

1972

# Attitudes Toward the War in Viet Nam: A Population Study

Ralph George O'Sullivan  
*Eastern Illinois University*

---

## Recommended Citation

O'Sullivan, Ralph George, "Attitudes Toward the War in Viet Nam: A Population Study" (1972). *Masters Theses*. 3914.  
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/3914>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

PAPER CERTIFICATE #2

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Author

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because I may want to use it for further (Doctoral) research

August 4, 1972  
Date

pdm

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE WAR IN VIET NAM:

A POPULATION STUDY

BY

RALPH GEORGE O'SULLIVAN

B. S., Eastern Illinois University, 1970

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement  
for the Degree of Master of Arts in Sociology at the Graduate School  
of Eastern Illinois University

CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS  
1972

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research has not been completed through the sole efforts of the researcher. It is the final product of a number of people working in harmony toward a specific goal. Special gratitude is extended to my graduate adviser, Dr. Frieda Stute, for helping me to formulate my final ideas for research. I thank Mr. Richard Hummel for being on my graduate committee, and especially for his patience and assistance in the computerization and interpretation of my data. I thank also Dr. Byron E. Munson for being on my graduate committee.

The most important person to whom gratitude is extended is my wife, Beth Anne. She has been fully cooperative in providing a pleasant working atmosphere; and without her comfort and advice in times of despair this work would not now be completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Chapter I - INTRODUCTION</b>	
A. Historical Perspective .....	1
B. Statement of the Problem .....	5
C. Review of the Literature .....	12
<b>Chapter II - THEORY AND HYPOTHESES</b>	
A. Theoretical Framework .....	15
B. Hypotheses to be Tested .....	18
<b>Chapter III - RESEARCH PROCEDURES</b>	
A. Questionnaire Distribution and Collection .....	22
B. Questionnaire Coding .....	23
C. Variable Collapsing and Table Construction .....	23
<b>Chapter IV - RESULTS OF THE STUDY</b>	
A. Data Analysis .....	26
B. Dependent Variable Covariance .....	28
C. Alternative Explanations .....	30
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>35</b>

TABLE SETS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Attitude Components by Sex .....	66
II. Attitude Components by Academic Major .....	68
III. Attitude Components by Established Religion Affiliation .....	71
IV. Attitude Components by Veteran Status .....	73
V. Attitude Components by Veteran Status and Southeast Asian Duty .....	75
VI. Attitude Components by Television and News Broadcasts .....	77
VII. Attitude Components by Newspapers, and Magazines and Journals Sometimes Read .....	81
VIII. Attitude Components by Individual Research into the History of the War .....	85
IX. Dependent Variable Covariance .....	87

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### A. Historical Perspective

In Viet Nam the period between 1946 and 1954 was marked by French efforts to keep the country from coming under the political control of the Communist forces from North Viet Nam.<sup>1</sup> Then in 1954 the French met a final and crushing military defeat at Dien Bien Phu, which ended French involvement in the affairs of Viet Nam.

But President Diem of South Viet Nam realized that his country could not singlehandedly fight the Communist forces without aid from another country. The United States had been assisting the French and the South Vietnamese forces for several years with logistical support. In 1965 President Dwight D. Eisenhower began to give direct politico-military aid to South Viet Nam, at the request of Diem. This aid was in the forms of material and military advisers who were trained in unconventional and counterinsurgency warfare, but were not themselves to be combatants. This limited aid continued throughout the remainder of Eisenhower's administration and through that of John F. Kennedy.

Under the Presidential administration of Lyndon B. Johnson, first one and then two U. S. Navy destroyers were allegedly attacked by North

---

<sup>1</sup>Harry S. Ashmore and William C. Baggs. Mission to Hanoi. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1968), p. 208.

Vietnamese torpedo boats. President Johnson, with the concurrence of the Congress then passed the Tonkin Gulf Resolution which was to serve as an unofficial declaration of war against the North Vietnamese Communists.

From 1965 to 1968 the United States had, at the height of the fighting, committed approximately 500,000 active military personnel to fighting and military support in the country South Viet Nam.

This period saw many major military efforts on the part of both sides; resulting in such now famous, or infamous, names as Hamburger Hill, Tet, Hue, and so on. But, some people thought that we were and are fighting a war that cannot be won. Our B-52 Air Force strategic bombers have apparently had no noticeable effect on the fighting ability of the enemy, except to destroy the countryside, which serves as his hiding place. Our Marine and Army infantrymen have apparently not yet killed enough of the enemy to keep him from returning. Our "body count" of the "enemy" has come to include anyone killed, without regard as to whether or not he or she was, in fact, the enemy. In short, then, we have apparently made no noticeable progress toward destroying, or at least undermining, the fighting ability or the morale of the North Vietnamese forces.

In 1969 Richard M. Nixon became yet another President to be plagued by the war. In 1970 he ordered the incursion of the U. S. - South Vietnamese allied forces into the "Fishhook" region of Cambodia to capture and/or to destroy a major enemy command post. The command post was never found. In 1971 the South Vietnamese forces, with the aid of U. S. air support, incurred into the Plain of Jars region of Laos, which ended in a disastrous defeat and military retreat on the part of the South Vietnamese.

Most recently President Nixon has ordered the mining of Haiphong and other coastal harbors, as well as inland waterways in an attempt to keep military supplies from being imported into North Viet Nam. He has also ordered the resumed bombing of both major and minor, as well as quasi-, military targets throughout North Viet Nam. These actions were apparently in reaction to the March, 1972 major offensive by the North Vietnamese, which is the 1972 equivalent of the 1968 Tet offensive.

But this offensive is different from the one that occurred in 1968. The North Vietnamese forces are using conventional warfare tactics, especially in their usage of armored tanks. Vo Nguyen Giap, the North Vietnamese military commander, has engineered a master plan to take over the Northern provinces of South Viet Nam, designed to achieve both morale destroying and military victories.

Whether or not the South Vietnamese Army, numbering approximately 1,000,000 men can survive this offensive in light of U. S. military withdrawal, is speculative. The South Vietnamese forces have had the advice and the support of our nation for many years, and, it seems, that they can do very little better now than they were able to do in the 1950's and the 1960's.

At this point in time one might wonder why we as a nation have committed many billions of dollars and approximately 48,000 men dead,<sup>2</sup> many more thousands wounded, and 1,618 prisoners of war (POW's) and/or missing in action (MIA's) to this war.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>This figure varies with sources, but 48,000-49,000 dead seems to be the most consistent figure.

<sup>3</sup>Peter J. Ognibene, "Politics and POW's." New Republic. Volume 166 Number 23, June 3, 1972. p. 17.

A history of Asia, and Southeast Asia in particular, will show that there has been a constant downward movement of Northern people into the rich, fertile heartland of the Southeast. But, more recently there has been infected into this movement conflicting political ideologies and the expanding need for natural resources. The political ideology conflict is between the Chinese form of Communism and our own concept of Democratic Republicanism imposed on the South Vietnamese. Each side wants to have, explicitly or implicitly, control over the countries of Southeast Asia.

The People's Republic of China does not have enough fertile areas to produce crops to support its population of approximately 800,000,000 people. Southeast Asia, on the other hand, is rich in rice crop production and production potential. Southeast Asia is also abundantly supplied with other natural resources which include oil, ferrous metals, and perhaps most importantly, nuclear materials. It is the researcher's contention that the political ideology conflict between Communism and Democratic Republicanism is of secondary importance to the real struggle for bountiful resources accorded to the victor of Southeast Asia. But this is speculation.

Our Federal government(s) has (have) given we the people many reasons as to why we have been involved in Vietnamese affairs. Our military strength there has been reduced from its approximate peak of 500,000 men to its current level of 62,400 men in Viet Nam, 45,000 men in Thailand, and 41,000 men in the Seventh Fleet,<sup>4</sup> all under the administration of President Nixon. Whether or not the war effort will continue on our part to be de-escalated in favor

---

<sup>4</sup>The Editors, "Making It Work." New Republic, Volume 166, Number 24, June 10, 1972, p. 7.

of Vietnamization, or whether or not we will become re-obligated to continue the war, is, again, speculative. The fact remains however that U. S. Military forces are still actively involved in efforts to stop the 1972 offensive.

The fact also remains that 1972 is the year for a U. S. Presidential election. Richard M. Nixon is the incumbent President who will run for a second term. He has reduced our troop strength in Southeast Asia; he is negotiating the Paris peace talks; and he is attempting to fulfill his 1968 campaign promise to end our involvement in Vietnamese affairs. His opponent is the Democratic Party Presidential nominee George S. McGovern.

McGovern voted for the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, but later proved to be a "dove" toward the war. Since he is not in the position of ultimate power in this country it is easy for him to speak out against the current administration's efforts to make a meaningful and lasting peace in Viet Nam.

In effect then, we have a choice of two men for the Presidency; each of whom desire to end the war. Yet the war continues, and threatens to continue.

Since this is a Presidential election year the researcher feels that in order to make a rational political decision regarding the war and the candidates the populace would, hopefully, make a concerned effort to find out what has happened in Viet Nam in terms of the history of the war. This stems from the domain assumption that the more one knows about a situation of a set of circumstances, the better one's appraisal of it will be.

#### B. Statement of the Problem

The overall purpose of this research is an attempt through a one-shot survey questionnaire to determine if there are any significant

differences in personal background characteristics of the respondents to account for their different degrees of involvement in their attitude system directed toward the war in Viet Nam.

Before one can proceed with this aspect of the research we must first determine what is an attitude and of what is composed.

There are many definitions of attitudes. The one found most useful for this research was offered by Harold Proshansky and Bernard Seidenberg.

Their definition is as follows:

An attitude is a complex tendency of the person to respond consistently in a favorable or unfavorable way to social objects in his environment. The existence of an attitude is inferred from the individual's behavior on the basis of how he reacts toward or what he says about the attitudinal object or referent.<sup>5</sup>

Further,

Perhaps the most striking aspect of an attitude is its evaluative character. The person is 'for' or 'against' something, and the individuals may be distinguished not only in terms of what side of the evaluative dimension they are on, but also with respect to the degree to which they are favorably or unfavorably disposed.<sup>6</sup>

Human beings are in a constant state of action-reaction to objects or other persons in their social and physical environments. How they react toward these objects is, in part, determined by their predispositions, or attitudes, toward them.

In an attitudinal survey such as this, we must also determine of what an attitude is composed, because an attitude is not an abstract concept

---

<sup>5</sup>Harold Proshansky and Bernard Seidenberg (editors). Basis Studies in Social Psychology. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965), p. 97.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid, p. 98.

existing in limbo. Rather, an attitude is definable and identifiable in terms of its three components, thus forming an attitude system.

The first component of an attitude is the cognitive component, which consists of the beliefs the individual holds about the object. In this component the individual has beliefs about the attributes or the qualities of the object, which are, in part, determined by the individual's knowledge about the object.

The second component of the attitude system consists of the individual's feelings or affect toward the object. It is this component that can be measured in terms of its elements, toward the object on the basis of a test "score." The "score" reflect the degree and the direction (valence) of the attitude.

The third and final component of an attitude system consists of the action or the overt behavior directed toward the object. The individual acts toward the object on the basis of his cognitive and affective elements toward the object.<sup>7</sup>

We must also be concerned with the sources of an individual's attitude toward the object. The researcher will, therefore, briefly discuss several possible bases for attitudes.

The first possible basis of the development of an attitude is want satisfaction.<sup>8</sup> Attitudes are here developed in terms of the satisfaction of specific wants or goals. Thus, a person may develop a favorable attitude toward an attained goal, and/or an unfavorable attitude toward

---

<sup>7</sup>David Kretch, Richard S. Crutchfield, and Egerton L. Ballachey, Individual in Society. (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1962), p. 181.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid, p. 191.

an unattained goal. In search for the basis(es) of an individual's attitude toward the war war satisfaction might not be considered as a basis, except, possibly, as a latent result from an individual's effort(s) to understand more about the war.

A second possible basis for attitudes in general might be personal experience with the object. Here the individual would learn about the object in question through first-hand experience. In the case of the war in Viet Nam this might be of particular importance regarding veterans who have served there.

A third possible basis for the development of an attitude might be group affiliation.<sup>9</sup>

Many of the attitudes of the individual have their sources and their support in the groups to which the individual gives allegiance. His attitudes tend to reflect the beliefs, values, and norms of his group. And to maintain his attitudes, the individual must have the support of like-minded persons.<sup>10</sup>

No individual exists in society without belonging to any social group. The smallest group to which the individual belongs is the primary group, consisting of face-to-face relationships. The way a person behaves in primary groups is determined by the beliefs, values and the norms held by the groups.

Some investigators believe that the primary group, especially the family, is a major determinant in attitude development. For example, in studies by Bernard Berelson, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and W. N. McPhee (1954)

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid, p. 181.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

and by Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson, and H. Gaudet (1944) they found that three-fourths of their study panel members voted for the same political party as did their fathers.<sup>11</sup> This may not indicate agreement by father and offspring on all aspects of the election issues, but, at least, it indicates a sharing of the same general or overall frames of reference, or attitudes.

Primary groups generally have a relatively homogeneous attitude and belief system, which is determined in four ways. First, conformity to group attitudes is induced by group pressure. Second, groups seek out potential members with attitudes congenial to the established attitude system. Third, members of primary groups are exposed to the same sources of information. Finally, the individual voluntarily takes on the attitude system of the group to gain its members acceptance.<sup>12</sup>

Another aspect of the individual's attitude development is reference group identification. Here an individual identifies with some group, to which he may or may not be a member, and uses its belief systems, attitudes or ideologies, as the basis(es) for his behavior or attitude development.

A fourth, possible basis for an individual's attitude is the source(s) of information to which he is exposed.

Our world is complex, and, therefore, it is almost impossible for an individual to keep up with all the events that happen daily. The individual must seek out information sources to keep him informed.

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid, p. 195.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid, p. 196.

As such then, an individual has a choice to make regarding media. He may seek out those information sources which serve to reinforce his developed belief system. Or, he may seek out those media which present both sides of the issue so that he may evaluate them in order to facilitate a rational attitude decision about the event.

To exemplify, L. S. Cottrell and Sylvia Eberhart (1948) attempted to discover something about people's sources of information about the atomic bomb. Some of their findings are as follows:

(1) The number of sources of information a person had was closely related to his education and income; (2) people with higher than average education and income tended to consider magazines their most trustworthy sources; (3) the poorly educated tended to trust the radio more than the newspapers, whereas the well-informed trusted them equally; (4) the radio was trusted because it reported the news quickly; magazines because of their detailed accounts.<sup>13</sup>

Today, in addition to newspapers, magazines, and radio we have the technological advantages of television. Through this medium we are not only given news reports and news commentary, but we also are "taken" to the event that is being reported; thereby enabling us to see what is happening.

Whichever medium the individual chooses to use, each has its own editorial opinions and biases. Therefore the individual must choose media that have attitudes either consonant or dissonant with his belief system. Those that are in agreement with my beliefs help to reinforce his attitudes. Those media attitudes that are in disagreement may assist the individual in developing an attitude.

It will be recalled in the chosen definition of "attitude" two words were of particular importance. They were "favorable" and "unfavorable."

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid, p. 189.

These, in general, refer to the valence of an attitude; which is the degree and the direction of affect attached to the attitude.

There are many means of measuring attitudes, among them are: (1) the Guttman Scalogram; (2) the paired-comparisons test; (3) the equal appearing intervals test; (4) and the Likert scale. The type of measurement technique chosen will depend on what ends the researcher desires to accomplish. In order to determine the degrees of valence toward the war in Viet Nam the researcher chose the Likert attitude measurement technique. It was chosen because it locates an individual's attitude on a continuum of affect toward the object (Appendix A, page 39). This attitude location is the primary dependent variable in the research.

The researcher felt that the list of possible bases provided in the questionnaire was broad enough to cover a number of major possibilities (Appendix A, page 37). At the same time the categories were broad enough so that the individual respondent would not have to manufacture reasons or stretch his imagination to find some minute point or personal incident to serve as the stated basis for his attitude. Another factor considered in the development of possible bases was that they had to be closed-ended to facilitate data tabulation.

Not all people have attitudes toward all objects, however. Therefore another task facing the researcher was to "weed out" those respondents who did not have an attitude toward the war. This was accomplished by asking the respondents if they did indeed have an attitude toward the war. Those individuals indicating no identifiable attitude were requested not to complete the remainder of the questionnaire. (Appendix A, page 36, question 31).

Another matter of concern for the research variable, was what the respondent had actually done, in terms of overt behavior, to support his attitude toward the war (Appendix A, pages 38-39). What a person says he does or what he says he will do toward an object or event does not necessarily represent what the person actually does. Due to the size of the population and time limitation the researcher was not able to personally view individual behavior patterns. Therefore, the researcher must assume that the respondents' stated actions are valid and reliable.

A final matter of concern for the research was what "facts" the respondent's had learned about the war from media coverage. What a person learns about an object, it will be recalled, will assist in the development of an attitude toward the object in question.

The dependent variables to be measured, then, are: (1) "knowledge" about the war; (2) attitude strength and direction; and (3) persuasive efforts of the individual (overt behavior). These, then, are the components of an attitude system. But, they are also the components of what the researcher labels an involvement system, which will be discussed in further detail later in this paper.

### C. Review of the Literature

The researcher has reviewed the major professional journals in the following fields to determine what has been done in terms of related research: (1) political science; (2) sociology; and (3) public opinion. The specific journals reviewed were: (1) American Political Science Review; (2) American Sociological Review; (3) American Journal of Sociology; and

(4) Public Opinion Quarterly, all of which are in the periodical section of Eastern Illinois University's Booth Library. Two articles of related research were found. One was in the June, 1967 issue of the Public Opinion Quarterly. The other was in the June, 1967 issue of the American Political Science Review.

The article in the Public Opinion Quarterly was entitled "Professors' Attitudes toward the Viet Nam War," researched and written by David J. Armour, Joseph B. Giaquinta, R. Gordon McIntosh, and Diana E. H. Russell.<sup>14</sup> Their survey was conducted in a large metropolitan area using university and college professors in the humanities and the social sciences. Their purpose was to determine if university professors could be labelled as more "radical" on the topic of the war than the public-at-large.

From their data they concluded that their professors could not be labelled, in any absolute sense, as any more radical toward the war than the public-at-large.

The article in the American Political Science Review was entitled "Public Opinion and the Viet Nam War," which was researched and written by Sidney Verba, Richard A. Brady, Edwin B. Barker, Norman H. Nie, Nelson W. Palsby, Paul Ekman, and Gordon S. Black.<sup>15</sup> Their paper reports the

---

<sup>14</sup>David J. Armour, Joseph B. Giaquinta, R. Gordon McIntosh, and Diana E. H. Russel, "Professors' Attitudes Toward the Viet Nam War." Public Opinion Quarterly, Volume XXXI, Number 2, Summer, 1967, pp. 162-165.

<sup>15</sup>Sidney Verba, Richard A. Brady, Edwin B. Barker, Norman H. Nie, Nelson W. Palsby, Paul Ekman, and Gordon S. Black, "Public Opinion and the Viet Nam War." American Political Science Review, Volume LXI, Number 2, June, 1967, p. 326.

results of a survey of American attitudes toward the war in Viet Nam which attempted to research somewhat more deeply into the public's attitudes toward the war than have newspaper and commercial polls.

From their data they determined that the "informed" cannot be said to form a distinct "policy public;" nor could they be substantially differentiated from the less "well-informed."

Both of the articles were concerned with the attitudes of their subjects toward the war in Viet Nam. They were concerned with: (1) attitude strength and direction; (2) some "facts" about the war; (3) and with activity supporting the attitudes. But neither study attempted to draw the three attitude components into a type of involvement system.

## CHAPTER II

### THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

#### A. Theoretical Framework

According to Cognitive theory man does not create his environment, nor is he a product of it. Rather, man knows how to manipulate his environment for his own benefit. The model for man in the cognitive approach is Homo sapiens because he can think, which is a quality that is not acknowledged in several other human motivation theories.

Man's cognitive world is that world, both social and physical, that is relevant to him. Man responds to objects or to other persons in his world in ways that they are perceived by him.

How man behaves is determined by any one or a combination of the following possible determinants: (1) his physical and social environments; (2) his physiological structure; (3) his wants and goals; and (4) by his past experience.<sup>17</sup> By being a thinking animal, capable of rational and calculated behavior, man can learn about his world and then act or react to it in a manner that is in agreement with his own cognitions.

Daniel Katz and Ezra Stotland have done extensive work in the field of attitude structure and have attempted "to define the structural

---

<sup>17</sup>Ibid, p. 17-18.

characteristics of attitudes, (and) to describe the motivational processes related to these characteristics."<sup>18</sup> Further

we assume an affective process has energizing properties . . . Affect is accompanied by a neural excitation of greater intensity or extensity than that which accompanies a cognitive process. Here, the person with an attitude which includes a behavioral component will need no other motivation than the presentation of the attitudinal object or its symbol to act positively or negatively toward the object . . . For attitudes which lack an action orientation or behavioral component, the presentation of the object will arouse the affective process but may not lead to overt behavior toward the object.<sup>19</sup>

Katz and Stotland then present several attitude types which are based on the extent to which one of the components are structurally dominant. The first, of those represented here, is affective associations.

The attitudes which we term affective associations represent the spread of affect during the process of motive satisfaction to objects which happen to be present at the time . . . These affective associations become attitudes only if the individual thinks about them sufficiently to evaluate them. If an affective association of this sort is not salient enough to perception or memory, it will probably not lead to sufficient cognitive activity to become an attitude.<sup>20</sup>

Thus "a person may have a strong positive or negative affect toward an object and at the same time have very little knowledge about it and a minimum or no action orientation toward it."<sup>21</sup>

A second attitude type, as presented by Katz and Stotland, closely adheres to the model of rational men who seeks an understanding of his

---

<sup>18</sup>Daniel Katz and Ezra Stotland, "A Preliminary Statement to a Theory of Attitude Structure and Change." S. Koch (ed.) Psychology: A Study of a Science (Volume 3) Formulations of the Person and the Social Context. (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1959), p. 425.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid, p. 434.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid, p. 435.

<sup>21</sup>Proshansky and Seidenberg, op cit, p. 100.

world. This type of attitude is called an intellectualized attitude.<sup>22</sup>

According to Katz and Stotland:

beliefs about the objects can satisfy a strong need within the person, the need to understand the world about him realistically and coherently<sup>23</sup> . . . Such attitudes tend to be interpreted within the cognitive system of the individual. The need for a coherent view of the world evokes effort to encompass many objects and classes of events in a coherent scheme, provided that the facts offer some basis for such integration. The heavy cognitive content of these attitudes also makes possible many areas of connectedness so that they can be organized into a complex value system.<sup>24</sup>

Thus we see that an intellectualized attitude may "involve extensively developed beliefs and feelings but lack any action tendencies."<sup>25</sup> The ideas of Katz and Stotland on attitude components is here presented because they suggest that people have different degrees of attitude involvement toward objects or events. This is due to the fact that, as previously stated, not all persons are affected by all events in identical ways.

To recapitulate, man constantly seeks to make a meaningful cognitive world; he seeks to understand events and the world in general around him. He seeks out information sources that are in agreement with his developed belief system(s), or those information sources that will help him to better understand the world. He then acts or reacts to those objects that are meaningful to him.

---

<sup>22</sup>Lutz and Stotland, op cit, p. 449.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid, p. 450.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid, p. 451.

<sup>25</sup>Proshansky and Seidenberg, op cit, p. 100.

The cognitive model, or theory, then states that man is capable of rational, calculated action. It implies that man can seek out information sources and learn about events in order that he may make a final attitudinal decision about the situation. However, a problem with theories in general, and a theory on human motivation in particular, is that they can never explain all variations of, for example, behavior patterns. Theories are generalizations about attributes or characteristics of phenomena.

A way to test a theory is to devise a set of hypotheses and research procedures to determine how close the theory approximates reality. That is what this research is an attempt to do. It is specifically designed to see what kinds of personality characteristics may motivate an individual to become involved in an attitude system toward the war; and to then determine what possible kinds of bases the individuals have for their attitude involvement system.

#### B. Hypothesis to be tested

To restate the problem, the research is

an attempt through a one-shot survey questionnaire to determine if there are any significant differences in personal background characteristics of the respondents to account for their different degrees of involvement in their attitude system directed toward the war in Viet Nam.

No two individuals have the same cognitive worlds. Therefore, no two people will behave in the same ways, because they hold different values and belief systems. Since no people will have the same cognitions and beliefs they will not have the same attitude strengths on an issue, such as the war in Viet Nam. Nor will they have identical bases for their attitude toward the war.

The war has been going on for approximately eighteen years in terms of direct U. S. politico-military involvement. It has been the topic of much concern and debate over this period. As such, then, the war has been a constant news story and the object, or target of editorial policies by the different media. Approximately forty-eight to forty-nine thousand men have been killed there; some media report our wounded casualties at nearly 500,000 men; and there are approximately 1,618 men classified as Prisoners of War (POW) and/or Missing in Action (MIA). And the war threatens to continue.

Since the war is so complex, and because it is a Presidential election year the researcher feels that some people will be more concerned than others reflected in degrees of personal involvement, and, therefore, that they will have stronger attitude systems directed toward the war than those who are less concerned.

As such, then, the dependent variables to be measured are: (1) knowledge about the war issue (part of cognition); (2) attitude strength and direction, directed toward the war (affect); and (3) the amount of persuasive efforts conducted by the individual (overt behavior). The researcher will test the following hypotheses.

Hypothesis I. Males will have stronger attitude systems directed toward the war than females. This would be due to the fact that women have the multiple roles of wife, mother, and housekeeper which does not allow them much leisure time, let alone time to conduct in depth news analysis.

Hypothesis II. Those students in the humanities and the social sciences will have stronger attitude systems directed toward the war than those students in other academic areas. This would be due to the fact that

the humanities and the social sciences are, generally, more concerned with the social order in our society than are the other academic areas.

Hypothesis III. Those persons who belong to established religions will have stronger attitude systems directed toward the war than those people who are unaffiliated with a religious ideology. This would be due to the fact that the teachings of peace and good will toward men by the churches are absent in those people who are unaffiliated.

Hypothesis IV. Veterans will have stronger attitudes systems directed toward the war than non-veterans. This would be due to the amount and intensity of military indoctrination and "Americanism" directed toward those in the military that non-veterans do not, generally, receive.

Hypothesis V. Those veterans who were stationed in Southeast Asia will have stronger attitude systems directed toward the war than those veterans who were not stationed in Southeast Asia. This would be due to close personal involvement with the war, and the result of seeing the ravages of war in general.

Hypothesis VI. Those people who are regularly attentive to news broadcasts, radio and/or television, will have stronger attitude systems directed toward the war than those who are not regularly attentive. This would, also, be due to result of exposure to news events and differing attitudes presented.

Hypothesis VII. Those people who sometimes read the magazines, journals, and newspapers presented will have stronger attitude systems directed toward the war than those who never were exposed to these media. Again, this would be due to the amount of news exposure and the different attitudes presented, assuming that the respondents did read about the war. All of the media presented are available in Booth Library for anyone to read.

Hypothesis VIII. Those people who have conducted personal inquiries into the history of the war will have stronger attitude systems directed toward the war than those who have not done so. How the inquiries were conducted was not determined in the questionnaire. However, there are several possibilities. It could have been conducted through keeping a daily mental record of news events, as presented on the television or the radio. It could have been conducted through the reading of one of the several books on the history of the war, some of which are The Pentagon Papers, Mission to Hanoi, and The Eye of the Dragon. Or, finally, it could have been conducted by keeping a daily record of the war's story in the regular editions of newspapers or news magazines.

The concepts "knowledge of the war," "attitude strength (directed toward the war)," and "persuasion efforts" are all dependent variables. But, it is expected that they are reciprocally influencing one another as parts of an involvement system. For example, the more an individual knows about a situation or an event, in this case the war, the stronger his attitude toward it may be. The attitude strength then may serve as the motivation to try and persuade someone else to your own attitude direction; or, in other words, the attitude may serve as the motivation for overt behavior. Further, the individual might then constantly seek new information about the object or event to strengthen, or possibly to change his attitude direction and in strength. Thus, the expectation is that the three variables will covary. In other words, then, the attitude or involvement system is a dynamic process involving the total personality.

CHAPTER III  
RESEARCH PROCEDURE

A. Questionnaire Distribution and Collection

The questionnaire was distributed to the apartment residents over the period of April 29 and May 30. The residents were asked to attempt to complete the questionnaire in not more than two days. (Several respondents told the researcher that it did not take over one-half of an hour to complete the entire questionnaire.)

When the researcher presented himself to each apartment he told the residents who he was, what he was doing, and told them of the overall purpose of the research, that is, thesis requirements. He did not discuss with them the hypotheses to be tested nor the other research techniques to be used. If the resident(s) declined to cooperate, the researcher thanked them and then moved on to the next apartment.

It was hoped that the respondents would have the questionnaires completed in not more than two days, to be picked up on the evenings of May 1 and 2. However, this was not the case. The researcher made many rounds of the housing complex picking up questionnaires. On Sunday, May 7, the researcher had to stop collection and begin the questionnaire coding process.

## B. Questionnaire Coding

A total of 290 questionnaires were distributed; of which 247 were returned; and of these 203 were usable. "Usable" meant that the respondents did indicate an attitude toward the war. Thus, there was a gross return rate of 85%, and a net return of 70%. Once the collection, distribution, and sorting processes were completed, the next task was to put the responses to the questionnaire into numerical terms for computerized statistical analysis.

A code book was developed (Appendix B) in which verbal responses were given numerical equivalents. The coded answers were then recorded on a sheet of paper with spaces simulating an I.B.M. card.

After the coding process was completed the data was punched onto the I.B.M. cards for data processing. This was accomplished over a period of several days in the Student Services Building, which houses the computer center and key punch machines that are available to the students.

## C. Variable Collapsing and Table Construction

After the questionnaire had been coded and processed to I.B.M. cards, the distribution of variable responses was determined by the use of a computer packaged program (NUCROS).

This tabulation process for thirty-nine variables enabled the researcher to deal with those variable categories containing too few individuals by eliminating or collapsing these categories for further analysis in contingency table construction. Fifteen variables were eliminated for further analysis because of insufficient variation in responses.

When the process was completed a total of twenty-four variables were chosen for analysis; of which there were eighteen independent variables and six dependent variables. The independent variables chosen for analysis are as follows: (1) sex; (2) academic major; (3) veteran status; (4) veteran status and Southeast Asian duty; (5) religious preference; (6) watching television news broadcasts; (7) listening to radio news broadcasts; (8) total of magazines and/or journals (as presented) sometimes read; (9) total of newspapers (as presented) sometimes read; (10) had the individual conducted individual research into the history of the war?; (11) is the attitude based on the history of the war?; (12) is the attitude based on media persuasion?; (13) is the attitude based on the persuasive efforts of others?; (14) is the attitude based on personal military experience?; (15) is the attitude based on family experiences, e.g. a "military family?"; (16) is the attitude based on having someone known to the respondent killed, wounded or missing in action?; (17) is the attitude based on Federal government support?; and (18) is the attitude based on religious convictions?

The six dependent variables chosen for analysis are as follows: (1) has the respondent participated in face-to-face persuasion efforts, to try and change someone else's attitude?; (2) has the respondent ever participated in demonstrations about the war?; (3) has the respondent ever signed any petitions about the war?; (4) does the respondent belong to any organization that actively supports or opposes the war?; (5) the respondents score range on the multiple choice test about Viet Nam and the war; and (6) the respondents score range on the Likert attitude measurement technique. The first four dependent variables comprise the behavioral

component of the attitude system. The "knowledge" about the war helps to represent the respondent's cognitions about the war. The respondent's attitude score represents the affective component in the attitude system.

Originally there were eight possibilities of attitude behavior in the questionnaire. Since four of the possibilities had very few respondents in the categories they were eliminated from analysis, thus leaving the four sub-components indicated above.

The first three behavioral subcomponents were collapsed into the following frequencies: (1) never; (2) once; (3) two to five times; and (4) six or more times. Organization embership was dichotomized into "Yes" and "No" categories. The scores on the knowledge and attitude tests were both dichotomized at the median scores.

CHAPTER IV  
RESULTS OF STUDY

A. Data Analysis

As the data was analyzed it was predicted that the gamma co-efficient valences would be distributed as the following matrix indicated:

	A	B	C	D	E	F	
Sex	-	-	-	-	+	-	- Hypothesis I
Academic Major	-	-	-	-	+	-	- Hypothesis II
Religious Affiliation	-	-	-	-	+	-	- Hypothesis III
Veteran Status	-	-	-	-	+	-	- Hypothesis IV
Southeast Asian Duty	-	-	-	-	+	-	- Hypothesis V
Watching Television News Broadcasts	-	-	-	-	+	-	- Hypothesis VI
Listening to Radio News Broadcasts	-	-	-	-	+	-	- Hypothesis VI
Newspaper Reading	+	+	+	+	-	+	- Hypothesis VII
Magazine and Journal Reading	+	+	+	+	-	+	- Hypothesis VII
Research into History of the War	-	-	-	-	+	-	- Hypothesis VIII

- A - Face-to-face Persuasion
- B - Demonstration Participation
- C - Petition Signing
- D - Organization Membership
- E - Knowledge
- F - Attitude

If the gamma coefficient had had the appropriate valences as indicated on the preceding page, the hypotheses would have been proven. This is strict adherence to established standards. Then, each independent variable would affect each dependent variable, as tested.

All hypotheses must be rejected as they are stated because the gamma coefficient valences are at deviance with the established criteria; nor are all of the chi-squares appropriately significant at the .05 level. The matrix pattern of the gamma coefficient valences is as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	F	
Sex	-	-	-	+	-	+	- Hypothesis I
Academic Major	-	-	-	-	-	-	- Hypothesis II
Religious Affiliation	+	+	+	+	-	-	- Hypothesis III
Veteran Status	-	+	-	+	-	+	- Hypothesis IV
Southeast Asian Duty	-	+	+	+	-	+	- Hypothesis V
Watching Television News Broadcasts	-	-	-	+	-	+	- Hypothesis VI
Listening to Radio News Broadcasts	-	+	+	+	-	-	
Newspaper Reading	-	+	+	+	-	+	- Hypothesis VII
Magazine and Journal Reading	+	+	-	-	+	+	
Research into History of the War	-	-	-	+	-	+	- Hypothesis VIII

- A - Face-to-face Persuasion
- B - Demonstration Participation
- C - Petition Signing
- D - Organization Membership
- E - Knowledge
- F - Attitude

If all of the relationships tested had had the valences as predicted the hypotheses would have been accepted. The strength of the relationship would then have been indicated by the degree enumeration. A large numerical figure represents a very strong relationship; and conversely, a low figure represents a moderately weak relationship. There were no consistent gamma degree strengths.

The hypotheses were rejected because they did not have the predicted valences. However, the researcher acknowledges that there were relationships that were as predicted among the independent and dependent variables. Further analysis into these relationships is beyond the scope of this research at this time.

Therefore we can state that the independent variable subcomponents and possible attitude bases do not provide a propensity for differences in attitude system components.

#### B. Dependent Variable Covariance

Another task of the research although it was not explicitly stated as such, was to determine to what extent each dependent variable, as tested, co-varied with each other; because it was assumed that each attitude component, and subcomponents, would be of equal strength, and be mutually influencing. A matrix of the expected dependent variable gamma coefficient valences would be as follows:

	6	5	4	3	2	1
1	-	+	-	+	+	
2	-	+	+	+		
3	+	-	-			
4	-	-				
5	-					
6						

- 1 - Face-to-face Persuasion
- 2 - Demonstration Participation
- 3 - Petition Signing
- 4 - Organization Membership
- 5 - Knowledge
- 6 - Attitude

If the dependent variables did co-vary, as predicted, then the valences would so indicate. The strength of the relationship would, as in the case of the independent-dependent variable relationships, be indicated by the degree enumeration. The matrix pattern for the dependent variable gamma coefficient valences is as follows:

	6	5	4	3	2	1
1	+	+	-	+	+	
2	+	-	+	-		
3	-	+	-			
4	-	+				
5	-					
6						

- 1 - Face-to-face Persuasion
- 2 - Demonstration Participation
- 3 - Petition Signing
- 4 - Organization Membership
- 5 - Knowledge
- 6 - Attitude

Again, if the relationships did have the appropriate valences, and the appropriate chi-squares, at the .05 level, then we could have accepted an idea that the attitude system components comprised a type of cybernetic feedback system process. However, by strict adherence to the established criteria, we must reject this idea because the valences were not indicated

as predicted. However, it also must be rejected with qualification because there are some relationships that did exist as predicted. This, too, suggests possibilities for further research, beyond the scope of this research project.

### C. Alternative Explanations

Stated with each hypothesis is a possible explanation regarding why it might have proven true, if that had been the case. However, since all hypotheses were rejected, these explanations must subsequently be rejected also. Therefore, there are several explanations as to why the residents in the population studied have not become very personally involved in the war in Viet Nam.

The first is that the multiple roles fulfilled by the population, those of parents, student(s), provider, do not allow the respondents satisfactory time to become involved to a very high degree in an attitude system directed toward the war in Viet Nam.

The second may reside in the nature of the war itself. Our nation has been fighting in the war for almost two decades, and, as in Korea, we have "lost." Also, the war has saturated the media since 1965, and, therefore, the people may have become apathetic and, subsequently, "tune out" all kinds of news, commentary, or actions of other people to "do something" about the war. In other words, then, the war may not be sufficiently salient to the individuals for them to develop a strong attitude system in their respective cognitive worlds.

A third possibility may reside in the general feeling of futility about trying to persuade someone else to change their ideas or policies

about the war. It may be felt by the respondents that talking to other people, or other similar behavior patterns, e.g. petition signing, is useless, because it really does very little to help end the war.

A last possibility may reside in that we, as "Homo sapiens," have not yet reached a state of rational, calculated behavior, as Gestalt and Cognitive social psychology suggest. Rather, humans may still behave in response to emotional stimuli, rather than on the basis of rationalism.

In conclusion, the research quotes Herbert Blumer,

The concept of attitude is empirically ambiguous. We do not yet have any set of reliable marks or characteristics which enable us to properly identify attitudes in the empirical world we study. An attitude is not perceived directly but must be pieced together through a process of inference . . . . We are at a loss to know what to reject as not belonging to an attitude. Not knowing what enters into an attitude (in an absolute sense), we obviously lack guidance in selecting the kinds of data needed to identify or to determine an attitude.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup>Herbert Blumer, Symbolic Interaction: Method and Perspective. (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1969), p. 91.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Armour, David J., Joseph B. Giaquinta, R. Gordon McIntosh, and Diana E. H. Russel, "Professors' Attitudes Toward the Viet Nam War." Public Opinion Quarterly, Volume XXXI, Number 2, Summer, 1967, p. 159-175.
- Ashmore, Harry S. and William C. Baggs. Mission to Hanoi. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1968.
- Bloodworth, Dennis. An Eye for the Dragon. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1970.
- Blumer, Herbert. Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1969.
- Buckley, Walter. Sociology and Modern Systems Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1967.
- Campbell, Donald and Julian C. Stanley. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1963.
- The Consultative Council of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Viet Nam. Viet Nam and International Law. Flanders, N. J.: O'Hare Books, 1967.
- The Editors, "Making It Work." New Republic, Volume 166, Number 24, June 10, 1972, p. 7-8.
- Freeman, Linton C. Elementary Applied Statistics. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.
- Guttman, Louis, "The Basis for Scalogram Analysis," Studies in Social Psychology in World War II (Volume 4) Measurement and Prediction. New York: Princeton University Press, 1949, p. 60-90.
- Katz, Naniel and Ezra Stotland, "A Preliminary Statement to a Theory of Attitude Structure and Change." S. Koch (ed.) Psychology: A Study of a Science (Volume 3) Formulations of the Person and the Social Context. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959, p. 423-475.
- Krech, David, Richard S. Crutchfield, and Egerton L. Ballachev. Individual in Society. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962.

- Labovitz, Sanford and Robert Hagedorn. Introduction to Social Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.
- McNemar, Quinn, "Opinion-Attitude Methodology." Psychological Bulletin, Volume 43, June, 1946, p. 289-374.
- Ognibene, Peter J., "Politics and POW's." New Republic, Volume 166, Number 24, June 3, 1972, p. 17-19.
- Phillips, Bernard S. Social Research: Strategy and Tactics (2nd edition). New York: The MacMillan Company, 1971.
- Proshansky, Harold and Bernard Seidenber (ed.). Basic Studies in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965, p. 97-110.
- Rosenberg, Morris. The Logic of Survey Analysis. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968.
- Sheehan, Neil, Hedrick Smith, E. W. Kenworthy, and Fox Bitterfield. The Pentagon Papers. New York: Batam Books, Inc., 1971.
- Verba, Stanley, Richard A. Brady, Edwin B. Barker, Norman H. Nie, Nelson W. Palsby, Paul Ekman, and Gordon S. Black. "Public Opinion and the Viet Nam War." American Political Science Review, Volume LXI, Number 2, June, 1967, p. 317-333.

**APPENDIX A**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

This questionnaire is concerned with the general area of public opinion and propaganda on the issue of the war in Viet Nam. The data from it will be analyzed and used for thesis requirements for the degree M.A. in Sociology. You will note that no where on the questionnaire or answer sheet provided is there a place for your name, to assure the anonymity of your responses. There will be no effort made to correlate the number on the questionnaire to your apartment number.

It should not take you a long time to fill out the questionnaire. When you do, please do so in a relaxed atmosphere to help alleviate the possibility of erroneous answers. Please keep in mind that the data analysis can only be valid if you provide me with truthful, and well thoughtout answers to the questions provided.

Also, on the last part of the questionnaire, please do not consult your answers with anyone or use outside material to help answer the questions. In that section I want your responses to be "off the top of your head."

I will collect the questionnaire in two (2) days.

Thank you.

1. Sex: Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_
2. Age: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Year in School: Freshman \_\_\_\_\_ Sophomore \_\_\_\_\_ Junior \_\_\_\_\_  
Senior \_\_\_\_\_ Graduate Student \_\_\_\_\_ Not a Student \_\_\_\_\_
4. Grade Point Average: (If applicable) \_\_\_\_\_
5. Academic Major: (If applicable) \_\_\_\_\_
6. Are you a Military Veteran (Including Reserves) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
7. If "Yes" to the Above (6) Were you Stationed in Southeast Asia?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
8. Are You a Citizen of the United States? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No: \_\_\_\_\_
9. What is your general political preference, in terms of Independence, Conservatism, or Liberalness; and its Degrees, if any, such as Conservative Liberal, Liberal Independent, or Moderate Liberal?  
  
\_\_\_\_\_
10. What is Your Religious Preference? \_\_\_\_\_
11. Do You have a Television Set? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
12. Do Your Regularly Watch Television News Broadcasts? Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
No \_\_\_\_\_ Sometimes \_\_\_\_\_ Inapplicable (No. T.V.) \_\_\_\_\_

-2-

13. Do You Regularly Watch Television Special Broadcasts? Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 No \_\_\_\_\_ Sometimes \_\_\_\_\_ Inapplicable (No. T.V.) \_\_\_\_\_
14. Do you have a Radio? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
15. Do You Regularly Listen to the Radio News Broadcasts? Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 No \_\_\_\_\_ Inapplicable (No Radio) \_\_\_\_\_

Do you regularly read (When each Issue is Published) any of the following Magazines or Journals?

- |   | <u>REGULARLY</u> | <u>SOMETIMES</u> | <u>NEVER</u> |
|---|------------------|------------------|--------------|
| 16. <u>Foreign Affairs</u>              | _____            | _____            | _____        |
| 17. <u>Time</u>                         | _____            | _____            | _____        |
| 18. <u>Newsweek</u>                     | _____            | _____            | _____        |
| 19. <u>U.S. News &amp; World Report</u> | _____            | _____            | _____        |
| 20. <u>Life</u>                         | _____            | _____            | _____        |
| 21. <u>The New Republic</u>             | _____            | _____            | _____        |
| 22. <u>The National Review</u>          | _____            | _____            | _____        |

Do you regularly read (Daily or at the time of Publication) any of the following newspapers?

- |                                      | <u>REGULARLY</u> | <u>SOMETIMES</u> | <u>NEVER</u> |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------|
| 23. The Chicago Tribune              | _____            | _____            | _____        |
| 24. Chicago Today                    | _____            | _____            | _____        |
| 25. St. Louis Post-Dispatch          | _____            | _____            | _____        |
| 26. The Chicago Daily News           | _____            | _____            | _____        |
| 27. The New York Times               | _____            | _____            | _____        |
| 28. The Christian Science<br>Monitor | _____            | _____            | _____        |
| 29. The National Observer            | _____            | _____            | _____        |

30. Have you ever conducted your own independent research into the political and military history of the war in South Viet Nam?  
 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
31. Do you have a political stand toward the war in Viet Nam?  
 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If you answered "No" to the above (31) please do not answer the remainder of this questionnaire.

32. What is your general political standpoint toward the war?  
 For \_\_\_\_\_ Against \_\_\_\_\_ Uncommitted \_\_\_\_\_

-3-

The following questions will be concerned with how you reached your political standpoint decision toward the Viet Nam war.

How did you reach your position?	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Partially</u>
33. Has your political position toward the war ever changed?	_____	_____	_____
34. If "Yes" to the above (33), How? Pro to Con _____ Con to Pro _____ Pro to Uncommitted _____ Con to Uncommitted _____ Uncommitted to Pro _____ Uncommitted to Con _____			
35. Does your position seem to be based on knowledge of the historical development of the War?	_____	_____	_____
36. Does your position seem to be based on media persuasion?	_____	_____	_____
37. Does your position seem to be based on the persuasive efforts of people you know with whom you have discussed the war?	_____	_____	_____
38. Does your position seem to be based on personal military experience? (If applicable leave blank)	_____	_____	_____
39. Does your position seem to be based on family experiences, such as a "military family?"	_____	_____	_____
40. Does your position seem to be based on emotional experiences, such as having someone known to you or close to you having been killed, wounded, or missing in action?	_____	_____	_____
41. Does your position seem to be based on strict political party affiliation?	_____	_____	_____
42. Does your position seem to be based on the absolute support of the Federal government irregardless of its political affiliation?	_____	_____	_____
43. Does your position seem to be based on your religious affiliation?	_____	_____	_____
44. Do you perceive your position to be based most strongly on <u>any one factor</u> given in 35-43 of this questionnaire? Yes _____ No _____			

- 45. If "Yes" to the above (44), please indicate which one. If "No" to the above, please leave blank. \_\_\_\_\_
- 46. Do you perceive your position to be based most strongly on any combination of the factors given in 35-44 of this questionnaire?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
- 47. If "Yes" to the above, please rank order them (Use only the two or three strongest). If "No" to the above, leave blank.  
\_\_\_\_\_ .

The following questions concern political activity toward the war.

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+times</u>	<u>Don't Remember</u>
48. Have you ever directly, face-to-face, tried to influence someone else's political position toward the war?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
49. Have you ever participated in public speaking, radio, television debates concerning the issue of the war in Viet Nam?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
50. Have you ever participated in public demonstrations or teach-ins regarding the issue of the Viet Nam War?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
51. Have you ever written any books or published any articles regarding the issue of the war in Viet Nam?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
52. Have you ever written any public letters, e.g. "letters to the editor regarding the issue of the war in Viet Nam?"	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
53. Have you ever signed any petitions or public advertising the issue of the War in Viet Nam?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
54. Have you every consulted with National leaders, e.g. the President, U.S. Congressmen, or U.S. Senators, regarding the issue of the war in Viet Nam?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

-5-

55. Do you belong to any organization that actively support or oppose the Viet Nam war effort? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_
56. Which of the above (49-55) do you perceive to be the most effective technique of persuasion? (Choose one (1) only) \_\_\_\_\_
57. Which of the above (49-55) do you perceive to be the least effective? (choose one (1) only) \_\_\_\_\_

Please indicate your reaction to the following questions on the continuum indicated.

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>
58. I suppose that the U.S. Had no choice but to continue the war effort in Viet Nam.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
59. We should be willing to give our allies more money and/or materials to continue the war effort in Viet Nam.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
60. Withdrawing our troops at this times will only make matters worse.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
61. The war in Viet Nam might not have been the best way to try and stop Communism, but it was the only thing to do at the time.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
62. Winning the war in Viet Nam is absolutely necessary, whatever the cost.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
63. We are directly protecting the U.S. by fighting in Viet Nam.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
64. The reason we are in Viet Nam is to protect the American way of life.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
65. The reason that we are in Viet Nam is to protect American economic interests only.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
66. It is the duty of the U.S. to be a world policeman, especially in Southeast Asian affairs.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
67. We have no business whatsoever being involved in Vietnamese affairs.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Please answer the Following Questions on the IBM Sheet Provided with this Questionnaire, starting with the Number One. Use a soft-leaded pencil, No. 2, and do not make any other marks on the sheet.

1. What are the respective capitols of North and South Viet Nam?
  1. Hanoi and Saigon
  2. Vientiane and Saigon
  3. Pnom Phenh and Vientiane
2. What countries border (North and South) Viet Nam?
  1. Cambodia
  2. Laos
  3. Peoples Republic of China
  4. 1 and 2
  5. All of the above
3. What is the dividing line between North and South Viet Nam?
  1. DMZ
  2. 17th Parallel
  3. 32nd Parallel
4. What is the major river in South Viet Nam?
  1. Yangtze
  2. Mekong
  3. Ganghis
5. Some natural resources in the Southeast Asia area which the U.S. and other countries might be interested in are:
  1. Nuclear materials
  2. ferrous metals
  3. oil
  4. all of the above
  5. None of the above
6. What is the major North Vietnamese supply route into South Viet Nam?
  1. the peoples highway
  2. Ho Chi Minh Trail
  3. Hanoi-Saigon Highway
7. What is the North Vietnamese harbor which until the recent offensive the U.S. would neither bomb nor mine?
  1. Haiphong
  2. Natrang
  3. Cam Rahn Bay
8. Where is Saigon geographically located within its national boundaries?
  1. Northeast
  2. South Central
  3. Southwest
  4. Southeast
9. Mass media terms used to denote small isolated communities, e.g. My Lai?
  1. Village
  2. Hamlet
  3. Community

10. What is the mountainous region North of Saigon?
  1. Central Highlands
  2. Grande Terra
11. What is Viet Nam's former name?
  1. Indonesia
  2. Siam
  3. Indochina
12. U.S. Politico-military involvement began approximately when:
  1. 1947
  2. 1963
  3. 1954
13. What is the name of the place where the French met their final major military defeat in what is now called Viet Nam?
  1. Bien Hoa
  2. Can Tho
  3. Dienbienphu
14. What are the areas called that have been evacuated of all human inhabitation, wherein any moving object/person is assumed to be the (our) enemy, and is fired upon as such?
  1. Free Fire Zone
  2. Demilitarized Zone
  3. De-foliated Zone
15. U.S. South Vietnamese forces have incurred into both Cambodia and Laos. What are the respective names for the specific geographical areas of these incursions?
  1. Fishhook and Plain of Jars
  2. Plain of Jars and the Eye of the Needle
  3. Fishhook and Laotian Foothills
16. Who is Giap?
  1. Chief peace negotiator in Paris
  2. Commander of the recent North Vietnamese offensive
  3. Commander of the South Vietnamese forces at An Loc
17. What is the former name of the Viet Cong?
  1. Peoples Guerillas
  2. Peoples Liberation Army
  3. Viet Minh
18. What was the approximate total number of U.S. troop strength in South Viet Nam during the height of the fighting?
  1. 500,000
  2. 350,000
  3. 750,000
19. What is the name of the 15,000 pound bomb used to clear large land areas?
  1. Blockbuster
  2. Honest John
  3. Daisy Cutter

-8-

20. Approximately how many U.S. troops have been killed in action in Viet Nam?
  1. 48,000
  2. 25,000
  3. 37,000
21. Has there ever been a formal declaration of war by the U.S. against North Viet Nam?
  1. Yes
  2. No
22. What was the incident that served as the "spark" for U.S. involvement in the war?
  1. the murder of our South Vietnamese ambassador
  2. Having U.S. warships attacked by torpedo boats
  3. the capture of one of the U.S.'s most sophisticated spy ships
23. What is the I.C.C.
  1. Internal Concubine Control
  2. International Control Commission
  3. Initial Congressional Concern (Committee)
24. Mountain tribesmen that are U.S. South Vietnamese allies?
  1. Dani
  2. Tiv
  3. Montagnards
25. Principle airplane used in bombing raids?
  1. B-52
  2. B-1
  3. B-48
26. Lt. Calley belonged to which U.S. Army division?
  1. 1st Infantry
  2. Americal
  3. 82nd Airborne
27. Part of which U.S. naval fleet provides support in South Viet Nam?
  1. 5th
  2. 7th
  3. 8th
28. Which U.S. World War II battleship was restored and recommissioned to be used for off-shore fire support in Viet Nam?
  1. Texas
  2. New Hampshire
  3. Missouri
  4. New Jersey
29. What is the general name applied to Russian-built North Vietnamese fighter aircraft?
  1. MIP's
  2. MIG's
  3. MIK's

-9-

30. 1968 and alleged 1972 North Vietnamese offensive, term meaning lunar new year?
  1. Tet
  2. Tho
  3. Lie
31. Major U.S. Army counter-insurgency, unconventional warfare force?
  1. SEALS
  2. Commandoes
  3. Special Forces
  4. Pathfinders
  5. Airborne Rangers
32. Does the South Vietnamese Army use a draft system?
  1. No
  2. Yes
33. Approximately how large is the current standing South Vietnamese Army?
  1. 750,000
  2. 1,000,000
  3. 500,000
34. Current U.S. Commander in South Viet Nam?
  1. Ralph E. Haines, Jr.
  2. Craighton Abrams
  3. William C. Westmoreland
35. Former U.S. commander in South Viet Nam?
  1. Ralph E. Haines, Jr.
  2. Craighton Abrams
  3. William C. Westmoreland
36. Term given to a hole in the ground for the incarceration, and interrogation of North Vietnamese troops; used by U.S.-South Vietnamese forces?
  1. PITS
  2. Cages
  3. Tiger Cages
37. "Pentagon Papers" were exposed by?
  1. Richard Faden
  2. Daniel Ellsberg
  3. Leo Marx
38. What is the principle U.S. infantry weapon used in South Viet Nam?
  1. M-16 rifle
  2. M-14 rifle
  3. M-15 carbine
39. Which U.S. Army divisions have seen duty in South Viet Nam?
  1. 1st (Air mobile) Cavalry, 1st Infantry
  2. 101st Airborne, Americal, 25th Infantry
  3. 4th Infantry, 9th Infantry
  4. All of the above

-10-

40. Principle U.S. Marine Corps base in South Viet Nam?
  1. My Thai
  2. Da Nang
  3. Natrang
  4. Bien Hoa
  
41. Term used for resumption of the U.S. bombing raids over North Viet Nam?
  1. Protective reaction
  2. Reaction resumption
  
42. Nixon term for letting the South Vietnamese fight their own civil war?
  1. Vietnamization
  2. Self-rule
  3. Home-rule
  
43. Current President of South Viet Nam?
  1. Thieu
  2. Diem
  3. Ky
  
44. Former President of the South Viet Nam?
  1. Diem
  2. Parke
  3. Lei
  
45. Former North Vietnamese leader?
  1. Chou En-Lai
  2. Ho Chi Minh
  3. Parke
  
46. Under whose U.S. Presidential administration did the major U.S. troop buildup in Viet Nam take Place?
  1. Eisenhower
  2. Kennedy
  3. Johnson
  
47. Some U.S. Secretaries of Defense in the last decade were?
  1. McNamara
  2. Clifford
  3. Laird
  4. 1 and 3
  5. All of the above
  
48. Approximately how many sessions have there been of the Paris peace talks?
  1. 96
  2. 148
  3. 233
  4. 27
  
49. Premier U.S. negotiator at the Paris peace talks?
  1. William Porter
  2. Charles Butler
  3. Randolph Parker
  
50. How was the former President of South Viet Nam removed from office?
  1. election
  2. Assassination
  3. Coup

APPENDIX B

CODING FORM

APPENDIX B

CODING FORM

No. Col. Used	Card Col.	Question	Response
3	1-3	I.D. Number	
1	4	Sex	1. Male 2. Female 3. Blank
2	5-6	Age	Actual Age
1	7	Year in School	1. Freshman 2. Sophomore 3. Junior 4. Senior 5. Graduate Student 6. Not a Student 7. Blank
1	8	Grade Point Average	1. Below 1.49 2. 1.5 - 1.99 3. 2.0 - 2.49 4. 2.5 - 2.99 5. 3.0 - 3.49 6. 3.5 - 4.0 7. Blank (Inapplicable)
2	9-10	Academic Major	01. Social Sciences 02. Humanities 03. Education 04. Home Economics 05. Industrial Arts (I.Tech) 06. Phys.Ed. and Recreation 07. Life Sciences 08. Physical Sciences 09. Mathematics 10. Business 11. Undecided 12. Blank

1	11	Veteran Status	1. Yes 2. No 3. Blank
1	12	Southeast Asia Duty	1. Yes 2. No 3. Blank (Inapplicable)
1	13	U.S. Citizen	1. Yes 2. No 3. Blank
1	14-15	General Political Preference	01. Liberal Conservative 02. Moderate Conservative 03. Conservative Conservative 04. Liberal Independent 05. Moderate Independent 06. Conservative Independent 07. Liberal Liberal 08. Moderate Liberal 09. Conservative Liberal 10. Blank
1	16	Religious Preference	1. Protestant 2. Roman Catholic 3. Jewish 4. Other 5. Unaffiliated 6. Atheist 7. Agnostic 8. Blank
1	17	T.V. in Home	1. Yes 2. No 3. Blank
1	18	T.V. News	1. Yes 2. No 3. Sometimes 4. Inapplicable 5. Blank

1	19	T.V. Specials	1. Yes 2. No 3. Sometimes 4. Inapplicable 5. Blank
1	20	Radio in Home	1. Yes 2. No 3. Blank
1	21	Radio News	1. Yes 2. No 3. Sometimes 4. Inapplicable 5. Blank
1	22	<u>Foreign Affairs</u>	1. Regularly 2. Sometimes 3. Never 4. Blank
1	23	<u>Time</u>	1. Regularly 2. Sometimes 3. Never 4. Blank
1	24	<u>Newsweek</u>	1. Regularly 2. Sometimes 3. Never 4. Blank
1	25	<u>U.S. News and World Report</u>	1. Regularly 2. Sometimes 3. Never 4. Blank
1	26	<u>Life</u>	1. Regularly 2. Sometimes 3. Never 4. Blank

1	27	<u>New Republic</u>	1. Regularly 2. Sometimes 3. Never 4. Blank
---	----	---------------------	--

---

1	28	<u>National Review</u>	1. Regularly 2. Sometimes 3. Never 4. Blank
---	----	------------------------	--

---

1	29	Total Regularly Read	1. 1 2. 2 3. 3 4. 4 5. 5 6. 6 7. 7 8. 0
---	----	----------------------	--

---

1	30	Total Sometimes Read	1. 1 2. 2 3. 3 4. 4 5. 5 6. 6 7. 7 8. 0
---	----	----------------------	--

---

1	31	Total Never Read	1. 1 2. 2 3. 3 4. 4 5. 5 6. 6 7. 7 8. 0
---	----	------------------	--

---

1	32	Tribune	1. Regularly 2. Sometimes 3. Never 4. Blank
---	----	---------	--

---

1	33	Chicago Today	1. Regularly 2. Sometimes 3. Never 4. Blank
---	----	---------------	--

---

1	34	St. Louis Post Dispatch	1. Regularly 2. Sometimes 3. Never 4. Blank
---	----	----------------------------	--

---

1	35	Chicago Daily News	1. Regularly 2. Sometimes 3. Never 4. Blank
---	----	-----------------------	--

---

1	36	New York Times	1. Regularly 2. Sometimes 3. Never 4. Blank
---	----	-------------------	--

---

1	37	Christian Science Monitor	1. Regularly 2. Sometimes 3. Never 4. Blank
---	----	---------------------------------	--

---

1	38	National Observer	1. Regularly 2. Sometimes 3. Never 4. Blank
---	----	----------------------	--

---

1	39	Total Regular- ly Read	1. 1 2. 2 3. 3 4. 4 5. 5 6. 6 7. 7 8. 0
---	----	---------------------------	--

---

1	40	Total Some- times Read	1. 1 2. 2 3. 3 4. 4 5. 5 6. 6 7. 7 8. 0
---	----	---------------------------	--

---

1	41	Total Never Read	1. 1 2. 2 3. 3 4. 4 5. 5 6. 6 7. 7 8. 0
1	42	Individual Research into War	1. Yes 2. No 3. Blank
1	43	Do they have an Attitude Toward War	1. Yes 2. No 3. Blank
1	44	General Attitude Toward War	1. For 2. Against 3. Uncommitted 4. Blank
1	45	Has Attitude Ever Changed	1. Yes 2. No 3. Partially 4. Blank
1	46	What was the Change	1. Pro to Con 2. Con to Pro 3. Pro to Uncommitted 4. Con to Uncommitted 5. Uncommitted to Pro 6. Uncommitted to Con 7. Blank 8. Inapplicable
1	47	Is Attitude Based on Hist- orical Develop- ment of the War?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Partially 4. Blank

1	48	Is Attitude Based on Media Persuasion?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Partially 4. Blank
1	49	Is Attitude Based on Eff- orts of Others?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Partially 4. Blank
1	50	Is Attitude Based on Military Experience?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Partially 4. Blank (Inapplicable)
1	51	Is Attitude Based on Family Experience?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Partially 4. Blank
1	52	Is Attitude Based on Emotional Experience? (e.g. killed, wounded, or missing in action)	1. Yes 2. No 3. Partially 4. Blank
1	53	Is Attitude Based on Polit- ical Party Affiliation?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Partially 4. Blank
1	54	Is Attitude Based On Federal Govern- ment Support?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Partially 4. Blank
1	55	Is Attitude Based on Religious Preference?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Partially 4. Blank

1	56	Is Attitude Based on Any One Strongest Factor?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Blank
1	57-58	If Yes, Which One?	01. 35 02. 36 03. 37 04. 38 05. 39 06. 40 07. 41 08. 42 09. 43 10. Blank
1	59	Is Attitude Based on a Combination of Factors?	1. Yes 2. No 3. Blank
1	60	Have you ever participated in face-to-face persuasion efforts regarding the War?	1. Never 2. Once 3. 2-5 times 4. 6 + times 5. Don't Remember 6. Blank
1	61	Have you ever participated in public speaking regarding the war?	1. Never 2. Once 3. 2-5 times 4. 6 + times 5. Don't Remember 6. Blank
1	62	Have you ever participated in Public Demonstrations regarding the War?	1. Never 2. Once 3. 2-5 times 4. 6 + times 5. Don't remember 6. Blank



1	69	Total 2-5	1.	1
			2.	2
			3.	3
			4.	4
			5.	5
			6.	6
			7.	7
			8.	0

---

1	70	Total 6+	1.	1
			2.	2
			3.	3
			4.	4
			5.	5
			6.	6
			7.	7
			8.	0

---

1	71	Total Don't Remember	1.	1
			2.	2
			3.	3
			4.	4
			5.	5
			6.	6
			7.	7
			8.	0

---

1	72	Do you belong to any organization that actively supports or opposes the war?	1.	Yes
			2.	No
			3.	Blank

---

1	73	Most Effective	1.	48
			2.	49
			3.	50
			4.	51
			5.	52
			6.	53
			7.	54
			8.	55
			9.	Blank

---

1	74	Least Effective	1. 48 2. 49 3. 50 4. 51 5. 52 6. 53 7. 54 8. 55 9. Blank
1	75	Continue War	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Unknown 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree 6. Blank
1	76	Willing to Give Aid	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Unknown 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree 6. Blank
1	77	Withdrawal	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Unknown 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree 6. Blank
1	78		BLANK
1	79		BLANK
1	80	Dummy Variable	1
<u>Begin Card # 2</u>			
3	1-3	I.D. Number	

1	4	Only Thing to Do	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strongly Agree</li> <li>2. Agree</li> <li>3. Unknown</li> <li>4. Disagree</li> <li>5. Strongly Disagree</li> <li>6. Blank</li> </ol>
---	---	------------------	--

---

1	5	Win Whatever Cost	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strongly Agree</li> <li>2. Agree</li> <li>3. Unknown</li> <li>4. Disagree</li> <li>5. Strongly Disagree</li> <li>6. Blank</li> </ol>
---	---	-------------------	--

---

1	6	Directly Protecting U. S.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strongly Agree</li> <li>2. Agree</li> <li>3. Unknown</li> <li>4. Disagree</li> <li>5. Strongly Disagree</li> <li>6. Blank</li> </ol>
---	---	---------------------------	--

---

1	7	Protect American Way of Life	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strongly Agree</li> <li>2. Agree</li> <li>3. Unknown</li> <li>4. Disagree</li> <li>5. Strongly Disagree</li> <li>6. Blank</li> </ol>
---	---	------------------------------	--

---

1	8	Protecting Economic Interests Only	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strongly Agree</li> <li>2. Agree</li> <li>3. Unknown</li> <li>4. Disagree</li> <li>5. Strongly Disagree</li> <li>6. Blank</li> </ol>
---	---	------------------------------------	--

---

1	9	World Policeman	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strongly Agree</li> <li>2. Agree</li> <li>3. Unknown</li> <li>4. Disagree</li> <li>5. Strongly Disagree</li> <li>6. Blank</li> </ol>
---	---	-----------------	--

---

1	10	No Business	1. Strongly Agree 2. Agree 3. Unknown 4. Disagree 5. Strongly Disagree 6. Blank
---	----	-------------	--

---

2	11-12	Score Likert	Actual Score
---	-------	--------------	--------------

---

2	13-14	Score Test	Actual Score
---	-------	------------	--------------

---

2	15-16	Rescored Likert	Actual Score
---	-------	--------------------	--------------

---

**APPENDIX C**

**POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS**

APPENDIX C

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

Respondent Distribution by Sex

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Male	100	49
Female	103	51
	<u>203</u>	

---

Respondent Distribution by Age

<u>Age</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
18	3	2
19	12	6
20	37	18
21	48	24
22	37	18
23	23	11
24	13	6
25	10	5
26	9	4
27	4	2
28	3	1
29	0	

30	1	.5
31	1	.5
32	0	
33	0	
34	0	
35	2	1
	<hr/>	
	203	

Range - 18-35  
Average - 22.13

---

Respondent Distribution by Academic Status

<u>Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Student	148	73
Non-student	53	26
Blank	2	1
	<hr/>	
	203	

---

Respondent Distribution by Religious Affiliation

<u>Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Roman Catholic	31	15
Protestant	128	63
Jewish	0	
Other	2	1
Unaffiliated	36	18
Atheist	0	
Agnostic	0	
Blank	6	2
	<hr/>	
	203	

---

Respondent Distribution by Veteran Status

<u>Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Veteran	35	17
Non-veteran	149	73
Blank	<u>19</u>	9
	203	

---

Veteran Status and Southeast Asian Duty

<u>Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Stationed in Southeast Asia	14	40
Not Stationed in Southeast Asia	19	54
Blank	<u>2</u>	6
	35	

---

Respondent Distribution by General Political Preference

<u>Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Liberal Conservative	5	2
Moderate Conservative	18	9
Conservative Conservative	1	.5
Liberal Independent	30	15
Moderate Independent	20	10
Conservative Independent	7	3
Liberal Liberal	4	2
Moderate Liberal	53	26
Conservative Liberal	49	24
Blank	<u>16</u>	8
	203	

Respondent Distribution by Personal Inquiry into the  
History of the War

<u>Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Conducted Inquiry	26	13
Did not Conduct Inquiry	177	87
Blank	<u>0</u>	
	203	

---

Respondent Distribution by General Attitude Toward the War

<u>Status</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
For the War	28	14
Against the War	143	70
Uncommitted	<u>32</u>	16
	203	

Respondent Distribution By Perceived Attitude Bases  
(With Percentages)

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Partially</u>
Is the attitude based on the historical development of the war?	93 (46)	46 (23)	63 (31)
Is the attitude based on media persuasion?	36 (18)	78 (38)	88 (43)
Is the attitude based on the persuasive efforts of others?	43 (21)	89 (44)	71 (35)
Is the attitude based on personal military experience?	20 (10)	18 (09)	4 (02)
Is the attitude based on family experiences, e.g. a "military family?"	22 (11)	172 (85)	7 (03)
Is the attitude based on having someone known or close to you killed, wounded, or missing in action?	34 (17)	135 (67)	33 (16)
Is the attitude based on political party affiliation?	0	192 (95)	9 (4)
Is the attitude based on Federal government support?	13 (06)	168 (83)	21 (10)
Is the attitude based on religious convictions?	7 (03)	168 (83)	27 (13)

TABLES I - IX

TABLE SET I

ATTITUDE COMPONENTS BY SEX  
(WITH PERCENTAGES)

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Face-to-Face Persuasion</u>				<u>Total</u>
	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	
Male	28 (30)	8 (9)	36 (39)	20 (22)	92
Female	46 (50)	8 (9)	32 (34)	7 (8)	93
	74	16	68	27	185

Gamma = -0.364    Chi-square = 10.868

Participation in Demonstrations

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Male	76 (76)	10 (10)	13 (13)	1 (01)	100
Female	83 (82)	9 (9)	9 (9)	0	101
	159	19	22	1	201

Gamma = -0.187    Chi-square = 2.083

Petition Signing

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Male	47 (49)	24 (25)	22 (23)	4 (4)	97
Female	63 (63)	26 (26)	8 (8)	2 (2)	99
	110	50	30	8	196

Gamma = -0.323    Chi-square = 9.588

Organization Membership

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Male	11 (11)	87 (89)	98
Female	7 (7)	94 (93)	101
	18	181	199

Gamma = 0.259      Chi-square = 1.115

Knowledge

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Total</u>
Male	37 (37)	63 (63)	100
Female	71 (70)	31 (30)	102
	108	94	202

Gamma = -0.592      Chi-square = 21.580

Attitude

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Positive*</u>	<u>Total</u>
Male	55 (55)	45 (45)	100
Female	52 (51)	50 (49)	102
	107	95	202

Gamma = 0.081      Chi-square = 0.327

\* These are relative terms only. The median was 24, whereas "uncommitted" or middle range on the continuum was 30. Therefore, the greater distribution of scores was below the ideal middle range, and, generally, having a negative attitude toward the war, by the statements tested.

TABLE SET II

ATTITUDE COMPONENTS BY ACADEMIC MAJOR  
(WITH PERCENTAGES)

Face-to-Face Persuasion

<u>Major</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humanities and Social Sciences	10 (29)	1 (3)	13 (38)	10 (29)	34
Education, Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Physical Education, Recreation	18 (31)	9 (16)	26 (45)	5 (9)	58
Sciences	7 (35)	0	8 (40)	5 (25)	20
Mathematics and Business	13 (42)	1 (3)	12 (39)	5 (16)	31
	48	11	59	25	143

Gamma = -0.111    Chi-square = 15.264

Participation in Demonstrations

<u>Major</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humanities and Social Sciences	21 (58)	7 (19)	7 (19)	1 (3)	36
Education, Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Physical Education, Recreation	54 (82)	7 (11)	5 (8)	0	66
Sciences	14 (64)	3 (14)	5 (23)	0	22
Mathematics and Business	27 (84)	1 (3)	4 (13)	0	32
	116	18	21	1	156

Gamma = -0.212    Chi-square = 13.970

Petition Signing

<u>Major</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humanities and Social Sciences	10 (28)	13 (36)	11 (31)	2 (6)	36
Education, Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Physical Education, Recreation	37 (58)	18 (28)	8 (13)	1 (2)	64
Sciences	10 (46)	6 (27)	4 (18)	2 (9)	22
Mathematics and Business	16 _(55)	7 _(24)	5 _(17)	1 _(3)	29
	73	44	28	6	151

Gamma = -0.183      Chi-square = 12.276

Organization Membership

<u>Major</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humanities and Social Sciences	5 (14)	31 (86)	36
Education, Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Physical Education, Recreation	4 (6)	62 (94)	66
Sciences	4 (19)	17 (87)	21
Mathematics and Business	3 _(10)	28 _(90)	31
	16	138	154

Gamma = -0.001      Chi-square = 3.510

Knowledge

<u>Major</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humanities and Social Sciences	11 (31)	25 (70)	36

Education, Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Physical Education, Recreation	46 (70)	20 (30)	66
Sciences	7 (32)	15 (68)	22
Mathematics and Business	13 (41)	19 (60)	32
	77	79	159

Gamma = -0.010      Chi-square = 19.699

Attitude

<u>Major</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Total</u>
Humanities and Social Sciences	19 (53)	17 (47)	36
Education, Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Physical Education, Recreation	33 (50)	33 (50)	66
Sciences	15 (68)	7 (32)	22
Mathematics and Business	18 (56)	14 (44)	32
	85	71	156

Gamma = -0.096      Chi-square = 2.282

TABLE SET III

ATTITUDE COMPONENTS BY ESTABLISHED RELIGION MEMBERSHIP  
(WITH PERCENTAGES)

Face-to-Face Persuasion

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Established Religion Membership	62 (43)	15 (10)	55 (38)	13 (9)	145
No Established Religion Membership	10 (28)	1 (3)	12 (33)	13 (36)	36
	72	16	67	26	181

Gamma = 0.439    Chi-square = 18.454

Demonstration Participation

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Established Religion Membership	132 (83)	12 (8)	15 (9)	0	159
No Established Religion Membership	25 (68)	5 (14)	6 (16)	1 (3)	37
	157	17	21	1	196

Gamma = 0.383    Chi-square = 7.712

Petition Signing

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Established Religion Membership	93 (60)	41 (27)	17 (11)	4 (3)	155
No Established Religion Membership	15 (42)	9 (25)	11 (31)	1 (3)	36
	108	50	28	5	191

Gamma = 0.358    Chi-square = 9.411

Organization Membership

<u>Status</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Established Religion Membership	15 (10)	143 (91)	158
No Established Religion Membership	3 (8)	34 (92)	37
	18	177	195

Gamma = 0.086      Chi-square = 0.069

Knowledge

<u>Status</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Total</u>
Established Religion Membership	91 (57)	69 (43)	160
No Established Religion Membership	12 (32)	25 (68)	37
	103	94	197

Gamma = -0.466      Chi-square = 7.196

Attitude

<u>Status</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Total</u>
Established Religion Membership	81 (51)	79 (49)	160
No Established Religion Membership	24 (65)	13 (35)	37
	105	92	197

Gamma = -0.286      Chi-square = 2.448

## TABLE SET IV

ATTITUDE COMPONENTS BY VETERAN STATUS  
(WITH PERCENTAGES)

Face-to-Face Persuasion

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Veteran	7 (23)	3 (10)	10 (32)	11 (36)	31
Non-Veteran	67 (43)	13 (8)	58 (37)	17 (11)	186
	74	16	68	28	217

Gamma = -0.427    Chi-square = 13.320

Demonstration Participation

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Veteran	28 (82)	3 (9)	3 (9)	0	34
Non-Veteran	132 (79)	16 (10)	19 (11)	1	168
	160	19	22	1	202

Gamma = 0.121    Chi-square = 0.429

Petition Signing

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Veteran	17 (50)	11 (32)	5 (15)	1 (3)	34
Non-Veteran	94 (58)	39 (24)	25 (15)	5 (3)	163
	111	50	30	6	197

Gamma = -0.097    Chi-square = 1.084

Organization Membership

<u>Status</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Veteran	5 (15)	29 (85)	34
Non-Veteran	13 ____(8)	153 ____(92)	166 ____
	18	182	200

Gamma = 0.340    Chi-square = 1.628

Knowledge

<u>Status</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Total</u>
Veteran	7 (21)	27 (79)	34
Non-Veteran	101 ____(60)	68 ____(40)	169 ____
	108	95	203

Gamma = -0.703    Chi-square = 17.448

Attitude

<u>Status</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Total</u>
Veteran	16 (47)	18 (53)	34
Non-Veteran	92 ____(54)	77 ____(46)	169 ____
	108	95	203

Gamma = 0.147    Chi-square = 0.619

TABLE SET V

ATTITUDE COMPONENTS BY VETERAN STATUS AND SOUTHEAST ASIAN DUTY  
(WITH PERCENTAGES)

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Southeast Asian Duty	4 (25)	2 (13)	5 (31)	5 (31)	16
Not Stationed in Southeast Asia	5 (31)	1 (6)	5 (31)	5 (31)	16
	9	3	10	10	32

Gamma = -0.033      Chi-square = 0.444

Demonstration Participation

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Southeast Asian Duty	15 (88)	0	2 (12)	0	17
Not Stationed in Southeast Asia	15 (83)	3 (17)	0	0	18
	30	3	2	0	35

Gamma = 0.111      Chi-square = 4.975

Petition Signing

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Southeast Asian Duty	10 (59)	4 (24)	3 (18)	0	17
Not Stationed in Southeast Asia	9 (50)	6 (33)	2 (11)	1 (6)	18
	19	10	5	1	35

Gamma = 0.129      Chi-square = 1.625

Organization Membership

<u>Status</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Southeast Asian Duty	3 (18)	14 (82)	17
Not Stationed in Southeast Asia	2 (11)	16 (89)	18
	5	30	35

Gamma = 0.263    Chi-square = 0.305

Knowledge

<u>Status</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Total</u>
Southeast Asian Duty	3 (18)	14 (82)	17
Not Stationed in Southeast Asia	4 (22)	14 (78)	18
	7	28	35

Gamma = -0.143    Chi-square = 0.114

Attitude

<u>Status</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Total</u>
Southeast Asian Duty	8 (47)	9 (53)	17
Not Stationed in Southeast Asia	9 (50)	9 (50)	18
	17	18	35

Gamma = -0.059    Chi-square = 0.030

TABLE SET VI

ATTITUDE COMPONENTS BY TELEVISION AND RADIO NEWS BROADCASTS  
(WITH PERCENTAGES)

Face-to-Face Persuasion

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Watches Television News	44 (33)	9 (7)	56 (42)	26 (19)	135
Does Not Watch Television News	28 (58)	6 (13)	12 (25)	2 (4)	48
	72	15	68	28	183

Gamma = -0.500    Chi-square = 15.293

Demonstration Participation

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Watches Television News	109 (76)	14 (10)	19 (13)	7 (5)	143
Does Not Watch Television News	48 (86)	5 (9)	3 (5)	0	56
	157	19	22	7	199

Gamma = -0.310    Chi-square = 3.171

Petition Signing

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Watches Television News	76 (54)	38 (27)	23 (16)	5 (4)	142
Does Not Watch Television News	34 (65)	10 (19)	7 (14)	1 (2)	52
	110	48	30	6	194

Gamma = -0.203    Chi-square = 2.315

Organisation Membership

<u>Status</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Watches Television News	13 (9)	129 (91)	142
Does Not Watch Television News	5 (9)	50 (91)	55
	18	179	197

Gamma = 0.004    Chi-square = 0.000

Knowledge

<u>Status</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Total</u>
Watches Television News	62 (43)	81 (57)	143
Does Not Watch Television News	45 (79)	12 (21)	57
	107	93	200

Gamma = -0.661    Chi-square = 20.751

Attitude

<u>Status</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Total</u>
Watches Television News	76 (53)	67 (47)	143
Does Not Watch Television News	30 (53)	27 (47)	57
	106	94	200

Gamma = 0.010    Chi-square = 0.004

Face-to-Face Persuasion

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Listens to Radio News	30 (36)	9 (11)	30 (36)	15 (18)	84
Does Not Listen to Radio News	39 (42)	7 (07)	36 (38)	12 (13)	94
	69	16	66	27	178

Gamma = -.096    Chi-square = 1.746

Demonstration Participation

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Listens to Radio News	77 (83)	6 (07)	10 (11)	0	93
Does Not Listen to Radio News	76 ____(75)	13 ____(13)	11 ____(11)	1 ____(01)	101 ____
	153	19	21	1	194

Gamma = 0.197      Chi-square = 3.309

Petition Signing

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Listens to Radio News	56 (62)	22 (24)	11 (13)	2 (02)	91
Does Not Listen to Radio News	51 ____(52)	27 ____(23)	18 ____(18)	3 ____(07)	99 ____
	107	49	28	5	190

Gamma = 0.189      Chi-square = 2.301

Organization Membership

<u>Status</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Listens to Radio News	13 (14)	79 (86)	92
Does Not Listen to Radio News	5 ____(05)	96 ____(95)	101 ____
	18	175	193

Gamma = 0.519      Chi-square = 4.798

Knowledge

<u>Status</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Total</u>
Listens to Radio News	43 (46)	50 (54)	93
Does Not Listen to Radio News	58 ____(57)	44 ____(43)	102 ____
	101	94	195

Gamma = -0.210      Chi-square = 2.200

<u>Status</u>	<u>Attitude</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Positive</u>	
Listens to Radio News	47 (51)	46 (50)	93
Does Not Listen to Radio News	56 ____(55)	46 ____(45)	102 ____
	103	92	195

Gamma = -0.087    Chi-square = 0.372

TABLE SET VII

ATTITUDE COMPONENTS BY MAGAZINES, JOURNALS AND NEWSPAPERS SOMETIMES READ  
(WITH PERCENTAGES)

Face-to-Face Persuasion

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
1 - 4 Newspapers Sometimes Read	46 (34)	11 (68)	56 (42)	21 (16)	134
5 - 8 Newspapers Sometimes Read	28 (54)	5 (10)	12 (23)	7 (14)	52
	74	16	68	21	186

Gamma = -0.290    Chi-square = 7.383

Demonstration Participation

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
1 - 4 Newspapers Sometimes Read	113 (79)	16 (11)	14 (10)	0	143
5 - 8 Newspapers Sometimes Read	47 (78)	3 (05)	8 (14)	1 (02)	59
	160	19	22	1	202

Gamma = 0.021    Chi-square = 4.625

Petition Signing

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
1 - 4 Newspapers Sometimes Read	79 (57)	36 (26)	21 (15)	3 (02)	139
5 - 8 Newspapers Sometimes Read	32 (55)	14 (24)	9 (16)	3 (05)	58
	111	50	30	6	197

Gamma = 0.055    Chi-square = 1.295

Organization Membership

<u>Status</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
1 - 4 Newspapers Sometimes Read	14 (10)	129 (90)	143
5 - 8 Newspapers Sometimes Read	4 (07)	53 (93)	57
	28	182	200

Gamma = 0.180      Chi-square = 0.383

Knowledge

<u>Status</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Total</u>
1 - 4 Newspapers Sometimes Read	71 (50)	72 (50)	143
5 - 8 Newspapers Sometimes Read	37 (62)	23 (38)	60
	108	95	203

Gamma = -0.240      Chi-square = 2.451

Attitude

<u>Status</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Total</u>
1 - 4 Newspapers Sometimes Read	78 (55)	65 (45)	143
5 - 8 Newspapers Sometimes Read	30 (50)	30 (50)	60
	108	95	203

Gamma = 0.091      Chi-square = 0.351

Face-to-Face Persuasion

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
1 - 5 Magazines and Journals Sometimes Read	64 (40)	14 (08)	59 (37)	23 (14)	160
6 - 8 Magazines and Journals Sometimes Read	10 (39)	2 (08)	9 (35)	5 (19)	26
	74	16	68	28	186

Gamma = 0.065      Chi-square = 0.424

Demonstration Participation

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
1 - 5 Magazines and Journals Sometimes Read	136 (80)	18 (11)	16 (09)	1 (01)	171
6 - 8 Magazines and Journals Sometimes Read	24 (77)	1 (03)	6 (19)	0	31
	160	19	22	1	202

Gamma = 0.102 Chi-square = 4.092

Petition Signing

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
1 - 5 Magazines and Journals Sometimes Read	90 (54)	45 (27)	27 (16)	5 (03)	167
6 - 8 Magazines and Journals Sometimes Read	21 (70)	5 (17)	3 (10)	1 (03)	30
	111	50	30	6	197

Gamma = -0.276 Chi-square = 2.875

Organization Membership

<u>Status</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
1 - 5 Magazines and Journals Sometimes Read	14 (08)	157 (92)	171
6 - 8 Magazines and Journals Sometimes Read	4 (14)	25 (86)	29
	18	182	200

Gamma = -0.284 Chi-square = 0.951

Knowledge

<u>Status</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Total</u>
1 - 5 Magazines and Journals Sometimes Read	93 (54)	79 (46)	172
6 - 8 Magazines and Journals Sometimes Read	15 (65)	16 (52)	31
	108	95	203

Gamma = 0.113 Chi-square = 0.341

<u>Status</u>	<u>Attitude</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Positive</u>	
1 - 5 Magazines and Journals Sometimes Read	92 (54)	80 (47)	172
6 - 8 Magazines and Journals Sometimes Read	16 ____(52)	15 ____(49)	31 ____
	108	95	203

Gamma = 0.038    Chi-square = 0.037

## TABLE SET VIII

ATTITUDE COMPONENTS BY INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH INTO HISTORY OF WAR  
(WITH PERCENTAGES)

Face-to-Face Persuasion

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Conducted Research	7 (28)	0	9 (36)	9 (36)	25
Did Not Conduct Research	67 (42)	16 (10)	59 (37)	19 (12)	161
	74	16	68	28	186

Gamma = -0.419    Chi-square = 11.913

Demonstration Participation

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Conducted Research	15 (58)	3 (12)	7 (27)	1 (04)	26
Did Not Conduct Research	145 (82)	16 (09)	15 (09)	0	176
	160	19	22	1	202

Gamma = -0.546    Chi-square = 15.700

Petition Signing

<u>Status</u>	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	<u>Total</u>
Conducted Research	8 (31)	7 (27)	8 (31)	3 (12)	26
Did Not Conduct Research	103 (60)	43 (25)	22 (13)	3 (02)	171
	111	50	30	6	197

Gamma = -0.526    Chi-square = 15.349

Organization Membership

<u>Status</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
Conducted Research	5 (20)	20 (80)	25
Did Not Conduct Research	13 (07)	162 (93)	175
	18	182	200

Gamma = 0.514    Chi-square = 4.221

Knowledge

<u>Status</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Total</u>
Conducted Research	10 (39)	16 (62)	26
Did Not Conduct Research	98 (55)	79 (45)	177
	108	95	203

Gamma = -0.330    Chi-square = 2.602

Attitude

<u>Status</u>	<u>Negative</u>	<u>Positive</u>	<u>Total</u>
Conducted Research	14 (54)	12 (46)	26
Did Not Conduct Research	94 (53)	83 (4)	177
	108	95	203

Gamma = 0.015    Chi-square = 0.005

TABLE SET IX

DEPENDENT VARIABLE COVARIANCE  
(WITH PERCENTAGES)

<u>Face-to-Face</u> <u>Persuasion</u>	<u>Demonstration Participation</u>				<u>Total</u>
	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	
Never	65 (88)	5 (7)	4 (5)	0	74
Once	16 (100)	0	0	0	100
2-5 Times	52 (77)	8 (12)	8 (12)	0	68
6+ Times	13 (46)	5 (18)	7 (32)	1 (4)	28
	146	18	21	1	186

Gamma = 0.543      Chi-square = 30.428

<u>Face-to-Face</u> <u>Persuasion</u>	<u>Petition Signing</u>				<u>Total</u>
	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	
Never	49 (67)	18 (25)	5 (9)	1 (1)	73
Once	13 (81)	2 (13)	1 (6)	0	16
2-5 Times	28 (43)	23 (35)	11 (17)	3 (5)	65
6+ Times	11 (39)	4 (14)	11 (39)	2 (7)	28
	101	47	28	6	182

Gamma = 0.401      Chi-square = 29.476

<u>Face-to-Face Persuasion</u>	<u>Organization Membership</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
Never	3 (4)	71 (96)	74
Once	0	16 (100)	16
2-5 Times	8 (12)	60 (88)	68
6+ Times	5 ____(19)	22 ____(82)	27
	16	169	185

Gamma = -0.506    Chi-square = 7.657

<u>Face-to-Face Persuasion</u>	<u>Knowledge</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	
Never	45 (61)	29 (39)	74
Once	11 (69)	5 (31)	16
2-5 Times	32 (47)	36 (53)	68
6+ Times	6 ____(21)	22 ____(29)	28
	94	92	186

Gamma = 0.391    Chi-square = 15.068

<u>Face-to-Face Persuasion</u>	<u>Attitude Range</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	
Never	42 (57)	32 (43)	74
Once	7 (44)	9 (56)	16
2-5 Times	34 (50)	34 (50)	68
6+ Times	17 ____(61)	11 ____(39)	28
	100	86	186

Gamma = 0.011    Chi-square = 1.844

<u>Demonstration Participation</u>	<u>Petition Signing</u>				<u>Total</u>
	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>2-5 Times</u>	<u>6+ Times</u>	
Never	104 (66)	35 (22)	16 (10)	2 (1)	157
Once	4 (22)	8 (44)	6 (33)	0	18
2-5 Times	3 (14)	7 (33)	7 (33)	4 (19)	21
6+ Times	0	0	0	1 (100)	0
	<u>111</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>197</u>

Gamma = 0.407      Chi-square = 53.132

<u>Demonstration Participation</u>	<u>Organization Membership</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
Never	10 (6)	149 (94)	159
Once	3 (16)	16 (84)	19
2-5 Times	5 (24)	16 (76)	21
6+ Times	0	1 (100)	1
	<u>18</u>	<u>182</u>	<u>200</u>

Gamma = -0.534      Chi-square = 8.218

<u>Demonstration Participation</u>	<u>Knowledge Range</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	
Never	89 (56)	71 (44)	160
Once	11 (58)	8 (42)	19
2-5 Times	7 (32)	15 (58)	22
6+ Times	0	1 (100)	1
	<u>107</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>202</u>

Gamma = 0.270      Chi-square = 5.715

<u>Demonstration Participation</u>	<u>Attitude Range</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	
Never	82 (51)	78 (49)	160
Once	12 (63)	7 (37)	19
2-5 Times	12 (55)	10 (46)	22
6+ Times	1 (100)	0 —	1
	107	95	202

Gamma = -0.151    Chi-square = 1.891

<u>Petition Signing</u>	<u>Organization Membership</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
Never	9 (8)	101 (102)	110
Once	3 (6)	47 (94)	50
2-5 Times	4 (13)	26 (87)	30
6+ Times	1 (20)	4 (80)	5
	17	178	195

Gamma = -0.145    Chi-square = 2.107

<u>Petition Signing</u>	<u>Knowledge</u>		<u>Total</u>
	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	
Never	59 (53)	52 (47)	111
Once	27 (54)	23 (46)	50
2-5 Times	15 (50)	15 (50)	30
6+ Times	2 (33)	4 (67)	6
	103	94	197

Gamma = 0.059    Chi-square = 1.019

<u>Petition Signing</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Attitude High</u>	<u>Total</u>
Never	50 (45)	61 (55)	111
Once	29 (58)	21 (42)	50
2-5 Times	21 (70)	9 (30)	30
6+ Times	3 (50)	3 (50)	6
	103	94	197

Gamma = -0.292    Chi-square = 6.773

<u>Organization Membership</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Knowledge High</u>	<u>Total</u>
Yes	7 (39)	11 (61)	18
No	98 (54)	84 (46)	182
	105	95	200

Gamma = -0.294    Chi-square = 1.469

<u>Organization Membership</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Knowledge High</u>	<u>Total</u>
Yes	10 (56)	8 (44)	18
No	96 (53)	86 (47)	182
	106	94	200

Gamma = 0.057    Chi-square = 0.052

<u>Knowledge</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Attitude High</u>	<u>Total</u>
Low	54 (50)	54 (50)	108
High	54 (57)	41 (43)	95
	108	95	203

Gamma = -0.137    Chi-square = 0.950