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Abstract

The present experiment was designed to study the effect of the variables of naivete concerning psychological experimentation, the use of deception, and level of trust on a S's ability to become demand aware. It was hypothesized that the demand awareness of high and low trust Ss would be differentially affected by their level of knowledge about psychological experimentation, and by the type of explanation given to them (none, honest, deceptive) as to the purpose of the experiment. Non-significant results indicated no support for this hypothesis. Difficulties with the subjective aspect of the demand awareness measure used are discussed in relation to their possible effect upon the reliability and validity of the measure.
Orne (1962, 1973) has thoroughly discussed the concept of demand characteristics and their importance in the experimental situation. He has proposed that Es consider their Ss as active problem solvers rather than passive responders. With these new conceptualizations have come numerous studies of the effects of demand characteristics on experimental results, but few of these studies have dealt with the variables which affect a S's ability to perceive the demand cues.

Orne (1962, p. 779) defines demand characteristics as "the totality of cues which convey an experimental hypothesis to the subject." Page and Scheidt suggest that a more "operationalizable" concept is that of demand awareness --- "the perceptual or cognitive aspects of the subject's conclusions from the experimental situation regarding what is expected of him" (1971, p. 304). It is important to note the difference between these two concepts. Demand characteristics are the situational cues as to what the E's hypothesis is. Demand awareness is the S's conclusions, based upon his perception of these demand cues, as to what the E's hypothesis is and as to what behaviors will validate this hypothesis. When a S accurately perceives what the E's hypothesis is, he is said to be demand aware.

In order to determine how demand characteristics and demand awareness affect the results of an experiment, psychologists have focused their studies on determining what a S's response will be to the demand cues and to demand awareness. This has led to a
discussion of S motivation in response to demand characteristics and demand awareness. Essentially, three major motives have been identified and their existence supported experimentally:


(b.) A lack of commitment to the experiment on the part of the S, leading him to be uncooperative in validating the E's hypothesis. (Argyris, 1968; Masling, 1966; Orne, 1973; Page, 1969; Page & Scheidt, 1971; Sigall, et al., 1970)

(c.) Evaluation apprehension, or the desire to hide any psychological weaknesses from the E by responding in what the S perceives to be a psychologically healthy manner. (Altemeyer, 1971; Page & Scheidt, 1971; Silverman & Regula, 1968)

Although much effort has gone into dealing with responses to demand characteristics in terms of motives (especially Silverman & Shulman, 1970), it would appear to be much more efficacious to deal with response modes. Borrowing from Orne's (1973) conceptualization of two motives, it is suggested that Es use two more easily operationalized concepts -- the two response modes of cooperation and non-cooperation with the E in validating his hypothesis (evaluation apprehension being subsumed under both cooperation and non-cooperation).

The uncritical use of deception in psychological experiments has been roundly decried (Kelman, 1969; Orne, 1973, Stricker,
Messick & Jackson, 1969), and has a direct bearing on a S's perception of demand characteristics. The objective of the use of deception is essentially to prevent the S from accurately perceiving the demand characteristics or becoming demand aware during the experiment --- what Orne (1973) calls a quasi-control. However, when a deception is poorly performed, is too transparent or when a S has been previously deceived in an experiment, this quasi-control may not perform its function. S suspicion is likely to be aroused, and this in turn will lead to an increase in extraneous variation (Stricker, et al., 1969). It is important to here note that demand awareness is not necessarily the same as suspicion of deception, in that in some deception experiments a S can be demand aware but not suspicious that he is being deceived (Page & Scheidt, 1971).

Directly related to S suspicion and demand awareness is the problem of S naivete. Page (1968, 1970) has demonstrated that different results are obtained from sophisticated and naive Ss, and these results are directly related to the S's ability to pick up demand cues and become demand aware. Further complicating this problem is the fact that many Ss who would be considered naive (no courses in psychology or introductory psychology student) are in fact fairly sophisticated. Silverman & Regula (1968) found that many of their Ss, who had only had several weeks of an introductory psychology course, were constructing highly sophisticated hypotheses for the experiment in which they participated. Page & Scheidt (1971) found that Ss who had never
had a psychology course were highly sophisticated in creating experimental hypotheses.

Numerous discussions have either stated or inferred the importance of interpersonal trust to the psychological experiment's social setting (Kee & Knox, 1970; Milgram, 1965; Nottingham, 1972; Orne, 1973; Rotter, 1971; Sherman, 1967; Stricker, et al., 1969). Rotter conceptualizes trust as a generalized expectancy "held by an individual or a group that the word, premise, verbal or written statement of another individual or group can be relied upon" (1967, p. 651). The implication of this definition is that communications must be explicit, but this definition must be expanded to include the fact that communications may also be implicit (Schlenker, Helm & Tedeschi, 1973). This is especially true of the experimental situation, in which there is the implicit understanding that no harm will come to the S (Orne, 1973). Milgram (1965), for example, found that one of the reasons his Ss continued to obey the E and shock another individual, was their belief that no E would allow them to seriously harm another person.

Orne (1962, 1973) delineated the experimental problems which he has focused on as the role expectations brought into the experimental situations by both the S and the E. If we accept Rotter's (1967) definition of trust (with the Schlenker, et al., 1973 amendment) it seems to follow that some aspect of role expectation will involve interpersonal trust. Also, it would appear to follow, a priori, that interpersonal trust would have
some bearing on the effectiveness of a deception used in an experiment, and would in some manner interact with S's naivete in determining how or whether the S perceives the demand characteristics of, or becomes demand aware during an experiment. To better conceptualize these relationships one might view them as involving the interaction of the experimental situation with both the S's level of trust and his level of naivete (or degree of sophistication) about psychological experiments. The interaction of these three variables will affect the S's perception of the demand characteristics of the experiment, and this perception may or may not lead to the S becoming demand aware.

We may define the relationship between trust and naivete in terms of Rotter's (1971) theory that the more novel and ambiguous a situation is, the greater weight generalized expectancies will have. If a S is naive, the experimental situation in which he finds himself is novel and more ambiguous; hence, the trust variable should have a significant effect on his behavior. If, however, the S has knowledge of what to expect in the experimental situation, the effect of the trust variable should be nullified.

Suspicion may be seen in some cases as being aroused by the demand characteristics of an experiment, given that the S has not been briefed by a former S about the purpose of the experiment. The demand cues may be conveying the message that "You are not supposed to know what I'm really trying to do," and this message, in turn, may cause the S to search more actively for other demand
cues. One suggestion to remove most of the possibility of $S$ suspicion from the experiment is to give an honest explanation of the purpose of the experiment, but this only increases the probability of the $S$ becoming demand aware. Another problem with this solution is the fact that sometimes the deceptive explanation may appear to the $S$ to be the more plausible explanation (Orne, 1973).

The present experiment was designed to study the effect of the variables of $S$ naivete, the use of deception, and level of trust on a $S$'s ability to become demand aware, and took the form of a study of the effect of racial attitudes upon the evaluation of a communication. There were three sets of conditions manipulated in a $2 \times 2 \times 3$ design. $S$s were divided into high and low levels of trust, then placed in either naive or non-naive conditions of knowledge about the use of deception in psychological experiments, and finally placed in one of three experimental explanation conditions (none, honest, or deceptive).

It was hypothesized that there would be a three way interaction among the variables; that is, high and low trust would differentially affect demand awareness and suspicion depending on the level of naivete (knowledge) about psychological experimentation, and on the type of explanation given (none, honest, deceptive) as to the purpose of the experiment. Specifically:

(1.) In the naive, no experimental explanation condition, low trust $S$s would show significantly greater suspicion and demand awareness than would high trust $S$s.
(2.) In the naive, honest explanation condition the low trust Ss would show significantly greater suspicion than would the high trust Ss, but there would be no difference in demand awareness due to the fact that the high trust Ss would accept the honest explanation at face value, and be prepared to pick up the demand cues.

(3.) In all non-naive conditions high and low trust Ss would not differ significantly in suspicion and demand awareness.

(4.) There would be a significant positive relationship between measures of suspicion and of demand awareness.

Method

Subjects. The Ss were 60 (31 male, 29 female) undergraduate, introductory psychology students at the University of Richmond. Introductory classes in psychology were given the Rotter Interpersonal Trust Scale (1967), the Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1959), and a modified form of the Negro Prejudice Scale (Westie, 1953; see Appendix A). The three scales were administered by the E in the first week of classes. In order to prevent E bias, an associate of the E's selected, from the 218 persons tested, 30 Ss from the top 15% and 30 Ss from the bottom 15% of the scores on the Rotter Interpersonal Trust Scale (X = 69.09; s = 7.84; see Appendix A). At no time during the experiment did the E know who was in the high or low trust conditions. The same associate of the E randomly assigned the Ss to the other two treatment conditions. Ss were then run through the experiment individually.
Apparatus. A tape recorder and one tape were used. The tape contained two prerecorded messages.

Procedure. Just prior to being run in the experiment, the Ss who had been previously randomly assigned to the non-naive condition (15 high and 15 low trust) had read to them, as they read to themselves, a printed statement designed to sensitize them to, or make them aware of the possible use of deception in psychological experiments (see Appendix B). The statement was presented to the Ss as a statement of experimental ethics, and they were told that all Es at the university were required to present such a statement to their Ss. The remaining 30 Ss in the naive condition did not receive this statement.

Again from the previous random selection, 20 Ss (10 high and 10 low trust) were then placed in each of three conditions. One group was given a deceptive explanation of the purpose of the experiment; they were told that the experiment was designed to test their ability to listen to and learn spoken material. A second group was told the "true" purpose of the experiment; it was the study of the effect of racial attitudes on evaluation of a communication. The third group was given no explanation of the purpose of the experiment. Any S in this third group who inquired about the purpose of the experiment was told that there would be a feedback session after all Ss had been run, at which time the experiment would be explained and all of his/her questions would be answered. (See Appendix B for explanation transcripts.)
Following these treatments the Ss listened to two different tape recorded messages, each favoring racial integration (see Appendix B for message transcripts). Both messages were read by males, one with a Northern accent and one with an Afro-American accent. Immediately following each message presentation, the Ss were given a brief comprehension test on the material which they had just heard, and asked to rate the messages, on a five point scale, for clarity of ideas, content, logicality, vocabulary used, overall effectiveness and whether they agreed or disagreed with the message. (See Appendix B for comprehension tests and rating scales.)

When the second comprehension test had been completed, the E gave the S a questionnaire designed to get at demand awareness and suspicion. The questionnaire utilized the funnel technique described by Page (1969) and consisted of nine or ten pages (depending on whether or not the S had received the ethics statement), with one question per page and space for the S to write his answer. (See Appendix B.)

At the conclusion of the experimental session each S was told that there would be a feedback session after all Ss had been run, at which time the experiment would be fully explained and all questions answered. Ss were asked not to speak to others about the experiment until after this feedback session.

Results

The questionnaires were scored by two, trained independent
raters (see Appendix C for instructions and training procedures) in a manner similar to that used by Jones (1971). Each question was scored for either demand awareness or suspicion, from a one for no awareness or suspicion, to a four for maximum awareness or suspicion. Intermediate levels of awareness or suspicion were scored either two or three. Individual question scores were then summed to give each S both a total demand awareness score and a total suspicion score. Inter-rater reliability (using a Pearson r) was .88 for total demand awareness scores and a .76 for total suspicion scores, indicating a modest amount of reliability for both measures.

Raters also assigned each questionnaire overall scores for demand awareness and suspicion. These overall scores were given on the basis of considering each questionnaire in its entirety and then assigning one score (of from one to four) for demand awareness, and one score (of from one to four) for suspicion. This is similar to the scoring method used by Page (1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1973) and Page and Scheidt (1971). As a measure of inter-rater reliability, phi coefficients were computed after these scores had been dichotomized according to whether the S was or was not demand aware or suspicious (scores of 3 & 4, and 1 & 2 respectively). The phi coefficients for the overall scores were quite low and little confidence could be placed in these measures (demand awareness: $\phi = 0.43/\phi_{\text{MAX}} = 0.43$; suspicion: $\phi = 0.55/\phi_{\text{MAX}} = 0.82$).

of having post-experimental questionnaires scored by himself and one other independent rater, the present E also rated the questionnaires for demand awareness and suspicion. The E correlated (using a Pearson r) .98 and .79 with raters #1 and #2 respectively on the total demand awareness scores, and .67 and .58 on the total suspicion scores. On the overall demand awareness scores the phi coefficient for the E and rater #1 was $.66/\phi_{MAX}=.66$, and for the E and rater #2 was $.56/\phi_{MAX}=.65$. The overall suspicion scores yielded $\phi=.53/\phi_{MAX}=.74$ for the E and rater #1, and $\phi=.42/\phi_{MAX}=.81$ for the E and rater #2. (See Table 1)

Total demand awareness and total suspicion scores for individual Ss were each summed across the two raters. These two sets of scores were then used in separate ANOVAs. Total demand awareness scores yielded non-significant results. The trust factor had an $F=3.25$ (df=1/58, p <.10), while the naivete factor, the experimental explanation factor and all interactions had $F<1.00$. Total suspicion scores also produced non-significant results, with $F=2.69$ (df=1/58, p <.25) on the trust factor and with $F<1.00$ for the naivete factor, the experimental explanation factor and all interactions. (See Tables 2 & 3)

In order to determine if there was any relationship between the total demand awareness and total suspicion scores, a Pearson r was performed, resulting in a .62 correlation.

Discussion

In order to see if the overall scores would yield significant
TABLE 1

Inter-rater Reliabilities for Scoring of Post-experimental Questionnaires on Measures of Demand Awareness and Suspicion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>#1 &amp; #2</th>
<th>E &amp; #1</th>
<th>E &amp; #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Demand Awareness</td>
<td>r=.88</td>
<td>r=.98</td>
<td>r=.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Demand Awareness</td>
<td>φ=.43/φ_{MAX}=.43</td>
<td>φ=.66/φ_{MAX}=.66</td>
<td>φ=.56/φ_{MAX}=.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Suspicion</td>
<td>r=.76</td>
<td>r=.67</td>
<td>r=.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Suspicion</td>
<td>φ=.55/φ_{MAX}=.82</td>
<td>φ=.53/φ_{MAX}=.74</td>
<td>φ=.42/φ_{MAX}=.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2

Results of Analysis of Variance on:

Total Demand Awareness Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>239.99</td>
<td>239.99</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naivete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>less than 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.53</td>
<td>25.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust x Naivete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust x Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>130.81</td>
<td>65.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naivete x Experimental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.14</td>
<td>50.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust x Naivete x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SwG</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3545.20</td>
<td>73.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3

Results of Analysis of Variance on:

Total Suspicion Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96.26</td>
<td>96.26</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naivete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.26</td>
<td>32.26</td>
<td>Less than 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust x Naivete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust x Experimental Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naivete x Experimental Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.14</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust x Naivete x Experimental Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59.71</td>
<td>29.86</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SwG</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1717.60</td>
<td>35.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
results, a post hoc chi square, using the dichotomized overall demand awareness scores, was performed on trust by demand awareness. The chi square (using a Yates correction) was run on all Ss upon whom the raters agreed as to their awareness status (N=38), and the results were non-significant ($\chi^2 = 3.77$, df=1, $p < .10$).

The hypotheses set forth for this study predicted a three way interaction, which did not come close to appearing for either total demand awareness or total suspicion scores ($F < 1.00$, df=1/48). This, and the fact that for both measures all of the other interactions and all main effects, except trust, also had $F < 1.00$, appears to indicate that the naiveté and experimental explanation treatments had no effect on the Ss. It may be that anxiety caused by evaluation apprehension or distraction caused by a lack of interest in participating in the experiment interfered with a S's ability to attend closely to the reading of the ethics statement or to the explanation of the purpose of the experiment. But lack of attention alone could probably account for only the responses of a small number of Ss.

The ethics statement may have sensitized naive Ss to the possible use of deception and to possible lapses in experimental ethics --- as it was designed to do. However, knowledge of potential deception does not necessarily make a naive S psychologically sophisticated enough to know how and where to look for a deception. It is suggested, therefore, that to make a naive S truly non-naive (sophisticated) it would be necessary to present
him/her with information about typical experimental paradigms used in social psychological experiments.

There are also some factors which may have rendered the experimental explanation treatments ineffective. Perhaps the deception used was not elaborate enough to distinguish between the effects of high and low trust. The demand characteristics of the experiment pointing toward the involvement of racial attitudes may have been so blatant that few, if any, Ss could accept the deceptive statement that it was simply a learning experiment. The honest explanation may not have had its expected effect due to a lack of explicitness. Perhaps it was necessary to spell out more clearly what the study was all about in order to assure that the S understood what the E was trying to do.

Finally, the impotence of both the naïve and experimental explanation treatments may have been related to the fact that the experiment in which the Ss were participating was a contrived, "pseudo" experiment. The E was not actually trying to measure the effects of racial attitudes, and this may have affected the potency of the treatments used. Perhaps if the E had actually intended to measure the effects of racial attitudes on the evaluation of a communication more potent treatments would have been used, and the predicted three way interaction would have appeared.

The fact that all treatments failed to have a significant effect may also be related to a more general difficulty, that of rater reliability in the scoring of the post-experimental questionnaires.
In the process of scoring the questionnaires it is necessary for the raters to place an interpretation upon what the Ss are trying to state (Page, personal communication). This is necessitated by the fact that the Ss vary in their ability to express themselves clearly and are not familiar with the use of psychological jargon. This need for interpretation allows subjectivity to enter into what ideally should be an objective process. Therefore, it is necessary for the E in training the raters to communicate somehow a single interpretive set to the raters, and thereby assure more reliable scoring. This may be a hit or miss process, as is suggested by the E's correlating .98 and .79 with each rater on total demand awareness scores, and correlating .66 and .56 on the overall demand awareness scores.

Another contributing factor to these modest to poor inter-rater reliabilities may have been the post-experimental questionnaire itself. The questionnaire used Page's (1969, 1970, 1971, 1973) and Page and Scheidt's (1971) "funnel" structure. Questions, patterned after those used by Page and Scheidt (1971), were constructed on the basis of the E's own perceptions of what were the salient demand characteristics of the experiment. Page (1973), however, suggests that detailed oral interviews be used in the pilot stage of the experiment, and that the experience from these interviews be used in constructing questions which will be most effective in getting a S demand awareness. The questions used in the present study's questionnaire also may not have been specific enough in some instances to "elicit reports that are concrete and
detailed enough so that a scorer can interpret what is being said" (Page, 1973, p. 321).

Regardless of the adequacy of the questionnaire used, the need for interpretation of what a S is trying to state still allows subjectivity to enter into the questionnaire scoring procedure. This has serious ramifications in terms of replication and further experimentation. The interpretive set used by one E may not (probably will not) be the same as that used by another E, even though both follow the same rating instructions. This may make replication a near impossibility unless the variables under consideration exert a powerful effect or the experiment does not involve a complex interaction of treatment effects which Ss must describe in order to be considered demand aware. Page's work (1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1973) has dealt chiefly with the classical conditioning of attitudes and verbal conditioning, both of which involve a minimum of interpretation of S statements on demand awareness questionnaires. They involve relatively clear-cut contingencies and lack complex interactions among treatments. It was felt that the present experiment was also relatively uncomplicated and yet the modest to poor rater reliabilities do not jibe with the high reliability coefficients reported in Page's (1969, 1970, 1971, 1973) work.

Page (1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1973) scores the post-experimental questionnaires along with one other independent rater. Page (personal communication) trains this rater very thoroughly giving him/her experience in rating and in the experimental
situation --- in order to assure high rater reliability coefficients. This training, in which he must communicate his own interpretive set to the other rater, may very well be a biasing factor --- who is to say that the E's interpretive set does indeed actually discriminate between those Ss who are or are not demand aware? Perhaps impressive results obtained would fall apart if those questionnaires which required the most interpretation on the part of the raters were scored by raters placing a more conservative or a more liberal interpretation on what the Ss stated. Because of Page's (1969, 1970, 1971, 1973) reported high rater reliability coefficients, the present E chose to combine his scores with those of rater #1, with whom he correlated .98 on the total demand awareness measure. The ANOVA resulted in a pattern of F ratios similar to that of the ANOVA run on the scores of the two independent raters (i.e. all interactions and main effects, except trust, having F < 1.00). However, in the ANOVA on the E's and rater #1's scores, the trust effect, instead of merely approaching significance, was found to be significant (F = 4.11, df = 1/58, p < .05). Following this up further, it was decided to run separate ANOVAs on each rater's total demand awareness scores in order to discover if their individual results were consistent with the other results reported above. Rater #1's results showed a significant trust effect (F = 5.45, df = 1/58, p < .05), while all other main effects and interactions had F < 1.00. Rater #2's results had no significant effects (see Tables 4, 5, and 6). Taking these results into consideration,
TABLE 4

Results of Analysis of Variance Performed on:
Total Demand Awareness Scores of E and Rater #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>453.74</td>
<td>453.74</td>
<td>4.11 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naivete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>less than 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>133.23</td>
<td>66.62</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust x Naivete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.38</td>
<td>25.38</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust x Experimental Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99.11</td>
<td>49.56</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naivete x Experimental Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>103.91</td>
<td>51.96</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust x Naivete x Experimental Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47.47</td>
<td>23.74</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SwG</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5299.60</td>
<td>110.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* df=1/58, p < .05
### TABLE 5

Results of Analysis of Variance Performed on:

Total Demand Awareness of Rater #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96.26</td>
<td>96.26</td>
<td>5.45 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naivete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>less than 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust x Naivete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust x Experimental Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38.94</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naivete x Experimental Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust x Naivete x Experimental Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SwG</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>847.60</td>
<td>17.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* df=1/58, p < .05
TABLE 6

Results of Analysis of Variance Performed on:

Total Demand Awareness Scores of Rater #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.26</td>
<td>32.26</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naivete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>less than 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust x Naivete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust x Experimental Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.54</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naivete x Experimental Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.21</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>less than 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust x Naivete x Experimental Explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SwG</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>824.00</td>
<td>17.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
we must again ask the question of who had the correct interpretation of Ss' statements on the post-experimental questionnaires. Perhaps rater #2's interpretation was the more correct. Perhaps neither interpretive set was correct. If this was indeed the case then the results of this study could be merely experimental artifacts.

It appears that the post-experimental questionnaire is the most practical method of detecting demand awareness, yet one must have some indication of how accurate one's interpretation of Ss' statements is in reflecting reality. An experimental paradigm which might help bolster confidence in our interpretations might be an experiment consisting of two distinct sections. The second section of the experiment would be identical to the first, except that one of the demand characteristics (perhaps a treatment variable) would be changed. The post-experimental questionnaire, administered after the completion of both sections, would be divided into two parts and treat each section as though it were an entirely separate experiment. In this manner we would be obtaining a second S report which might help clarify his/her understanding of the experimental hypotheses involved.

All the previous discussion has dealt chiefly with demand awareness measures. Regarding the suspicion measures we must conclude that there is little indication that suspicion need be investigated any further at the present time. The hypothesis that there would be a significant positive relationship between suspicion and trust measures was partially born out by the
Pearson $r$ of .62 for the total demand awareness and total suspicion scores. The correlation was significantly different in a positive direction from .00, but only 38 percent of the variance was explained by the relationship between the two measures ($r^2 = .38$). This relationship between the scores, plus the fact that suspicion was partly defined in terms of S statements of awareness of particular demand characteristics, brings into question the independence of the suspicion measures from the demand awareness measures. Without the independence of the suspicion measures not too much can be inferred from their results.

A great deal of subjectivity also entered into the suspicion measures. This was due mainly to the fact that suspicion was defined in terms not only of S statements concerning awareness of demand characteristics, but also in terms of statements concerning other aspects of the experiment which Ss may have perceived as important (such as the locked testing room, the possible disclosure of information about oneself, etc.). This latter part of the definition allowed a great deal of subjectivity to enter into the scoring, as is suggested by the low inter-rater reliabilities (see Table 1). The difficulty in defining suspicion also led a number of Ss to state that the use of the term "suspicion" was ambiguous. They felt that they were not necessarily "suspicious" about certain aspects of the experiment, but merely "curious."

Finally, taking an overview of the entire experiment it must be concluded that few firm conclusions can be made. The
results strongly suggest a follow-up study of the relationship between demand awareness and trust, in order to discover if trust does indeed have any effect on a S's ability to become demand aware. This follow-up study would hopefully remove some of the difficulties in the construction and scoring of the post-experimental questionnaire. Further, it appears that the suspicion measures used in the present experiment are open to question. They require better definition in order to make them independent of the demand awareness measures, and in order to make the scoring of suspicion questions more objective.
Appendix A

Pre-experimental questionnaire given to introductory psychology classes, consisting of:

I. Rotter Interpersonal Trust Scale (1967)

II. Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1959)

III. Modified form of the Negro Prejudice Scale (Westie, 1953)

Frequency distribution of Rotter Interpersonal Trust Inventory scores.
IDENTIFICATION NUMBER: 052

NAME: ______________________ (last) ______________________ (first) SEX: M  F

SCHOOL OR LOCAL PHONE NUMBER: ________________

SCHOOL YEAR (circle one): FRSH  SOPH  JR  SR

INTRO. PSYCH. PROFESSOR: ______________________
4. Mildly disagree 5. Strongly disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDENTIFICATION NUMBER: 12345
GENERAL OPINION SURVEY

This is a questionnaire to determine the attitudes and beliefs of different people on a variety of statements. Please answer the statements by giving as true a picture of your own beliefs as possible. Be sure to read each item carefully and show your beliefs by marking the appropriate number on your answer sheet.

If you strongly agree with an item, fill in the space numbered one. Mark the space numbered two if you mildly agree with the item. That is, mark number two if you think the item is generally more true than untrue according to your beliefs. Fill in the space numbered three if you feel that the item is about equally true as untrue. Fill in the space numbered four if you mildly disagree with the item. That is, mark number four if you feel the item is more untrue than true. If you strongly disagree with an item, fill in the space numbered five.

1. Strongly agree
2. Mildly agree
3. Agree and disagree equally
4. Mildly disagree
5. Strongly disagree

Please be sure to fill in the spaces completely and to erase completely any marks to be changed. Make no extra marks on either the answer sheet or the questionnaire.
1. Most people would rather live in a climate that is mild all year around than in one in which winters are cold.

2. Hypocrisy is on the increase in our society.

3. In dealing with strangers one is better off to be cautious until they have provided evidence that they are trustworthy.

4. This country has a dark future unless we can attract better people into politics.

5. Fear of social disgrace or punishment rather than conscience prevents most people from breaking the law.

6. Parents usually can be relied upon to keep their promises.

7. The advice of elders is often poor because the older person doesn't recognize how times have changed.

8. Using the Honor System of not having a teacher present during exams would probably result in increased cheating.

9. The United Nations will never be an effective force in keeping world peace.

10. Parents and teachers are likely to say what they believe themselves and not just what they think is good for the child to hear.

11. Most people can be counted on to do what they say they will do.

12. As evidenced by recent books and movies morality seems on the downgrade in this country.

13. The judiciary is a place where we can all get unbiased treatment.

14. It is safe to believe that in spite of what people say, most people are primarily interested in their own welfare.

15. The future seems very promising.

16. Most people would be horrified if they knew how much news the public hears and sees is distorted.

17. Seeking advice from several people is more likely to confuse than it is to help one.
I. Strongly agree  2. Mildly agree  3. Agree and disagree equally  
4. Mildly disagree  5. Strongly disagree

18. Most elected public officials are really sincere in their campaign promises.
19. There is no simple way of deciding who is telling the truth.
20. This country has progressed to the point where we can reduce the amount of competitiveness encouraged by schools and parents.
21. Even though we have reports in newspapers, radio and television, it is hard to get objective accounts of public events.
22. It is more important that people achieve happiness than that they achieve greatness.
23. Most experts can be relied upon to tell the truth about the limits of their knowledge.
24. Most parents can be relied upon to carry out their threats of punishment.
25. One should not attack the political beliefs of other people.
26. In these competitive times one has to be alert or someone is likely to take advantage of you.
27. Children need to be given more guidance by teachers and parents than they now typically get.
28. Most rumors usually have a strong element of truth.
29. Many major national sports contests are fixed in one way or another.
30. A good leader molds the opinions of the group he is leading rather than merely following the wishes of the majority.
31. Most idealists are sincere and usually practice what they preach.
32. Most salesmen are honest in describing their products.
33. Education in this country is not really preparing young men and women to deal with the problems of the future.

34. Most students in school would not cheat even if they were sure of getting away with it.

35. The hordes of students now going to college are going to find it more difficult to find good jobs when they graduate than did the college graduates of the past.

36. Most repairmen will not overcharge even if they think you are ignorant of their speciality.

37. A large share of accident claims filed against insurance companies are phony.

38. One should not attack the religious beliefs of other people.

39. Most people answer public opinion polls honestly.

40. If we really knew what was going on in international politics, the public would have more reason to be frightened than they now seem to be.
INSTRUCTIONS: In this portion of the opinion survey, please indicate what type of relationships you would be willing to enter into with members of the various groups listed by:

1. Putting an X under each group in as many of the rows as your feelings dictate.

2. Remember to give your first feeling reactions in every case.

3. Give your reactions to each group as a group. Do not give your reactions to the best or to the worst members that you have known, but think of the picture or stereotype that you have of the whole group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Indians, Native Americans</th>
<th>Swedes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To close kinship by marriage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To my club as personal chums.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To my street as neighbors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To employment in my occupation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To citizenship in my country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. As visitors only to my country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Would exclude from my country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Negroes</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Indians, (from India)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To close kinship by marriage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To my club as personal chums.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To my street as neighbors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To employment in my occupation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To citizenship in my country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. As visitors only to my country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Would exclude from my country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE GO ON
SURVEY CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE
III.

7.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate all the items with which you agree by placing an X to the left of each numbered item. Mark as many of the numbered items as your feelings dictate. Remember to give your first feeling reactions in every case.

-------------------------------------------------------------

I believe I would be willing to have a Negro banker.    

_ 1. live in the same apartment building I live in.  
_ 2. live across the street from me.  
_ 3. live in my neighborhood.  
_ 4. live in my end of town.  
_ 5. live in my town.  
_ 6. live in my country.

I believe that I would be willing to have a white ditch-digger.   

_ 1. as President of the United States.  
_ 2. as U.S. Congressman from my district.  
_ 3. as a councilman on my city's council.  
_ 4. as head of the local community chest drive.  
_ 5. as a member of a Red Cross Committee in my town.  
_ 6. as a member of a national patriotic organization.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
I believe I would be willing to have a white banker....

1. use the same towel that I use.
2. swim in the same pool as I do.
3. have his hair cut by the same barber who cuts mine.
4. try on clothes at the store where I buy my clothes.
5. ride in a crowded elevator I am in.
6. use lending library books I also borrow.

I believe I would be willing to have a Negro ditch-digger....

1. as a close personal friend.
2. as a dinner guest in my home.
3. as a person I might often visit with.
4. as an acquaintance.
5. as someone I might say hello to.
6. as someone I might see on the street.

I believe I would be willing to have a white banker....

1. as President of the United States.
2. as U.S. Congressman from my district.
3. as a councilman on my city's council.
4. as head of the local community chest drive.
5. as a member of a Red Cross Committee in my town.
6. as a member of a national patriotic organization.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
I believe I would be willing to have a Negro ditch-digger...

1. use the same towel that I use.
2. swim in the same pool as I do.
3. have his hair cut by the same barber who cuts mine.
4. try on clothes at the store where I buy my clothes.
5. ride in a crowded elevator I am in.
6. use lending library books I also borrow.

I believe I would be willing to have a Negro banker...

1. as a close personal friend.
2. as a dinner guest in my home.
3. as a person I might often visit with.
4. as an acquaintance.
5. as someone I might say hello to.
6. as someone I might see on the street.

I believe I would be willing to have a white ditch-digger...

1. live in the same apartment building I live in.
2. live across the street from me.
3. live in my neighborhood.
4. live in my end of town.
5. live in my town.
6. live in my country.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
I believe I would be willing to have a Negro banker....

___ 1. use the same towel that I use.
___ 2. swim in the same pool as I do.
___ 3. have his hair cut by the same barber who cuts mine.
___ 4. try on clothes at the store where I buy my clothes.
___ 5. ride in a crowded elevator I am in.
___ 6. use lending library books I also borrow.

I believe I would be willing to have a white ditch-digger....

___ 1. as a close personal friend.
___ 2. as a dinner guest in my home.
___ 3. as a person I might often visit with.
___ 4. as an acquaintance.
___ 5. as someone I might say hello to.
___ 6. as someone I might see on the street.

I believe I would be willing to have a white banker....

___ 1. live in the same apartment building I live in.
___ 2. live across the street from me.
___ 3. live in my neighborhood.
___ 4. live in my end of town.
___ 5. live in my town.
___ live in my country.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
III.

I believe I would be willing to have a Negro ditch-digger....

1. as President of the United States.
2. as U.S. Congressman from my district.
3. as a councilman on my city's council.
4. as head of the local community chest drive.
5. as a member of a Red Cross Committee in my town.
6. as a member of a national patriotic organization.

I believe I would be willing to have a white banker....

1. as a close personal friend.
2. as a dinner guest in my home.
3. as a person I might often visit with.
4. as an acquaintance.
5. as someone I might say hello to.
6. as someone I might see on the street.

I believe I would be willing to have a Negro ditch-digger....

1. live in the same apartment building I live in.
2. live across the street from me.
3. live in my neighborhood.
4. live in my end of town.
5. live in my town.
6. live in my country.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
12.

I believe I would be willing to have a Negro banker....
   ___ 1. as President of the United States.
   ___ 2. as U.S. Congressman from my district.
   ___ 3. as a councilman on my city's council.
   ___ 4. as head of the local community chest drive.
   ___ 5. as a member of a Red Cross Committee in my town.
   ___ 6. as a member of a national patriotic organization.

I believe I would be willing to have a white ditch-digger....
   ___ 1. use the same towel that I use.
   ___ 2. swim in the same pool as I do.
   ___ 3. have his hair cut by the same barber who cuts mine.
   ___ 4. try on clothes at the store where I buy my clothes.
   ___ 5. ride in a crowded elevator I am in.
   ___ 6. use lending library books I also borrow.

END OF SURVEY!

THANK YOU FOR YOUR KIND ASSISTANCE!!!!!!!!!
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION -
ROTTER INTERPERSONAL TRUST INVENTORY SCORES

SCORE

FREQUENCY
Appendix B

Experimental materials used in experimental session with individual Ss.

I. Ethics statement

II. Experimental explanations

III. Tape recorded message transcripts

IV. Comprehension tests and rating scales

V. Post-experimental questionnaire
In order to assure the welfare of all students participating in psychological experiments, it is the present policy of the Psychology Department of The University of Richmond to present each subject with a brief statement relevant to the ethics which guide every psychological experimenter.

No subject shall be exposed to any situation in which there is the possibility of physical or psychological harm. In the recent past some experimenters have not strictly followed this guideline, forcing most all universities (The University of Richmond included) to screen all experimental proposals to assure high ethical standards.

Deception may be used in psychological experiments in an attempt to study how an individual would respond in a "real world" situation, rather than how he would respond in an experimental situation. If deception is used in an experiment, experimental ethics demand that the subject must be informed at the conclusion of the experiment of the true nature of the task, and have any questions he or she may have thoroughly answered.

Finally, if any subject has any criticisms or complaints about the ethics involved in any experiment conducted at The University of Richmond, please address them to Dr. Barbara K. Shelley of the Psychology Department.

Dr. J. James Tromater
Chairman
Psychology Department
EXPERIMENTAL EXPLANATIONS

None - What I would like you to do is listen to this tape recording. After you have listened to it you will be asked to answer some questions about what you have heard.

Deceptive - This experiment is a study of how well people can listen to and learn spoken material. It has a direct bearing on determining how effective a technique public speeches and lecturing are in transmitting information. What I would like you to do is listen to this tape recording. After you have listened to it you will be asked to answer some questions about what you have heard.

Honest - This experiment is a study of how an individual's racial attitudes affect his evaluation of a communication. It has a direct bearing on determining how a persuasive argument can be most effective in changing attitudes. What I would like you to do is listen to this tape recording. After you have listened to it you will be asked to answer some questions about what you have heard.
TAPE RECORDED MESSAGES

I. The great economic wealth and social stability which the United States has achieved in the relatively short period of 200 years, is something we all can be proud of. This great wealth and stability is threatened, however, if we do not take action to bring about true racial integration in our country. The riots in Watts and Detroit are only two examples of what may happen on a larger scale if any significant portion of our population becomes frustrated by discriminatory economic, educational and political practices. Through racial integration we will become a stronger, more united nation, not having to fear the social chaos which has torn through so many South American and colonized African nations. It is through racial integration that we can achieve the level of social stability which will allow us to remain a democracy in the face of a crumbling world order.

II. In an integrated community there would never have to be forced school busing. Children would go to neighborhood schools and receive an equal education. Money spent on the buses, the fuel for the buses and the government to organize and run the busing program could be spent on improving the educational system. In a racially integrated community adults would learn that living with all people presents the same joys and problems, no matter what their color may be. If we are willing to make the moral commitment and take action in such areas as open housing and equality of job opportunity, the integrated community will begin to emerge, and we can begin to put the energy and money used for
busing into some other constructive program. Integration makes good economic sense.
The following questions are about the message which you have just heard. Please answer them by circling the letter on your answer sheet which corresponds with the response you feel best answers the question.

1. How long has it taken the U.S. to achieve its wealth and stability?
   (a.) a relatively long period of time
   (b.) over one hundred years
   (c.) two hundred and fifty years
   (d.) a short period of time

2. What country has suffered from social chaos?
   (a.) Argentina
   (b.) England
   (c.) Australia
   (d.) Japan

3. What may trigger riots in this country?
   (a.) economic discrimination
   (b.) alienation
   (c.) frustration
   (d.) political discrimination

4. Why do we need a racially integrated society?
   (a.) to increase our economic wealth
   (b.) to maintain our present level of social stability
   (c.) to aid in the construction of a new world order
   (d.) to increase our present level of social stability

5. What two riots were mentioned by the speaker?
   (a.) Detroit & Watts
   (b.) Memphis & Washington, D.C.
   (c.) Memphis & Newark
   (d.) Newark & Detroit
Please rate the message you heard for:

Clarity of Ideas —
Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

Content —
Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

Logicality —
Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

Vocabulary Used —
Excellent 5 4 3 2 1 Poor

Overall Effectiveness —
Excellent 5 4 3 2 1 Poor

Please rate the message based on how much you agreed or disagreed with it.

Disagree
Entirely
Agree
Entirely
The following questions are about the message which you have just heard. Please answer them by circling the letter on your answer sheet which corresponds with the response you feel best answers the question.

(1.) What concrete action was suggested to bring about racial integration?
   (a.) equal educational opportunities
   (b.) a successful bussing program
   (c.) open housing
   (d.) more job opportunities

(2.) What was the speaker's major argument?
   (a.) the community will benefit financially from racial integration.
   (b.) bussing is an ineffective and wasteful program
   (c.) neighborhood schools and equal education go together
   (d.) all people are alike in many ways, regardless of color

(3.) To what major political problem was the speaker suggesting a solution?
   (a.) neighborhood schools
   (b.) school bussing
   (c.) equal education
   (d.) effective use of tax money

(4.) Who would benefit most from the learning experience in the racially integrated community?
   (a.) adults
   (b.) children
   (c.) the entire community
   (d.) does not state
(5.) What type of commitment is necessary to achieve racial integration?

(a.) a commitment to action
(b.) a commitment to the laws of the nation
(c.) a commitment to equal education
(d.) a commitment to laws higher than those of man.

Please rate the message you heard for:

Clarity of Ideas ---

Poor 1 2 3 4 5

Excellent

Content ---

Poor 1 2 3 4 5

Excellent

Logicality ---

Poor 1 2 3 4 5

Excellent

Vocabulary Used ---

Excellent 5 4 3 2 1

Poor

Overall Effectiveness ---

Excellent 5 4 3 2 1

Poor

Please rate the message based on how much you agreed or disagreed with it.

Disagree Entirely ___________ Agree

Entirely ___________
POST-EXPERIMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE

The experiment proper is now over and this is the post-experimental questionnaire. In order to determine what the results of the experiment actually mean it is very important to find out what your thoughts were during the experiment. The only way I can think of to find out what your thoughts were is just to have you open up and to write down what you thought. I'm interested in any ideas you had about the purpose of the experiment and any suspicions you may have had about any of the procedures. Keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers at this point. What I am interested in is whatever you actually thought during the experiment and before this questionnaire was introduced. Please answer each question as thoroughly as possible and remember that I am interested in what you thought during the experiment and before this questionnaire was given to you.
1. Generally, what did you think the experiment was about?

2. Specifically, what did you think my hypothesis was (i.e., what did you think I was looking for, trying to study, etc.)?

3. During the experiment and before this questionnaire was given, what suspicions did you have if any?

4. If you were suspicious, when did you become suspicious and what things made you suspicious? Please answer in detail if you haven't already.

5. (a.) During the experiment did you suspect that the content of the messages you heard was an important part of the experiment?
   (b.) If yes, what role did it play in the experiment?
   (c.) If yes, how suspicious were you? (Check point on scale which you feel best represents the amount of suspicion you had about this part of the experiment.)

   Only Slightly Suspicious __:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__) Quite Suspicious

6. (a.) During the experiment did you suspect that the accents of the different speakers had something to do with the experiment?
   (b.) If yes, what role did they play in the experiment?
   (c.) If yes, how suspicious were you?

   Only Slightly Suspicious __:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__) Quite Suspicious

7. (a.) When answering the questionnaires following each message you heard, was there any section(s) or question(s) which you thought was (were) the most important in proving my hypothesis?
   (b.) If yes, which one(s)? Why was it or why were they important?

8. During the experiment did you think that the accent of the speakers was supposed to have an effect on how you rated each of their messages? If yes, how certain were you of this?

   Only Slightly Suspicious __:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__) Quite Suspicious

9. You answered a questionnaire in class prior to this experiment. (a.) What did it measure?
   (b.) What was it used for, and how was it used?

10. Did you have any suspicions about the ethics statement which was read to you at the beginning of the experiment? If yes, please explain.
Appendix C

Rater training --- Both raters were first run through the experiment. Following this they were given the scoring directions to read (following pages). Questions were then answered concerning the scoring directions, and each rater was then given three sample post-experimental questionnaires to score. The fictitious responses on these questionnaires were created by the E. After scoring the questionnaires the raters compared their scoring to that of the E and discussed exactly why certain responses were scored in the manner they were.
GENERAL SCORING DIRECTIONS

Demand Awareness - When a S has successfully figured out what the E is trying to do in an experiment, i.e. he knows what the treatment conditions are, and how they are supposed to affect him/her.

1. Be conservative on rating demand awareness. Don't attribute too much awareness. Don't be sucked in too easily in determining that the S is demand aware.

2. Look for CRITICAL IDEAS. Don't be afraid to put an interpretation on what the S said about the hypotheses, i.e. Ss are not psychologically sophisticated, so they may not use the same words to describe what they thought was going on as the E uses in his examples of answers (on a following sheet), so try to figure out what they mean.

3. WHAT IS IMPORTANT IS TO MAINTAIN A BALANCE BETWEEN INTERPRETING WHAT S MEANT AND NOT PUTTING WORDS INTO HIS MOUTH (i.e. between instructions #1 & #2).

4. When scoring, start with question #1 and go through each questionnaire, in its entirety, in serial order. In determining scores for later questions always consider responses which have been given to questions preceding them. Don't be afraid to look back at responses which have already been scored when determining the score for an item.

5. Scores:

1 - not demand aware; have not figured out anything about the true nature of the experiment.

2 - have a vague idea of what the experiment was about, but don't know how the various treatments were supposed to affect them.

3 - have a fairly good idea of what the experiment was about, but only vague or partly correct about how the various treatments were supposed to affect them.

4. - have a good idea of what the experiment was about, and a good idea about how the various treatments were supposed to affect them.

6. For unanswered items:

(a.) Give a score of 1, UNLESS
(b.) The answer to the particular item has been specifically stated in the context of one of the previous questions, then score on the basis of that response.

7. (a.) Score items #1, 2, 5b., 6b., 7, 8, & 9 for demand awareness, total the scores & place score on sheet provided under "Summed D.A. Score."

(b.) Score items #3, 4, 5a. & c. (combined for one score), 6a. & c. (combined for one score) for suspicion, total the scores and place score under "Summed Suspicion Score."

(c.) Consider the entire questionnaire as a whole and give it one score (between 1-4) as to whether the S was demand aware, and enter under "Overall D.A. Score."

(d.) Consider items #3, 4, 5a. & c., and when appropriate item #10, and give one score (between 1-4) as to how suspicious the S was, and record under "Overall Suspicion Score."

NOTE: For scoring overall demand awareness and suspicion see attached sheet. Scoring of individual suspicion items for the summed suspicion score is based on the overall suspicion scoring explanation. (See attached sheet)

DON'T PUT ANY MARKS OR SCORES ON D.A. QUESTIONNAIRES
D.A. QUESTIONNAIRE ANSWERS

(1.) 4 pt. - Racial attitudes (prejudice) and how it might differentially affect one's ratings of similar messages, depending on whether the message is delivered by a white or by a black person.

3 pt. - An answer similar to the 4 pt. answer which leaves out one or two of the salient points, but is obviously in the right direction. OR

   Racial attitudes (prejudice) and how it might differentially affect one's comprehension and ratings of similar messages. OR

   To see whether one would agree more with a white speaker than with a black speaker, depending on one's racial attitudes

2 pt. - Racial prejudice, or similar type response.

1 pt. - Any response that doesn't mention racial prejudice at all.

(2.) 4 pt. - Prejudiced S will rate the black lower than the white speaker, and/or will rate both messages lower than non-prejudiced S due to message content.

3 pt. - An answer similar to the 4 pt. answer which leaves out one or two salient points, but is obviously in the right direction. OR

   Prejudiced S will remember less of what the black speaker said and rate the black's message lower than the non-prejudiced S. OR

   Prejudiced S will agree less with the black than with the white speaker.

2 pt. - Prejudiced person will comprehend less of what was said by the black and more of what was said by the white. OR

   Something to the effect that prejudice will affect the S in some manner other than what is stated above in the 4 and 3 pt. answers.

1 pt. - Any answer which does not in some way include the statement that racial prejudice was involved in the hypotheses.

(3.) See "Suspicion" section under OVERALL SCORING.

(4.) See "Suspicion" section under OVERALL SCORING.

(5a. & c.) See "Suspicion" section under OVERALL SCORING.
(5b.) 4 pt. - Something to the effect that the content of the message (racial integration) would affect a person's evaluation of it depending on his/her racial attitudes.

3 pt. - Content of both messages was similar and on a controversial subject, so it was difficult to remember the material especially for the prejudiced S.

2 pt. - Statements which include the fact that the material was on a controversial subject (racial integration).

1 pt. - Any statement not touching on the controversial nature of the two messages.

(6a. & c.) See "Suspicion" section under OVERALL SCORING.

(6b.) 4 pt. - Something to the effect that the race of the speaker would affect a person's evaluation of the message, depending on his/her racial attitudes.

3 pt. - An answer similar to the 4 pt. answer which leaves out one or two salient points, but is obviously in the right direction. OR

Something to the effect that the speaker's race would affect the S's comprehension of the message and evaluation of it. OR

See if the race of the speaker would affect how much the S agreed or disagreed with the speaker, depending on the racial attitudes of the S.

2 pt. - Any statement which states that the race of the speaker was supposed to have some effect on the S, other than those stated above.

1 pt. - Any statement which does not include the fact that the accents were used to distinguish between the races of the two speakers.

(7.) 4 pt. - Yes. Ratings most important in terms of seeing what affect the race of the speaker and/or content of the message had on the S's evaluation of the message.

3 pt. - Yes. Question regarding whether agreed or disagreed with the speaker was most important in order to evaluate the effect the messages of the two speakers had in changing S's opinion.

2 pt. - Statement that both were important (should actually state in these or very similar terms).

1 pt. - Statement that 1st part (comprehension) most important, or a "no" as an answer.
(8.) Give 4 pts. if high certainty (last two spaces on scale checked) and if S has shown in the previous answers (especially #6) that he/she knew that evaluation of the messages was important.

Give 3 pts. if high certainty and inferred knowledge of importance of evaluation or middle certainty and has shown that knew importance of evaluations.

Give 2 pts. if high or middle certainty and has not stated or inferred importance of evaluations, or if rates low certainty.

Give 1 pt. no matter what certainty rating if S has not shown self to be at all demand aware.

(9.) 4 pt. - Racial attitudes, racial prejudice, etc., and selection of Ss by obtaining those with high or low prejudice for the second half of the experiment.

3 pt. - Racial attitudes, etc., and used to select Ss for the second half of the experiment.

2 pt. - Racial attitudes, etc., and any other response to b.

1 pt. - doesn't know either answer.
OVERALL SCORING

Demand Awareness

Points

1 Absolutely no mention or indication that the S thought that racial attitudes were supposed to affect his/her responses (ratings of communications or answering of comprehension questions).

2 Mentions racial attitudes but unclear as to its role in the experiment.

3 Mentions that prejudice or racial attitudes were supposed to affect S's responses on the questionnaires answered after each message, but only infers or is vague as to how it was supposed to affect the message evaluations.

4 Indicates that racial attitudes were supposed to affect his/her responses on the message evaluation section, depending on what his/her racial attitudes were.

Suspicion

Points

1 Absolutely no indication of suspicion. Reports consistently that believed everything.

2 Possible indication of suspicion at some point, but unclear because of any combination of vagueness, contradictions, or low suspicion ratings.

3 Was clearly suspicious at some point, but rates self near the middle on suspicion ratings or is vague before the more direct questions.

4 Reports before the direct questions that was suspicious about such things as message content, accents, the content of the questionnaires, the content of the pretest, etc.
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