



University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

Student Work

6-1980

Dogmatism and inequality: Effects on affect and performance

S. Alan Rosenkrantz

University of Nebraska at Omaha

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

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rosenkrantz, S. Alan, "Dogmatism and inequality: Effects on affect and performance" (1980). *Student Work*. 101.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/101>

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.



DOGMATISM AND INEQUITY:
EFFECTS ON AFFECT AND PERFORMANCE

A Thesis
Presented to the
Department of Psychology
and the
Faculty of the Graduate College
University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
University of Nebraska at Omaha

by
S. Alan Rosenkrantz

June 1980

UMI Number: EP72745

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 EP72745

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

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

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

Thesis Committee Norman H. Hamer Psychology
Name Department

Ronald J. Grandgenett Secondary Education

Dennis L. Dosssett Psychology

Carl J. Greubey
Chairman
July 9, 1980
Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Carl I. Greenberg who served as major thesis advisor; to Dr. Dennis Dossett, Dr. Donald J. Grandgenett, and Dr. Norman Hamm, thesis committee members, for their guidance, insights, and encouragement through the various stages of this thesis.

A special thanks is extended to my wife, Polly, for her boundless patience and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ABSTRACT	1
INTRODUCTION	2
Background	2
Inequity and Affect	3
Inequity and Performance	3
Choice and Performance	4
Components of the Exchange Process	5
Individual Differences	5
Dogmatism	7
Statement of the Problem	7
Hypotheses	9
METHOD	10
Subjects	10
Design	10
Measuring Instruments	11
Dogmatism Scale	11
Experimental Work Package	11
Control of the Experimental Manipulation	12
Mood Adjective Check List (MACL)	13
Manipulation Check	13
PROCEDURE	13

	Page
RESULTS	15
Distribution of Dogmatism Among Treatment Groups	15
Reliability of MACL	15
Equity Manipulation Check	15
Effects of Dogmatism on Perceived Fairness (Perceived Equity)	18
Effects of Equity on Affect	18
Effects of Dogmatism on Affect	21
Effects of Equity on Performance	24
Effects of Dogmatism on Performance	29
Effects of Dogmatism and Equity on Perceived Reward	29
Relationship Between Affect and Performance	29
DISCUSSION	34
Summary	37
Recommendations for Further Research	38
REFERENCES	39
APPENDIX A--Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale Form D	43
APPENDIX B--Materials Given to Equity Group	50
APPENDIX C--Exceptional Materials Provided to Inequity With Ability to Control Inputs Group	60
APPENDIX D--Exceptional Materials Provided to Inequity With No Ability to Control Inputs Group	65
APPENDIX E--Informed Consent Form	70

	Page
APPENDIX F--Distribution of Subjects Across Levels of Dogmatism and Equity Treatment Conditions . . .	72
APPENDIX G--Means and Standard Deviations: Total Population	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	ANOVA Summary Table: Dogmatism Scores as a Function of Equity Condition	16
2	Cell Means and Standard Deviations: Dogmatism	17
3	ANOVA Summary Table: Perceived Fairness	19
4	Cell Means and Standard Deviations: Perceived Fairness	20
5	ANOVA Summary Table: Affect	22
6	Cell Means and Standard Deviations: Affect	23
7	ANOVA Summary Table: Performance Quality	25
8	Cell Means and Standard Deviations: Performance Quality	26
9	ANOVA Summary Table: Performance Quantity	27
10	Cell Means and Standard Deviations: Performance Quantity	28
11	ANOVA Summary Table: Perceived Reward	30
12	Cell Means and Standard Deviations: Perceived Reward	31
13	Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Total Sample	32
14	Pearson Correlation Coefficients: Affect vs. Performance Under Varying Conditions of Equity and Dogmatism	33

Abstract

An experiment was conducted to examine the relationships among dogmatism, perceived fairness, and subjects' affective responses and performance effectiveness. One hundred and twenty male and female university students were divided into three equity treatment groups: equity, and inequity with ability or without ability to control their inputs. Each inequity group was informed that greater inputs were demanded of them than were demanded of the other groups in exchange for the same rewards. Subjects were also blocked on three levels of dogmatism. Each dependent variable was subjected to analysis of variance in a 3 X 3 factorial design. Inequity with input-control subjects reduced performance, while those experiencing inequity without control reduced affect, in order to restore equity. Dogmatism appeared to moderate the relationship between equity and affect. Dogmatism was inversely related to perceived equity and to affect. However, dogmatism was independent of performance effectiveness. Equity was the single factor affecting performance. Evidently, dogmatism, as an index of an individual's value system, relates to behavior in a manner that supports previous research in Social Exchange, Protestant Ethic, and Equity theories.

Dogmatism and Inequity:

Effects on Affect and Performance

IntroductionBackground

Equity Theory is a process theory derived from Cognitive Dissonance Theory (Festinger, 1957). Cognitive Dissonance Theory posits that when an individual's expectancies about a situation are disconfirmed, conflicting (dissonant) cognitions result which are discomfoting to the individual. To reduce the discomfort, the individual alters either: (a) his expectancies, or (b) his perceptions of the disconfirming information.

In Equity Theory: (a) the individual has expectations of a "fair" return (outcomes) in exchange for his inputs; (b) when he does not receive his concept of a "fair" return, "inequity" exists (Adams, 1963); (c) individuals in inequity situations experience distress, in direct proportion to the amount of inequity they perceive themselves as receiving; (d) to reduce the distress, the individual tries to restore either actual or psychological equity (Walster, Berscheid, & Walster, 1973).

The individual may use one of two methods to form his concept of a "fair" return. One approach is to compare his inputs and outcomes with those of other individuals in the same situation. Homans (1961) expressed this in a formula stating that, when equity prevails, the proportion of the individual's profits to investments (earnings ratio) is equal to the earnings ratio of any other individual he chooses to use for comparison. When the individual recognizes a difference

between the two earnings ratios, he experiences inequity. Research tends to support this comparison process and the attendant feelings of distress due to inequity (Austin & Walster, 1974; Messé, Dawson, & Lane, 1973; Radinsky, 1969; Wicker & Bushweiler, 1970).

The second method a person may use to form his concept of a "fair" return is through his own "internal" standard. In this case the individual has a socially-derived referent that he may use for comparison purposes (Carrell & Dittrich, 1978). Research also supports this approach (Goodman, 1974; Lane & Messé, 1972; Middlemist & Peterson, 1976; Weick & Nessel, 1968; Zedeck & Smith, 1968).

Inequity and Affect

Adams (1963) found that inequity resulted in distress, dissonance, and internal conflict. Homans (1961) claimed that positive inequity (overreward) produces guilt, and negative inequity (underreward) produces anger. Other research also indicates that inequity causes distress and negative affect. Whether or not the inequity is expected has a direct bearing on the affective response. Unexpected inequity leads to higher levels of distress than expected inequity. This conforms to Festinger's (1957) Cognitive Dissonance Theory in that, when expected inequity occurs, expectancies are not disconfirmed, therefore dissonance does not occur (Wicker & Bushweiler, 1970; Pritchard, Dunnette, & Jorgenson, 1972; Austin & Walster, 1974; Ilgen & Gunn, 1976).

Inequity and Performance

When inequity occurs through underreward, one of the strategies individuals use to restore equity is to reduce their productivity.

This can be done by reducing either work quality, quantity, or both. The reduced input election strategy depends on the reward system affecting the worker. A worker paid on a piecework basis, in an inequity situation, reduces quality because it does not immediately reduce his pay. Conversely, an individual paid an hourly wage, in an inequitable situation, reduces quantity and quality because this strategy demands the least effort and has minimum consequences on his pay (Adams, 1963; Andrews, 1967; Lawler & O'Gara, 1967).

Choice and Performance

Some research findings seem to contradict Equity Theory. In these cases (Linder, Cooper, & Jones, 1967; Collins & Hoyt, 1972; Calder, Ross, & Insko, 1973; Folger, Rosenfield, & Hays, 1978) individuals delivered high performance despite "low" levels of reward. It should be noted, however, that the individuals had agreed to the transaction, including the "low" level of reward, prior to performing the experimental task. If one accepts the proposition that a form of inequity can be created when denying an individual the ability to control his inputs by disconfirming his expectations about the outcomes of the transaction, then the converse should also apply. The individual able to control his inputs, through his choice in agreeing to the transaction, should not perceive himself as the victim of negative inequity (i.e., underrewarded). It is possible that in these cases the low reward was an expected outcome that subjects had already accepted as part of an "equitable" transaction. The factor of choice is important because it is another way of describing control of the means to restore actual equity. When the means to restore

actual equity are denied, the individual can only resort to restoring psychological equity. When he does so, it is evidenced as increased negative affect (Walster, Walster, & Berscheid, 1978).

Components of the Exchange Process

Vroom (1964) described several components of the process that make it difficult to predict feelings of inequity. These cognitive components are as follows: (1) self-image, (2) conviction of value of inputs, (3) perceptions of reward, (4) perceptions of others, (5) perceptions of rewards to others, and (6) tendency to compare. The cognitions of no two people are identical. Therefore, it is fallacious to assume that another individual perceives the same levels of reward, or even the same inputs and outcomes, as the researcher. Where the researcher's "set" includes those extrinsic rewards he may choose to offer, the subject may perceive his very participation as part of the outcome. Each of these components is sensitive to individual differences in perception.

Individual Differences

Individual differences in personality underlie the components. Individuals differ greatly in their perceptions of the same things. Allport (1955) has described perception as "nothing more nor less than a discriminatory response." An individual may be limited in his ability to discriminate by a restricted number of response categories, either in the number of choices offered to him, or in his socially-determined value system (Garner, Hake, & Eriksen, 1956). If an individual possesses limited discrimination ability, then his perception of each component, and his ultimate perception of equity, or

inequity, will be limited. The daily purchasing transactions of any retail consumer typify this situation. The consumer can observe inputs (cost) and outputs (the product), in transactions for some nationally advertised item, among some (but not all) referent others. Some consumers extensively research costs to referent others and outputs (product quality and features) obtained by referent others. Those researching consumers become perceptive of inequity when they find an item available at a "nationally advertised price" in one store, and the same item is available at a fraction of that price in an equally accessible store. What is suggested is that discrimination learning between levels of equity is the same as any other discrimination learning and that perception (sensitivity) of inequity is a function of the ability to discriminate between degrees (levels) of equity. In that context, sensitivity to inequity should vary among individuals to the same extent as their value systems.

If individual value systems underlie perceptions of inequity, then it becomes worthwhile to examine them further. One available measure that suggests itself as a possible indicator of perceptual discrimination ability for equity, is the Protestant Ethic Scale (Mirels & Garrett, 1971; MacDonald, 1972; Greenberg, 1977, 1978). The Protestant Ethic Scale has a high correlation ($r = .69$) with the F Scale (Kerlinger & Rokeach, 1966). Both of these measures relate to structure and self-righteousness in individual personality.

If perceptual discrimination is the key to sensitivity in perceptions of equity, then those perceptions should be clearest when the most well-defined categories, or the most rigid personality

structure exists. Among normals the most rigid personality structure is indicated by a high level of dogmatism.

Dogmatism

Rokeach (1956) developed the D (dogmatism) Scale to measure authoritarianism as part of the individual's belief system, independent of content. Lee and Ehrlich (1971) contend that high dogmatics display moral self-righteousness. This suggests a high sensitivity to inequity, and strong perceptions of dissonance in the presence of inequity.

Statement of the Problem

In an industrial setting the predisposition to perceive similar transactional outcomes as equitable or inequitable seems to vary among individuals. Among managers and subordinates some individuals accept inequity with equanimity while others evidence intense responses to the same kinds of transactions. Managers often question the effectiveness of their incentive efforts when they receive inadequate or inappropriate responses (less than expected performance increments). Subordinates often question the return on their inputs as inequitable, even when management has made a sincere effort to provide equitable returns.

Since we do not live in an absolutely just world, it would seem that persons who are highly sensitive to inequity would be more prone to become dissatisfied employees than those with low sensitivity to inequity and that those dissatisfied employees would reflect their feelings through their work performance.

A general statement of the problem is: What are the relationships

among dogmatism, negative inequity, affect, and performance?

According to the review of the literature, an individual will experience inequity when all of the following conditions exist.

- The person is involved in a transaction.
- He has an available "standard" of comparison.
- He has expectancies for inputs and outcomes.
- His expectancies are disconfirmed (demanded inputs are greater than, or outcomes are less than his expectations).

This study concerns itself with the relationships among the individual's "standard" of comparison (his values as defined by level of dogmatism), the experimenter's concept of equity (as he defines equity, inequity with control, and inequity with no control), the person's perception of equity (the level of fairness he perceives in the transaction), and the person's coping strategy to restore equity (actual equity through reduced performance or psychological equity through more negative affect).

If dogmatism affects the "standard" from which an individual determines his measure of equity, then it also may influence his responses to inequity. If affect is a coping mechanism to restore psychological equity, then it should relate to dogmatism and perceived equity.

Specific questions to be addressed in this study are:

- (1) How does equity relate to affect?
- (2) How does opportunity to control inputs relate to affect?
- (3) How does dogmatism relate to affect?
- (4) How does opportunity to control inputs relate to performance?

(5) How does dogmatism relate to performance?

(6) How does dogmatism relate to perceptions of inequity?

(7) How does dogmatism relate to perceptions of reward?

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. Dogmatism and perceptions of equity have an inverse linear relationship.

Hypothesis 2. Inequity and affect will have an inverse linear relationship.

Hypothesis 3. In similar transactions, people who have an opportunity to control their inputs will evidence significantly more positive affect than people who are not able to control their inputs.

Hypothesis 4. Dogmatism and positive affect have an inverse linear relationship.

Hypothesis 5. People with an opportunity to control their inputs in an inequity situation will reflect significantly lower performance levels than people in an equity situation or people in an inequity situation who are not able to control their inputs.

Hypothesis 6. There will be a linear relationship in an unspecified direction, between levels of dogmatism and performance quantity and quality.

Hypothesis 7. Perceptions of reward will significantly differ, in an unspecified direction, between levels of dogmatism.

Method

Subjects

One hundred and twenty male and female introductory psychology students between the ages of 18 and 45 were recruited from the University of Nebraska at Omaha to participate as subjects. They were recruited by rosters soliciting voluntary participation that were posted in the Psychology Department. The investigator complied with all university rules relating to treatment of human subjects. In exchange for their participation, each subject received one and one quarter hours worth of extra credit toward his Psychology course grade.

Subjects were assigned to treatment groups as they reported for testing. All subjects (10-20) reporting to a session were given the same treatment. Although each treatment was given more than once, none clustered on any single day of the week.

A 10-minute explanation and debriefing was given at the end of each testing session. During that time subjects were invited to ask any questions they might have regarding the experiment.

Design

Nine experimental conditions were established and organized in a 3 X 3 factorial design. Independent variables were three levels of dogmatism crossed with: (1) equity, (2) inequity with ability to control one's own performance inputs, and (3) inequity with no ability to control one's own performance inputs. High, medium, and low levels of dogmatism were defined by equal thirds of the distribution of dogmatism scores across the total sample. Dependent variables were:

(1) affect, (2) performance quality, (3) performance quantity, (4) perceived fairness (perceived equity), and (5) perceived reward. The investigator attempted to obtain an approximately equal number of cases in each cell. However, the distribution of dogmatism scores caused cell sample size to vary markedly (see Appendix F).

Measuring Instruments

Dogmatism Scale. The instrument used to measure dogmatism was the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, Form D. The form consists of 66 6-point (-3, -2, -1, +1, +2, +3) Likert-type items on a disagree-agree continuum. The "0" point is excluded, making it a "forced choice" test. Scores were converted to a 1 to 7 scale by adding "4" to each score, resulting in a range of possible scores of 66-462. The higher the score, the greater the level of dogmatism.

Other forms (A, B, C, D, E) of the scale were considered and rejected in favor of the higher reliability (.91) of Form D (Robinson & Shaver, 1973). A sample form and answer sheet are included in Appendix A. The operational definition of dogmatism, for purposes of this study, is Rokeach's measuring instrument (D scale). This study does not address potential relationships with the Ethnocentrism and Facism Scales (Kerlinger & Rokeach, 1966).

Experimental Work Package. The instrument used to measure work consisted of a 30-question multiple-choice test on three newspaper clippings (see Appendix B for samples of the test and answer sheets). It contained: five questions on the first clipping (approximately 300 words long); ten questions on a television broadcasting schedule for 37 stations (approximately 800 items from which to research);

and 15 questions on the contents of a farm auction (approximately 1,000 words long, in very fine print). The test was designed to present work with minimum intrinsic reward. The questions were intended to demand close attention to the research material provided. It was an "open-book" research task with objectives to: (a) raise the required work level for the subject to the point that his earned extra credit was not, in fact, gratuitous; and (b) provide scores that would indicate differential inputs that might occur. A pilot of the task yielded a 50 per cent rate of completion when a 15 minute time limit was used. This was the time limit used for the experiment. Performance quantity was scored as the total number of answers attempted. Performance quality was scored as the per cent of answers correct of those attempted.

Control of the Experimental Manipulation. The equity manipulation was defined by the perception that one person was doing the work of three. Inequity was achieved by a cover sheet for the work task which declared that the task package was for three people and that the normal work load was one part per person. The inequity with no ability to control inputs group received this cover "inadvertently" stapled to the front of the materials provided immediately subsequent to completion of the work task. To further support the illusion of differential treatment, the answer sheet underneath the cover was divided into three columns, each headed for "person number one," "person number two," and "person number three." The equity group, and the inequity with no control of inputs group received the same materials, which did not

include the bogus cover and answer sheets, until completion of the work task (see Appendix C for materials provided to the inequity with control group, and Appendix D for materials provided to the inequity with no control group).

Mood Adjective Check List (MACL). Affect in this study was operationalized by scores on the MACL which consists of 30 adjectives describing three positive and three negative moods. A total score is derived by summing the positive and negative scores reported. Each adjective is scored on a 4-point scale for the subject's feelings with negative values given to negative mood scores: 1 = not at all, 2 = a little, 3 = somewhat, 4 = very much (Nowlis & Green, 1957; Walster, Walster, & Berscheid, 1978). These authors indicate that this measure has been used successfully to measure affect. A sample questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

Manipulation Check. A manipulation check for equity and a test for perceived reward were made using a posttest questionnaire (see Appendix B). The check used a 7-point Likert-type scale with anchor points for the equity check at "very fair," "very unfair," and anchor points for perceived reward at "overrewarded," "underrewarded."

Procedure

When the subjects arrived in the classroom, they were put at ease and asked if they had heard, or knew anything about the impending experiment, in order to verify that they were naive to this experimental manipulation. Informed consent forms were distributed, signed, and returned (see Appendix E). Then, the test for dogmatism was administered, with no time limit. Subjects were informed that the

typical time to complete this questionnaire was about 10-15 minutes, that their anonymity was protected through a numbering system in which their names never appeared, that the test was to be answered without lengthy consideration for each question, and as honestly as they could without regard to what anyone else's opinions might be.

Before the work task was administered, subjects were each separated by a vacant seating position and instructed not to express any feelings about the task in order not to influence each other. They were informed that a questionnaire to be distributed later would provide an opportunity to express their opinions and that the privacy of their opinions was an essential part of the experiment. They were then informed of the 15-minute time limit, and timed with an electronic stop-watch. At this point the inequity with control subjects were told that due to a shortage of subjects, they would have to perform the entire work task, rather than the amount "normally" asked of one person. The cover and answer sheets for their package (see Appendix C) supported this.

After the work task, the equity groups and the inequity with control groups received a package that included the MACL and posttest questionnaires. No time limit was placed on completing these forms (see Appendices B and C). The inequity with no control group was given a package that included: the "three-person" cover, the "three-person" answer sheet, the MACL, and posttest questionnaires. At this point, they were informed that an error had been made by whoever assembled the package and that they were not supposed to receive the "three-person" sheets. They were informed that we were indeed

short of subjects but that it was intended to simply let them do the "three-person" task alone because we had a problem.

After the session approximately ten minutes were given to full disclosure of the experiment including the purpose of each questionnaire, the experimental design, and the experimental objectives.

Results

Distribution of Dogmatism Among Treatment Groups

An analysis of variance of dogmatism scores for the three equity treatment groups and the three levels of dogmatism was performed on these data in a 3 X 3 factorial design. As shown in Table 1 no significant differences were evident among equity treatment groups, $F(2, 111) = .005$, $p > .99$. Thus, within each equity treatment, mean dogmatism scores were comparable (see Table 2).

Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here

Reliability of the Mood Adjective Check List (MACL)

An inter-item reliability analysis of the 30 item affect scale showed that the scale is internally consistent (Cronbach's alpha = .91). Therefore, a single affect score for each subject was used in subsequent data analyses.

Equity Manipulation Check

An analysis of variance of perceived fairness scores for the three equity treatment groups was performed. As shown in Tables 3 and 4, highly significant differences were evident, $F(2, 111) = 7.421$, $p < .005$. The equity manipulation was perceived correctly. Consequently, perceived fairness scores were used as perceived equity

Table 1

Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Subjects' Dogmatism
Scores as a Function of Equity Condition

Source of Variance	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Dogmatism	138963.063	2	69481.500	224.272	.000
Equity	3.042	2	1.521	.005	.995
Dogmatism x Equity	1657.996	4	414.499	1.338	.260
Totals	176588.563	119	1483.938		

N = 120

Table 2

Cell Means and Standard Deviations:

Dogmatism

Dogmatism Level	All Equity Treatments	Equity	Inequity With Control of Inputs	Inequity With No Control of Inputs
High	290.810 (23.910)	294.333 (27.148)	291.083 (24.100)	282.222 (13.151)
Medium	249.205 (8.554)	243.889 (7.253)	251.000 (8.134)	250.647 (8.782)
Low	207.462 (16.087)	206.235 (15.754)	203.556 (20.069)	211.769 (13.651)

Note. Numbers in parentheses indicate standard deviations.

whenever possible in subsequent analyses.

Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here

Effects of Dogmatism on Perceived Fairness (Perceived Equity)

An inverse linear relationship was hypothesized between dogmatism and perceived fairness. The Pearson correlation coefficient also revealed a significant inverse linear relationship, $r(120) = -.21$, $p < .05$, between dogmatism and perceived fairness.

An analysis of variance of perceived fairness scores was performed resulting in a highly significant relationship, $F(2, 111) = 6.030$, $p < .005$ (see Tables 3 and 4). Further data analysis revealed that high dogmatics ($M = 4.98$) perceived less fairness than moderate ($M = 5.74$) and low dogmatics ($M = 5.77$), according to Duncan's Multiple Range Tests ($p < .05$).

Effects of Equity on Affect

A positive linear relationship was hypothesized between equity and affect. That is, the more equity that subjects perceived in the transaction, the higher their affect scores should be. The Pearson correlation coefficient between affect and perceived fairness shows a highly significant positive linear relationship, $r(120) = .38$, $p < .001$.

An analysis of variance of affect scores indicated a significant difference between equity treatment conditions as shown in Table 5, $F(2, 111) = 3.169$, $p < .05$. Post hoc analyses (Duncan's Multiple Range Tests) revealed that the inequity with no control group had significantly ($p < .05$) lower affect scores ($M = 14.03$) than the inequity with control group ($M = 20.38$). However, the equity group

Table 3

Analysis of Variance Summary Table:

Perceived Fairness

Source of Variance	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Dogmatism	25.908	2	12.954	6.030	.003
Equity	31.885	2	15.943	7.421	.001
Dogmatism x Equity	10.998	4	2.749	1.280	.282
Error	238.450	111	2.148		
Totals	297.964	119	2.504		

N = 120

Table 4

Cell Means and Standard Deviations:

Perceived Fairness

Dogmatism Level	Equity	Inequity With Control of Inputs	Inequity With No Control of Inputs
High	5.095 (1.513)	5.583 (1.730)	3.889 (1.537)
Medium	6.333 (1.118)	5.846 (.987)	5.353 (1.498)
Low	6.588 (.795)	5.444 (1.944)	4.923 (1.891)

Note. Numbers in parentheses indicate standard deviation.

($\bar{M} = 15.66$) was not significantly different from either of the other two conditions.

Insert Tables 5 and 6 about here

Pearson correlation coefficients were also computed at each level of dogmatism. Among low dogmatism subjects the relationship is not significant, $r(39) = .26$, $p > .10$. Among both moderate and high dogmatics the relationship was significant, $r(39) = .39$, $p < .05$, and $r(42) = .42$, $p < .01$, respectively. However, the correlations were not significantly different. Thus, affect appears to be related to perceived equity only for medium and high dogmatics. Among low dogmatics, no relationship between these two variables emerged.

Effects of Dogmatism on Affect

An inverse linear relationship was hypothesized between dogmatism and affect. The Pearson correlation coefficient between dogmatism and affect indicates a highly significant inverse linear relationship, $r(120) = -.25$, $p < .01$.

An analysis of variance of affect scores shown in Table 5 indicates a significant effect, $F(2, 111) = 4.531$, $p < .05$, due to dogmatism. Post hoc analyses on these data (Duncan's Multiple Range Tests) indicate that low dogmatism subjects ($\bar{M} = 20.67$) had significantly ($p < .05$) lower affect scores than high dogmatics ($\bar{M} = 13.05$). No difference was found between high or low dogmatics and moderate dogmatics ($\bar{M} = 15.95$). A trend analysis was performed to further examine linearity. It yielded a highly significant linear component, $F(1, 117) = 7.519$, $p < .01$, while deviation from linearity was not

Table 5

Analysis of Variance Summary Table:

Affect

Source of Variance	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Dogmatism	1347.431	2	673.715	4.531	.013
Equity	942.343	2	471.171	3.169	.046
Dogmatism x Equity	818.781	4	204.695	1.377	.247
Error	16505.145	111	148.695		
Totals	19455.668	119	163.493		

N = 120

Table 6

Cell Means and Standard Deviations:

Affect

Dogmatism Level	Equity	Inequity With Control of Inputs	Inequity With No Control of Inputs
High	10.476 (12.197)	22.417 (7.366)	6.556 (11.348)
Medium	18.222 (12.587)	16.769 (13.547)	14.118 (9.130)
Low	20.706 (14.141)	22.889 (15.333)	19.077 (12.971)

Note. Numbers in parentheses indicate standard deviation.

significant, $F(1, 117) = 0.139$, $p > .70$. In short, collapsing across equity conditions, subjects' dogmatism scores were found to be inversely related to their affect scores.

Effects of Equity on Performance

Significantly lower performance levels were hypothesized for people who were inequitably treated with control over performance than for people who were inequitably treated with no control or who were equitably treated. An analysis of variance of performance scores for each variable is shown in Tables 7 and 9. No significant differences were evident in performance quantity. However, significant differences were found in performance quality, $F(2, 111) = 6.644$, $p < .01$. According to a Duncan's Multiple Range Test analysis, subjects in the inequity with control condition ($M = .77$) had significantly ($p < .05$) lower performance quality scores than subjects in the equity condition ($M = .85$) and subjects in the inequity with no control condition ($M = .84$). These data indicate that when subjects are aware of their inequitable treatment prior to their performing a task, they appear to reduce their quality of performance in order to maintain equity. In contrast, subjects in the equity and inequity with no control conditions had essentially the same performance quality.

The similarity of performance quality between these two groups is not surprising since the inequity with no control subjects were not given any information regarding comparison others' outcomes in this work transaction and they performed the task as if they were being equitably treated.

Insert Tables 7, 8, 9, and 10 about here

Table 7
Analysis of Variance Summary Table:
Performance Quality

Source of Variance	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Dogmatism	.017	2	.008	.787	.458
Equity	.143	2	.071	6.644	.002
Dogmatism x Equity	.018	4	.005	.426	.789
Error	1.193	111	.011		
Totals	1.369	119	.012		

N = 120

Table 8

Cell Means and Standard Deviations:

Performance Quality

Dogmatism Level	Equity	Inequity With Control of Inputs	Inequity With No Control of Inputs
High	.831 (.064)	.743 (.174)	.834 (.078)
Medium	.872 (.087)	.796 (.095)	.832 (.090)
Low	.848 (.063)	.758 (.200)	.858 (.061)

Note. Numbers in parentheses indicate standard deviation.

Table 9

Analysis of Variance Summary Table:
Performance Quantity

Source of Variance	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Dogmatism	3.300	2	1.650	.194	.824
Equity	16.821	2	8.410	.987	.376
Dogmatism x Equity	12.142	4	3.035	.356	.839
Error	945.753	111	8.520		
Totals	975.982	119	8.202		

N = 120

Table 10

Cell Means and Standard Deviations:
Performance Quantity

Dogmatism Level	Equity	Inequity With Control of Inputs	Inequity With No Control of Inputs
High	28.238 (2.234)	27.167 (4.174)	26.778 (3.962)
Medium	28.444 (2.128)	27.846 (2.911)	27.471 (2.649)
Low	28.0 (2.475)	27.111 (2.667)	28.154 (3.211)

Note. Numbers in parentheses indicate standard deviation.

Effects of Dogmatism on Performance

A linear relationship was hypothesized between dogmatism and performance. Analyses of variance of performance quality and performance quantity scores yielded no significant effects as shown in Tables 7 and 9. Similarly, Pearson correlation coefficients show no significant relationship between dogmatism and performance quality, $r(120) = .09, p > .30$, or between dogmatism and performance quantity, $r(120) = .03, p > .70$.

Effects of Dogmatism and Equity on Perceived Reward

As shown in Table 11, an analysis of variance of perceived reward scores indicated no significant differences in perceptions of reward.

Insert Tables 11 and 12 about here

Relationship Between Affect and Performance

Pearson correlation coefficients were computed for affect and performance scores yielding no significance as shown in Table 13. Subsequently, correlation matrices were computed at each level of dogmatism and for each equity treatment condition. No significant relationship was evident at any of the three levels or for any of the three equity conditions (see Table 14).

Insert Tables 13 and 14 about here

Table 11

Analysis of Variance Summary Table:

Perceived Reward

Source of Variance	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Dogmatism	3.394	2	1.697	1.849	.162
Equity	3.911	2	1.955	2.130	.124
Dogmatism x Equity	8.031	4	2.008	2.187	.075
Error	101.898	111	.918		
Totals	115.924	119	.974		

N = 120

Table 12

Cell Means and Standard Deviations:

Perceived Reward

Dogmatism Level	Equity	Inequity With Control of Inputs	Inequity With No Control of Inputs
High	4.381 (.865)	4.500 (1.243)	3.444 (1.014)
Medium	4.556 (.726)	4.154 (.987)	4.647 (.786)
Low	4.471 (1.068)	4.0 (0.0)	3.846 (1.214)

Note. Numbers in parentheses indicate standard deviation.

Table 13
 Pearson Correlation Coefficients
 for Total Sample

	Performance Quality	Performance Quantity	Affect	Fairness	Reward
Performance Quantity	-.0290				
Affect	-.0619	-.0114			
Fairness	0.1316	.0037	0.3750***		
Reward	-0.1324	-.0357	.0324	.1832*	
Dogmatism	-.0926	-.0330	-0.2450**	-0.2090*	.0225

Note. N = 120

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Table 14
 Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between Affect and
 Performance Under Varying Conditions of
 Equity and Dogmatism

Condition	Performance Quality	Performance Quantity
Equity (n = 47)	.0076	.0227
Inequity With Control (n = 34)	.0404	0.1942
Inequity With No Control (n = 39)	-.0861	0.1562
High Dogmatism (n = 42)	-0.1409	-0.1895
Medium Dogmatism (n = 39)	-.0023	0.1308
Low Dogmatism (n = 39)	-.0906	.0566
All (n = 120)	-.0619	-.0114

Note. $p > .2$ for all correlations

Discussion

The major purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between perceived fairness and subjects' affective responses and performance effectiveness. Specifically, it was hypothesized that subjects' perceptions of inequity would be inversely related to their affective responses. The data supported that contention.

Three equity conditions were created: equitably rewarded, inequitably rewarded via underpayment with control of inputs, and inequitably rewarded via underpayment with no control of inputs. It was hypothesized that subjects who were inequitably rewarded and could not control their inputs would have the lowest affect scores. In contrast, subjects who knew they were being inequitably rewarded prior to performance of the task (inequity with control condition) would compensate for their inequitable treatment by adjusting their inputs (i.e., lower their performance effectiveness). Consequently, at the end of their task performance session these subjects would not perceive the relationship as inequitable since they had already altered the transaction to restore equity. Thus, subjects in the inequity with control condition were expected to have significantly more positive affect than their inequity with no control treatment counterparts. In addition, these inequity with control subjects should be analogous to subjects in the equity condition, in regard to their affect scores. The data appear to support these hypotheses. Subjects in the inequity with control condition had significantly more positive affect than subjects in the inequity with no control condition. Furthermore, subjects in the equity condition did not

have significantly different scores than inequity with control subjects. Moreover, performance data revealed that subjects in the inequity with control condition performed the task with lower quality than subjects in either of the other two conditions. In sum, these data support the notion that inequity can be restored by reducing inputs to the transaction and that if equity cannot be restored negative affect will be manifested in underpaid subjects. These findings are consistent with previous research (e.g., Homans, 1961; Pritchard et al., 1972; Lawler & O'Gara, 1967; Walster et al., 1973).

A second purpose of the study was to determine the influence of subjects' dogmatism scores on perceptions of fairness, and on positive affect, under the three equity conditions. Overall, it was found that dogmatism was inversely related to positive affect scores, and to perceived fairness. These data are in line with previous research on the Protestant Ethic (Mirels & Garrett, 1971; MacDonald, 1972; Greenberg, 1977, 1978), with the high correlation between the Protestant Ethic and Dogmatism scales (Kerlinger & Rokeach, 1966), with the findings regarding operationism and perception (Garner et al., 1956), with Vroom's (1964) components of the exchange process, and with the concept of a "standard" or comparison "other" (e.g., Middlemist & Peterson, 1976; Carrell & Dittrich, 1978). Further, the relationship between perceived fairness (perceived equity) and affect tends to be stronger as dogmatism increases (although not significantly). This partially supports the moderating effect dogmatism has on the relationship between equity and affect and it suggests that the concept that dogmatism moderates

the ability to discriminate between levels of equity, as proposed by the author, is correct.

The third purpose of the study was to examine the influence of dogmatism scores on performance. It was hypothesized that high dogmatics (highly self-righteous) would perform differently than low dogmatics (low self-righteous individuals) either due to possible differences in feelings of commitment to the transaction (they had agreed to it), or due to differences in need to restore equity. Results indicated no differences in performance among high dogmatics, moderate dogmatics, or low dogmatics. Dogmatism and performance were virtually independent variables.

Because the raw data were already in hand, a post hoc analysis of the relationship between affect and performance was conducted. Results showed that individuals with low affect scores performed the same as individuals with high affect scores. Affect and performance were virtually independent variables. Taken in isolation, these data appear to contradict previous research (e.g., Mayo, 1933, 1945; Herzberg, 1966, 1968). However, when the definition of "employee satisfaction" is considered to include the equity or exchange process (of which affect is only a part), consistency with prior research is restored (cf. Vroom, 1964). That is, human relations and motivation-hygiene theories do not distinguish between equity-dependent relationships with affect and other variables that may influence motivation and performance.

A fourth objective of the study was to determine the relationship between dogmatism and perceived reward. It was hypothesized that high

dogmatics would have different perceptions of whether they were over-rewarded or underrewarded than low dogmatics. No differences in perception were observed. Two possibilities come to mind that might explain these results. The first is that the measuring instrument (one question rated on a 7-point Likert scale) was too insensitive. The second, more plausible explanation is that this was the last item in the experiment and that actual or psychological restoration of equity had already occurred, in which case performance or affect would have previously been adjusted to make the reward equitable. Possible serial position effects, in this regard, were not controlled.

Summary

Results of this study support previous findings in Social Exchange, Protestant Ethic, and Equity theories. Persons who expected inequity in a transaction reduced their performance in order to restore actual equity. They then manifested the same high affect as equitably treated persons. Persons who unexpectedly received inequitable outcomes in a transaction (therefore who were not able to reduce their performance to restore actual equity) attempted to restore psychological equity by reducing affect.

Dogmatism appears to fit very well with all of the cited theories as an index of the person's value system ("standard") which directly affects his perceptions of equity (or inequity). This contention is supported by the observation that the strength of the relationship between equity and affect tended to be related to subjects' levels of dogmatism although the differences were not statistically significant. The contribution to existing theory is the concept that dogmatism

seems to enhance perceptual discrimination of equity levels by adding rigidity to boundaries in a person's value system.

As expected, dogmatism inversely related to both perceived equity and affect. However, dogmatism and affect were each independent of performance. The single factor affecting performance was perceived equity. Dogmatism was also not related to perceptions of reward.

Recommendations for Future Research

Because the determination of equity is embedded in individual cognitive processes, research in this area should, whenever possible, use a feedback measurement technique that includes the individual's expressed perception of his equity treatment. This would reduce experimenter effects in assessing equity treatment conditions.

Antithetic perceptions of equity for a common transaction are the substance of most adversary situations between people. When such perceptions occur unintentionally, they indicate egregious levels of communications distortion. The research to solve this problem should center on what is available and necessary to change and converge value systems (i.e., all participants in a transaction need a common "standard" from which to determine equity). Since all other psychological change is usually intended toward a "norm," this is not a utopian objective.

References

- Adams, J. S. Toward an understanding of inequity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 422-436.
- Andrews, I. R. Wage inequity and job performance: An experimental study. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51, 39-45.
- Austin, W., & Walster, E. Reactions to confirmations and disconfirmations of expectancies of equity and inequity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 30, 208-216.
- Calder, B. J., Ross, M., & Insko, C. A. Attitude change and attitude attribution: Effects of incentive, choice, and consequences. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 84-99.
- Carrell, M. R., & Dittrich, J. E. Equity theory: The recent literature, methodological considerations, and new directions. Academy of Management Review, 1978, 3, 202-210.
- Collins, B. E., & Hoyt, M. F. Personal responsibility for consequences: An integration of the "forced compliance" literature. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1972, 8, 558-593.
- Festinger, L. A. A theory of cognitive dissonance. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.
- Folger, R., Rosenfield, D., & Hays, R. P. Equity and intrinsic motivation: The role of choice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, 36, 557-564.
- Garner, W. R., Hake, H. W., & Eriksen, C. W. Operationism and the concept of perception. The Psychological Review, 1956, 63, 149-159.

- Goodman, P. S. An examination of referents used in the evaluation of pay. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1974, 3, 340-352.
- Greenberg, J. The protestant work ethic and negative performance evaluations on a laboratory task. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1977, 62, 682-690.
- Greenberg, J. Protestant ethic endorsement and attitudes toward commuting to work among mass transit riders. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, 755-758.
- Herzberg, F. Work and the nature of man. Cleveland: World, 1966.
- Herzberg, F. One more time: How do you motivate employees? Harvard Business Review, 1968, 46, 53-62.
- Homans, G. C. Social behavior: Its elementary forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1961.
- Ilgen, D. R., & Gunn, J. D. Affective consequences of disconfirming performance expectations. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1976, 100, 245-255.
- Kerlinger, F., & Rokeach, M. The factorial nature of the F and D scales. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 391-399.
- Lane, I. M., & Messé, L. A. Distribution of insufficient, sufficient, and oversufficient rewards: A clarification of equity theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 14, 228-233.
- Lawler, E. E. III, & O'Gara, P. W. Effects of inequity produced by underpayment on work output, work quality, and attitudes toward the work. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51, 403-410.

- Lee, D. E., & Ehrlich, H. J. Beliefs about self and others: A test of the dogmatism theory. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28, 919-922.
- Linder, D. E., Cooper, J., & Jones, E. E. Decision freedom as a determinant of the role of incentive magnitude in attitude change. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 6, 245-254.
- Mayo, E. The human problems of an industrial civilization. New York: Macmillan, 1933.
- Mayo, E. The social problems of an industrial civilization. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1945.
- MacDonald, A. P. Jr. More on the protestant ethic. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1972, 39, 116-122.
- Messé, L. A., Dawson, J. E., & Lane, I. M. Equity as a mediator of the effect of reward level on behavior in the prisoner's dilemma game. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26, 60-65.
- Middlemist, R. D., & Peterson, R. B. Test of equity theory by controlling for comparison co-workers efforts. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1976, 15, 335-354.
- Mirels, H. L., & Garrett, J. B. The protestant ethic as a personality variable. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 36, 40-44.
- Nowlis, V., & Green, R. The experimental study of mood. Technical Report No. 3. Office of Naval Research: Contract No. Nonr-668 (12), 1957.

- Pritchard, R. D., Dunnette, M. D., & Jorgenson, D. O. Effects of perceptions of equity and inequity on worker performance and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 75-94.
- Radinsky, T. L. Equity and inequity as a source of reward and punishment. Psychonomic Science, 1969, 15, 293-295.
- Robinson, J. P., & Shaver, P. R. Measures of social psychological attitudes. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1973.
- Rokeach, M. Political and religious dogmatism: An alternative to the authoritarian personality. Psychological Monograph, 1956, 43, 70.
- Walster, E., Berscheid, E., & Walster, G. W. New directions in equity research. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 151-176.
- Walster, E., Walster, G. W., & Berscheid, E. Equity theory and research. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.
- Weick, K. E., & Nasset, B. Preferences among forms of equity. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1968, 3, 400-416.
- Wicker, A. A., & Bushweiler, G. Perceived fairness and pleasantness of social exchange situations: Two factorial studies of inequity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 15, 63-75.
- Vroom, V. H. Work and motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Zedeck, S., & Smith, P. E. A psychophysical determination of equitable payment: A methodological study. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52, 343-347.

APPENDIX A

ROKEACH'S DOGMATISM SCALE FORM D

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS TEST BOOKLET

S. A. Rosenkrantz 1

Experimental Questionnaire Number One

Instructions

A. Be sure that you enter your "participant number" in the space provided in the lower right hand corner of your answer sheet.

B. Do not confer with your neighbor. Read each statement carefully, then blacken one mark on your answer sheet. Be sure to use "-3" for "strongly disagree", and "+3" for "strongly agree". DO NOT CONFUSE THESE, OR YOUR PAPER WILL BE INVALIDATED.

C. When you are finished, please return the answer sheet and the questionnaire to the proctor.

1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.
2. Communism and Catholicism have nothing in common.
3. The principles I have come to believe in are quite different from those believed in by most people.
4. In a heated discussion people have a way of bringing up irrelevant issues rather than sticking to the main issue.
5. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.
6. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.
7. While the use of force is wrong by and large, it is sometimes the only way possible to advance a noble ideal.
8. Even though I have a lot of faith in the intelligence and wisdom of the common man I must say that the masses behave stupidly at times.

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS TEST BOOKLET

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS TEST BOOKLET
Questionnaire Number One 2

9. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.
10. There are certain "isms" that are really the same even though those who believe in these "isms" try to tell you they are different.
11. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.
12. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.
13. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.
14. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.
15. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.
16. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.
17. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.
18. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.
19. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what others are saying.
20. In a discussion I sometimes interrupt others too much in my eagerness to put across my own point of view.
21. It is better to be a dead hero than a live coward.
22. My hardest battles are with myself.
23. At times I think I am no good at all.
24. I am afraid of people who want to find out what I'm really like for fear they'll be disappointed in me.
25. 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.
26. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS TEST BOOKLET

Questionnaire Number One 3

27. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.
28. If I had to choose between happiness and greatness, I'd choose greatness.
29. It's all too true that people just won't practice what they preach.
30. Most people are failures and it is the system which is responsible for this.
31. I have often felt that strangers were looking at me critically.
32. It is only natural for a person to have a guilty conscience.
33. People say insulting and vulgar things about me.
34. I am sure I am being talked about.
35. In the history of mankind, there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.
36. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.
37. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.
38. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.
39. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is only one which is correct.
40. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.
41. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.
42. 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.
43. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.
44. To compromise with our opponents is to be guilty of appeasement

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS TEST BOOKLET

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS TEST BOOKLET

Questionnaire Number One 4

45. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.
46. 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.
47. A group which tolerates too many differences of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.
48. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.
49. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.
50. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.
51. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.
52. I sometimes have a tendency to be too critical of the ideas of others.
53. 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.
54. It is often desirable to reserve judgement about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.
55. 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.
56. There's no use wasting your money on newspapers which you know in advance are just plain propaganda.
57. Young people should not have too easy access to books which are likely to confuse them.
58. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.
59. It is by returning to our glorious and forgotten past that real social progress can be achieved.

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS TEST BOOKLET

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS TEST BOOKLET

Questionnaire Number One

5

60. To achieve the happiness of mankind in the future it is sometimes necessary to put up with injustices in the present.
61. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all".
62. Unfortunately a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.
63. Most people just don't know what's good for them.
64. There is nothing new under the sun.
65. To one who really takes the trouble to understand the world he lives in, it's an easy matter to predict future events.
66. It is sometimes necessary to resort to force to advance an ideal one strongly believes in.

PLEASE CHECK TO BE SURE THAT YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL QUESTIONS

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS TEST BOOKLET

Answer Sheet for Experimental Questionnaire Number One

STRONGLY AGREE							DO NOT AGREE						STRONGLY AGREE							DO NOT AGREE						STRONGLY AGREE							DO NOT AGREE																				
+3			+2			+1			-1			-2			-3			+3			+2			+1			-1			-2			-3			+3			+2			+1			-1			-2			-3		
1.	0	0	0	0	0	0	23.	0	0	0	0	0	0	45.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
2.	0	0	0	0	0	0	24.	0	0	0	0	0	0	46.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
3.	0	0	0	0	0	0	25.	0	0	0	0	0	0	47.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
4.	0	0	0	0	0	0	26.	0	0	0	0	0	0	48.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
5.	0	0	0	0	0	0	27.	0	0	0	0	0	0	49.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
6.	0	0	0	0	0	0	28.	0	0	0	0	0	0	50.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
7.	0	0	0	0	0	0	29.	0	0	0	0	0	0	51.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
8.	0	0	0	0	0	0	30.	0	0	0	0	0	0	52.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
9.	0	0	0	0	0	0	31.	0	0	0	0	0	0	53.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
10.	0	0	0	0	0	0	32.	0	0	0	0	0	0	54.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
11.	0	0	0	0	0	0	33.	0	0	0	0	0	0	55.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
12.	0	0	0	0	0	0	34.	0	0	0	0	0	0	56.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
13.	0	0	0	0	0	0	35.	0	0	0	0	0	0	57.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
14.	0	0	0	0	0	0	36.	0	0	0	0	0	0	58.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
15.	0	0	0	0	0	0	37.	0	0	0	0	0	0	59.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
16.	0	0	0	0	0	0	38.	0	0	0	0	0	0	60.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
17.	0	0	0	0	0	0	39.	0	0	0	0	0	0	61.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
18.	0	0	0	0	0	0	40.	0	0	0	0	0	0	62.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
19.	0	0	0	0	0	0	41.	0	0	0	0	0	0	63.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
20.	0	0	0	0	0	0	42.	0	0	0	0	0	0	64.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
21.	0	0	0	0	0	0	43.	0	0	0	0	0	0	65.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	
22.	0	0	0	0	0	0	44.	0	0	0	0	0	0	66.	0	0	0	0	0	0																																	

BE SURE THAT YOU HAVE BLACKENED YOUR ANSWER COMPLETELY AND THAT YOU HAVE ANSWERED EACH QUESTION.

Participant Number _____

APPENDIX B

MATERIALS GIVEN TO EQUITY GROUP

Participant Number _____

Answer Sheet for Experimental Task Package

1.	a	b	c	d	11.	a	b	c	d	21.	a	b	c	d
	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0	12.	0	0	0	0	22.	0	0	0	0
3.	0	0	0	0	13.	0	0	0	0	23.	0	0	0	0
4.	0	0	0	0	14.	0	0	0	0	24.	0	0	0	0
5.	0	0	0	0	15.	0	0	0	0	25.	0	0	0	0
6.	0	0	0	0	16.	0	0	0	0	26.	0	0	0	0
7.	0	0	0	0	17.	0	0	0	0	27.	0	0	0	0
8.	0	0	0	0	18.	0	0	0	0	28.	0	0	0	0
9.	0	0	0	0	19.	0	0	0	0	29.	0	0	0	0
10.	0	0	0	0	20.	0	0	0	0	30.	0	0	0	0

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS BOOKLET

EXPERIMENTAL TASK PACKAGE

DO NOT OPEN THIS BOOKLET UNTIL INSTRUCTED TO DO SO

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS TEST BOOKLET

S. A. Rosenkrantz

1

Experimental Task Package**Instructions**

- A. Be sure that you enter your "participant number in the "identification number" block on your answer sheet.
- B. Each news clipping contains the answers to the questions numbered at the top of the clipping. Blacken only one mark for each answer. DO NOT MARK OR WRITE ON THE NEWS CLIPPING. Use only the clipping to answer the question.

DC-10s

1. _____ people were killed in Chicago last year.
(a) 215 (b) 225 (c) 275 (d) 375
2. DC-10s must now have _____ computer(s) for wing slats.
(a) 1 (b) 2 (c) 3 (d) 0
3. An _____ must also be installed. (a) engine monitor
(b) slat connector (c) stick shaker (d) slat synchronizer
4. The _____ slats retracted, causing the plane to stall.
(a) right hydraulic (b) left rudder (c) right rudder
(d) left wing
5. Operators of DC-10s have _____ days to modify their aircraft. (a) 220 (b) 240 (c) 270 (d) 180

Outstate Programs

Identify the correct time for the programs/stations indicated.

6. WOI-TV Public P. (a) 10:30 (b) 3:00 (c) 7:30 (d) 1:00
7. KLOE-TV News (a) 10:00 (b) 9:30 (c) 6:00 (d) 5:30
8. KMEG-TV Lucy Show (a) 8:00 (b) 12:00 (c) 3:30 (d) 10:30
9. KOLN-TV Football (a) 9:00 (b) 12:00 (c) 3:30 (d) 2:00
10. KOMC-TV World War (a) 9:00 (b) 11:00 (c) 10:30 (d) 3:30
11. KWGN-TV Your Right (a) 10:00 (b) 8:30 (c) 9:00 (d) 11:00
12. KLOE-TV Feature (a) 8:00 (b) 8:30 (c) 12:00 (d) 10:00
13. KCNA-TV Focus (a) 9:00 (b) 10:30 (c) 5:30 (d) 6:30
14. KCAU-TV Feature (a) 6:30 (b) 11:30 (c) 12:30 (d) 10:30
15. KBTB News (a) 7:00 (b) 9:00 (c) 10:30 (d) 10:00

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS TEST BOOKLET

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS TEST BOOKLET
Experimental Task Package 2

Public Auction

16. The farm is located _____ and _____ from junction of Hwys 6 and 14. (a) 6½ mi. s., 1½ mi. w. (b) 9 mi. n., 1½ mi. w. (c) 6 mi. e., 3 mi. s. (d) ½ mi. e., 3 mi. s.
17. The farm is located _____ and _____ from Giltner. (a) 6½ mi. s., 1½ mi. w. (b) 9 mi. n., 1½ mi. w. (c) 6mi. e., 3 mi. s., ½ mi. e. (d) 6 mi. e., 3 mi. s.
18. The auction is scheduled for _____. (a) Jan. 29, 1980, 12:00 am (b) Jan. 29, 1980, 1:00 pm (c) Jan. 19, 1980, 1:00 am (d) Jan 19, 1980, 12:00 pm
19. _____ tractors are for sale. (a) 5 (b) 6 (c) 7 (d) 4
20. The oldest tractor is a _____ model. (a) 1968 (b) 2300 hour (c) 1959 (d) 1941
21. The _____ model has a cab and radio. (a) 1968 (b) 1976 (c) 1966 (d) 1963
22. The 4 row rolling cultivator is a _____ model. (a) 14' (b) 12' (c) 1974 (d) not listed
23. _____ plow(s) is(are) for sale. (a) 2 (b) 3 (c) 4 (d) 5
24. _____ trailer(s) is(are) for sale. (a) less than 3 (b) more than 4 (c) 4 (d) 3.
25. _____ truck(s) is(are) for sale. (a) 1 (b) 2 (c) 3 (d) 4
26. The Anderson-Miller Tow Line consists of _____ lengths of 40 foot pipe. (a) 42 (b) 32 (c) 10 (d) don't know
27. _____ pipe trailer(s) is(are) for sale. (a) 2. (b) 3 (c) 4 (d) don't know
28. A _____ gallon fuel tank is for sale. (a) 2000 (b) 800 (c) 1500 (d) 600
29. The platform scale is a(n) _____ model. (a) 1973 (b) 1963 (c) 1959 (d) antique
30. The portable loading chute consists of _____ portable corral panels. (a) 23 (b) 14 (c) 16 (d) 18

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS BOOKLET

EXPERIMENTAL TASK PACKAGE

DO NOT OPEN THIS BOOKLET UNTIL INSTRUCTED TO DO SO

Questions 1-5

FAA Orders Safety Steps For DC-10s

Washington (AP) - The Federal Aviation Administration Saturday ordered that airlines operating DC-10 jetliners make changes intended to prevent the type of crash that killed 275 people in Chicago last year.

The Chicago crash, the nation's worst air tragedy involving a single aircraft, was blamed in part on the pilot's lack of information about his craft, and the FAA order would require backup systems to monitor aircraft equipment.

The order mandates that DC-10s have two independently powered computers to keep track of wing slats. It also calls for installation of a "stick shaker" at both the pilot's and co-pilot's positions.

This device literally shakes the control stick of the aircraft to warn if the plane is in a stall.

The FAA noted in its order that in the Chicago crash of an American Airlines jet last May 25, "the left engine tore away from the aircraft . . . rupturing hydraulic lines that controlled the leading edge slats on the left wing, cutting off both power and sensing information to the single computer that was monitoring the status of the slats."

The changes required by the order were recommended in the report on the Chicago crash by the National Transportation Safety Board, the FAA noted.

In its report on the Chicago crash, the transportation board said that if the pilot had information about the wing slats, he could have pulled the aircraft up despite the loss of the left engine.

The FAA's order describes its requirement as "increased redundancy in the stall warning system" of the DC-10.

The safety board's report said that because the slats on the left wing of the DC-10 had retracted, the plane went into a stall, rolled to the left and went into an uncontrolled dive.

The slats are flaps at the front of the wing which can be used to give the aircraft extra lift at takeoff. In the case of the Chicago crash, the slats on the left wing retracted - while those on the right wing did not - and the pilot was not aware of the condition.

The FAA said operators of DC-10s would have 240 days to comply with the order.

S. A. Rosenkrantz

Experimental Task Package Ref 1

Questions 6-15

Outstate Programs

For highlights, see Omaha-Lincoln Programs

Table listing TV programs for various stations including Ames, Des Moines, Keosauqua, and others, with columns for time and program name.

Experimental Task Package Ref 2

DO NOT WRITE OR MARK ON THIS TEST BOOKLET

Questions 16-30

PUBLIC AUCTION
Sat. Jan. 19, 1980 12 Noon
STORM DATE: One week later
Jan. 26, 1980

Having sold our farm will sell on farm located from Aurora I-80 Interchange 6 1/2 mi. south and 1 1/2 west of from Junction of Hwy. 6 and 14, 9 mi. north and 1 1/2 west of from Giltner 6 mi. east, 3 south, 1/2 east starting at 12:00 pm. The following items at Public Auction:

Complete line of farm machinery--most all been shedded and in top condition.

TRACTORS: 1968 170 AC Gas Tractor, WF, 3 pt., dual hyd, 2300 hrs. (1325 hrs. since motor OH); 1959 "630" JD Gas Tractor, roll-o-matic, 3 pt., new rear tires & tubes, good paint. (130 hrs. since ring job), 1949 "A" JD Gas Tractor, roll-o-matic, Behlen ps., cast wheels, 1966 190X AC dsl w/turbo, cab, radio, dual hyd., WF, 3 pt., 1941 "B" JD Fuel Burner Tractor, power lift, 6 sp., good tires & paint, 1941 "B" JD Tractor, 6 sp., power lift, power shott OK (As is).

MACHINERY: 14" JD RWA Tandem Disc w/sealed bearings, Harrow attached for above disc; 1974 Lillist 4 Row Rolling Cult. w/double bar, go. wheels, ripper shields; JD 4 Row G-dia. 3 pt.; F-10 Farm Hand Loader w/7' manure bucket & w/gravel plate, forage tank; 12' sweep JD mountings Servis; 7 ft. Heavy Duty Spreader, Hyd. equipped for mowing hay; 4 Row JD Lister, 3 pt. w/herb. kill; 18 x7 JD End Wheel Grain Drill w/seed-er attach. & hyd. (extra good); IHC 4-16 Plow Hyd. Lift; JD 3-16 Plow Hyd. Lift; 4 Sect. Harrow & 2 Sect. Harrow; 3 Row Hiler; 7-3 pt. Oliver Mower; Blair 2 Wheel PTO, Manure Spreader 4 x7' (real good); 9' Chisel, 3 pt.; Sp. King 52' Auger PTO; 4 Row Crustbuster, 3 pt.; Eze-Flow Spreader; 8' 3 pt. Rear Tractor Blade; 16' Springtooth w/2 Wheel Carrier & Hyd.; JD 12' Spring Tooth.

TRAILERS: 4 Wheel Trailer w/barge box on elec. gear w/11 tires & hoist; 4 Wheel Trailer w/barge box & hoist; 15 ft. 2 Wheel Impl. Trailer w/7' 00x20 tires.

TRUCKS: 1974 Ford Truck F-700, Heavy Duty, 5 sp. & 2 sp., 138 in. cab, axle, 7,000 lb. front axle, 17,500 lb. rear axle, spoke wheels, 361 cu. in. HD motor, double frame hitch, radio, red w/white top, 9' 00x20 rubber, Schwartz 20 T dual hoist, 18 ft. steel comb. box, 15,000 gal. ml.; 1975 Ford Heavy Duty 1/2 T 360 PU burns reg., auto, ps, power disc brakes, radials, radio, sliding rear window, box rails, bumper, blue & white, 57,000 gal. ml.; (Both above units bought new by owner); 1 Weather Pro-tex Tractor Box Cover, Fits up to 22' box.

IRR. EQUIP: 1977 Tri-matic Self Move Sprinkler System, elec. start, 1/8 mi. long, used 2 yrs on 70 acres of corn; Anderson-Miller Tow Line consisting of 32 lengths 4" 40' pipe & 10 lengths 5" 40' pipe w/4' risers; 2 Wheel Pipe Trailer; 4 Wheel Pipe Trailer; AC "G-226" 4 Cyl. Prop. Irr. motor on cart w/starter, 3 yrs. since motor OH, Spare mag for above motor; Fairbanks-Morse High Pressure Booster Pump, 6" in. 8" out., mounts on any 2 cyl. tractor; 107 lengths 40" Gated 8" Irr. Pipe w/EPD Gates; 40 lengths 40" Gated 8" Irr. Pipe w/Tex-flow Gates; 4 lengths 8" Gated Pipe 20' lengths; 5 lengths 8" Gated Pipe 10' lengths; 15 lengths 8" Staggered Gates 30' lengths Pipe; 42 lengths 6" High Pressure Plain Pipe w/locks; 30' lengths; 14 lengths 8" Plain Pipe; Many 8" 40 degree & 90 degree Elbows; Elbow w/2 way shut-off.

MISC: AC, 500 lb. Pressure washer; Wheelers 1/2 HP Air Compressor; 3 1/2 HP Rolo Tiller; 800 Gal. Fuel Tank; 2 Elec. Fence Chargers; Wheelers 8' Slide-in PU Stock Rack w/cover; Near New Wheelers 9' 3 pt. Post Hole Digger; Sno-Co Grain Cleaner; PU Tow Bar & Tractor Tow Bar; Super Snout for 630 Tractor; Pull Type Weed Sprayer; 12x38 Used Rear Tractor Tire; 2 Gandy Insec. Boxes; 4 Rolls Snow Fencing; 12x38 Tractor Tire Chains; 4' x12' Auger w/ 1/2 HP motor; 2 JD Hyd. Cyl. w/ hoses; 6 Burn Bbls.; 5 Gal. & 10 Gal. Prop. Bottles; 4 Old Cream Separators; Antique Platform Scale; 2 Ford PU Axles; 2 Plymouth Car Axles; 12 RR Ties; 10 Poles up to 35 ft. long; Used 14"-15"-16" Tires; 60 steel Fence Posts; 80 Wooden Fence Posts; Barbed wire; Many Elec. Fence Posts & Wire; Omaha Standard Cattle End Gate; Old Machinery For Iron.

LS. EQUIP: Near New Part Loading Chute w/14 Part, Corral Panels made by Stockham Fert.; Cattle Waterer; 2 Wheelers Mineral Feeders; 5' stock Tank; Wooden Feed Bunk; Steel Feed Bunk; Several Gates & Panels.

CATTLE: 25 Head Hereford & Angus, cows, good age, pasture bred to Sim. Bull to start giving April 1.

TERMS OF SALE: Cash. No property to be removed until settled for. All property at bidders risk after bid in. Not responsible for accidents.

The following items belonging to Kenneth Mihm will be sold following above items: IHC 70"; 4 Row G-dia w/Orthman Trip Saver; JD 4 Row 803 Min. Tillage Lister w/Noble Fiberglass Insec. Boxes, auto. markers; 7' x12' JD Barge Box on 953 JD Gear w/hoist; 2 23-B JD Surface Planting Units w/insect. boxes & fert. tanks; 2 "25" JD Surface Planting Units w/insect. boxes & fert. tanks; (All the above times are in A-1 cond. & always shedded).

DO NOT WRITE OR MARK ON THIS TEST BOOKLET

Participant Number _____

Answer Sheet for Experimental Task Package

1.	a	b	c	d	11.	a	b	c	d	21.	a	b	c	d
	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0	12.	0	0	0	0	22.	0	0	0	0
3.	0	0	0	0	13.	0	0	0	0	23.	0	0	0	0
4.	0	0	0	0	14.	0	0	0	0	24.	0	0	0	0
5.	0	0	0	0	15.	0	0	0	0	25.	0	0	0	0
6.	0	0	0	0	16.	0	0	0	0	26.	0	0	0	0
7.	0	0	0	0	17.	0	0	0	0	27.	0	0	0	0
8.	0	0	0	0	18.	0	0	0	0	28.	0	0	0	0
9.	0	0	0	0	19.	0	0	0	0	29.	0	0	0	0
10.	0	0	0	0	20.	0	0	0	0	30.	0	0	0	0

APPENDIX C

EXCEPTIONAL MATERIALS PROVIDED TO INEQUITY

WITH ABILITY TO CONTROL INPUTS GROUP

Participant Number _____

Answer Sheet for Experimental Task Package

First Person (10 Questions)					Second Person (10 Questions)					Third Person (10 Questions)				
	a	b	c	d		a	b	c	d		a	b	c	d
1.	0	0	0	0	11.	0	0	0	0	21.	0	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0	12.	0	0	0	0	22.	0	0	0	0
3.	0	0	0	0	13.	0	0	0	0	23.	0	0	0	0
4.	0	0	0	0	14.	0	0	0	0	24.	0	0	0	0
5.	0	0	0	0	15.	0	0	0	0	25.	0	0	0	0
6.	0	0	0	0	16.	0	0	0	0	26.	0	0	0	0
7.	0	0	0	0	17.	0	0	0	0	27.	0	0	0	0
8.	0	0	0	0	18.	0	0	0	0	28.	0	0	0	0
9.	0	0	0	0	19.	0	0	0	0	29.	0	0	0	0
10.	0	0	0	0	20.	0	0	0	0	30.	0	0	0	0

THREE CLIPPING TASK PACKAGE

THIS TASK PACKAGE IS FOR THREE-PERSON GROUPS

STANDARD WORK LOAD IS ONE PART PER PERSON

DO NOT OPEN THIS BOOKLET UNTIL INSTRUCTED TO DO SO

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS TEST BOOKLET

S. A. Rosenkrantz

1

Experimental Task Package**Instructions**

- A. Be sure that you enter your "participant number in the "identification number" block on your answer sheet.
- B. Each news clipping contains the answers to the questions numbered at the top of the clipping. Blacken only one mark for each answer. DO NOT MARK OR WRITE ON THE NEWS CLIPPING. Use only the clipping to answer the question.

DC-10s

1. _____ people were killed in Chicago last year.
(a) 215 (b) 225 (c) 275 (d) 375
2. DC-10s must now have _____ computer(s) for wing slats.
(a) 1 (b) 2 (c) 3 (d) 0
3. _____ must also be installed. (a) engine monitor
(b) slat connector (c) stick shaker (d) slat synchronizer
4. The _____ slats retracted, causing the plane to stall.
(a) right hydraulic (b) left rudder (c) right rudder
(d) left wing
5. Operators of DC-10s have _____ days to modify their aircraft. (a) 220 (b) 240 (c) 270 (d) 180

Outstate Programs

Identify the correct time for the programs/stations indicated.

6. WOI-TV Public P. (a) 10:30 (b) 3:00 (c) 7:30 (d) 1:00
7. KLOE-TV News (a) 10:00 (b) 9:30 (c) 6:00 (d) 5:30
8. KMEG-TV Lucy Show (a) 8:00 (b) 12:00 (c) 3:30 (d) 10:30
9. KOLN-TV Football (a) 9:00 (b) 12:00 (c) 3:30 (d) 2:00
10. KOMC-TV World War (a) 9:00 (b) 11:00 (c) 10:30 (d) 3:30
11. KWGN-TV Your Right (a) 10:00 (b) 8:30 (c) 9:00 (d) 11:00
12. KLOE-TV Feature (a) 8:00 (b) 8:30 (c) 12:00 (d) 10:00
13. KCNA-TV Focus (a) 9:00 (b) 10:30 (c) 5:30 (d) 6:30
14. KCAU-TV Feature (a) 6:30 (b) 11:30 (c) 12:30 (d) 10:30
15. KBTB News (a) 7:00 (b) 9:00 (c) 10:30 (d) 10:00

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS TEST BOOKLET

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS TEST BOOKLET
Experimental Task Package 2

Public Auction

16. The farm is located _____ and _____ from junction of Hwys 6 and 14. (a) $6\frac{1}{2}$ mi. s., $1\frac{1}{2}$ mi. w. (b) 9 mi. n., $1\frac{1}{2}$ mi. w. (c) 6 mi. e., 3 mi. s. (d) $\frac{1}{2}$ mi. e., 3 mi. s.
17. The farm is located _____ and _____ from Giltner. (a) $6\frac{1}{2}$ mi. s., $1\frac{1}{2}$ mi. w. (b) 9 mi. n., $1\frac{1}{2}$ mi. w. (c) 6 mi. e., 3 mi. s., $\frac{1}{2}$ mi. e. (d) 6 mi. e., 3 mi. s.
18. The auction is scheduled for _____. (a) Jan. 29, 1980, 12:00 am (b) Jan 29, 1980, 1:00 pm (c) Jan. 19, 1980, 1:00 am (d) Jan 19, 1980, 12:00 pm
19. _____ tractors are for sale. (a) 5 (b) 6 (c) 7 (d) 4
20. The oldest tractor is a _____ model. (a) 1968 (b) 2300 hour (c) 1959 (d) 1941
21. The _____ model has a cab and radio. (a) 1968 (b) 1976 (c) 1966 (d) 1963
22. The 4 row rolling cultivator is a _____ model. (a) 14' (b) 12' (c) 1974 (d) not listed
23. _____ plow(s) is(are) for sale. (a) 2 (b) 3 (c) 4 (d) 5
24. _____ trailer(s) is(are) for sale. (a) less than 3 (b) more than 4 (c) 4 (d) 3.
25. _____ truck(s) is(are) for sale. (a) 1 (b) 2 (c) 3 (d) 4
26. The Anderson-Miller Tow Line consists of _____ lengths of 40 foot pipe. (a) 42 (b) 32 (c) 10 (d) don't know
27. _____ pipe trailer(s) is(are) for sale. (a) 2 (b) 3 (c) 4 (d) don't know
28. A _____ gallon fuel tank is for sale. (a) 2000 (b) 800 (c) 1500 (d) 600
29. The platform scale is a(n) _____ model. (a) 1973 (b) 1963 (c) 1959 (d) antique
30. The portable loading chute consists of _____ portable corral panels. (a) 23 (b) 14 (c) 16 (d) 18

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS TEST BOOKLET

APPENDIX D

EXCEPTIONAL MATERIALS PROVIDED TO INEQUITY

WITH NO ABILITY TO CONTROL INPUTS GROUP

THREE CLIPPING TASK PACKAGE

THIS TASK PACKAGE IS FOR THREE-PERSON GROUPS

STANDARD WORK LOAD IS ONE PART PER PERSON

DO NOT OPEN THIS BOOKLET UNTIL INSTRUCTED TO DO SO

Participant Number _____

Answer Sheet for Experimental Task Package

First Person
(10 Questions)

	a	b	c	d
1.	0	0	0	0
2.	0	0	0	0
3.	0	0	0	0
4.	0	0	0	0
5.	0	0	0	0
6.	0	0	0	0
7.	0	0	0	0
8.	0	0	0	0
9.	0	0	0	0
10.	0	0	0	0

Second Person
(10 Questions)

	a	b	c	d
11.	0	0	0	0
12.	0	0	0	0
13.	0	0	0	0
14.	0	0	0	0
15.	0	0	0	0
16.	0	0	0	0
17.	0	0	0	0
18.	0	0	0	0
19.	0	0	0	0
20.	0	0	0	0

Third Person
(10 Questions)

	a	b	c	d
21.	0	0	0	0
22.	0	0	0	0
23.	0	0	0	0
24.	0	0	0	0
25.	0	0	0	0
26.	0	0	0	0
27.	0	0	0	0
28.	0	0	0	0
29.	0	0	0	0
30.	0	0	0	0

Participant Number _____

Below is a list of words that describe people's moods and feelings. Indicate how much each word describes the way you feel at this moment by blackening the appropriate space before each word.

1 = Not At All 2 = A Little 3 = Somewhat 4 = Very Much

1	2	3	4		1	2	3	4	
0	0	0	0	Pleased	0	0	0	0	Friendly
0	0	0	0	Happy	0	0	0	0	Alert
0	0	0	0	Lively	0	0	0	0	Angry
0	0	0	0	Trustful	0	0	0	0	Vulnerable
0	0	0	0	Downhearted	0	0	0	0	Forgiving
0	0	0	0	Shocked	0	0	0	0	Cooperative
0	0	0	0	Vigorous	0	0	0	0	Annoyed
0	0	0	0	Sad	0	0	0	0	Upset
0	0	0	0	Guilty	0	0	0	0	Satisfied
0	0	0	0	Startled	0	0	0	0	Joyous
0	0	0	0	Elated	0	0	0	0	Frustrated
0	0	0	0	Fed-up	0	0	0	0	Blue
0	0	0	0	Helpless	0	0	0	0	Hostile
0	0	0	0	Energetic	0	0	0	0	Irritated
0	0	0	0	Active	0	0	0	0	Kindly

APPENDIX E
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

You are invited to participate in a study of differences between people in their desire to seek information. We hope to learn what kinds of factors relate to that desire.

If you decide to participate, you will receive a group of four questionnaires. Three of them ask for your opinions. One of them is a research exercise. These will be completed in a single two hour session.

Your answer sheets will be numbered to assure you anonymity when they are analyzed. If you give us your permission, by signing this document, we plan to disclose the results, without identifying individuals, to various professional journals.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your future relations with the University of Nebraska. If you decide to participate, you are free to discontinue participation at any time without prejudice.

Full details of the study will be given to you when you have completed the two hour session. Results of the study will be available when the analysis is completed. If you have any questions, Mr. S. Alan Rosenkrantz (c/o Department of Psychology, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, Nebraska 68182. Tel 554-2592) will be happy to answer them.

You will be given a copy of this form to keep.

**YOU ARE MAKING A DECISION WHETHER OR NOT TO PARTICIPATE.
YOUR SIGNATURE INDICATES YOU HAVE DECIDED TO PARTICIPATE
HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE.**

Date

Signature

Witness

Investigator

APPENDIX F
DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS ACROSS LEVELS OF DOGMATISM
AND EQUITY TREATMENT CONDITIONS

Distribution of Subjects Across Levels of Dogmatism
and Equity Treatment Conditions

N = 120

Dogmatism Level	Equity (n = 47)	Inequity With Control of Inputs (n = 34)	Inequity With No Control of Inputs (n = 39)
High (n = 39)	21	12	9
Med (n = 39)	9	13	17
Low (n = 42)	17	9	13

APPENDIX G
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
TOTAL POPULATION

Means and Standard Deviations

Total Population

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Dogmatism	250.200	38.522
Performance Quality	0.822	0.107
Performance Quantity	27.758	2.864
Affect	16.467	12.787
Fairness	5.483	1.582
Reward	4.275	0.987

N = 120