EP72866

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

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



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Accepted for the faculty of The Graduate College of the University
of Nebraska at Omaha, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree Master of Arts.

Graduate Committee

Donald D. Mannon Speech
Name Department

Walter H. Conbo Speech

John M. Bel Psychology

John H. Brilliant Speech
Chairman

December 25, 1972
Date

ABSTRACT

Psychologists and researchers in communication have shown much interest in personality variables such as Machiavellianism and dogmatism. The purpose of this study was to explore the relationships between these two traits and perceived persuasiveness of different message types. Four hundred and twenty-six students enrolled in Speech 101, Fundamentals of Speech Communication, at the University of Nebraska at Omaha were administered the Mach V scale and the Dogmatism Scale-Form E. They were also presented two hypothetical news releases to read and to rate on persuasibility. One release was based on authority and the other on reason.

The results of this study indicated that for this sample of urban midwestern university students there was no significant correlation between scores on the Mach V and Dogmatism Scale-Form E. Machiavellianism and dogmatism appeared to be two independent variables.

The scores were split at the median to determine categories of low and high Machs and Dogs. The only significant difference in perceived persuasiveness of the two news releases was that the classification of Low Dogs gave lower persuasibility ratings to the release based on reason than did the High Dogs. This finding is in opposition to the results of similar studies of F.A. Powell and of N. M. Wagman.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Without the cooperation of the Speech 101 instructors and their students during the spring semester of 1972 this study could not have been made. I would like to express my sincere appreciation to them for their gracious assistance.

For their expertise and time I would like to thank committee members, Dr. Gordon Becker, Dr. John K. Brilhart, Mr. Walter Combs, and Dr. Donald Manson.

The counsel of Dr. Mary Williamson and the patience and efficiency of my typist, Mrs. Bernice Ackerman will not be forgotten. A special thanks to both of them—and also to Roger, Charlie, and Christopher for assuming new roles and responsibilities in our home that I might achieve this personal goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Survey of Literature	
Statement of Problem	
Hypotheses	
Operational Definitions	
II. METHOD	12
Subjects	
Instruments	
Data Gathering Procedures	
Analysis of Results	
III. RESULTS	17
IV. DISCUSSION	23
Conclusions	
Practical Implications	
APPENDIXES	29
Appendix A: Opinion Survey and Answer Sheets	
Appendix B: Scoring Keys for Scales	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	44

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Characteristics of Frequency Distributions for Scale Scores	17
2.	Observed Frequencies of Release A Ratings Given by Category Combinations of Low and High Machs and Dogs	18
3.	Observed Frequencies of Release B Ratings Given by Category Combinations of Low and High Machs and Dogs	19
4.	Observed Frequencies of Release A Ratings Given by Low and High Machs	20
5.	Observed Frequencies of Release B Ratings Given by Low and High Machs	20
6.	Observed Frequencies of Release A Ratings Given by Low and High Dogs	21
7.	Observed Frequencies of Release B Ratings Given by Low and High Dogs	22

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In both the ancient and modern world the problem of interpersonal power has been a fascinating topic for writers and thinkers. Despite the differences in time and in the cultures in which their observations were made, there seem to be two common themes involved. One is the assumption that man is basically weak, fallible, and gullible. A second theme, interwoven with this uncomplimentary view of human nature, theorizes that if people are so weak, a rational man should take advantage of the situation to increase his own power.

While research has been applied to discovering the characteristics of formally designated leaders and their followers, very little empirical study had been focused on those who actually manipulate the followers and their acknowledged leaders until Richard Christie and his associates constructed the Machiavellian scales. These tests are based on the writings of a master of interpersonal control, Niccolo Machiavelli. Since first introduced to the idea of the Machiavellian scales by John K. Brillhart, this researcher has been intrigued with the provocative nature of the scales and this interest has subsequently led to the undertaking of this study.

One purpose of this investigation was to discover whether or not a relationship existed between the characteristics of Machiavellianism and an open or closed belief system. Although a negative correlation

had been found between the Mach scale and the California F scale measuring "authoritarianism," this researcher was unable to find reports of a study made on a possibly significant correlation existing between scores made on the Mach scale and the Rokeach Dogmatism scale. As will be cited later in this thesis, there seemed to appear a significant enough difference in the variables measured by the F scale and the Dogmatism scale to warrant this study.

The findings about the Mach scale indicated that Machiavellian scores appeared to be increasing over time.¹ If this speculation should prove to be true, it seemed important that we become more knowledgeable of the skilled manipulator and the relationship of his personality to other individual differences such as dogmatism. It should be useful for teachers and others interested in the study of communication and social behavioral patterns to know what methods of persuasion are most effective with high and low "Machs." Therefore, this study is designed to discover whether persons scoring high or low on the Mach scale and on the Rokeach Dogmatism scale are more susceptible to a persuasive message with appeal based on authority or to a message based on high appeal to reason.

Survey of Literature

Although the topic of interpersonal power has held as much fascination for psychologists as for others, only in the last decade have psychologists turned specifically to proving empirically or experimentally whether manipulating strategies exist as personality syndromes and if they

¹Richard Christie, et al., Studies in Machiavellianism (New York: Academic Press, 1970), p. 39.

can be validly measured.² Using Machiavelli's ideas in The Prince³ and The Discourses⁴ as a prime example of manipulatory tactics, Richard Christie and his associates have developed a scale to measure the attitudes of people who exemplify the personal tactics suggested by Machiavelli.⁵

Seventy-one items based primarily upon Machiavelli's reflections on human nature and the success of manipulating others were the beginning of the first Mach scale. Twenty of the most discriminating items were selected for further study. Half of the items were worded so that agreement with them was scored in a pro-Machiavelli direction while the other ten were reversals so that disagreement with them was rated to be pro-Machiavelli. This version of the scale is referred to as "Mach IV," and though it effectively reduced agreement response set biases, it did not eliminate the effects of social desirability. By 1968 a forced-choice scale, "Mach V," consisting of twenty triads of items, was constructed. This scale did not correlate with external measures of social desirability.⁶

That the scale is reliable and consistent and that people who score high on the scale do behave in a more Machiavellian fashion than

²Jerome E. Singer, "The Use of Manipulative Strategies: Machiavellianism and Attractiveness," Sociometry, XXVII (June, 1964), 128-150.

³Niccolo Machiavelli, The Prince (New York: Modern Library, 1940).

⁴Niccolo Machiavelli, The Discourses (New York: Modern Library, 1940).

⁵Christie, Studies in Machiavellianism, pp. 1-34.

⁶Ibid., p. 33.

those who score low have been shown by a number of studies by Christie⁷ and others.⁸ In the article "Machiavellianism" by Christie and others, the authors express the impracticality of commenting on the results of all experiments relevant to the validity of the Mach scales and therefore summarize with the following quote:

. . . in 12 or 13 instances in which face-to-face contact, latitude for improvisation, and irrelevant affect were all judged present, the high Machs won more, were persuaded less, persuaded others more, or behaved as predicted significantly compared to low Machs. . . . in seven of the nine cases in which two of the variables were present, high Machs did better.⁹

Within several years after the formulation of the Mach test it was correlated with other relevant tests. One of the first questions many psychologists ask about a particular personality test is whether the findings might be explained by the fact that individuals who score high on the scale under scrutiny respond differently to measures of intellectual ability. Based on the findings of many studies made on Mach IV and Mach V and various intelligence aptitude tests, Christie and his associates have proceeded on the assumption that there is no major correlation between Mach scores and IQ and have ignored intellectual differences in selecting samples for experimental studies.¹⁰

⁷Richard Christie, "Impersonal Interpersonal Orientations and Behavior," (Mimeographed research proposal, Columbia University, 1962); Richard Christie and Stanley Budner, "Medical School Value Climates and Machiavellian Orientations of Students," Mimeographed research report, Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1959).

⁸Ralph Exline, et al., "Visual Interaction in Relation to Machiavellianism and an Unethical Act." American Psychologist, XVI (July, 1961), p. 396.

⁹Richard Christie, et al., "Machiavellianism," in Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes, ed. by John P. Robinson and Phillip R. Shaver (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1969), p. 507.

¹⁰Christie, Studies in Machiavellianism, pp. 36-38.

One of the variables studied in relation to Machiavellianism has been "authoritarianism" as defined in The Authoritarian Personality and measured by several versions of the California F scale.¹¹ One of the initial assumptions of the creators of the Mach scale was that a Machiavellian person is basically apolitical in an ideological sense and that high Machs view others in a cool rather than in a moralistic judgmental way. This image should lead to the prediction of no relationship between the F scale and Mach. However, both authoritarianism and Machiavellianism hold an unflattering view of man and this could lead to the expectation of a slight correlation.

The prediction that there would be no major correlation between the F and Mach scales turned out to be true when in 1955 and 1956 the scales were administered to the first nine samples which consisted of four classes of medical school students and five of college undergraduates. The correlations had a mean of $-.08$ and ranged from $+.04$ to $-.15$. These correlations were with the Mach IV and the Christie et al. (1958) version of the F scale.¹²

Later, the F scale and the Mach IV scale were administered to 1,782 college students in a 1964 election study. Unexpectedly the overall correlation was $-.20$, which is highly significant with that number of participants. Christie gives one possible explanation for the increase in the negative correlations. He notes that many of the original F scale items which received affirmative answers from college

¹¹T. W. Adorno, et al., The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper, 1950), pp. 227-228.

¹²Christie, Studies in Machiavellianism, p. 38.

students in 1944 and 1945 were no longer as acceptable in 1956. College students, partly as a result of an increase in test sophistication, and perhaps in response to an increasingly sophisticated society, are less apt to agree with F scale items over time. Also, the evidence suggests that Mach scores are increasing as time goes by. If the hypothesized position shift on Mach and the negative one on F over a period of time were characteristic of college students in general, the correlation between the two scales would not change. However, if it were the more socially sophisticated students who were most alert to these changes, they would tend to rise on Mach and drop on F, thus increasing the negative correlation. Although the data are in agreement with this conclusion, Christie admits this is mere speculation since a rigorous test would call for carefully matched samples over a period of a decade or more.¹³

Authoritarianism as defined in The Authoritarian Personality and measured by one or another of the versions of the California F scale is probably one of the variables most studied in the social sciences in the last twenty years. However, Christie and his associates feel that the responses on the F scale have a tendency to measure right-wing political ideology as authoritarianism rather than general authoritarianism, or many other varieties of authoritarianism and intolerance.¹⁴

Rokeach agrees with this interpretation that scores of the California F scale are somewhat biased in measuring right-of-center

¹³Christie, Studies in Machiavellianism, pp. 38-39.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 38.

authoritarianism.¹⁵ However, he offers another approach, a scale to measure dogmatism, which he advances as a suitable way to conceptualize general authoritarianism.¹⁶ He describes dogmatism theoretically as a characteristic of people with closed minds independent of their particular ideology. He states that the primary purpose of the Dogmatism scale is the measurement of individual differences in openness or closedness of belief systems. According to Rokeach, the scores of the Dogmatism scale are positively related to both left and right opinionation, and a person's scores on left and right opinionation may be meaningfully added together to yield a measure of general open-or closed-mindedness as predicted by his theory.¹⁷

General studies indicate the success of his efforts. Plant found the Dogmatism scale to be a better measure of general authoritarianism than the F scale in a large student population.¹⁸ Hanson found that F measures right-of-center authoritarianism while the Dogmatism scale measures general authoritarianism.¹⁹ Kerlinger and Rokeach, in a factor-analytic study, discovered a common base of authoritarianism

¹⁵ Milton Rokeach, "Political and Religious Dogmatism: An Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality," Psychological Monographs, LXX (1956), 19-21.

¹⁶ Milton Rokeach and B. Fruchter, "A Factorial Study of Dogmatism and Related Concepts," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIII (November, 1956), 356-360.

¹⁷ Milton Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960), pp. 71-72.

¹⁸ W. T. Plant, "Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale as a Measure of General Authoritarianism," Psychological Reports, VI (February, 1960), 164.

¹⁹ D. J. Hanson, "Dogmatism and Authoritarianism," Journal of Social Psychology, LXXVI (October, 1968), 89-95.

underlying both F and the Dogmatism scales, but a second-order factoring revealed differences between the scales with the Dogmatism scale appearing to be more general.²⁰ According to Shaver, more studies are needed with non-college population to obtain a more exact connection between dogmatism and authoritarianism. However, he admits that the general trends in the data tend to support Rokeach in his distinction between the variables measured by his scales and those measured by the California F scales and that Rokeach's scale has accomplished the purpose for which it was constructed.²¹

As measurements of the Dogmatism scale involve more the structure than the content of a person's beliefs, the scale can be used to score different belief systems as to their openness or closedness on many subjects whether political, religious, philosophic, or scientific.²² While the Dogmatism scale was being constructed, it went through five editions. "Form D" contains 66 of the original 89 items, and the final "Form E" contains the best 40 items taken from Form D as determined by item analysis. For all statements, agreement is scored as closed, and disagreement as open.²³ Thus, the Dogmatism scale has been demonstrated to be a content-free measure of general open-or closed-mindedness.

²⁰Fred N. Kerlinger and Milton Rokeach, "The Factorial Nature of the F and D Scales," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, IV (July, 1966), 391-399.

²¹Phillip Shaver, "Authoritarianism, Dogmatism and Related Measures," in Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes, ed by John P. Robinson and Phillip R. Shaver (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1969), p. 219.

²²Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind, p. 35.

²³Ibid., p. 73.

These successive revisions in the Dogmatism scale were not only to continue refinements in theoretical formulations but to increase the reliability of the scale. When the final form of the Dogmatism scale, Form E, was administered to 60 English workers it received a correlation of .78 on the degree of consistency of a subject's scores from one half the test to the other half. A split-half reliability correlation of .81 was found when Form E was given to 80 students at Birbeck College, England. Correlations on the earlier forms of this scale plus these tests on the later Form E prove sufficiently the reliability of the Rokeach Dogmatism scale.²⁴

Statement of Problem

After reviewing literature concerning the Mach scale and the Dogmatism scale, it was decided it would be advantageous to learn more about the relationships between the personality variables these scales test and susceptibility to persuasive communication. Therefore the purpose of this study was to examine relationships between Machiavellianism, dogmatism, and perceived persuasiveness of messages. The following specific questions were proposed:

Does a significant correlation exist between Machiavellianism and dogmatism?

Does a significant relationship exist between Machiavellianism and perceived persuasibility of messages based on high authority and high reason appeal?

²⁴Shaver, "Authoritarianism, Dogmatism and Related Measures," pp. 334-335.

Does a significant relationship exist between dogmatism and perceived persuasibility of messages based on high authority and high reason appeal?

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant correlation between scores on the "Mach V" scale and the "Dogmatism Scale-Form E."

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant relationship between classification of subjects as "Low Machs" and "High Machs" and their persuasibility ratings given "Release A" based on authority and "Release B" based on reason.

Sub-hypothesis 2A: There is a significant relationship between classification of Ss as Low Machs and High Machs and their persuasibility ratings given Release A.

Sub-hypothesis 2B: There is a significant relationship between classification of Ss as Low Machs and High Machs and their persuasibility ratings given Release B.

Hypothesis 3: There is a significant relationship between classification of subjects as "Low Dogs" and "High Dogs" and their persuasibility ratings given Release A based on authority and Release B based on reason.

Sub-hypothesis 3A: There is a significant relationship between classification of Ss as Low Dogs and High Dogs and their persuasibility ratings given Release A.

Sub-hypothesis 3B: There is a significant relationship between classification of Ss as Low Dogs and High Dogs and their persuasibility ratings given Release B.

Operational Definitions

1. Machiavellianism.--The score received on the Mach V scale.
This scale is presented in Appendix A, page 31.
2. Low Mach.--Any respondent whose score on the Mach V scale fell below the median.
3. High Mach.--Any respondent whose score on the Mach V scale fell above the median.
4. General closed-mindedness or dogmatism.--The score received on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale-Form E. This scale is presented in Appendix A, page 34.
5. Low Dog.--Any respondent whose score on the Dogmatism Scale-Form E fell below the median.
6. High Dog.--Any respondent whose score on the Dogmatism Scale-Form E fell above the median.
7. Persuasibility rating.--The rating checked on the 1-7 degree scale concerning the perceived persuasiveness of each hypothetical news release. The scoring sheet for Release A and Release B is presented in Appendix A, page 39.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

The Ss in this study were students enrolled in Speech 101, Fundamentals of Speech Communication. Included were all students in attendance on the day the Opinion Survey was administered to their section of the classes, the number being 426. Students enrolled in the evening sections, those scheduled after 4:30 P.M., were not included because of differences in age, employment, and structure from the regular daytime classes.

Instruments

Each S was given one set of papers entitled "Opinion Survey" and another collection of papers described to him as his answer sheets. The Opinion Survey consisted of a forced-choice version of the "Mach Scale V (1968)"²⁵ and a copy of the forty-item "Dogmatism Scale-Form E,"²⁶ stapled together with the Mach scale on top. At no time during the testing were the names or nature of the scales revealed. The Mach scale was entitled "Opinion Survey #1" and the Dogmatism scale as "Opinion Survey #2." The origin, validity, and reliability of both

²⁵ John Robinson, "General Attitudes Toward People," in Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes, ed. by John P. Robinson and Phillip R. Shaver (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1969), pp. 511-514.

²⁶ Shaver, "Authoritarianism, Dogmatism, and Related Measures," pp. 342-345.

these scales were described in Chapter I of this thesis.

The answer sheets were arranged with the Mach scale answer sheet on top, then the response sheet for the Dogmatism scale, and last a page containing the two hypothetical news releases with the 1-7 scale for scoring the perceived persuasiveness of each release. Release A was written as a statement by a person of high authority and Release B was based on reason. Both of these releases are presented in Appendix A, page 39. The three pages of the answer sheets were labeled as "Opinion Survey No. I," "Opinion Survey No. II," and "Opinion Survey No. III." Each of the three pages had the same subject code number on it. A "ticket" bearing that same code number in two places, top and bottom, was stapled to the upper left corner of the set of answer sheets.

To check the validity of the two messages, they were presented merely as Release A and Release B to six instructors in the Department of Speech at varying times. The instructors were requested to describe the nature of the two messages. Without exception each instructor described Release A as based on authority and Release B on reason. Four of the six instructors had a specialized background in rhetoric. The topic of the hypothetical news releases was a current event subject at the time of the administering of the scales. The Presidential trip to China was of recent history and a subject of discussion by the public.

Data Gathering Procedures

All speech instructors cooperated in arranging a time for each of their 101 classes to be administered the Opinion Survey from April 19 to May 2, 1972. At the class meeting before the scheduled day for the scaling, the instructor informed the students that they would be requested to participate in an opinion survey to help with department research. To

insure consistency the survey was scheduled so that the researcher was able to administer the scales to every class. The testing was done in the regular classroom and at the regularly scheduled class time.

At the beginning of each testing period the researcher briefly explained that the Opinion Survey was part of a communication research project. She expressed appreciation for the Ss's participation, and assured them that after the completion of the total survey they would be informed as to the purpose of the study and the nature of the scales. The Ss were also instructed not to sign their names to the answer sheets. This was done to encourage natural responses; otherwise the nature of the items might have prevented honest answers. They were requested to put one-half of the "ticket" marked with their code number in safe keeping, perhaps in a wallet, and also to write the code number in a text book they brought to class. This procedure was included so that randomly selected subjects could participate in a later related study planned by another researcher. Next, the subjects were asked to read the instructions at the beginning of each survey and proceed accordingly. Finally, the researcher commented that there were no right or wrong answers; they were merely expressing opinions.

Most Ss completed the three scales in less than the fifty-minute class period. At the end of each class, answer sheets were counted and sealed in a large envelope on which was recorded the date, time, location, name of instructor, and number of Ss attending the class that day.

A total of 435 Ss were present in all classes, but only 426 sets of answer sheets were useable. Two students objected to answering the questions, so were dismissed; two numbered sets of answer sheets were missing, apparently carried off by students in spite of explicit instructions to leave them on the desk in front of the room. Five sets

were marked so incompletely or incorrectly that they could not be used.

As promised, a brief description of the nature of the scales and the purpose of the research survey was handed out in printed form to the Ss as they attended class for the final exam at the end of the spring semester. Because of the nature of the scoring for the Mach V scale, all responses were hand scored and double checked. Instructions for scoring all three scales can be found in Appendix B.

Analysis of Results

The facilities of the University of Nebraska Computer Network, employing a 360/65 IBM system, were used for all computations of results for this study. Programs were taken from Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).²⁷

Since the Mach V and the Dogmatism Scale-Form E are considered to be interval scales, the Pearson product moment correlation, r , was used to determine the relationship between the scores. An alpha region of .05 was established for a two-tailed test of significance. The actual formula²⁸ used by SPSS for computing Pearson correlation coefficients was

$$r = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N X_i Y_i - (\sum_{i=1}^N X_i)(\sum_{i=1}^N Y_i)/N}{\left\{ \left[\sum_{i=1}^N X_i^2 - (\sum_{i=1}^N X_i)^2/N \right] \left[\sum_{i=1}^N Y_i^2 - (\sum_{i=1}^N Y_i)^2/N \right] \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

It was decided that if a significant correlation was found, a multiple-factor analysis of variance would be used to test the remaining hypotheses after establishing two categories on each scale

²⁷Norman Nie, Dale H. Bent, and C. Hadlai Hull, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970).

²⁸Ibid., p. 146.

by splitting the scores at the median. If a non-significant correlation was found, it was decided to test the significance of the relationships between responses to each of the message types and Machiavellianism and dogmatism separately by the Chi-square for k independent samples.²⁹

²⁹Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1956), pp. 174-175.

CHAPTER III

The results of this study fall into two major divisions. The first

RESULTS

The results of this study fall into two major divisions. The first phase concerns Hypothesis 1, and the second phase, Hypotheses 2 and 3 and their sub-hypotheses. The first hypothesis predicted a significant correlation between matched scores on the Mach V scale and the Dogmatism Scale-Form E. The procedure used to analyze this data, the Pearson product moment correlation, gave a coefficient of 0.00477. Since the r was not significant at the .05 level established for a two-tailed test of significance, this hypothesis was rejected and the null hypothesis, accepted—that there is not a significant correlation between matched scores of the two scales.

A scattergram made to illustrate this relationship illustrated that there was little or no relationship, linear or otherwise. Characteristics of the frequency distributions for the scores on both scales are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1
CHARACTERISTICS OF FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS
FOR SCALE SCORES

Characteristic	Mach V Scale	Dogmatism Scale-Form E
Mean	102.16	152.09
Median	101.96	151.27
Kurtosis	-0.35	1.76
Skewness	0.02	-0.21
Range	48.00	195.00
Minimum Score	74.00	40.00
Maximum Score	122.00	235.00
Number	426.00	426.00

The second phase of this study involved the tests of significance of the relationships between responses to each of the message types and Machiavellianism and dogmatism categories of respondents. The test used for significance of difference of relationship was the Chi-square for k independent samples.

A preliminary analysis of crossbreaks for the Low-High Mach and Low-High Dog categories by their ratings of perceived persuasiveness to Message A based on high authority appeal is indicated in Table 2. In order to meet the assumptions of the test, column 4 was omitted and columns 6 and 7 combined.³⁰ The test was not significant at the .05 level ($\chi^2 = 13.42$; $df = 12$; $p < .50 > .30$).

TABLE 2
OBSERVED FREQUENCIES OF RELEASE A RATINGS
GIVEN BY CATEGORY COMBINATIONS OF
LOW AND HIGH MACHS AND DOGS

Category of Ss	Persuasibility Ratings Given Release A (Authority Based)*					
	1	2	3	5	6 and 7	Total
MH-DH	11	22	32	30	17	112
ML-DH	10	6	30	28	14	88
MH-DL	12	14	42	29	9	106
ML-DL	14	14	33	32	9	102
Total	47	56	137	119	49	408

*Ratings:

- | | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| 1 = Definitely convinced release a fraud | 5 = Suspicious about trip |
| 2 = Almost convinced release a fraud | 6 = Almost convinced trip a hoax |
| 3 = Suspicious of release | 7 = Definitely convinced trip |
| 4 = No reaction to trip or release | a hoax |

*This scale for ratings is the source of data in subsequent tables.

³⁰(Similar adjustments were made in following tests to meet recommendations of Cochran (1954) concerning expected frequency of cells). Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics, p. 178.

A preliminary analysis of crossbreaks was also made for the Low-High Mach and Low-High Dog categories by their ratings of perceived persuasiveness to Release B based on high reason appeal. The observed frequencies are shown in Table 3. The results of the Chi-square proved to be significant ($\chi^2 = 27.48$; $df = 15$; $p < .05 > .02$) indicating there was a significant difference in ratings given Release B by different classifications of Ss.

TABLE 3
OBSERVED FREQUENCIES OF RELEASE B RATINGS
GIVEN BY CATEGORY COMBINATIONS OF
LOW AND HIGH MACHS AND DOGS

Category of <u>Ss</u>	Persuasibility Ratings Given Release B (Reason Based)						
	1	2	3	4	5	6 and 7	Total
MH-DH	20	18	33	12	25	9	117
ML-DH	11	19	16	17	17	13	93
MH-DL	17	21	38	13	21	3	113
ML-DL	23	13	36	9	17	5	103
Total	71	71	123	51	80	30	426

The second phase of this study was expressed in two main hypotheses, H.2 and H.3. Each of these hypotheses was divided into two sub-hypotheses to explore further relationships between respondents and release ratings.

Sub-hypothesis 2A predicted a significant relationship between classification as Low or High Mach and persuasibility ratings on Release A based on authority. This sub-hypothesis was rejected because the test was not significant ($\chi^2 = 6.60$; $df = 6$; $p < .50 > .30$). Observed frequencies for ratings involved in this test are shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4
OBSERVED FREQUENCIES OF RELEASE A RATINGS
GIVEN BY LOW AND HIGH MACHS

Category of <u>Ss</u>	Persuasibility Ratings Given Release A (Authority Based)							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Low Mach	24	20	63	6	60	18	5	196
High Mach	23	36	74	12	59	16	10	230
Total	47	56	137	18	119	34	15	426

Sub-hypothesis 2B stated that there was a significant relationship between classification as Low Mach or High Mach and persuasibility ratings given Release B based on reason. The results of the Chi-square test were not significant ($\chi^2 = 4.08$; $df = 5$; $p < .70 > .50$). Therefore sub-hypothesis 2B was not accepted. Observed frequencies for persuasibility ratings involved in this test are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5
OBSERVED FREQUENCIES OF RELEASE B RATINGS
GIVEN BY LOW AND HIGH MACHS

Category of <u>Ss</u>	Persuasibility Ratings Given Release B (Reason Based)						
	1	2	3	4	5	6 and 7	Total
Low Mach	34	32	52	26	34	18	196
High Mach	37	39	71	25	46	12	230
Total	71	71	123	51	80	30	426

Because the tests of sub-hypotheses 2A and 2B did not show a significant difference in ratings given persuasiveness of Release A or B and classification of Ss as Low or High Mach, the second major hypothesis was rejected.

Data did not support the prediction of sub-hypothesis 3A that there was a significant relationship between classification of Ss as Low Dogs and High Dogs and persuasibility ratings given Release A based on authority. The results of the Chi-square were not significant at the .05 level ($\chi^2 = 5.53$; $df = 6$; $p < .50 > .30$). Observed frequencies for credibility ratings involved in this test are shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6
OBSERVED FREQUENCIES OF RELEASE A RATINGS
GIVEN BY LOW AND HIGH DOGS

Category of <u>Ss</u>	Persuasibility Ratings Given Release A (Authority Based)							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
Low Dog	26	28	75	8	61	13	5	216
High Dog	21	28	62	10	58	21	10	210
Total	47	56	137	18	119	34	15	426

However, the test of sub-hypothesis 3B was significant ($\chi^2 = 13.96$; $df = 5$; $p < .02 > .01$). Results reveal that there is a significant relationship between persuasibility ratings given Release B based on reason and classification as Low and High Dog. Observed frequencies for persuasibility ratings involved in this test are shown in Table 7. From a study of this frequency count it can be inferred that in this study the persuasibility ratings of Low Dogs for Release B based on reason were significantly lower than those given by High Dogs.

TABLE 7
OBSERVED FREQUENCIES OF RELEASE B RATINGS
GIVEN BY LOW AND HIGH DOGS

Category of Ss	Persuasibility Ratings Given Release B (Reason Based)						
	1	2	3	4	5	6 and 7	Total
Low Dog	40	34	74	22	38	8	216
High Dog	31	37	49	29	42	22	210
Total	71	71	123	51	80	30	426

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Conclusions

The results obtained from this study do not support the first hypothesis that there is a significant correlation between matched scores on the Mach V scale and the Dogmatism Scale-Form E. On the basis of this one study it would be inappropriate to generalize that a highly skilled or unskilled manipulator may be either open-or closed-minded. However, the sample number was of such size that the researcher predicts from the data obtained that there is no significant correlation between the characteristics of Machiavellianism and dogmatism in students of a basic speech class in a midwestern urban university.

In a different sample of the general population a significant correlation of these two characteristics might exist. Future research could include changing the combinations of variables such as sex, age, education, occupation, or location. The environment of the respondents, whether urban or rural, or the section of this nation or of a foreign country might influence the outcome of such a comparison of Machiavellianism and dogmatism.

Replication of this study using the Mach V scale and the Gough-Sanford Rigidity Scale³¹ might show a significant correlation not found with the Dogmatism Scale-Form E. Rokeach describes the two kinds of

³¹Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind, p. 418.

thinking, dogmatic and rigid, as appearing at first glance to refer to synonymous thought processes. Often the two terms are used interchangeably in everyday conversation. Both types of thinking refer to resistance to change. Rigid thinking refers to resistance to change of single beliefs, sets, or habits, whereas dogmatic thinking refers to the resistance to change of systems of beliefs. Results of a study conducted with the Denny Doodlebug Problem imply that dogmatic and rigid thinking are discriminable processes.³² This conclusion is supported further by the results of two factor analyses by Rokeach and Fruchter³³ and by Fruchter, Rokeach, and Novak.³⁴ A later rigidity scale than the Gough-Sanford scale was designed by Rehfisch in 1958.³⁵ This scale might also be tested for a common variance with the Mach V scale.

A second purpose of this study was to discover if a significant relationship exists between Machiavellianism and perceived persuasibility of messages based on high authority and high reason appeal. The results of the data did not show a significant relationship between categories of Low Machs and High Machs and messages based on authority and on reason.

However, results did reveal a significant relationship between Low Dogs and High Dogs and the message based on reason. The results

³²Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind, pp. 182-195.

³³Rokeach, "A Factorial Study of Dogmatism," 356-360.

³⁴Benjamin Fruchter, Milton Rokeach, and Edwin G. Novak, "A Factorial Study of Dogmatism, Opinionation, and Related Scales," Psychological Reports, IV (March, 1958), 19-22.

³⁵John M. Rehfisch, "A Scale for Personality Rigidity," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXII (February, 1958), 11-15; Shaver, "Authoritarianism, Dogmatism, and Related Measures," pp. 304-308.

that Low Dogs were less persuaded than High Dogs by a message based on reason appear to be contrary to the conclusions of F. A. Powell and others.³⁶ In his study Powell found that the more open a person's belief system, the better able he was to act upon information on its own merits, independent of the positiveness or negativeness of the source.³⁷

The results of the test for sub-hypothesis 3B also appear in opposition to findings of Nathaniel M. Wagman for authoritarian and non-authoritarian types as classified by the California F scale and persuasive communication based on authority and one based on factual information.³⁸ In this study of Wagman the results implied that the Low Dogs were persuaded less by the message based on authority than the High Dogs. The difference between the California F scale and the Dogmatism scale described earlier in this thesis could account for this discrepancy. Also, the communication in the Wagman study was a factual information booklet whereas Release B in this study was based on reason.

Another possible explanation for the results found in this study was the effect on the subjects of reading the message based on authority and the one on reason, one after another, at the same rating time. Perhaps some respondents could have been influenced against Release B based on reason because they were persuaded more by Release A based

³⁶Erwin P. Bettinghaus, Persuasive Communication (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968), pp. 91-92.

³⁷Fredric A. Powell, "Open-and Closed-Mindedness and the Ability to Differentiate Source and Message," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIV (July, 1962), 61-64.

³⁸Nathaniel Morton Wagman, "An Investigation of the Effectiveness of Authoritarian Suggestion and Non-Authoritarian Information as Methods of Changing the Prejudiced Attitudes of Relatively Authoritarian and Non-Authoritarian Personalities," Dissertation Abstracts, XIV (January-June, 1954), 728-729; as described by Herbert Irving Abelson, Persuasion (New York: Springer Publishing Co., 1959), p. 65.

on authority. The authority figure to whom Release A was attributed might have been perceived as arguing against his own best interests. According to a study by Walster, Aronson, and Abrahams³⁹ and a later study by Koeske and Crano,⁴⁰ a statement was judged more persuasive when it was voiced by one arguing against his own best interests. The persuasibility of the authority figure in Release A might have been an intervening variable in the persuasibility rating given to Release B.

Respondents' involvement with Nixon as a political figure could have also been an intervening variable. These tentative explanations need further investigation. Future research involving Dogmatism Scale-Form E scores and persuasibility ratings for different messages based on high authority and on high reason is needed for more definite predictions. However, this study demonstrated that the generalized prediction that Low Dogs are more influenced by reason than High Dogs does not always prove to be accurate.

Practical Implications

Much interest is being given the subject of personality in the fields of communication, education, and psychology. Dogmatism appears to be a variable of personality structure which helps provide a characteristic approach to life for people. It is a complex variable but through study of this open-and closed-minded dimension, more accurate

³⁹ Elaine Walster, Elliot Aronson, and Darcy Abrahams, "On Increasing the Persuasiveness of a Low Prestige Communicator," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, II (October, 1966), 325-342.

⁴⁰ Gary F. Koeske and William D. Crano, "The Effect of Congruous and Incongruous Source-Statement Combinations Upon the Judged Credibility of a Communication," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, IV (October, 1968), 384-399.

predictions can be made of the ways individuals or groups might view the world, authorities, and persuasive messages addressed to them.

Recent research by psychologists and speech communication researchers also suggests that Machiavellianism might influence communication behaviors and even success in certain types of communication courses. Michael Burgoon found that the relationship between Machiavellianism and success will be significantly more positive in an interpersonal communication course than in a public speaking course.⁴¹ Such information could help predict the success of students in certain type courses.

Since this study revealed these two personality characteristics to be independent and not significantly correlated variables, the prediction that a High Mach would fare better in an interpersonal communication course would not necessarily indicate that he was especially open-minded. Also, his lack of dogmatism would not inevitably insure success in this interpersonal situation. One cannot predict that the structure and class interaction of an interpersonal course will encourage or facilitate the trait of low or high dogmatism as it might Machiavillianism because of the lack of correlation between the two traits.

Predicting the two characteristics to be independent of one another, a multiple correlation of Machiavellianism and dogmatism with one or more other personality traits could be useful in selection of personnel for various specific appointments in industry and diplomacy.

Considering the two independent variables above, one might look for a combination of High Mach and Low Dog in a candidate for an

⁴¹Michael Burgoon, "The Relationship Between Willingness to Manipulate Others and Success in Two Different Types of Basic Speech Communication Courses," The Speech Teacher, XX (September, 1971), 178-183.

executive position where value is placed on one who could manipulate toward a definite goal and at the same time be open-minded toward new concepts. Both characteristics would need to be verified since possessing one trait would not necessarily indicate having a high or low amount of the other trait.

It is advisable that more research be conducted with different combinations of subjects and differently worded messages to make more definite and more generalized predictions about Machiavellianism and dogmatism and perceived persuasibility to different types of messages. However, some significant results have been revealed in this study. One discovery was that adjusting messages to be specifically based upon high authority or upon reason does not insure that they will be perceived as more persuasive one way or the other by low or high Machs or Dogs. Also, for this sample of urban midwestern university students Machiavellianism and dogmatism proved to be two independent characteristics.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

OPINION SURVEY AND ANSWER SHEETS

OPINION SURVEY #1

You will find 20 groups of statements listed below. Each group is composed of three statements. Each statement refers to a way of thinking about people or things in general. They reflect opinions and not matters of fact--there are no "right" or "wrong" answers and different people have been found to agree with different statements.

Please read each of the three statements in each group. Then decide first which of the statements is most true or comes the closest to describing your own beliefs. Write the letter of this statement on your answer sheet and place a plus (+) next to it.

Then decide which of the remaining two statements is most false or is the farthest from your own beliefs. Write the letter of this statement on your answer sheet and place a minus (-) next to it.

Here is an example:

- A. It is easy to persuade people but hard to keep them persuaded.
- B. Theories that run counter to common sense are a waste of time.
- C. It is only common sense to go along with what other people are doing and not be too different.

Answer Sheet

1. B+
 C-

In this example, statement B would be the one you believe in most strongly and statement C would be the one that is least characteristic of your opinion.

You will find some of the choices easy to make; others will be quite difficult. Do not fail to make a choice no matter how hard it may be. List two statements in each group of three--the one that comes the closest to your own beliefs and the one farthest from your own beliefs--on your answer sheet. The remaining statement should not be listed on your answer sheet.

Do not omit any groups of statements.

1. A. It takes more imagination to be a successful criminal than a successful business man.
B. The phrase, "the road to hell is paved with good intentions" contains a lot of truth.
C. Most men forget more easily the death of their father than the loss of their property.
2. A. Men are more concerned with the car they drive than with the clothes their wives wear.
B. It is very important that imagination and creativity in children be cultivated.
C. People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death.
3. A. Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.
B. The well-being of the individual is the goal that should be worked for before anything else.
C. Since most people don't know what they want, it is only reasonable for ambitious people to talk them into doing things.
4. A. People are getting so lazy and self-indulgent that it is bad for our country.
B. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.
C. It would be a good thing if people were kinder to others less fortunate than themselves.
5. A. Most people are basically good and kind.
B. The best criteria for a wife or husband is compatibility—other characteristics are nice but not essential.
C. Only after a man has gotten what he wants from life should he concern himself with the injustices in the world.
6. A. Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives.
B. Any man worth his salt shouldn't be blamed for putting his career above his family.
C. People would be better off if they were concerned less with how to do things and more with what to do.
7. A. A good teacher is one who points out unanswered questions rather than gives explicit answers.
B. When you ask someone to do something, it is best to give the real reasons for wanting it rather than giving reasons which might carry more weight.
C. A person's job is the best single guide as to the sort of person he is.
8. A. The construction of such monumental works as the Egyptian pyramids was worth the enslavement of the workers who built them.
B. Once a way of handling problems has been worked out it is best to stick to it.
C. One should take action only when sure it is morally right.
9. A. The world would be a much better place to live in if people would let the future take care of itself and concern themselves only with enjoying the present.
B. It is wise to flatter important people.
C. Once a decision has been made, it is best to keep changing it as new circumstances arise.
10. A. It is a good policy to act as if you are doing the things you do because you have no other choice.

- B. The biggest difference between most criminals and other people is that criminals are stupid enough to get caught.
- C. Even the most hardened and vicious criminal has a spark of decency somewhere within him.
11. A. All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than to be important and dishonest.
- B. A man who is able and willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding in whatever he wants to do.
- C. If a thing does not help us in our daily lives, it isn't very important.
12. A. A person shouldn't be punished for breaking a law that he thinks is unreasonable.
- B. Too many criminals are not punished for their crimes.
- C. There is no excuse for lying to someone else.
13. A. Generally speaking, men won't work hard unless they are forced to do so.
- B. Every person is entitled to a second chance, even after he commits a serious mistake.
- C. People who can't make up their minds are not worth bothering about.
14. A. A man's first responsibility is to his wife, not his mother.
- B. Most men are brave.
- C. It is best to pick friends that are intellectually stimulating rather than ones it is comfortable to be around.
15. A. There are very few people in the world worth concerning oneself about.
- B. It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.
- C. A capable person motivated for his own gain is more useful to society than a well-meaning but ineffective one.
16. A. It is best to give others the impression that you can change your mind easily.
- B. It is a good working policy to keep on good terms with everyone.
- C. Honesty is the best policy in all cases.
17. A. It is possible to be good in all respects.
- B. To help oneself is good; to help others even better.
- C. War and threats of war are unchangeable facts of human life.
18. A. Barnum was probably right when he said that there's at least one sucker born every minute.
- B. Life is pretty dull unless one deliberately stirs up some excitement.
- C. Most people would be better off if they controlled their emotions.
19. A. Sensitivity to the feelings of others is worth more than poise in social situations.
- B. The ideal society is one where everybody knows his place and accepts it.
- C. It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak and it will come out when they are given a chance.
20. A. People who talk about abstract problems usually don't know what they are talking about.
- B. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.
- C. It is essential for the functioning of a democracy that everyone vote.

OPINION SURVEY

Directions: The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

On the accompanying score sheet indicate how much you agree or disagree with the statement. Please mark every one.

Write +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| +1: I AGREE A LITTLE | -1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE |
| +2: I AGREE ON THE WHOLE | -2: I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE |
| +3: I AGREE VERY MUCH | -3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH |

1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.
2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are the most intelligent.
3. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.
- ✓ 4. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.
5. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.
6. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.
7. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.
8. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.
9. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.
10. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.
- × 11. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.
- × 12. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.

- X 13. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.
- 14. It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.
- 15. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.
- 16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.
- 17. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.
- 18. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.
- > 19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.
- 20. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.
- X 21. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.
- > 22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.
- X 23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.
- 24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.
- X 25. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.
- 26. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.
- X 27. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.
- 28. In times like these, it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.

- ✓ 29. A group which tolerates too much difference of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.
- ✗ 30. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.
- ✓ 31. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refused to admit he's wrong.
- ✓ 32. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.
- ✗ 33. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.
- 34. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.
- ✗ 35. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.
- ✗ 36. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.
- 37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.
- 38. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."
- ✗ 39. Unfortunately, a good many people with who I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.
- 40. Most people just don't know what's good for them.

OPINION SURVEY NO. I

NO. _ _ _

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____
11. _____
12. _____
13. _____
14. _____
15. _____
16. _____
17. _____
18. _____
19. _____
20. _____

OPINION SURVEY NO. II

NO. _____

Write +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

+1: I AGREE A LITTLE

-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE

+2: I AGREE ON THE WHOLE

-2: I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE

+3: I AGREE VERY MUCH

-3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH

1. _____

21. _____

2. _____

22. _____

3. _____

23. _____

4. _____

24. _____

5. _____

25. _____

6. _____

26. _____

7. _____

27. _____

8. _____

28. _____

9. _____

29. _____

10. _____

30. _____

11. _____

31. _____

12. _____

32. _____

13. _____

33. _____

14. _____

34. _____

15. _____

35. _____

16. _____

36. _____

17. _____

37. _____

18. _____

38. _____

19. _____

39. _____

20. _____

40. _____

OPINION SURVEY NO. III

NO. _____

Consider the following two hypothetical news releases, both of which start with:

President Nixon's much publicized trip to China was a complicated hoax perpetuated on the American public.

Release A

According to an U.S. Army General, a prominent member of the President's official family, the entire meeting took place on an elaborate stage set up in the Aleutian Islands. Furthermore, in a special news conference, the General states, "By skillful makeup, film cutting and splicing, the entire meeting was forged for presentation to the world. I can no longer live with this international fraud on my conscience."

Release B

The entire meeting took place on an elaborate stage set up in the Aleutian Islands. This conclusion is valid when one considers the following evidence. If the trip had actually occurred, the war in Viet Nam would be de-escalated with troop withdrawals on both sides. There would be more pro-American news from the Far East from the news media, and furthermore, the scheduled Presidential trip to Moscow would not be taking place.

For each of the releases check the one statement that best reflects the way that release would effect you.

Release AResponseRelease B

_____	Would be definitely convinced that the China trip was a hoax.	_____
_____	Would be almost convinced that the trip was a hoax.	_____
_____	Would make me suspicious about the trip.	_____
_____	Would have no reaction either to trip or release.	_____
_____	Would be suspicious of the release.	_____
_____	Would be almost convinced that the release was a fraud.	_____
_____	Would be definitely convinced that the release was a fraud.	_____

APPENDIX B

SCORING KEYS FOR SCALES

SCORING KEY FOR MACH V (1968)⁴² (OPINION SURVEY #1)

Points Per Item by Response Patterns

Item #	1	2	3	5	7
1	A+	B+	A+	B+	C+
	C-	C-	B-	A-	B-
2	A+	B+	A+	B+	C+
	C-	C-	B-	A-	B-
3	C+	B+	C+	B+	A+
	A-	A-	B-	C-	B-
4	A+	C+	A+	C+	B+
	B-	B-	C-	A-	C-
5	A+	C+	A+	C+	B+
	B-	B-	C-	A-	C-
6	A+	B+	A+	B+	C+
	C-	C-	B-	A-	B-
7	B+	C+	B+	C+	A+
	A-	A-	C-	B-	C-
8	C+	A+	C+	A+	B+
	B-	B-	A-	C-	A-
9	C+	A+	C+	A+	B+
	B-	B-	A-	C-	A-
10	A+	C+	A+	C+	B+
	B-	B-	C-	A-	C-
11	A+	C+	A+	C+	B+
	B-	B-	C-	A-	C-
12	C+	A+	C+	A+	B+
	B-	B-	A-	C-	A-
13	C+	B+	C+	B+	A+
	A-	A-	B-	C-	B-
14	B+	A+	B+	A+	C+
	C-	C-	A-	B-	A-
15	C+	A+	C+	A+	B+
	B-	B-	A-	C-	A-
16	C+	A+	C+	A+	B+
	B-	B-	A-	C-	A-
17	A+	B+	A+	B+	C+
	C-	C-	B-	A-	B-
18	C+	B+	C+	B+	A+
	A-	A-	B-	C-	B-
19	B+	A+	B+	A+	C+
	C-	C-	A-	B-	A-
20	A+	C+	A+	C+	B+
	B-	B-	C-	A-	C-

Sum for all 20 items and add constant of 20. Range: 40 - 160 with the theoretical neutral point at 100.⁴³

⁴²Robinson, "General Attitudes Toward People," p. 512.

⁴³Christie, Studies in Machiavellianism, p. 32.

SCORING KEY FOR DOGMATISM SCALE-FORM E (OPINION SURVEY # 2)

Responses were scored along a +3 to -3 agree-disagree scale, with the 0 point excluded. These scores were converted to a 1 to 7 scale by adding the constant 4 to each score or the constant of 160 to each total score. Therefore the range of possible scores is from 40 to 280 on Form E. A high score indicates a high degree of dogmatism.⁴⁴

⁴⁴Shaver, "Authoritarianism, Dogmatism, and Related Measures," p. 334.

SCORING KEY FOR OPINION SURVEY #3

For each of the releases check the one statement that best reflects the way that release would effect you.

<u>Scoring Key</u>	<u>Release A</u>	<u>Response</u>	<u>Release B</u>	<u>Scoring Key</u>
7 _____		Would be definitely convinced that the China trip was a hoax.	_____	7
6 _____		Would be almost convinced that the trip was a hoax.	_____	6
5 _____		Would make me suspicious about the trip.	_____	5
4 _____		Would have no reaction either to trip or release.	_____	4
3 _____		Would be suspicious of the release.	_____	3
2 _____		Would be almost convinced that the release was a fraud.	_____	2
1 _____		Would be definitely convinced that the release was a fraud.	_____	1

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Abelson, Herbert Irving. Persuasion. New York: Springer Publishing Co., 1959.
- Adorno, T. W.; Frenkel-Brunswik, Else; Levinson, Daniel J.; and Sanford, R. Nevitt. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- Ben, Daryl J. Beliefs, Attitudes, and Human Affairs. Belmont, California: Brooks-Cole Publishing Co., 1970.
- Bettinghaus, Erwin P. Persuasive Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.
- Christie, Richard, and Geis, Florence L. Studies in Machiavellianism. New York: Academic Press, 1970.
- Crossman, Richard, ed. The God that Failed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.
- Hoffer, Eric. The True Believer. New York: Harper and Row, 1951.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. The Discourses. New York: Modern Library, 1940.
- _____. The Prince. New York: Modern Library, 1940.
- Nie, Norman H.; Bent, Dale H.; and Hull, C. Hadlai. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1970.
- Robinson, John P., and Shaver, Phillip R. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1969.
- Rokeach, Milton. Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1968.

- _____. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960.
- Scheibe, Karl E. Beliefs and Values. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1970.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.; 1956.

Journals

- Ainsworth, Leonard H. "Rigidity, Insecurity, and Stress." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LVI (January, 1958), 67-74.
- Borgatta, Edgar F.; Bales, Robert F.; and Couch, Arthur I. "Some Findings Relevant to the Great Man Theory of Leadership." American Sociological Review, XIX (1954), 755-759.
- Budner, Stanley. "Intolerance of Ambiguity as a Personality Variable." Journal of Personality, XXX (March, 1962), 29-50.
- Burgoon, Michael. "The Relationship Between Willingness to Manipulate Others and Success in Two Different Types of Basic Speech Communication Courses." The Speech Teacher, XX (September, 1971), 178-183.
- Chaney, Marilyn V., and Vinacke, Edgar W. "Achievement and Nurturance in Triads Varying in Power Distribution." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XX (March, 1960), 175-181.
- Christie, Richard. "Some Abuses of Psychology." Psychological Bulletin, LII (November, 1956), 439-451.
- _____, and Budnitsky, Stanley. "A Short Forced-Choice Anxiety Scale." Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXI (December, 1957), 501.

- _____, and Garcia, John. "Subcultural Variation in Authoritarian Personality." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVI (1951), 457-469.
- _____; Havel, Joan; and Seidenberg, Bernard. "Is the F Scale Irreversible?" Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LVI (March, 1958), 143-159.
- Cowen, Emory L., and Thompson, George G. "Problem Solving Rigidity and Personality Structure." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVI (1951), 165-176.
- Exline, Ralph; Thibaut, John; Brannon, Carak; and Gumpert, Peter. "Visual Interaction in Relation to Machiavellianism and an Unethical Act." American Psychologist, XVI (July, 1961), 396.
- Fructer, Benjamin; Rokeach, Milton; and Novak, Edwin G. "A Factorial Study of Dogmatism, Opinionation, and Related Scales." Psychological Reports, IV (March, 1958), 19-22.
- Hanson, D. J. "Dogmatism and Authoritarianism." Journal of Social Psychology, LXXVI (October, 1968), 89-95.
- Koeske, Gary F., and Crano, William D. "The Effect of Congruous and Incongruous Source-Statement Combinations Upon the Judged Credibility of a Communication," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, IV (October, 1968), 384-399.
- Kerlinger, Fred N., and Rokeach, Milton. "The Factorial Nature of the F and D Scales." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, IV (July, 1966), 391-399.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. "On Authoritarianism and Acquiescence: An Added Note to Bass and Messick and Jackson." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LVI (January, 1958), 141-142.

- Plant, W. T. "Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale as a Measure of General Authoritarianism." Psychological Reports, VI (February, 1960), 164.
- Powell, Fredric A. "Open-and Closed-Mindedness and the Ability to Differentiate Source and Message." Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, LXV (July, 1962), 61-64.
- Rehfisch, John M. "A Scale for Personality Rigidity." Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXII (February, 1958), 11-15.
- Roberts, Alan H., and Rokeach, Milton. "Anomie, Authoritarianism, and Prejudice: A Replication." American Journal of Sociology, LXI (January, 1956), 355-358.
- Rokeach, Milton, and Fruchter, Benjamin. "A Factorial Study of Dogmatism and Related Concepts." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIII (November, 1956), 356-360.
- _____. "A Method for Studying Individual Differences in Narrow-Mindedness." Journal of Personality, XX (December, 1951), 219-233.
- _____. "Narrow-Mindedness and Personality." Journal of Personality, XX (December, 1951), 234-251.
- _____. "Political and Religious Dogmatism: An Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality." Psychological Neonograms, LXX (1956), 425.
- _____. "Prejudice, Concreteness of Thinking, and Reification of Thinking." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVI (1951), 83-91.
- _____. "The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism." Psychological Review, LXI (May, 1954), 194-204.

- Singer, Jerome E. "The Use of Manipulative Strategies: Machiavellianism and Attractiveness." Sociometry, XXVII (June, 1964), 128-150.
- Vacchiano, R. B.; Strauss, P.S.; and Hochman, L. "The Open and Closed Mind; a Review of Dogmatism." Psychological Bulletin, LXXI (April, 1969), 261-273.
- Wagman, Nathaniel Morton. "An Investigation of the Effectiveness of Authoritarian Suggestion and Non-Authoritarian Information as Methods of Changing the Prejudiced Attitudes of Relatively Authoritarian and Non-Authoritarian Personalities." Dissertation Abstracts, XIV (January-June, 1954), 728-729.
- Walster, Elaine; Aronson, Elliot; and Abrahams, Darcy. "On Increasing the Persuasiveness of a Low Prestige Communicator." Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, II (October, 1966), 325-342.

Unpublished Papers

- Christie, Richard. "Impersonal Interpersonal Orientations and Behavior." Mimeographed research proposal, Columbia University, 1962.
- Christie, Richard, and Budner, Stanley. "Medical School Value Climates and Machiavellian Orientations of Students." Mimeographed research report, Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1959.