

Pittsburg State University

Pittsburg State University Digital Commons

Electronic Theses & Dissertations

2-1977

Rokeach's Two-Attitude Theory of Behavior: An Evaluation and Empirical Test

Wayne A. White
Kansas State College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pittstate.edu/etd>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

White, Wayne A., "Rokeach's Two-Attitude Theory of Behavior: An Evaluation and Empirical Test" (1977).
Electronic Theses & Dissertations. 45.
<https://digitalcommons.pittstate.edu/etd/45>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Pittsburg State University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Pittsburg State University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@pittstate.edu.

ROKEACH'S TWO-ATTITUDE THEORY OF BEHAVIOR:

AN EVALUATION AND EMPIRICAL TEST

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Division in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Science

by

Wayne A. White

LIBRARY
SEP 2 '77

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE OF PITTSBURG

Pittsburg, Kansas

February, 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Introduction to the Problem	1
	Need for the Study	3
	Statement of the Problem	3
	Delimitations of the Study	4
	Limitations and Explanation of Approach	4
II.	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW	6
	Attitude as a Precursor of Behavior	6
	Survey of Research on the Attitude-Behavior- Relationship	10
	Further Research: A Reconceptualization of the Problem	15
	Rokeach's Conceptualization and Research Strategy	23
III.	METHODOLOGY	33
	Statement of Hypotheses	34
	Data Collection Procedure	35
	Method of Data Analysis	40
IV.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS	45
	Assessment of the Hypotheses	48
	Modifications	51
	The Concept of Attitude-Toward-Situation . .	52
V.	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	55
	Summary	55
	Summary of the Results	58
	Recommendations	60
	APPENDIX A Questionnaire Instructions and Questionnaire . .	63
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	72

ABSTRACT

When social scientists first became interested in the concept of attitude it was assumed that attitudes were related to human social behavior. Most early definitions of the attitude concept reflected an assumption that attitudes are a precursor of behavior. This assumption was brought into question during the 1930's by research findings that indicated a lack of correspondence between attitudes and behavior. Numerous research strategies developed since that time have generally failed to produce strong support for the assumed relationship between attitudes and behavior.

In an attempt to overcome the generally weak results produced by attitude-behavior research, Milton Rokeach has developed a two-attitude theory of behavior. In a study utilizing his conceptualization and accompanying research strategy, Rokeach produced results indicating a stronger relationship between attitudes and behavior than has been reported previously.

The present study was designed in part to provide an empirical re-test of the propositions generated by Rokeach's approach. The basic propositions were: that behavior can be more accurately predicted than has generally been the case by utilizing attitude-toward-situation in addition to attitude-toward-object; and that when the two kinds of attitude are weighted for relative importance their predictive power will increase. The present study also provided a detailed discussion and evaluation of Rokeach's two-attitude theory

and related issues. Special attention was directed at an examination of the concept attitude-toward-situation.

The empirical re-test of Rokeach's theory and research approach was carried out by replicating the methods previously employed by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972). The four hypotheses developed for the original research were retained and tested. An additional hypothesis directed at exposing any difference in results due to different measurement techniques was also tested.

The data needed to test the hypotheses were obtained by a questionnaire administered under group conditions and from class attendance records kept for the courses in which the subjects were currently enrolled. The questionnaire was administered to 87 students enrolled in sociology and anthropology courses during the 1975 summer session at Kansas State College of Pittsburg.

The data obtained were coded, transferred to 80 column IBM data cards, and read into an IBM/360 computer. Using a Fortran IV language program, the computer provided product moment correlations between the attitude and behavior variables.

The correlations obtained made an assessment of the hypotheses possible. The findings generally supported Rokeach's proposition that behavior can be more accurately predicted than has generally been the case by utilizing attitude-toward-situation in addition to attitude-toward-object. The proposition that when the two kinds of attitude are weighted for relative importance their predictive power will increase, was not supported by the findings.

The attitude-toward-situation variable showed a stronger relationship to behavior than did the attitude-toward-object variable. This finding was important in that attitude-behavior research has typically concentrated upon attitudes toward an object and has failed to consider attitudes toward the situations in which objects are encountered.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Intercorrelations and Multiple Correlations Between Attitudes and Behavior	45
II. Intercorrelations and Multiple Correlations Between Attitudes and Behavior (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972)46	
III. Comparison of Correlations Between Behavior and the Two Types of Attitude	53

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Problem

The popularity and perceived importance of the attitude concept, among sociologists and social psychologists, is evidenced by the voluminous literature on the subject (McGuire, 1966). The earliest sociological work to systematically utilize the concept of attitude was that of Thomas and Znaniecki (1918). At that early date Thomas and Znaniecki identified attitudes as the subject "par excellence" of social psychology. Gordon Allport (1954:45) considered the attitude concept to be "the primary building stone in the edifice of social psychology."

An important reason for the continued interest in the attitude concept in recent years is the assumption that attitudes have something to do with human social behavior. The most common element of the many and varied definitions of attitude is that they are a state of readiness or a precursor of action (McGuire, 1966; Allport, 1935). It is this assumption, that attitudes are a precursor of behavior, that led to the present study and to the study of the relationship between attitudes and behavior generally.

Despite the central position of the attitude concept in social psychology and the vast amount of research dealing with the attitude-behavior relationship, many varying conceptualizations of the nature of the relationship, although it may seem evident, is relatively new to attitude-behavior research (Iska, 1974).

of attitudes and their relation to behavior exist (Allport, 1954; McGuire, 1969; Rokeach, 1968a). Many studies have found little correspondence between expressed attitudes and overt behavior. LaPiere's (1934) findings were a commonly cited example of attitude-behavior discrepancy. Influential research reporting a weak relationship between attitudes and behavior includes that of Kutner, Wilkens and Yarrow (1952), DeFleur and Westie (1958), Linn (1965), Vroom (1964), and others.

The common failure to find an empirically demonstrable relationship between attitudes and behavior has resulted in varying reactions. Doob (1947) and Blumer (1955) have suggested the abandonment of attitude as a scientific concept. The attempt to strengthen weak findings through the use of non-attitudinal variables seen as intervening in the attitude-behavior relationship has become common (Wicker, 1971; Liska, 1974).

In the interest of maintaining attitude as a scientific concept and clarifying its relationship to behavior, Milton Rokeach (1968a, 1968b, 1972) has developed a two-attitude theory of behavior. Rokeach's conceptualization advocates a distinction between attitude-toward-object and attitude-toward-situation. Rokeach asserts that (1972;194):

When these two kinds of attitudes are taken into account, an individual's behavior should be predicted to an extent that is considerably better than is generally believed to be the case by social psychologists.

The idea that more than one attitude may be relevant to any particular behavior, although it may seem evident, is relatively new to attitude-behavior research (Liska, 1974).

Need for the Study

A literature search revealed only research done by Rokeach himself (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972), which directly tested the two-attitude theory of behavior. Theoretical conceptualizations of the nature of attitudes and research dealing with the attitude-behavior relationship have dealt almost exclusively with attitudes toward an object (Rokeach 1968b). Since objects are always encountered in a concrete situation, Rokeach identifies the need to consider attitudes toward the situation as well as toward the object.

Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) found attitude-toward-situation to be a better predictor of behavior than attitude-toward-object, and the two attitudes together to be better than either one independently. In a study aimed at the same general issue, Weinstein (1972) reported similar findings. Since the extent to which behavior is predicted by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) is considerably better than that generally reported in other literature, the predictive power of the theory needs to be independently tested.

Statement of the Problem

The present study was a modified replication of previous research (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972) designed as a test of Rokeach's two-attitude theory of behavior. The predictive power of attitude-toward-situation, attitude-toward-object, the two types of attitudes combined, and the two attitudes combined and weighted for relative importance was tested.

In addition to empirically testing the propositions generated by Rokeach's theory, a detailed discussion of the theory itself was presented. Special emphasis was placed upon examining the concept "attitude-toward-situation" and how it differs from other theoretical considerations of situational influences upon the attitude-behavior relationship.

Delimitations of the Study

The individuals selected as subjects were students enrolled in sociology courses during the 1975 summer session at Kansas State College of Pittsburg. The data were obtained primarily in upper and intermediate level sociology courses, with the exception of one introductory anthropology course. Higher level courses were selected due to the greater likelihood of finding more students who had completed previous sociology courses. Such students were needed in order to obtain relevant self-report data.

Data were collected in five courses with 87 students present. The subjects were selected because of their availability in classes offered during the summer session.

Limitations and Explanation of Approach

As indicated in previous sections of this chapter, the present study was designed as an independent examination of the theoretical propositions generated by Rokeach's two-attitude theory. The examination of the propositions included an empirical test of their predictive power, but no attempt to generalize the findings to apply to any particular group was made.

Since an understanding of the theory and research derived from it is best attained in the context of a complex body of attitude theory and research, specific definitions of terms and hypotheses have been deferred to a later section. Rokeach's conceptualization of the nature of attitudes and his research strategy for examining the relationship between attitudes and behavior have been presented in Chapter Two. The chapter begins with a discussion of the way in which the attitude concept was viewed when it became a major concept in sociology and social psychology. A survey of previous research and recent theoretical and research issues places Rokeach's perspective in context.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Attitude as a Precursor of Behavior

As stated earlier, the first sociological work to give systematic priority to the attitude concept was that of Thomas and Znaniecki in 1918. Prior to their classic study of Polish peasants the concept had received little attention in sociological literature.

Thomas and Znaniecki defined attitude as a "state of mind of the individual toward a value", by using the concept "value" they were referring to social values defined as "any datum having an empirical content accessible to the members of some social group and a meaning with regard to which it is or may be an object of activity" (Thomas and Znaniecki; 1918:21)

The inclusion of the concepts "social values" and "social group" in the Thomas and Znaniecki definition is an indication of its specific application in their study of Polish peasants. Other key portions of the definition, however, contain a basic point common to most subsequent conceptualizations: attitude is an individual state of mind which is related to actual or potential activity.

In an attempt to illustrate the basic point that the essential feature of attitude definitions is that attitudes are a "preparation or readiness for response", Gordon Allport compiled the following list of representative definitions: (Allport, 1935: 804, 805)

An attitude is readiness for attention or action of a definite sort. (Baldwin, 1901-05)

Attitudes are literally mental postures, guides for conduct to which each new experience is referred before a response is made. (Morgan, 1934, p. 47)

Attitude = the specific mental disposition toward an incoming (or arising) experience, whereby that experience is modified, or, a condition of readiness for a certain type of activity. (Dictionary of Psychology, Warren, 1934)

An attitude is a complex of feelings, desires, fears, convictions, prejudices or other tendencies that have given a set or readiness to act to a person because of varied experiences. (Chave, 1928)

..... a more or less permanently enduring state of readiness of mental organization which predisposes an individual to react in a characteristic way to any object or situation with which it is related. (Cantril, 1934)

From the point of view of Gestalt psychology a change of attitude involves a definite physiological stress excited upon a sensory field of processes originating in other parts of the nervous system. (Kohler, 1929, p. 184)

An attitude is a tendency to act toward or against something in the environment which becomes thereby a positive or negative value. (Bogardus, 1931, p. 62)

By attitude we understand a process of individual consciousness which determines real or possible activity of the individual counterpart of the social value; activity, in whatever form, is the bond between them. (Thomas and Znaniecki, 1918, p. 27)

The attitude, or preparation in advance of the actual response, constitutes an important determinant of the ensuing social behavior. Such neural settings, with their accompanying consciousness, are numerous and significant in social life. (F.H. Allport, 1924, p. 320)

An attitude is a mental disposition of the human individual to act for or against a definite object. (Droba, 1933)

An attitude denotes the general set of the organism as a whole toward an object or situation which calls for adjustment. (Lundberg, 1929)

Attitudes are modes of emotional regard for objects, and motor "sets" or slight, tentative reactions toward them. (Ewer, 1921, p 136)

An attitude, roughly, is a residuum of experience, by which further activity is conditioned and controlled We may think of attitudes as acquired tendencies to act in specific ways toward objects. (Krueger and Reckless, 1931, p. 238)

When a certain type of experience is constantly repeated, a change of set is brought about which affects many central neurons and tends to spread over other parts of the central nervous system. These changes in the general set of the central nervous system temper the process of reception..... In terms of the subjective mental life these general sets are called attitudes. (Warren, 1922, pp. 360f.)

An attitude is a disposition to act which is built up by the integration of numerous specific responses of a similar type, but which exists as a general neural "set", and when activated by a specific stimulus results in behavior that is more obviously a function of the disposition than of the activating stimulus. The important thing to note about this definition is that it considers attitudes as broad, generic (not simple and specific) determinants of behavior. (G.W. Allport, 1929)

We shall regard attitudes here as verbalized or verbalizable tendencies, dispositions, adjustments toward certain acts. They relate not to the past nor even primarily to the present, but as a rule, to the future. Sometimes, of course, it is a hypothetical future.... The "attitude" is primarily a way of being "set" toward or against things. (Murphy and Murphy, 1931 p. 615)

This somewhat cumbersome list of definitions, when examined closely, provides a basis for understanding the diversity and similarity of early conceptualizations of the nature of attitudes. Although several divergent schools of thought were represented in the list, most authors agreed that attitudes were in some form a precursor of behavior. In his discussion of the definitions, Allport made this clarifying statement, "The attitude is incipient and preparatory rather than overt and consummatory. It is not behavior, but the precondition of behavior" (Allport, 1935:805)

Before examining some of the developments in attitude theory and research subsequent to this influential early conception, it is helpful to briefly trace its origin in our intellectual history.

Allport (1935) identified three points of origin from which the conception of attitude presented thus far arose: 1) experimental psychology; 2) psychoanalytic psychology; and 3) early sociology.

Within nineteenth century experimental psychology attitudes were first recognized in connection with the study of reaction-time. This early type of attitude was known as a task attitude or *Aufgabe*. The *Aufgabe* came to be used in many psychological experiments investigating a range of issues from perception to volition. As the central importance of subjects' preparedness became recognized, many specialized conceptions of particular types of mental and motor 'sets' were developed.

A major issue concerning 'attitudes' within early experimental psychology was the degree to which they were represented in consciousness. Experimental findings increasingly indicated that

attitudes were to a large degree unconscious. This discovery led to a tendency to regard attitudes "as manifestations of brain activity or of the unconscious mind" (Allport, 1935:801) and eventually led to the abandonment of experimental work with attitudes.

Within psychoanalytic psychology it was the influence of Freud and his emphasis upon the importance of the unconscious which brought the attitude concept back under consideration. Freud used attitude as a catch-all concept and, according to Allport, he related attitudes, "with longing, hatred and love, with passion and prejudice, in short with the onrushing stream of unconscious life" (Allport, 1935:801).

Probably the most direct influence upon the conception of attitude as a precursor of behavior came from nineteenth century sociology. This influence resulted from an ongoing search for a psychological concept which could express "in concrete terms the mechanisms through which culture is carried" (Allport, 1935:801). The concept of attitude gradually replaced the doctrine of instincts. Attitude was viewed as a more appropriate concept by social scientists who were beginning to recognize the importance of environmental influences upon human social behavior. It was in this vein that Thomas and Znaniecki conceived of attitudes and instituted the concept as an ongoing central point of interest within sociology and social psychology.

Survey of Research on the Attitude-Behavior Relationship

The view of attitude as a precursor of behavior was well established in attitude theory by the 1930's. It was also in the 1930's

that the first well known test of the largely assumed relationship between attitudes and behavior was undertaken.

LaPiere (1934) accompanied a young Chinese couple in visits to 250 motels, hotels, and restaurants throughout the United States. The couple was refused service only once in 250 instances. As a follow-up, LaPiere mailed questionnaires to the proprietors of the establishments visited and a control group of proprietors of similar establishments not visited. In both the test and control groups over 90% answered "no" to a question asking if they would accept members of the Chinese race as guests in their business establishments. These findings were among the first in a long list to report a large attitude-behavior discrepancy (Liska, 1974).

In a later study by Kutner et.al. (1952), LaPiere's basic approach was replicated using "Negroes" as confederates rather than Chinese. Again the findings indicated a large discrepancy between the hotel and restaurant owners' expressions of discrimination via letter or phone and their actual face to face behavior.

DeFleur and Westie (1958) also used the theme of attitudes and behaviors toward minority group members. Using the Summated Differences Scale (Westie, 1953), they obtained the attitudes of 250 white college students toward Negroes. A prejudiced group and an unprejudiced group consisting of twenty-three students per group were selected from the top and bottom quartiles of the attitude score distribution. As a projective test, the subjects were shown slides of a well-dressed Negro seated with a well-dressed white person of the opposite sex. The subjects were later asked if they

would be willing to pose for the purpose of making similar slides. The subjects were then asked to sign a "standard photograph release statement" containing a series of seven uses to which the photographs could be put. The uses ranged from "laboratory use to be seen only by professional sociologists" to "use in a nation-wide publicity campaign advocating racial integration". The subject was asked to sign his name for each use he agreed to. A mean level of agreed usage was calculated and the subjects' scores were dichotomized as falling either above or below the mean. The agreement level scores (behavior indicated by signing) were then compared to the attitude measure.

Five of the 23 subjects with the most negative attitudes toward Negroes signed more than the average number of uses to which the photographs could be put. Nine of the 23 subjects in the unprejudiced quartile signed fewer than the average number of uses. A chi-square analysis showed a significant relation between attitude and level of agreement (signing behavior). The fact that 14 out of 46 subjects showed an inconsistent relation between attitude and behavior, however, is substantial when it is taken into consideration that the subjects selected represented the extremes of the attitude scale.

The research design of DeFleur and Westie (1958) was later modified and replicated by Linn (1965). Linn attempted to improve the design by making the behavior situation more realistic by having blacks present. He also attempted to make the stimuli in the verbal and overt behavioral situations more similar.

Attitude questionnaires including essentially the same seven items regarding the subjects' willingness to be photographed with a Negro of the opposite sex were completed by students in introductory sociology courses. One month later, female students who had completed the questionnaire were asked to volunteer for interviews conducted by a psychology testing organization. Thirty-four students volunteered. In an interview, conducted by a Negro, each subject was told that the testing organization was developing a TAT that would show racially integrated couples in various social situations. The subjects were then asked to pose for such photographs and sign releases for four levels of use of the photographs. After the interview the subjects were introduced to a second Negro who was purportedly working on a racial integration campaign. The racial integration organization was also interested in the photographs. The subject was asked to sign three more release agreements for use of the photographs in the integration campaign. The seven levels of use indicated in the release agreements related directly to the seven items in the attitude questionnaire completed one month earlier by the subjects. An appointment was made to have the photographs taken that were agreed to by each subject. When the subject appeared for the appointment the deception of the research was explained.

The results showed even a greater discrepancy between the attitude and behavior measures than had been found in the earlier study by DeFleur and Westie (1958). Only two of the 34 subjects had indicated on the questionnaire that they were unwilling to pose with a Negro. In the actual situation 12 subjects refused to

sign any of the releases. The mean number of release levels signed on the questionnaire was 4.9 and only 2.8 in the behavior situation. A discrepancy of two or more levels between the attitude measure and the behavior measure was shown by 59% of the subjects.

Attitudes and behavior toward minority group members is one of the major areas in which a weak relationship between attitudes and behavior has been found. The research findings discussed above are representative of the general findings in this area (Wicker, 1969).

Job attitudes and behaviors is another specific issue which has been selected to examine the relationship between attitudes and behavior generally. Vroom (1964) reviewed 15 studies dealing with job attitudes and performance. The subjects in the studies Vroom examined represented a wide range of occupations from farmers to insurance agents.

Vroom found that the median product-moment correlation between attitudes and job performance, for the 15 studies, was .14. The range of correlations was .68 to -.03, with only seven coefficients significant beyond the .05 probability level. The second highest coefficient cited was .31. The strongest relationship cited by Vroom (.68 coefficient) was reported in an unpublished study and has been questioned (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955).

One of the studies that Vroom examined (Bernberg, 1952) found no correlation between attitudes toward the company and absences for 890 hourly workers in an aircraft plant. Another (Vroom, 1964) reported a correlation of -.07 between job satisfaction and absences for 489 oil company employees.

The findings reported in Vroom's (1964) review demonstrate that the discrepancies between attitude and behavior measures found in the realm of jobs are similar to the findings in the area of attitudes and behavior toward minority group members. The discrepancies reported between attitudes and behavior in both areas are large.

There have been many other studies examining the relationship of an attitude to a behavior. The results of those studies were generally of the same strength and direction of those summarized here. A comprehensive survey of this type of research has been provided by Wicker (1969) and supplemented by Liska (1974).

Further Research: A Reconceptualization of the Problem

The long history of research reporting a weak relationship between attitudes and behavior has resulted in varying reactions among theorists and practitioners in the field.

Doob (1947) was one of the first to suggest that perhaps the attitude concept should be replaced. Doob believed that attitude has a place as a socially useful concept but that as a scientific construct it lacks the necessary systematic characteristics. He argued in favor of replacing attitude with simpler, more specific learning theory constructs such as afferent-habit strength, efferent-habit strength, and drive mediating responses.

Doob's (1947) position has also been used in the development of a simple, unidimensional conception of attitude which equates attitude to affect (Fishbein, 1966).

Blumer (1955) recommended abandoning the attitude concept because of its ambiguity. Blumer's position was based on his observation that it is difficult to determine exactly what to include and what to exclude as part of an attitude. This position was used to support his contention that the attitude concept lacks an empirical reference and therefore cannot be used as a unit of analysis either in the study of social action or personality organization.

The positions taken by both Doob (1947) and Blumer (1955) raised issues that are still problematic. The complex nature of most conceptualizations of the attitude concept has made research which adequately tests the conceptualizations difficult (McGuire, 1966). The weak relationship reported between attitudes and behavior thus far has at least partially supported Blumer's (1955) contentions.

In spite of the generally weak findings reported in attitude-behavior research and the abandonment of the concept by some, research in the area has remained popular (McGuire, 1969). Rather than abandoning the area of attitude-behavior relationships, most recent research in the field has employed intervening or alternate variables to explain the discrepant relationship (Wicker, 1969; 1971; Liska, 1974).

The perspective represented by the trend toward the use of other variables postulated as intervening in or filling out the relationship between attitudes and behavior was articulated by Weissberg (1965:424):

An attitude, no matter how conceived, is simply one of the terms in the complex regression equation we use to predict behavior; we cannot expect it to do too much. I think we must take seriously Lewins formula, $B=F(P,E)$. If the latent variable [attitude] is conceived as inside P - - - one still needs to know the specific nature of the environment, the form of the function relating P and E, and the other predispositions and their interactions with the one under consideration before one can accurately predict behavior. The embarrassing thing is that we have not systematically investigated these other sources of influence on overt behavior and that we are unable to predict the overt behavior solely from the predisposition.

Wicker (1969) notes that other sources of influence on the attitude-behavior relationship have often been mentioned as post hoc explanations of weak research findings. The factors which have been offered as reasons for attitude-behavior inconsistency were categorized by Wicker as either "personal" or "situational" (Wicker, 1969:67).

The personal factors cited by Wicker (1969) include: other attitudes; competing motives; and a combination of verbal, intellectual, and social abilities.

The "other attitudes" explanation is based upon the position that there are many attitudes relevant to any particular instance of social behavior. The weak relationship found between any one attitude and behavior is thus a result of the failure to consider other relevant attitudes.

The view that "motives or drives underlying a given behavior may be stronger than motives which are in some way related to a relevant attitude", is the basis for the "competing motives" explanation (Wicker, 1969:68). As an example of this type of explanation

Wicker (1969) cites Corey's (1937) finding that the number of test questions students missed was a better predictor of cheating behavior than their attitudes toward cheating. The subjects were influenced more by the motive of improving their grades than by their attitudes toward behaving honestly.

Some of the research findings indicating attitude-behavior inconsistency may be explained by varying "verbal, intellectual, and social abilities" of individuals selected as subjects (Wicker, 1969). This explanation is based on the position that some subjects may lack the knowledge or ability to translate their attitudes into action. Other subjects, due to low intelligence or reading ability, may be unable to understand an investigator's questions or instructions.

The situational factors discussed by Wicker (1969) include: actual or considered presence of certain people; normative prescriptions of proper behavior; alternative behaviors available; specificity of attitude objects; unforeseen extraneous events; and expected and/or actual consequences of various acts. Wicker offered the following "general postulate regarding situational influences of attitude behavior relationships" (Wicker, 1969:69):

The more similar the situations in which verbal and overt behavioral responses are obtained, the stronger will be the attitude-behavior relationship. The situational factors may be thought of as potentially significant dimensions along which environments can vary from highly similar to highly dissimilar.

Wicker (1971) later put his postulate about situational influences to an empirical test. Using 152 church members as subjects, a multiple regression approach was applied to assess the relative

contribution of attitude and three situational variables to the prediction of behavior. The situational variables used were: perceived consequences of behavior; evaluation of behavior; and judged influence of extraneous events.

The "perceived consequences of behavior" variable was drawn directly from Wicker's previously cited list. It represents Wicker's (1969:73) assertion that "overt behavioral responses may be influenced by what the individual believes will follow as a consequence of his action....."

The "evaluation of behavior" variable was not included in Wicker's (1969) list of situational influences. It was drawn from Fishbein's (1966) list of determinants of behavior which bears great similarity of perspective with Wicker's list. The questions used to measure the evaluation of behavior linked the behavior to particular situations.

The third situational variable, "judged influence of extraneous events", was also drawn from Wicker's (1969) previously published list. This variable is intended to account for inconsistencies between attitude and behavior that may arise due to unforeseen circumstances. An example used by Wicker (1969) illustrates that church attendance may be affected by the presence of weekend guests who do not attend church.

The primary attitude measure obtained was a semantic differential evaluation of five concepts relating to the church. Eighty-seven of the 152 subjects also completed the Thurstone and Chave (1929) scale of attitudes toward the church. Three behavioral measures were obtained: attendance at Sunday worship service; contributions

LIBRARY

to the church; and participation in church activities. A behavioral composite score was also computed, combining the three separate behavioral measures.

The results of the study indicate that supplementing the attitude measure with the situational variables did improve predictions of the behaviors. The mean correlation coefficient for each predictor to the behaviors was: judged influence of extraneous events $r = .36$; evaluation of behavior $r = .26$; attitude $r = .22$; and perceived consequences of behavior $r = .15$. With all four predictors combined the correlation coefficient rose to .46, which is a stronger relationship than has generally been found between attitude and behavior (Wicker, 1969; McGuire, 1966; Liska, 1974).

Recently, Liska (1974) surveyed research which has attempted to reconceptualize the problem of attitude-behavior inconsistency as one of identifying the conditions which affect the relationship. After mentioning numerous variables that have been examined, Liska identified three underlying issues.

The first issue involves problems of measurement. As a response to the weak relationship found between attitudes and behavior, many researchers have questioned the validity of measures employed.

Criticism has been directed toward the use of self-reports and behavioral intentions as measures of overt behavior. Liska compared the findings of studies using these methods with those of research which directly measured overt behavior. The conclusion reached was the criticism of self report and behavioral intention measures as invalid has not been substantiated empirically. Liska (1974:263)

further states that the evidence "does not suggest that alternate measures of behavior would significantly increase the observed attitude-behavior relationship".

The validity of attitude measures has also been questioned. Liska identifies the problem most often mentioned as social desirability. The contention of those leveling this criticism is that subjects respond to attitude questionnaires in ways that they consider socially desirable. Liska was unable to locate any research that supports this claim. He did acknowledge that further research is needed in this area.

Based on the findings of Hyman (1949) and Fendrich (1967), Liska proposes that maximizing the similarities between the attitude and behavior measurement situations will improve results. The most common strategy for attempting to eliminate social desirability effects has been to "denude the measurement situation of social properties" (Liska, 1974:263). This strategy has been found to have the effect of reducing the relationship between attitude and behavior measures by creating a "play-like" atmosphere (Hyman, 1949). Liska cites Fendrich's (1967) study as empirical support for the contention that maximizing the similarities between the attitude and behavior measurement situations will improve results.

The second issue identified by Liska as affecting the weak findings in attitude-behavior research concerns the use of multiple attitudes. Most research has examined the relationship of a single attitude to a particular behavior. Liska reports that research including more than one relevant attitude (Campbell, et.al., 1960;

Goldberg, 1966; Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972; and Weinstein, 1972) has generally produced stronger results. The logic behind the multiple attitude approach was summarized by Liska (1974:265):

.....Social objects are composed of numerous properties.
.....Therefore, attempting to predict behavior....using
only one attitude makes little sense: rather we must
measure and include various relevant attitudes in the
predictive equation.

The third underlying issue identified by Liska (1974) as emerging from recent attitude-behavior research involves the effect of social support. Three general conceptualizations of how the influence of social support clarifies the relationship between attitudes and behavior were identified. The three approaches were classified as 1) consistency conceptualization; 2) additive conceptualization; and 3) interaction conceptualization.

Research that utilizes the consistency conceptualization is based upon the assumption that attitudes are primary precursors of behavior. Social support is examined in terms of its possible distortion of the attitude-behavior relationship.

Studies guided by the additive conceptualization have examined the independent effects of attitude and social support upon behavior. This perspective represents a shift away from considering attitude as a primary predisposition to behavior. Attitude, in this view, is one of many possible influences upon behavior.

The interaction conceptualization is represented by research that has examined the interaction between attitudes and social support. This perspective assumes that neither attitude nor social support has an independent effect upon behavior. The effect of each of the two variables upon behavior is viewed as dependent upon the level of the other.

Liska's (1974) discussion illuminated several issues relevant to the assessment of Rokeach and Kliejunas' (1972) research strategy, and therefore, relevant to the present study. The issues raised by Wicker (1969; 1971), especially those concerning situational variables, are also relevant to Rokeach's (1968b; 1972) approach. The positions taken by Rokeach, implicitly or explicitly, on these relevant issues are discussed as his conceptualization and research strategy are presented in the following section.

Rokeach's Conceptualization and Research Strategy

Rather than abandoning the attitude concept because of its conceptual ambiguity, Rokeach (1968a, 1968b) attempted to develop a more precise conceptual and operational meaning for the term. He later (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972) attempted to translate this conceptual and operational perspective into a research strategy designed to examine the relationship between attitudes and behavior.

The movement from concept development to research dealing with the attitude-behavior relationship was a logical one given Rokeach's perspective. The idea of attitude as a precursor of behavior was pervasive in his developing conceptualization.

In Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values (1968a) Rokeach drew from his previous work in cognitive interaction and belief systems to develop a comprehensive perspective of the three title concepts. The specifics of that work were not of direct relevance to the present study. It should be acknowledged, however, that the basic premises of his more direct statement on the nature of attitudes are to be

found dispersed throughout the text of Belief, Attitudes, and Values (1968a).

The following extended definition of attitude was offered by Rokeach as a summary of his discussion of the nature of attitudes and is a concise articulation of his conceptualization (1968b:457).

An attitude is a relatively enduring organization of interrelated beliefs that describe, evaluate, and advocate action with respect to an object or situation, with each belief having cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. Each one of these beliefs is a predisposition that when suitably activated results in some preferential response toward the attitude object or situation, or toward others who take a position with respect to the attitude object or situation, or toward the maintenance or preservation of the attitude itself. Since an attitude object must always be encountered within some situation about which we also have an attitude, a minimum condition for social behavior is the activation of at least two interacting attitudes, one concerning the attitude object and the other concerning the situation.

The inclusion of the phrase "relatively enduring" is a simple differentiation of attitude from momentary predispositions. As an organization of beliefs, an attitude is rooted in an individual's ongoing belief system and tends to be more persistent than momentary predispositions commonly referred to as "sets".

The assignment of cognitive, affective, and behavioral (or conative) components to attitudes is not unique to Rokeach's perspective. These same components are to be found in many different conceptualizations. The trichotomy was not even originated through the scientific study of attitudes. Philosophers since the time of Plato and Aristotle have identified knowing, feeling, and acting as the three basic existential stances to the human condition. (McGuire, 1966).

The manner in which Rokeach ties the components to beliefs is unique. In Rokeach's view, attitudes have cognitive, affective, and behavioral components because the beliefs that make up attitudes have them. This approach allows the components to be rooted in a manageable concept (belief), rather than remaining obscure and inaccessible. Other researchers and theorists utilizing the three components have not identified a source or conceptual base which is accessible (Rokeach, 1968b).

Rokeach defines belief as "any simple proposition, conscious or unconscious, inferred from what a person says or does, capable of being preceded by the phrase "I believe that" (Rokeach, 1968b: 450). The content of a belief may describe or evaluate an object or situation, or it may advocate a course of action in relation to an object or situation, or it may do all three. Regardless of the content of a belief, Rokeach views each as having a cognitive, affective, and behavioral component.

A belief has a cognitive component because it represents a person's knowledge about what is true or false or desirable or undesirable. The affective component is present because a belief is capable of eliciting affect when its validity is questioned by others. The behavioral component exists because a belief must lead to some kind of action when suitably activated (Rokeach, 1968b).

An example of a belief and an illustration of how it incorporates the components may clarify Rokeach's perspective. The statement "I believe that dogs can be good family pets", is an example of a belief.

The knowledge of the holder of this belief about what is desirable or undesirable is represented by his position that dogs can be good family pets. If a friend chose to disagree by stating his belief that dogs are dirty, expensive to keep, and dangerous to children, an affective reaction (of varying intensity) would be aroused within the holder of the first belief. When confronted with an opportunity to purchase a dog, the two friends will be predisposed to act quite differently, thus the belief, when suitably activated, also has a behavioral component.

Specifying the existence of cognitive, affective, and behavioral components within beliefs and attitudes is important for its heuristic value. Hypothesis formulation is guided and made more meaningful when attitude is conceptually rooted in these basic existential terms.

Research designed to examine the relationship between the components of attitude, although inconclusive, has indicated high intercorrelation between them (McGuire, 1966). Given the high intercorrelation between the components it is difficult to assess the relative influence of each upon behavior. This is an area of future research that may be enhanced by Rokeach's conceptualization which ties the components to beliefs and thus makes them less free-floating conceptually.

Rokeach asserts that until it is possible to empirically separate the components, and given their close interrelationship, it makes little difference which ones are used to assess individuals' attitudes (Rokeach, 1968b). Thus, there was no attempt at component separation in Rokeach's research (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972).

The portion of Rokeach's (1968b) conceptualization that had the most important ramifications for his later research and the present study involves his treatment of situations.

The view that "an attitude object must always be encountered within some situation about which we also have an attitude" (Rokeach, 1968b:457) is a key portion of Rokeach's perspective. The discrepancy found between attitude and behavior in research utilizing only one relevant attitude (toward the object) becomes more understandable when examined in terms of this perspective. LaPiere (1934), for example, used attitudes toward Chinese (attitudes toward an object) to predict the behavior of motel and restaurant proprietors. No consideration was given to the situation in which the attitude objects were encountered. Rokeach has suggested that, as business managers, the subjects in LaPiere's study must also have had attitudes about how to properly conduct a business (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972). The behavior of LaPiere's subjects must be understood in terms of their attitudes toward the situation as well as toward the object. The logic of this criticism applies similarly to other studies utilizing only an attitude toward an object to predict behavior.

The final statement in Rokeach's extended definition of attitude demonstrates that his conceptualization was specifically directed toward the attitude-behavior relationship: "a minimum condition for social behavior is the activation of at least two interacting attitudes, one concerning the attitude object and the other concerning the situation" (Rokeach, 1968b:457).

Rokeach's (1968b) conceptualization has been specified further and developed into a research strategy designed to strengthen the generally weak findings reported in attitude-behavior research (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972). Rokeach and Kliejunas developed three formulas to represent the specific propositions within Rokeach's conceptualization.

Formula one: $Bos = F(AoAs)$; represents the proposition that "behavior-with-respect-to-an-object-within-a-situation (Bos) is always a function (f) of at least two interacting attitudes: attitude-toward-object (Ao) and attitude-toward-situation (As)" (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972:195). This proposition was derived directly from the portion of Rokeach's (1968b) conceptualization cited above.

The second proposition elaborates upon the interaction between attitude-toward-object and attitude-toward-situation. Rokeach and Kliejunas recognized that Ao and As may influence behavior differentially. The relationship between the two kinds of attitude can be viewed as a figure-ground relationship. "The attitude object is the figure, and the situation within which the attitude object is encountered is the ground" (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972:195). Within the figure-ground relationship, the "psychological representation of the object and situation, Ao and As, will cognitively interact with one another and may exert differential influence upon behavior with respect to an object within a situation". (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972:195).

Based on previous research findings (Rokeach and Rothman, 1965), it was proposed that when two attitudes are activated a person will

compare them for relative importance. Therefore formula two: $AoAs = (w) Ao + (1-w) As$; represents the statement that "The evaluation of the total figure-ground configuration, $AoAs$, is postulated to be an average of the evaluations of Ao and As considered separately, weighted by the perceived importance of Ao and As relative to one another within the context of $AoAs$ " (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972:195). Within the formula $AoAs$ refers to attitude-toward-object interacting with attitude-toward-situation, and (w) and $(1-w)$ refer to the perceived importance of Ao and As with respect to one another.

Formula three: $Bos = f(AoAs) = (w) Ao + (1-w) As$: is the representation of the first two formulas combined (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972:196). This final formula contains the basic propositions, derived from Rokeach's (1968b) conceptualization, that make up the research strategy developed by Rokeach and Kliejunas. In summary, formula three states that: behavior with respect to an object within a situation is a function of attitude-toward-object interacting with attitude-toward-situation: the degree of influence exhibited by each of the two kinds of attitudes is determined by their perceived importance.

Rokeach's emphasis on the importance of the situation is consistent with Wicker's (1969) analysis and empirical findings (Wicker, 1971). There is a marked difference, however, in the approaches chosen by Wicker (1971) and Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) to account for the influence of situational factors. Wicker (1971) included three situational variables postulated as intervening in the attitude-behavior relationship. Wicker's (1969) earlier list of situational

influences included several other possible variables and still more were mentioned but not used in the 1971 research. It is conceivable that if all possible situational influences were represented the list of variables could become quite large and cumbersome. Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972), on the other hand, used only one variable in addition to the traditional attitude variable to predict behavior.

The additional variable introduced by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972:195) was termed "attitude-toward-situation". While there may be an almost infinite number of situational influences that could possibly affect the behavior of individuals, the inclusion of all of them is not feasible or necessarily desirable. Although it has not been stated explicitly by Rokeach, attitude-toward-situation is designed to assess only the more relevant situational influences: those perceived by the subject. Conceived as an organization of beliefs about the situation in which an object is encountered, the use of attitude-toward-situation represents an attempt to measure the influence of a particular situation as it is viewed by the acting individual.

The use of attitude-toward-situation to assess the influence of situational factors upon behavior provides greater parsimony than Wicker's (1971) approach. The complex research derived from Wicker's (1969;1971) list of possible situational variables demonstrated less predictive power than did Rokeach and Kliejunas's (1972) approach. Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972:199) applied the "same universe of discourse" to both attitude and situation, thereby clarifying the relative importance of each.

As noted previously, Liska (1974) raised several issues relevant to the assessment of the approach developed by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972). Within his discussion of the general area of measurement problems, Liska (1974) proposed that maximizing the similarities between the attitude and behavior measurement situations should improve results in research examining the relationship between attitudes and behavior. Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) avoided any possible dissimilarities between the behavior and attitude measurement situations by obtaining both measures simultaneously.

Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) used the self-report method of obtaining the behavior measure. Although this method has been critized, Liska (1974) found no significant difference between the results of studies using self-report measures and studies using direct measures of behavior.

Liska (1974) reported that studies using more than one relevant attitude to predict behavior have generally produced stronger results than studies using only one attitude. The inclusion of attitude-toward-situation by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) places their research in Liska's multiple attitude category. In addition to proposing the multiple attitude approach as one way of reducing attitude-behavior discrepancies, Liska (1974) identified the need to assess the relative importance of each relevant attitude. The fact that Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) had improved their findings by including an assessment of relative importance was cited by Liska (1974:265).

The issue of social support as discussed by Liska (1974) was not explicitly dealt with in the Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) research.

The concept "social support" refers to the degree to which others agree or disagree with an individual's attitudes and/or behavior. It has been proposed that "if social support is congruent with attitudes, the effect of social support on behavior will reinforce the effect of attitudes, thus increasing attitude behavior consistency". (Liska, 1974:276). If social support and attitude are incongruent, attitude-behavior consistency will be reduced.

The findings of research examining the effects of social support on attitudes and behavior are inconclusive. There is some evidence that social support can have a substantial impact in certain types of attitude-behavior conditions (Liska, 1974). The effect of social support appears to be strongest when the behavior under consideration "is socially deviant and visible" (Liska, 1974:267).

The inclusion of a control for social support effects may have strengthened the findings of Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972). The inclusion of a social support variable, however, would have changed the character of the research. A primary goal of Rokeach and Kliejunas was on establishing "attitude-toward-situation" as a variable capable of reducing attitude-behavior inconsistency, without introducing other types of variables (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972).

The hypotheses and specific method used by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) to test their propositions have been presented in the following chapter. The modifications of the Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) study implemented in the present study, and the rationale for implementing them have also been presented in Chapter Three.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

As stated in Chapter One, no research other than that of Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) was located which has empirically tested Rokeach's (1968a; 1968b) two-attitude theory. The present study has provided a retest of Rokeach's theoretical propositions.

Chapter Two provided a discussion of Rokeach's propositions in the context of their relation to early conceptualizations in the field, research findings on the attitude-behavior relationship, and recent research issues. Rokeach's basic propositions were: that behavior can be more accurately predicted than has generally been the case by utilizing attitude-toward-situation in addition to attitude-toward-object; and that when the two kinds of attitude are weighted for relative importance their predictive power increases.

It has been shown that these propositions represent a new approach to allowing for situational influence in the relationship between attitudes and behavior. Rokeach's two-attitude approach also provides a possible explanation of why research utilizing only one relevant attitude to predict behavior has provided such weak results in the past. The importance of these two issues for the development of attitude-behavior research (Wicker, 1971; Liska, 1974), and the strength of the findings reported by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972), indicate the need for an independent test of Rokeach's research approach.

The methods utilized in the present study to empirically test the theoretical propositions of Rokeach's two-attitude theory are presented in the following sections. Since the present study was a modified replication of previous research (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972), summaries of relevant portions of that research have been included. Modifications of the original research design have been identified and explained. Those portions of the present study that directly replicate parts of the Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) research have also been identified.

Statement of Hypotheses

Hypotheses I through IV were developed to represent the basic propositions of Rokeach's two-attitude theory of behavior (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972:196):

- | | | |
|------------|------|--|
| Hypothesis | I. | The two attitudes, A_o and A_s , are independent of one another. |
| Hypothesis | II. | Each of the two attitudes, A_o and A_s , will reliably predict behavior to at least some extent. |
| Hypothesis | III. | Behavior will be more accurately predicted if both attitudes, A_o and A_s , are taken into consideration. |
| Hypothesis | IV. | Behavior will be even more accurately predicted if the two attitudes, A_o and A_s , are weighted for their perceived importance with respect to one another. |

The above hypotheses were tested by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) and subjected to a re-test in the present study.

An additional hypothesis, Hypothesis V, was included in the present study.

- Hypothesis V. The measurement of behavior by direct means, rather than by self report, will not affect the strength of the relationship between attitudes and behavior.

Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) utilized self reports as their only means of measuring behavior and acknowledged this as a major limitation to their research.

The criticisms that have been leveled against the use of self report measures of behavior as cited by Liska (1974) have been discussed in Chapter II. Although Liska reported that empirical evidence to support the criticisms of self report measures of behavior is lacking, he cited no evidence to refute the criticisms. Hypothesis V was designed to provide some needed evidence on that methodological issue.

Date Collection Procedure

To test the first three hypotheses, measures of the two independent variables (A_o and A_s) and the dependent variable (behavior) were necessary. To test Hypothesis IV, a means of assessing the relative importance of the two kinds of attitudes was also required. Separate measures of behavior, one using the self report method and one directly observing behavior, were obtained to test Hypothesis V. The methods used to gather these necessary data are explained in the remainder of this section.

The behavior selected by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) as a dependent variable was "the frequency of cutting class in specified psychology courses." Attitude-toward-situation (A_s) was specified as the attitude a student has "toward the general activity of going to

class." Attitude-toward-object (Ao) was represented by "the attitude a student holds toward the particular professor who is teaching the class." The selection of these variables by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) was based upon the assumption that class cutting frequency would be mainly determined by students' attitudes toward the importance of class attendance and the professor teaching a particular class (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972:196).

The behavior, situation, and attitude objects utilized in the present study were highly similar to those selected by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972). The frequency of cutting class was measured in sociology and anthropology courses rather than in psychology courses. The attitude objects were the instructors of sociology and anthropology courses at Kansas State College of Pittsburg.

The means of obtaining the attitude and behavior measures in the present study, as in the Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) study, was a questionnaire administered under group conditions. The questionnaires were administered during regular class time to 87 students in four upper and intermediate level sociology courses and one introductory level anthropology course. Higher level courses were selected in order to find students who had completed previous sociology courses. Such students were needed in order to obtain self report behavioral measures of class cutting frequency. The anthropology course was selected because class attendance records were available, thus providing data needed to directly measure class cutting frequency.

Before each administration of the questionnaire the subjects were told that their responses were to be used in research designed

to determine some of the factors that may affect the frequency of attending class. The subjects were assured that their responses would not be made available to their instructor or anyone other than the researcher.

The first section of the questionnaire asked the subjects to list the course they were presently attending and up to four other sociology courses they had previously completed. Space was also provided for the subjects to list the number of course hours per week for each course and their estimated number of class cuts for each of the previously completed courses. This section of the questionnaire provided the information needed to compute class cutting frequency in previously completed courses.

The next section of the questionnaire asked the subjects to indicate how they felt about the importance of going to class. The specific question they were asked to respond to was "how do you feel about going to class in general?". The subjects' were asked to indicate their responses on a nine-point scale where nine represented "very important to me", five represented "important to me", and one represented "somewhat important to me." This item was designed to obtain a measure of attitude-toward-situation (As), and was derived from discussion provided by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972:196).

The third part of the questionnaire was designed to obtain the subjects' attitude toward the instructors of the courses they had listed (Ao). Two items were used to assess the students' attitudes. The first item asked the subjects to indicate the degree of their like or dislike for the instructor of each course they had listed.

The responses to this item were indicated on a nine-point scale where one represented "I dislike(d) the instructor very much", five represented "neither like(d) nor dislike(d)", and nine represented "I like(d) the instructor very much". This item was derived from Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972:196).

The second item designed to obtain the subjects' attitude toward the various instructors involved a rating of each instructor's lectures. The subjects were asked to indicate on a nine-point scale their assessment of the instructors' lectures where one represented "very informative and stimulating", five represented "informative and stimulating", and nine represented "a boring waste of time". The item concerning the instructors lectures was not used by Rokeach and Kliejunas. It was included in the present study to supplement what appeared to be a rather narrow basis (like or dislike) for students to base their attitude toward instructors. This item allowed the subjects to indicate their assessment of the instructor (attitude object) on the basis of his actual behavior in the classroom.

The data supplied by the questionnaire items described above provide a basis for determining: (1) class cutting frequency (behavior); (2) the subjects' attitude toward the importance of class attendance (attitude-toward-situation); and (3) the subjects' attitudes toward the instructors of the courses they listed (attitude-toward-object).

The final section of the questionnaire provided a means for the subjects to indicate their perception of the relative importance of attitude-toward-object and attitude-toward-situation in determining actual attendance for the duration of the

their behavior. For each previously completed course, listed on the first page of the questionnaire, a section was provided for the subjects to indicate the extent to which their class cutting frequency was jointly determined by their feelings about the instructor and/or their feelings about the importance of class attendance.

The item used to assess the relative importance of Ao and As was adapted from one used by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972:196):

You had _____ cuts (fill in from page 1) in Professor 1's course. To what extent was the frequency of attendance or the frequency of cuts in this course determined by

				Write % here
(a)	<u>your feeling about Professor 1?</u>			
	0%	50%	100%	_____
(b)	<u>your general feeling about the importance or unimportance of attending class?</u>			
	0%	50%	100%	_____
(c)	Total percentage (a + b)			<u>100%</u>

A complete copy of the questionnaire and the verbal instructions that accompanied it have been provided in Appendix A.

The data needed to test Hypotheses I through IV were obtained from the questionnaire. A direct measure of behavior, in addition to the self report measure included in the questionnaire, was needed to test Hypothesis V. Actual class cutting frequency was determined from class attendance records kept by the instructors of the courses the subjects were enrolled in during the summer session. After each administration of the questionnaire, willing subjects were asked to sign their questionnaire, thus making it possible to measure their actual attendance for the remainder of the term.

Method of Data Analysis

Of the eighty-seven questionnaires collected, six were excluded from analysis because the subject had either omitted an item or the percentages in the last section of the questionnaire did not add up to 100 per cent. Of the eighty-one subjects that properly completed the questionnaire, sixty-two reported previously completed sociology courses. Seventy subjects signed their questionnaire, making a direct behavior measure possible.

Responses to each of the nine point rating scales on the questionnaire were coded so that the most negative evaluation was represented by a numerical value of one and the most positive evaluation was represented by a numerical value of nine.

Class cutting frequency was computed on the self-report data by dividing the total number of cuts reported in each course by the number of times that course met each week. Class cutting frequency, for those subjects for whom actual attendance records were available, was computed by dividing the total number of cuts by the number of class periods in which roll was taken.

The method of computing the weighted value of AoAs (accounting for the perceived relative importance of Ao and As separately) was as follows: the value of Ao was multiplied by the percentage of importance placed upon it by the subject and added to the value of As multiplied by the percentage of importance placed upon it. For example, if As was nine and Ao was eight and the percentage of influence of each was 60% and 40% respectively, the formula would be $([.60] 9 + [.40] 8) = 8.6$. This formula was developed and used by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972).

After coding the responses to the questions using nine point scales, computing class cutting frequency, and computing the weighted value of AoAs, the data were organized into four analysis groups. The first analysis group included fifty three subjects who had reported at least two previously completed three hour sociology courses each. The responses given by the subjects for each three hour course were combined and averaged so that one set of data represented each subject.

The next analysis group consisted of the one hundred and twelve three hour courses reported by the fifty three subjects in the first group. In that analysis the responses were not combined and averaged by subject. Each of the one hundred and twelve courses reported was represented by a separate set of data.

The third analysis group represented the most comprehensive analysis of previously reported behavior. All previously completed courses reported were combined and averaged for all sixty two subjects reporting such courses. That analysis included two and five hour courses in addition to the three hour courses utilized in the first and second analyses.

In the fourth analysis group the direct measure of class cutting frequency (behavior), rather than self-report data, was utilized. The seventy subjects that had made a direct behavior measure possible by signing their questionnaires were each represented by a set of data. In that analysis it was not feasible to include the item representing the perceived relative importance of Ao and As. At the time of questionnaire administration the subjects had no way to

determine the extent to which their future cuts would be determined by their attitudes toward their instructor or toward the importance of class attendance.

The third and fourth analyses represent the most comprehensive utilization of both the self-report and direct measure data. The first analysis was developed to closely resemble the mode of analysis utilized by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972). The second analysis was included to expose any possible distortions in relationships arising from the averaging procedure used in the first and third analyses. Hereafter, the four analysis groupings have been referred to as Analysis I, II, III, and IV respectively.

After being grouped into separate analysis groupings the data were transferred to eighty column IBM cards. The resulting four data decks were separately read into an IBM/360 computer using a Fortran IV language program. The program was written to print Pearson's Product Moment Correlation between each variable represented on the cards. The correlations relevant to the hypotheses of the present study included those between the behavior variable and each attitude variable and those between the attitude-toward-object variable and the attitude-toward-situation variable.

The Pearsonian coefficient of correlation is an index of association from which it is possible to "ascertain from a single statistic whether the variables are related, how closely they are related and (from the sign) whether positively or negatively" (Buchanan, 1969:276). Interval level data are normally required

before correlation coefficients are appropriate as a measure of association. On an interval scale the distance between the units of measurement are equal. For example, "the distance between the positions labeled 1 and 2 on the scale is equal to the distance between positions 2 and 3" (Selltitz et. al., 1959:193).

The behavior measure in the present study qualified as an interval level measure (the difference between 1 and 2 class cuts is equal to the difference between 2 and 3 cuts). There has been considerable controversy over whether or not attitude scales, like those used in the present study, strictly conform to the requirements of an interval scale (Selltitz et. al., 1959). At the present stage of development in the social sciences, however, interval level statistics are commonly viewed as acceptable in working with numerical attitude scales (Selltitz et. al., 1959:193-197).

As stated in Chapter One, there was no attempt to generalize the findings of the present study to any specific population group. The subjects were selected because of their availability and not intended to constitute a random sample. Therefore, no statistical tests of significance were computed. Statistical tests of significance "rest on the assumption that the samples are not biased--that is, that the cases to be included in the samples have been selected by some procedure that gives every case in the population an equal, or at least specifiable, chance of being included in the sample. If this assumption is not justified, significance tests become meaningless" (Selltitz et. al., 1959:416).

The correlation coefficients obtained and an analysis of their support for the hypotheses stated earlier have been presented in the following chapter. The strength and direction of the findings have also been analysed in comparison to those claimed by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) and those produced by attitude-behavior research generally.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

The correlations yielded from the procedures described in Chapter Three have been presented in Table I.

TABLE I

INTERCORRELATIONS AND MULTIPLE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR

Data Analysis	n	I	2	3	4	5
		rAo,As	rBos,Ao	rBos,As	RBos Ao, As	rBos AoAs
I	53	.33	-.32	-.49	-.50	-.47
II	112	.19	-.26	-.37	-.40	-.45
III	62	.35	-.29	-.50	-.46	-.47
IV	70	.33	-.30	-.39	-.43	--

Column I shows the correlations (r) between Ao and As found in the four separate analyses described earlier. Column 2 shows the correlations between Bos and Ao for the four analyses. Column 3 exhibits the correlations found between Bos and As. Column 4 shows the multiple correlation (R) between Bos and Ao and As combined. Column 5 contains the correlations between Bos and the weighted AoAs measure.

Table II allows a comparison of the strength and direction of the findings in the present study with those reported by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972:197):

TABLE II

INTERCORRELATIONS AND MULTIPLE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR

		1	2	3	4	5
		n	RAo,As	RBos,Ao	rBos,As	RBos, Ao,As AoAs
[I] All subjects, all courses. First 3-hour-per-week		81	.07	-.20	-.46***	-.49***
[II] Course listed by subject; hours constant, course varied		71	.00	-.38**	-.35**	-.52***
[III] Course and hours constant						
1. Psychology 100	35	-.07	-.31	-.34*	-.48*	-.55***
2. Psychology 200	30	-.04	-.16	-.29	-.33	-.39*
3. Psychology 300	29	-.01	-.24	-.45*	-.51*	-.57**
4. Psychology 400	25	-.20	-.25	-.27	-.33	-.38
5. Psychology 500	20	-.26	-.68**	-.13	-.68**	-.78***

* p .05.

** p .01.

*** p .001.

Source: (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972:197)

Analysis I in Table I shows the results for 53 subjects who reported they had taken at least two three-hour courses in sociology. The data were averaged across two to three courses to provide a single index for each subject for Ao,As, AoAs, and Bos. Analysis I in Table II gives averaged data for 81 subjects across three to five courses (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972).

Analysis II in Table I shows the results for the 112 three-hour courses reported by the subjects in Analysis I. This data represents each course separately and was not averaged by subject. Analysis II in Table II shows the results for the first three-hour course listed by 71 subjects (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972).

Analysis III in Table I shows the averaged data of all previously completed courses for the 62 subjects reporting such courses in the present study. Analysis III in Table II shows the results for five specific courses separated by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972).

Analysis IV in Table I shows the data obtained from 70 subjects for which behavior (Bos) was directly measured. These data consist of one course for each subject and therefore is comparable to Analysis II in Table II. As stated in Chapter Three, an assessment of the relative importance of Ao and As was not feasible in this analysis, therefore column 5 is blank.

The major difference exhibited between the two sets of data is found in column I, the correlations between attitude-toward-object and attitude-toward-situation ($r_{Ao,As}$). Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) found consistently lower correlations between the two types of attitude than were found in the present study.

A second difference between the two sets of data is evident in column 3 of the two tables. The correlations between behavior and attitude-toward-situation ($r_{Bos,As}$) found in the present study are somewhat higher than those found by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972). The correlations in column 5 of Table II are slightly higher than those in column 5 of Table I. Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) found higher correlations between behavior and the weighted AoAs measure ($r_{Bos, AoAs}$) than were found in the present study. The correlations listed in columns 2 and 4 of the two tables are highly similar in direction and strength.

Assessment of the Hypotheses

An assessment of the support or lack of support the correlations obtained in the present study give to the hypotheses stated in Chapter Three is presented below.

Hypothesis I: Ao and As are independent. The findings of the present study neither strongly support nor refute the first hypothesis. Column I of Table I shows that the correlations between Ao and As range from .19 to .35. These correlations do not support the clear independence of the two attitude variables found by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972). The correlations, however, are weak to moderate in strength and do not strongly refute Hypothesis I.

Hypothesis II: Ao and As will each predict behavior to at least some extent. Column 2 of Table I shows the correlations between the frequency of class cuts (Bos) and attitude-toward-object (Ao). The correlations range from -.26 to -.32, with a mean

correlation of $-.29$. In all four analyses the correlations are negative, indicating the more positive the attitude toward the instructor, the fewer the class cuts. The strength of the correlations found between behavior and A_o in the present study is comparable to the strength of the correlations reported by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972). The size of the correlations are also in line with those reported in the literature between attitudes and behavior (Wicker, 1969, 1971).

Column 3 of Table I shows the correlations between class cutting frequency (Bos) and attitude toward the situation (As). The correlations range from $-.37$ to $-.50$, with a mean correlation of $-.44$. The correlations are all negative, indicating that the more positive the attitude toward the importance of class attendance, the fewer the class cuts. The strength of these correlations is greater than those generally reported between attitudes and behavior (Wicker, 1969, 1971). The findings of the present study support Hypothesis II.

Hypothesis III: Behavior will be more accurately predicted if both attitudes, A_o and As , are taken into consideration. The correlation between the two attitudes combined and class cutting frequency (Bos) are shown in Column 4 of Table I. The correlations range from $-.40$ to $-.50$, with a mean correlation of $-.45$. These correlations are consistently higher than those between Bos and A_o but have about the same strength as those found between Bos and As .

The two attitudes combined predicted behavior better than did attitude-toward-object alone and about the same as attitude-toward-situation considered separately. These findings do not strongly support or refute Hypothesis III.

Hypothesis IV: Behavior will be most accurately predicted if the two attitudes, Ao and As, are weighted for perceived importance.

Column 5 of Table I shows the correlations obtained between class cutting frequency and the weighted AoAs measure. The correlations range from $-.45$ to $-.47$, with a mean correlation of $-.46$. These correlations are of about the same strength and direction as those found in columns 3 and 4. Since the weighted AoAs measure did not show a substantial improvement of prediction of behavior over either As alone or Ao and As combined, Hypothesis IV was not supported by the findings.

Hypothesis V: The measurement of behavior by direct means, rather than by self report, will not affect the strength of the relationship between attitudes and behavior. This hypothesis was tested by comparing the correlations obtained for Analysis IV to those found in the other three analyses. In Analysis IV the Bos measure was determined by an actual record of class cutting frequency rather than by self report of past cuts as was used in the other three analyses. Table I shows that correlations in Analysis IV do not differ substantially in strength or direction from those in Analyses I through III. These findings support the contention made in Hypothesis V.

Modifications

As stated in Chapter III, the first four hypotheses were tested by methods very similar to those employed by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972). The data presented in Table I and discussed above in relation to Hypotheses I through IV represent the results of this replication.

Hypothesis V and the data related to it constitute a modification and are discussed below. A minor modification of the Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) approach consisted of the additional item used to assess the subjects attitude toward object (Ao). Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) used one item asking the subjects to assess their instructors on a like-dislike scale. This item was supplemented in the present study with a questionnaire item asking the subjects to assess the quality of the instructor's lectures. This item allowed the subjects to base their attitudes on their perception of the instructor's primary behavior in the classroom in addition to the like-dislike scale. It was found that responses to the additional questionnaire item showed a lower correlation to class cutting frequency (Bos) than did the original item based on a like-dislike scale. When the two items were combined the correlations with behavior were still lower than those exhibited by the like-dislike item alone. These findings showed the additional questionnaire item to be of no use in improving the quality of the attitude-toward-object measurement used by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972).

The primary modification introduced in the present study involved a direct measurement of behavior. The use of only self-report behavior measures was acknowledged as a major research limitation by

Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972:200). In the present study an actual recording of class cuts for 70 subjects made the direct measurement of class cutting frequency possible.

The correlations found between class cutting frequency (Bos) and the several attitude variables were similar in strength and direction for both the self-report and direct measure data. These findings support Liska's (1974) contention that criticism directed toward self-report behavior measures are not empirically supported.

The Concept of Attitude-Toward Situation

A primary goal of the present study was to examine the theoretical importance and empirical viability of the concept attitude-toward-situation. Attitude theorists have generally concentrated on attitude objects and either neglected attitudes-toward-situations or introduced non-attitudinal variables to account for situational influence (Rokeach, 1968b; Liska, 1974). Rokeach has asserted that this trend is due to "a failure to appreciate that an attitude object is always encountered within some situation, about which we also have an organized attitude" (Rokeach, 1968b:452).

A discussion of the theoretical importance of attitude-toward-situation was presented in Chapter II. The usefulness of the concept for empirical research is the topic here. Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) reported higher correlations between attitude-toward-situation and behavior than between attitude-toward-object and behavior. Those findings were supported by the findings of the present study. The correlations obtained in the present study suggest an even greater predictive power of the attitude-toward-situation variable than was exhibited by the correlations reported by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972).

TABLE III

COMPARISON OF CORRELATIONS BETWEEN BEHAVIOR AND THE TWO TYPES OF ATTITUDE

Data Analysis	n	rBos,Ao	rBos,As
I	53	-.32	-.49
II	112	-.26	-.37
III	62	-.29	-.50
IV	70	-.30	-.39

As shown in Table III, the correlations between class cutting frequency (Bos) and attitude-toward-situation (As) were consistently higher than those between Bos and Ao.

In addition to the objective comparison of the predictive power of the two variables, a subjective comparison was made by the subjects. The subjects were asked to assign a relative percentage of importance to the two types of attitude in determining their class-cutting frequency. Of the 62 subjects providing responses, 34 of them (55 per cent) considered As to be more important than Ao. Only 14 subjects (23 per cent) considered Ao to be more important than As, and an equal number considered the two types of attitude to be of equal importance in determining their behavior.

The results of the present study, as well as those reported by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972), indicate the usefulness of attitude-

toward-situation as a variable to be included in attitude-behavior research. In both studies As showed a stronger relationship to behavior than did Ao, yet researchers in the attitude-behavior field have primarily concentrated on attitudes toward objects (Rokeach, 1968b; Liska, 1974).

A summary of the issues, methods, and results of the present study has been presented in the following chapter. A set of recommendations for further research on the attitude-behavior relationship follows the summary and concludes Chapter Five.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The attitude concept has been of considerable interest to sociologists and social psychologists since the early 1900's. A major assumption made by social scientists interested in attitudes has been that they are in some way related to human social behavior. This assumption was brought into question by research undertaken in the 1930's which failed to document any empirically demonstrable relationship between attitudes and behavior. Since that time numerous research strategies have been developed in an attempt to understand and explain the relationship or lack of relationship between the two variables. In recent years the research strategies have become complex and statistically sophisticated. The general failure to produce strong findings has resulted in either the abandonment of attitude as a subject of inquiry or the introduction of other variables to supplement weak findings.

Milton Rokeach has developed an approach to attitude-behavior research which does not include non-attitudinal variables. Rokeach's conceptualization identifies two separate kinds of attitude, one directed toward objects (persons, places, things) and one directed toward the situations in which objects are encountered. The introduction of attitude-toward-situation as a variable in attitude-

behavior research differentiates Rokeach's approach from others.

Research examining the attitude-behavior relationship has concentrated upon attitudes toward objects and either ignored the situation in which the objects are encountered or introduced non-attitudinal variables to account for situational influence.

One study (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972) was located that utilized Rokeach's approach to examining the relationship between attitudes and behavior. The results of that study indicated a stronger relationship between attitudes and behavior than has generally been reported by others. The strength of the findings reported by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) indicated the need for an independent test of the approach. The present study was designed in part to provide such a test.

In addition to providing an empirical test of Rokeach's propositions and research strategy, several related issues were examined. A brief history of the origins of the attitude concept within sociology and social psychology was provided. Early definitions of attitude were examined, from which a basic characterization of attitude as a precursor of behavior emerged. A survey of research documented a general lack of empirical support for the largely assumed relationship between attitudes and behavior. A discussion was provided on relatively recent attempts by researchers to reconceptualize the problem by introducing non-attitudinal variables to account for predominately weak results. Finally, Rokeach's conceptualization of the nature of attitudes and his research strategy for examining the relationship between attitudes and behavior were discussed in detail.

The empirical re-test of Rokeach's theory and research approach was carried out by replicating the methods employed by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972). The four hypotheses previously developed to represent Rokeach's basic propositions were retained and tested.

An additional hypothesis was developed for the present study. It was designed to provide needed evidence on a methodological issue mentioned as a limitation to the Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) research and discussed by Liska (1974) as a possible measurement problem. To measure behavior, Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) relied exclusively upon their subjects' self report of past behavior. The self-report method was supplemented with a direct measurement of behavior in the present study. The additional hypothesis was directed at exposing any possible differences arising from the use of either self-report or direct measurement techniques.

The data needed to test the hypotheses were obtained by a questionnaire administered under group conditions and from class attendance records kept for the courses in which the subjects were currently enrolled. The questionnaire was administered to 87 students enrolled in sociology and anthropology courses during the 1975 summer session at Kansas State College of Pittsburg. Of the 81 students that properly completed the questionnaire, 70 were willing to identify themselves, thereby making a direct measure of their behavior (class-cutting frequency) possible.

The data obtained were coded, transferred to 80 column IBM data cards, and read into an IBM/360 computer. Using a Fortran IV language program, the computer provided product moment correlations between the

designated variables. The correlations obtained between the several attitude variables and the behavior variable made possible an assessment of the four hypotheses developed by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972: 196):

- Hypothesis I. The two attitudes, Ao and As, are independent of one another.
- Hypothesis II. Each of the two attitudes, Ao and As, will reliably predict behavior to at least some extent.
- Hypothesis III. Behavior will be more accurately predicted if both attitudes, Ao and As, are taken into consideration.
- Hypothesis IV. Behavior will be even more accurately predicted if the two attitudes, Ao and As, are weighted for their perceived importance with respect to one another.

The additional hypothesis, Hypothesis V, was tested by comparing the results in analyses where behavior was measured by self report to an analysis where behavior was directly measured.

- Hypothesis V. The measurement of behavior by direct means, rather than by self report, will not affect the strength of the relationship between attitudes and behavior.

Summary of the Results

Hypothesis I was neither strongly supported nor refuted by the correlations obtained between Ao and As. Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) reported correlations close to zero between the two attitude variables and interpreted their results as indicating a clear independence of the two variables. The weak to moderate correlations between Ao and

As obtained in the present study did not show a clear separation or a strong relationship between the two types of attitude.

Hypothesis II was supported by the findings. Both Ao and As predicted behavior to some extent. The correlations obtained between Ao and behavior were of about the same strength as those reported by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) and were comparable to the strength of the relationship between attitudes and behavior generally reported by others (Wicker, 1971; Liska, 1974). The correlations found between As and behavior were higher than those reported by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) and also indicated a stronger relationship between attitudes and behavior than has been reported generally (Wicker, 1971; Liska, 1974).

Hypothesis III was partially supported by the findings. The correlations between the two attitudes combined and behavior were consistently higher than those found between Ao and behavior, but about the same strength as those found between As and behavior.

Hypothesis IV was not supported by the results. The prediction of behavior was not improved when Ao and As were weighted for relative importance. The correlations obtained between behavior and the weighted AoAs measure were of about the same strength as those between behavior and As alone and those between behavior and Ao and As combined.

When the first four hypotheses are viewed as parts of a single theoretical perspective it is possible to discern two basic propositions: (1) that behavior can be more accurately predicted than has generally been the case by utilizing attitude-toward-situation as

well as attitude-toward-object; (2) and that when the two kinds of attitude are weighted for relative importance their predictive power increases. The first proposition was supported by the findings of the present study and the second was not.

Recommendations

Based upon the results of the present study and insights gained while conducting the research, the following recommendations relating to further research have been made.

1. The concept of attitude-toward-situation showed a stronger relationship to behavior than did attitude-toward-object in both the present study and in previous research (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972). This finding suggests that the common practice of utilizing only attitudes toward objects to assess the relationship between attitudes and behavior is inadequate. Further research utilizing both kinds of attitude variables is needed.

2. The present study and the one conducted by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) were carried out in similar environments and utilized basically the same attitude and behavior variables. New research utilizing different attitude and behavior variables would provide a broader basis for the evaluation of Rokeach's approach.

3. Rokeach's proposition that when the two kinds of attitude (Ao and As) are weighted for relative importance their predictive power will increase, warrants further study. Although the weighted AoAs measure did not produce strong results in the present study, it had previously done so (Rokeach and Kliejunas, 1972). The subjects'

subjective evaluation of As as more important than Ao in determining their behavior indicates that a measure of relative importance is meaningful.

4. The final recommendation is of a more general nature than the other three. Liska (1974) reported that research including more than one relevant attitude to predict behavior has generally produced stronger results than research relying upon a single attitude. The logic behind this multiple attitude approach was stated by Liska (1974:265):

Social objects are composed of numerous properties. ... Therefore, attempting to predict behavior ... using only one attitude makes little sense; rather we must measure and include various relevant attitudes in the predictive equation.

The relationship between attitudes and behavior found by Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) and in the present study support Liska's (1974) contention. These findings were obtained by using two attitudes, one directed toward the object and one directed toward the situation in which the object was encountered. There is no reason to assume, however, that two attitudes will represent all relevant dimensions of any given social act. Given the complexity of human social behavior it would be unreasonable to expect that behavior could be perfectly predicted by any number of attitude variables. Further research directed at identifying the attitudes relevant to a whole range of behaviors is needed. It would then be possible to more clearly establish the degree to which any particular behavior can be understood in terms of the attitudes relevant to it.

APPENDIX A

Before the questionnaires were distributed the subjects were told that their responses were to be used in research designed to determine some of the factors which may affect the frequency of attending class in sociology courses. The subjects were assured that their responses would not be made available to their instructors or anyone other than the researcher.

The following instructions were verbally given during each group administration of the questionnaire.

1. First, I would like for you to list the name of the course you are now in. A blank labeled Course I has been provided for this purpose at the top of the first page, in the blank labeled number of course hours per week, I need the number of times this class meets each week.

2. Next, list all other sociology courses that you have previously completed in the blanks provided. If you have completed more than four sociology courses list the four most recently completed. Indicate the number of class meetings per week for each class and then give your estimate, to the best of your recollection, of the number of times you cut each class. Don't count absences due to illness or any other reason that is considered an excused absence. After you have completed the first section please wait for further instructions.

3. At the bottom of the first page of your questionnaire there is a question asking how you feel about going to class in general. Indicate your response by circling the number on the scale that best represents the importance you place upon class attendance.

4. Pages two through four contain sections labeled Instructor of Course I through Instructor of Course V. Instructor of Course I refers to the instructor of the class you are now attending, Instructor of Course II refers to the instructor of the course you listed as Course II on the first page, and so forth. Please circle the number on the two scales which best represents your feelings or opinions about the instructor of each course you listed. When you have finished please wait for further instructions.

5. On pages five and six you will find separate sections for each of the previously completed courses that you listed on page one. I would like to know to what extent your going or not going to class was jointly determined by your feelings toward each of your instructors and your feelings about the importance of attending class. For each course you listed on page one, you are asked to indicate the number of class cuts you had and to fill in a percentage following each of the simple scales provided. In each case the two percentages should add up to 100 per cent.

6. So that additional information can be gathered later, I would like for any of you that are willing to do so to sign your name to your questionnaire. If you choose to sign, your responses will still be confidential. Thank you for your cooperation.

Questionnaire

Please follow the verbal instructions given.

Course I.	_____	No. of course hours	
	_____	per week	_____
Course II.	_____	No. of course hours	Estimated No. of
	_____	per week	class cuts _____
Course III.	_____	No. of course hours	Estimated No. of
	_____	per week	class cuts _____
Course IV.	_____	No. of course hours	Estimated No. of
	_____	per week	class cuts _____
Course V.	_____	No. of course hours	Estimated No. of
	_____	per week	class cuts _____

How do you feel about going
to class in general?

somewhat important to me

important to me

very important to me

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Instructor of Course I.

I dislike the instructor
very much

Neither like nor dislike

I like the instructor
very much

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

The instructor's lectures are:

Very informative and
stimulating

Informative and stimulating

A boring waste
of time

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Instructor of Course II.

I disliked the instructor
very much

Neither liked nor disliked

I liked the instructor
very much

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

The instructor's lectures are:

Very informative and
stimulating

Informative and stimulating

A boring waste
of time

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Instructor of Course III.

I disliked the instructor
very much

Neither liked nor disliked

I liked the instructor
very much

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

The instructor's lectures are:

Very informative and
stimulating

Informative and stimulating

A boring waste
of time

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Instructor of Course IV.

I disliked the instructor
very much

Neither liked nor disliked

I liked the instructor
very much

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

The instructor's lectures are:

Very informative and
stimulating

Informative and stimulating

A boring waste
of time

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

You had ____ cuts (fill in from page 1) in instructor IV's course.
 To what extent was the frequency of attendance or the frequency of
 cuts in this course determined by:

Write
 Percentage
 Here

(a) your feelings about instructor IV?

0% 50% 100%

(b) your general feeling about the im-
 portance or unimportance of attend-
 ing class?

0% 50% 100%

(c) Total percentage (a+b)

100%

You had ____ cuts (fill in from page 1) in instructor V's course.
 To what extent was the frequency of attendance or the frequency of
 cuts in this course determined by:

Write
 Percentage
 Here

(a) your feelings about instructor V?

0% 50% 100%

(b) your general feeling about the im-
 portance or unimportance of attend-
 ing class?

0% 50% 100%

(c) Total percentage (a+b)

100%

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allport, F.H.
1924 Social Psychology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Allport, G.W.
1929 "The composition of political attitudes." American Journal of Sociology 35: 220-228.
- 1935 "Attitudes." Pages 798-844 in Carl Murchison (ed.), A Handbook of Social Psychology. Worcester, Mass.: Clark University Press.
- 1954 The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison Wesley.
- Baldwin, J.M.
1901-05 Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology. (3 volumes) New York: Macmillan.
- Bernberg, R.E.
1952 "Socio-psychological factors in industrial morale: I. The prediction of specific indicators." Journal of Social Psychology. 36: 73-82.
- Blumer, H.
1955 "Attitudes and the social act." Social Forces. 3: 59-64.
- Bogardus, E.S.
1931 Fundamentals of social psychology. New York: Century.
- Brayfield, A.H., and W.H. Crockett.
1955 "Employee attitudes and employee performance." Psychological Bulletin. 52: 396-424.
- Buchanan, W.
1969 Understanding Political Variables. New York: Scribner.
- Campbell, A., P.E. Converse, W.E. Miller, and D.E. Stakes.
1960 The American Voter. New York: John Wiley.
- Cantril, H.
1934 "The social psychology of everyday life." Psychological Bulletin. 31: 297-330.

- Chave, E.J.
1928 "A new type scale for measuring attitudes." Religious Education. 23: 364-369.
- Corey, S.M.
1937 "Professed attitudes and actual behavior." Journal of Educational Psychology. 28: 271-280.
- Defleur, M.L., and F.R. Westie.
1958 "Verbal attitudes and overt acts: An experiment on the salience of attitudes." American Sociological Review 23: 667-673.
- Doob, L.W.
1947 "The behavior of attitudes." Psychological Review 54: 135-147.
- Droba, D.D.
1933 "The nature of attitude." Journal of Social Psychology 4: 444-463.
- Ewer, B.C.
1929 Social psychology. New York: Macmillan
- Fendrich, J.M.
1967 "Perceived reference group support: social attitudes and overt behavior." American Sociological Review 32: 960-970.
- Fishbein, M.
1966 "The relationships between beliefs, attitudes, and behavior." In S. Feldman (e.d.) Cognitive consistency. New York: Academic Press.
- Goldberg, A.S.
1966 "Discerning a causal pattern among data on voting behavior." American Political Science Review 60: 913-922.
- Hyman, H.H.
1949 "Inconsistencies as a problem in attitude measurement." Journal of Social Issues 5: 38-42.
- Kohler, W.
1929 Gestalt psychology. New York: Liveright.
- Krueger, E.T. and W.C. Reckless.
1931 Social psychology. New York: Longmans, Green.

- Kutner, B., C. Wilkins, and P.R. Yarrow.
1952 "Verbal attitudes and overt behavior." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 47: 667-673.
- LaPiere, R.Y.
1934 "Attitudes vs. Action." Social Forces 13: 230-237.
- Linn, L.S.
1965 "Verbal attitudes and overt behavior: A study of social discrimination." Social Forces 44: 353-364.
- Liska, A.E.
1974 "Emergent issues in the attitude-behavior consistency controversy." American Sociological Review 39: 261-272.
- Lundberg, G.A.
1929 Social Research. New York: Longmans, Green.
- McGuire, W.J.
1966 "The Nature of Attitudes and Attitude Change" in G. Lindzey (e.d.) The Handbook of Social Psychology. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Morgan, J.J.
1934 Keeping a sound mind. New York: Macmillan.
- Murphy G. and L.B. Murphy.
1931 Experimental social psychology. New York: Harper.
- Rokeach, M.
1968a Beliefs, Attitudes and Values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- 1968b "The Nature of Attitudes." in David L. Sills (ed.) International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York: Crowell Collier and Macmillan.
- Rokeach, M., and P. Kliejunas.
1972 "Behavior as a function of attitude-toward-object and attitude-toward-situation." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 22: 194-201.
- Rokeach, M., and G. Rothman.
1965 "The principle of belief congruence and the congruity principle as models of cognitive interaction." Psychological Review 72: 128-142.
- Selltiz, D., M. Jahoda, M. Deutsch, and S.W. Cook.
1959 Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- Thomas, W.I., and F. Znaniecki.
1918 The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. New York: Dover.
- Thurstone, L.L., and E.J. Chave.
1929 The measurement of attitude. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vroom, V.H.
1964 Work and motivation. New York: Wiley.
- Warren, H.C. (ed.)
1934 Dictionary of psychology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
1922 Elements of human psychology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Weinstein, A.G.
1972 "Predicting behavior from attitudes." Public Opinion Quarterly 36: 355-360.
- Weissberg, N.C.
1965 "On DeFleur and Westie's 'Attitude as a scientific concept.'" Social Forces 43: 425-433.
- Westie, F.R.
1953 "A technique for the measurement of race attitudes." American Sociological Review 18: 73-78.
- Wicker, A.W.
1969 "Attitudes versus actions: the relationship of verbal and overt behavioral responses to attitude objects." Journal of Social Issues 25: 41-78.
1971 "An examination of the 'other variables' explanation of attitude-behavior inconsistency." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 19: 18-30.