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ABSTRACT

TEACHING METHODS AND
RESISTANCE TO PERSUASION

by

Bettina A. Babbitt

Master of Arts in Educational Psychology

January, 1976

This research involves teaching techniques, and the use of propaganda in mass communication. Specifically, it was the hypothesis of the present study that the Structured Group Discussion method would be more effective than a Lecture method in inducing resistance to persuasion among a group of college students.

A review of the literature revealed no previous research of this nature. Most prior efforts deal extensively with mass communication and teaching methods.

The subjects in this study consisted of all members of three sections of Political Science 155 of California State University, Northridge, Summer Session I, 1975. The experimenter randomly assigned experimental and control group status to all of the subjects in each of the classrooms. Thus an entire classroom was designated randomly...
as an experimental or control group.

After the researcher assigned each classroom population for experimental treatment a pretest was administered to the experimental and control groups which were controlled for grade point average, age, sex, and previous experience with Political Science subject matter. Subsequently, one group was exposed to a Lecture technique designed to increase awareness of persuasive techniques. Another classroom population was exposed to a Structured Group Discussion treatment for the same purpose. The third classroom population received a pretest, but was not exposed to any form of experimental treatment. All groups then viewed the film "The Expense Fund Speech," ("The Checkers Speech"), by Richard M. Nixon. Following this, all three groups were given a posttest to determine subjects awareness of the persuasive techniques used in this classic persuasive presentation.

The statistical models selected for this study were Chi Square, Analysis of Variance, and Sheffe's test. The results did not confirm the expectations of the researcher, and the hypothesis was not supported.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Education faces the problem of creating and identifying more effective teaching techniques, because of an historical trend where specific values in the teaching process were not examined as thoroughly as general situational variables. Evaluations of teaching effectiveness usually focused on general situational variables such as class size, type of subject matter, and the socioeconomic backgrounds of the students. Little attention has been given to the complexities of interaction among these variables; as a result only rather ambiguous conclusions about effective teaching methods and conditions could be drawn. Contemporary foci on recent work realized that teaching techniques are better evaluated through an increasingly experimental emphasis on more specific independent variables such as student's level of academic achievement, student's sex; and (at the college level) heterogeniety of grade level and major areas of interest (Borg and Gall, 1974).

It was the hypothesis of the present study that the Structured Group Discussion method would be more effective than a Lecture method in inducing resistance to persuasion among a group of college students. In the
present study, the primary independent variable is the method of classroom presentation of materials intended to teach a specific skill: "resistance to persuasion."
The methods to be compared are (1) traditional classroom lecture, and (2) structured group discussion: the relative effectiveness of these two techniques in teaching resistance to persuasion was evaluated in the context of secondary variables because sometimes an experiment is more effective in predicting the behavior of certain subgroups than in predicting the behavior of other subgroups (Borg and Gall, 1974). In this instance, the following were designated as secondary variables to see if the essential relationship would hold up even when these factors were controlled statistically (Scott and Wertheimer, 1962): subject's age, subject's grade point average, subject's sex, and subject's first college level political science course. It is the investigator's hypothesis that the Group Discussion method will prove more effective in teaching resistance to persuasion than the Lecture method.

Von Haller Gilmer (1971) argues that encouraging active participation in the teaching process by the students permits the teacher to adopt the role of observer evaluator, and facilitator in the flow of information, and such a system of feedback leads to more efficient learning. Carl Rogers (1951) in his analysis of the problems of teaching suggested that group discussion makes it possible for teachers to be utilized by the students as a facilitator
in the learning process, and that this type of interaction will lead to learning with a minimum of student resistance. Rogers felt that the teacher, therefore, needs to develop a sensitive responsiveness to attitudes and ideas expressed by the student, and that learning would then take place in the exploratory fashion which is characteristic of the true learning process.

Recent developments in therapeutic methods also support the idea that active participation by the learner will promote the efficacy of the learning process. Kisker (1972) cites the effectiveness of contemporary group methods such as are used in sensitivity training, leadership training, in T groups, and in conventional therapeutic and resocialization groups. Kisker also draws attention to the therapeutic effectiveness of such group treatment methods as role playing and (in a more structured form) Moreno's psychodrama technique.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This review will be concerned with teaching techniques, strategies for inducing resistance to persuasion, and the role of mass communications in information transmission.

Theories of Learning and Teaching

A philosophy of education has the central function of providing teachers with a sense of purpose according to Silberman (1970):

"This means developing teachers' ability and their desire to think seriously, deeply, and continuously about the purposes and consequences of what they do--about the way in which their curriculum and teaching methods, classroom and school organization, testing and grading procedures, affect purpose and are affected by it."

For many years experts in the field of Education have written about paucity of theories of teaching in contrast with the plethora of theories of learning. Theories of learning continue to deal with what the learner does. Gage (1972) emphasizes that education needs to depend in large part upon what the teacher does. Methods teachers use to convey knowledge constitute part of the subject of theories of teaching.

In a paper by Martin (1971) he reviews several approaches to the evaluation of teaching techniques.
"In one way or another each of the approaches reviewed here has nibbled at the edges of a greater problem: the nature of human communication. Solutions to the first problem cannot stop short of solutions to the second. If teaching implies communication than we cannot ignore the latter and expect a realistic account of the former."

To improve the field of teaching it may, therefore, be fruitful to gain systematic input from language and communication research.

The study by Miller, Zavos, Vlandis, and Rosenbaum (1961) entitled "The Effect of Differential Reward on Speech Patterns" approaches this task of gaining systematic input from language involving speaking rate under different conditions of presentation. This article appears more useful for its methodology than its findings which were inconclusive.

Looking at teacher behavior through direct and indirect behaviors (i.e. direct influences are lecturing, directing, and criticizing while indirect influences are praise, acceptance of students ideas or feelings, and asking questions) Amidon and Flanders as quoted in Feldhusen and Wang (1966) concluded that students learned more course content under indirect teachers, and indirect behavior was predictive of teacher success because of flexibility and feedback involved in indirect teaching. Feldhusen and Wang suggest that teachers who are warm, friendly, intelligent, young, and interested in teaching have uniform instructional effectiveness as
long as the teacher is able to choose teaching techniques which suit his abilities and preferences.

One of the most popular teaching methods is lecturing. However, it is widely believed that methods which involve feedback from the students are more effective. Gage (1972) suggests that more effective instruction provides feedback to the teacher and the student. It also provides for individual differences, and activity on the part of the student.

Group size is related to feedback as pointed out by Hare (1962). As each additional member joins a group, the number of potential relationships between individuals and sub groups increases rapidly, thus placing more demands on the teacher in coordinating group activity. Additional members which increase group size also magnify the resources of the group so that a variety of problems may be solved more efficiently.

Smith and Scott (1961) hypothesize tension producing potential of various physiological or psychological needs experienced by the organism, and emphasize the role of learning in verbal and nonverbal behavior patterns. They offer a schema for motivation theory to provide linkages, for the student of persuasion, between human behavior and persuasive discourse. Goal relationships are examined with regard to interpretation on the part of the individual. Explicit curriculum developed for the student of persuasion (Brembeck, 1960, 1964) includes
such classroom goals as establishment of the role of persuasion in our modern society. Graves (1941) contends that freedom to persuade requires moral responsibility, review of experimental literature, and audience analysis.

**Teaching Resistance To Persuasion**

In teaching resistance to persuasion, Biddle (1932) as found in Wood, Bradac, Barnhart, and Kraft (1970), revealed that an immunized experimental group exhibited greater resistance to propaganda than a non-immunized control group. This finding was not supported by Collier (1944) and Osborn (1932 as found in Wood, et al., (1970) who reported that subjects in the immunizing condition increased their awareness of persuasive techniques, but did not show increased resistance to persuasive messages. Collier (1944) recognized that subjects were positively influenced by the materials studied, and there was increased resistance to persuasion. In a study by Wood, et al., (1970) it appeared that knowledge of prior attitude toward subject matter was an important variable since subject's knowledge of persuasive techniques failed to immunize subjects against a propagandistic speech when the subjects had a prior attitude toward the material used in the speech. Subjects who had no prior attitude about the material used in the speech were immunized against persuasion. The authors also felt that a single lecture session was sufficient to immunize subjects against persuasion to form attitudes.
Brandenburg (1950) feels that successful discussion methods have been used as a persuasive tool to propagandize others. Propaganda has been defined by Johnson (1939) as a systematic attempt by an individual to control the attitude of a group through the use of suggestion to modify behavior. Because effective speech is a tool of persuasion, students need to understand techniques of persuasion and the moral and societal obligations which such usage incurs. Since effective propaganda is concealed, education endeavors to induce critical questioning toward communications in order to allow the student to draw his own conclusions (Schilling, 1941).

**Inducing Resistance To Persuasion**

Our society places high value upon the autonomous individual. He is greatly admired while the easily swayed individual is held in much lower esteem for lacking in the courage of his convictions. The less autonomous individual appears to be more susceptible to persuasion. There also appears to be a relationship between ability to learn and susceptibility to persuasion.

Resistance is not always beneficial, and differentiation between "propaganda" and "education" is difficult to distinguish. If differentiation were clear perhaps it would be possible to develop pretreatments that would facilitate receptivity toward "truth" and resistance toward "untruth" (McGuire, 1964). Our society is influenced by moral judgments. According to Lesser (1971) the
central moral principle is justice. Principles of justice and human welfare are obtained through understanding and reasoning by stimulated development consisting of thoughtful consideration of moral conflicts. The misuse of persuasion by special pleaders and pressure groups requires that resistance to persuasion be promoted as a deterrent to wholesale manipulation of the public.

This review shall consider the uncovering of pretreatments which when applied to the subject make that subject less susceptible to persuasive messages than he is found to be without these pretreatments.

**General Approaches To Inducing Resistance To Persuasion**

Enhancing self-esteem creates resistance to persuasion regardless of variables such as source, channel, and message (Deutch and Gerard, 1955). Specific resistance can be generated against certain types of issues or to only one side of two sides of an issue. Other resistance-inducing techniques appear to be specific to certain sources (McGuire, 1964). General approaches to the problem of inducing resistance to persuasion shall be reviewed in greater detail.

**Anchoring--Bonding**

Producing resistance to persuasion through the anchoring method consists of connecting the belief to be immunized to other cognitions. A change in attitude would then cause the individual to break the linked relationships and suffer cognitive inconsistency.
Nelson (1968) tested the anchoring approach in immunizing beliefs against persuasion to determine whether amount, activity, and difficulty of the anchorings of the beliefs to the persons' values affected the beliefs subsequent to resistance to persuasion. Amount and difficulty of anchoring were not found to be significant, but active participation in the prior anchoring conferred a significant amount of resistance. In contradiction to active participation, McGuire (1962) found that passive exposure to defensive material was superior to active exposure. Because of the contradictory finding further research regarding anchoring should be conducted.

Hardyck (1966) predicted, and found, that the greatest resistance to change was among subjects with consistent belief systems, and subjects with the least resistance to change held initially inconsistent belief systems. Ostrom and Brock (1969) investigated bonding central values to a policy stand versus bonding peripheral values to a policy stand. Bonding is the process of relating central and/or peripheral values to a policy statement. Greater resistance to persuasion was induced when bonding to central values. Edwards (1970) induced initial attitudes cognitively bonded to value statements. Following counter-attitudinal propaganda, attitude measures showed that bonding important values to initial attitudes conferred greater resistance to persuasion than either no bonding or bonding to unimportant values.
Further support was given by Holt (1970) whose data offered support for the anchoring method of inducing resistance to persuasion although the main effect of commitment (commitment to the conclusions of message syllogisms) fell at the .10 percent level of significance. The implication is then that effecting belief-value linkages should strengthen the belief and increase immunity to attack. Using syllogisms, Feather (1964) investigated personality variables in relation to consistency of attitudes in a belief system. Subjects with a proreligious attitude accepted or rejected arguments in a consistent manner related to the strength of the attitude. There is a tendency for individuals lacking in ability for critical thinking to be intolerant of inconsistency.

Warning

Warning or forewarning refers to either a prior announcement that persuasion will be attempted or to a prior announcement of the topics and positions of forthcoming communications.

Papageorgis (1968) suggests that the term "warning" be used to define prior announcement of the topic and of the direction of argument of the communication. He also suggested that the term "persuasion context" be used to define the prior announcement that the experiment deals with persuasion.
It appears as though warning and persuasion context produce small but significant replicable changes in the direction of the communications. The subject does not need to anticipate immediate exposure to the communications for the changes to occur (Papageorgis, 1968). Warning may serve as a persuasive communication in its own right because opinion change may begin during the precommunication period that follows warning. This study suggests, then, that warning serves a possible immunization role in persuasion, and produces immediate effects on opinions prior to any persuasive communication (McGuire and Millman, 1965).

Empirical support for the assumption that awareness of persuasion reduces its impact has been ambiguous. The persuasion context has been found either to have no effect on opinion change (McGuire and Papageorgis, 1962) or to reduce opinion change (Kiesler and Kiesler, 1964). The discrepancy between the findings may be the result of the difference in the types of issues and messages that were used in the two studies. McGuire and Papageorgis (1962) used cultural truisms that appeared to be factual, and Kiesler and Kiesler (1964) used an emotional appeal on a controversial political issue.

According to Freedman and Sears (1965) warning is a method of inducing resistance to persuasion, distraction has also been effective, however, distraction is less effective than warning which proceeds the communication
by a few minutes. Subjects in the distracting condition were instructed to pay attention to the personality of the speaker instead of the content of the talk. Festinger and Maccoby (1964) suggest that subjects are influenced by a distractive communication because they are not able to counterargue effectively. Their hypothesis concerning the effect of distraction was supported where fraternity men were more influenced by the distracting presentation of the persuasive communication than by the ordinary version. An attempt was made by Vohs and Garrett (1968) to manipulate distraction complexity with the results being contradictory to those expected on the basis of the Festinger and Maccoby (1964) results. A pro-Klan message and an anti-fraternity message both advocated views that were not initially held by the audience. It is felt that the two messages differed in involvement where the anti-fraternity message challenged social identity of subjects, but the pro-Klan message was socially removed from the subjects. The effects of distraction in communication are not yet clear.

Inoculation

McGuire's (1964) version of inoculation theory assumes that pretreatments designed to make truisms resistant to subsequent attacks will be effective if the believer is unpracticed in defending his belief and if he is not motivated to get the necessary practice. The inoculation approach is taken from the biological
situation where a mild dose stimulates defenses so that the individual will be better able to overcome any massive infectious attack to which he is later exposed. The dosage must not be so strong that pre-exposure itself will cause the disease. Using the inoculation analogy, McGuire chose to use beliefs that have been maintained in a "germ-free" ideological environment.

McGuire and Papageorgis (1961) found that prior refutational defenses are superior to prior supportive defenses in making cultural truisms resistant to subsequent persuasion. A refutational defense involves the mention and refutation of possible counter-arguments against the belief and ignoring arguments positively supporting the belief. Supportive defenses mention and elaborate on arguments positively supporting the belief, and ignore counter-arguments against the belief.

McGuire and Papageorgis (1961) also demonstrated that the refutational defense confers resistance to subsequent attacks including novel counter-arguments which are different from those explicitly refuted in the defense. The supportive-only defense proved the most effective of the four defense treatments (supportive-only, refutational-only, supportive-then-refutational, and refutational-then-supportive) in a direct strengthening effect prior to any attack, but the supportive-only defensive was the least effective in conferring resistance to the attack (McGuire, 1961).
Research using inoculation has ignored the variable of controversy of issue, and worked with studies using noncontroversial issues. As with other inoculation studies (McGuire, 1961, 1964), subjects indicated greater interest in reading articles opposed to their own beliefs when the articles were noncontroversial (Ray, 1968). Subjects indicated equal interest in reading opposing and agreeing articles on controversial issues.

In another inoculation experiment, substantial support was found (McGuire, 1962) for the predictions that (1) immunity conferred by a refutational defense would decay less rapidly than a defense conferred by support, and (2) within refutational-defense conditions the conferred resistance to attacks by counter-arguments other than the explicitly refuted ones would decay less rapidly than resistance to attacks by the very counter-arguments refuted. The experimental design called for four different defensive conditions where supportive defense, and refutational defense, conditions each received attacks employing the same counter-arguments as refuted and by attacks of novel counter-arguments.

Since prior experiments have shown that intrinsically threatening defenses confer more resistance to attacks than reassuring supportive defenses, it was hypothesized and confirmed that giving the subject feedback his peers are in complete agreement with him will weaken the immunizing effect of the defenses (Anderson, and McGuire, 1965).
Stone (1969) was concerned with interactions between inoculation strategies and individual subject differences. Individual differences specifically investigated were source-message orientation where the person has a tendency to respond to interpersonal communications in terms of the source or in terms of the message of the communication. It was felt that source inoculation would be more effective for source-oriented individuals and that message inoculation would be more effective for message-oriented individuals. Female sex, low self-esteem, and high authoritarianism were treated as indicative of source orientation. There were no significant differences between source versus message orientation although source orientation was somewhat effective for persons low in self-esteem and failed to confer immunization on those high in self-esteem.

**Message Intensity**

Research has focused on message intensity as the amount of deviation from evaluative neutrality in a source's statement, the quality of the language, and language style which reflects the polarity of the message produced by a source. Inconclusive attempts have been made in relating message intensity to the amount of subsequent attitude change (McEwen and Greenburg, 1970).

Burgoon and Chase (1973), using inoculation theory, demonstrated that, when there was similarity between audience expectations and message intensity, minimal
attitude change occurred. When there were differences between audience expectations and message intensity, shifts in attitude occurred which were not significantly different than those subjects receiving no inoculation.

Confirmation of similar trends was supported by McEwen and Greenberg (1970) where the source of a high intensity message was rated as more dynamic, and the high intensity message as clearer, than the low intensity message. Individual perceptions of message intensity remain a problem, due to the fact that some subjects perceived the intensity of the message to be different from the experimenter's intended message intensity. Since non-ego involving messages were used, it was suggested that further research might investigate language intensity on ego involving messages. Cronen (1973) dichotomized ego involving messages by suggesting that belief salience is an independent dimension of attitude and may be a complex function of belief strength. Even with the erosion of belief strength through repeated exposure to mass media, beliefs may remain salient.

Persuasion and the Mass Media

Experimental investigation demands increasing research in attitude change to facilitate the clarification of whether attitude change effects subsequent behavior or only causes cognitive realignments (Miller, 1968). Whiting (1971) suggests that with exposure to mass media, in this case radio, individuals with personalities
measured high in empathy shall have greater facility in decoding. Miller (1968) feels that mass communication audiences largely consist of individuals with a prior sympathy toward the viewpoint expressed. This view is congruent with consistency theory which postulates that individuals prefer consistency among cognitions, and that the introduction of an inconsistent cognition will produce tension thereby causing the individual to become involved in behavior which restores consistency. To avoid situations with the potential for inconsistency selective exposure is invoked. Individuals tend to seek out communications which are congruent with their belief systems and avoid situations which are inconsistent with their beliefs.

When inconsistency occurs the individual may reject the new information, or may alter his belief (Alper and Leidy, 1970). In a survey concerned with attitude change, and persistence of attitude change and acquisition of new information via the television medium, attitude change did occur possibly because the source was highly credible but espoused discrepant views from that of the subjects. In a follow-up study six months after the television presentation, subjects' new information and attitudes had dissipated but not disappeared. It is not known whether continued time lapse would restore subjects to views identical to those of controls (non-viewers of television presentation), or whether subjects
attitudes had stabilized. Levonian (1969) warns against interpretation of studies involving attitude change. Since typical studies in attitude change measure attitude based on a readministration of the same instrument, regression is to be expected. When this is not taken into account, it is possible to produce a correlation even in the absence of an intervening communication.

King and Summers (1971) investigated the use of attitudinal profiles for media audiences. Their profiles were not primarily a function of educational level, but investigated such variables as leadership, attitudes toward risk, competitive exhibitionism, and attention seeking. They suggest the potential value of using attitudinal profiles of media audiences in the selection process of advertising media to reach a particular market segment.

Mass media transmission is on the increase because of advances in satellite transmission. Even so, satellite reception may be impeded by socio-political concerns (Weiss, 1971). As world detente proliferates, the possibilities for future world mass communication will increase the transmission of news information. According to Weiss (1971) television as a news information medium appears to distort reality by the selection and interweaving of images.
Summary

This research involves teaching techniques, resistance to persuasion, and the use of propaganda in mass communication. Education has concerned itself with learning theory. Very little educational research has been directed toward the problem of teaching methods in general, and even less for the teaching of awareness of propaganda. The research report by Wood et al. (1970) entitled "The effect of learning about techniques of propaganda on subsequent reaction to propagandistic communications" appears to be the only recent published research on teaching awareness of propaganda.

Most of the recent research has been concerned with various methods of inducing resistance to persuasion. These methods include: (1) Anchoring which consists of connecting the belief to be immunized to other cognitions; (2) bonding central values to a policy stand; (3) warning which is a prior announcement that persuasion will be attempted; (4) forewarning which is a prior announcement of the topics and positions of forthcoming communications; (5) the effects of distraction in communication; (6) inoculation theory which assumes that pretreatments designed to make truisms resistant to subsequent attacks will be effective if the believer is unpracticed in defending his belief; and (7) message
intensity which is the amount of deviation from neutrality in a source's statement.

The literature in the area of learning theory and teaching methods is somewhat general in that it is mainly concerned with theory, but not with research. This review of the literature does not deal extensively with mass communication because the main emphasis is on teaching methods and propaganda since mass communication is not a central concern of this thesis.

In view of the status of research as reflected in the literature the author decided to undertake a research approach to some applications of persuasion theory. The intent of this research was to determine which of two teaching methods would most effectively create awareness of persuasive techniques. The teaching methods selected for study were (1) lecture, and (2) structured group discussion.

It was the hypothesis of the researcher that a structured group discussion method would be more effective than a lecture method in this specific teaching situation. It is generally conceded among educators that teaching methods using information flow consisting of feedback between instructor and class are superior to instructional environments consisting of lecture without the opportunity for students to participate. This view is supported by Rogers and Von Haller Gilmore (1951 and 1971)
where they emphasize information flow for clarity in the communication, and the use of teachers in facilitating the learning process.
CHAPTER III

EXPERIMENTAL METHOD

Subjects

The experimental population was made up of 61 students enrolled in three sections of American Political Institutions, Political Science (155), at California State University, Northridge. The student body is relatively heterogeneous coming from a wide variety of age, socio-economic, and ability groups. This is a general education course required of all majors at California State University, Northridge.

Experimental Design

The experimental population was composed of three classrooms which constitute naturally assembled collectives. The assignment of the independent variable to a classroom represented random selection on the part of the Experimenter. The experimental design used for this experiment was "The Nonequivalent Control Group Design" (Campbell and Stanley, 1963).

Procedure

Phase one of the experiment was the administration of a pretest to all three classrooms involved in the experiment (See Appendix A). The professors' of the experimental classes administered the pretest to the subjects. The pretest was intended to measure the subject's knowledge of persuasive techniques, but the
test questions were imbedded in the pretest with questions on persuasive techniques, organizational patterns, and types of imagery. This was done in an attempt to conceal the intent of the pretest, and to make it appear as a survey of their knowledge of rhetorical criticism.

The following statement was read to the experimental classes by the professors as an introduction to the pretest.

"You have been chosen to represent California State University, Northridge in a survey, sponsored by the Speech Communication Department, which is designed to measure familiarity with the field of rhetorical criticism. Rhetorical criticism is the description, analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of persuasive uses of language.

Please complete the survey to the best of your ability. You will have 15 minutes to complete the survey."

Phase two of the experiment consisted of two experimental conditions. The first condition was a sixty-minute lecture on persuasive techniques. The lecture was given by the Experimenter. The lecture included a discussion of: (1) The organizational sequencing of a persuasive, (2) propaganda labels, (a) Glittering Generalities, (b) Testimonial, (c) Bandwagon, (d) Plain Folks, (e) Name-Calling, (f) Transfer, (g) Card-Stacking, (h) Assertion, (i) Substitution of Names, and (j) Stereotypes (See Appendix B).

The second experimental condition consisted of a sixty-minute structured group discussion. The structured
group discussion included discussion of the same topics listed under the lecture condition, and was conducted by the Experimenter. Each topic was explained by the Experimenter and then opened for discussion with the class. The Experimenter then moved on to the next topic. The topics were divided into two areas. The two topic areas opened for discussion were: (1) The organizational sequencing of a persuasive speech, and (2) propaganda labels. Organizational sequencing of a persuasive speech was explained and opened for discussion within a thirty minute time frame, and propaganda labels were explained and opened for discussion within a thirty minute time frame.

Experimental conditions, lecture and structured group discussion, received the following statement read by the Experimenter prior to receiving their experimental conditions.

"I am a graduate student completing requirements for the MA degree, and I am in the process of investigating persuasive techniques that speakers use with their audiences. I would very much appreciate your cooperation.

This will only take about two hours, and will not affect your class grade in any way. Do not feel badly if you are not familiar with the subject matter.

The lecture or structured group discussion followed this statement. The control group did not receive a treatment.

Phase three of the experiment consisted of the two
experimental conditions (lecture and structured group discussion) plus the control group viewing the film "The Expense Fund Speech," ("The Checkers Speech"), by Richard M. Nixon. Nixon's campaign-fund speech was effective in convincing a large portion of American society of his good moral character at a time when his resignation was demanded. A movement was under way to have Nixon removed from the ticket as the running mate of General Eisenhower. His 1952 campaign-fund speech elicited more than two million telegrams and letters within a week. Historical evidence has shown that Mr. Nixon was reasonably successful in persuading a significant portion of his audience of his positive attributes (McGuckin, 1968). (See Appendix D "The Expense Fund Speech").

Phase four of the experiment consisted of administration, by the Experimenter, of the posttest to the two experimental condition groups (lecture and structured group discussion) and the control group (See Appendix C).

The posttest measured the material covered in the sixty-minute lecture, and the sixty-minute structured group discussion. The topic areas covered in the posttest were: (1) The organizational sequencing of a persuasive speech, and (2) propaganda labels, (a) Glittering Generalities, (b) Testimonial, (c) Bandwagon, (d) Plain Folks, (e) Name-Calling, (f) Transfer, (g) Card-Stacking, (h) Assertion, (i) Substitution of Names,
and (j) Stereotypes.

The posttest varied from the pretest in that it used actual quotes from the "Checkers Speech" in an attempt to measure applied learning from the lecture and structured group discussion material viewed in the film.

Upon conclusion of the posttest, a general debriefing was held with the two experimental condition groups and the control group. The debriefing was concerned with the explanation of the experimental hypothesis, and the experimental design.

**Experimental Environment**

The pretest was administered by the professors of the experimental classes. The first pretest to be administered was to the Structured Group Discussion subjects on Friday, June 20, at 8 a.m., and the second pretest to be administered was to the Lecture Group subjects on Friday, June 20, at 10 a.m. The third pretest to be administered was to the Control Group subjects on Wednesday, June 18, at 6 p.m. All three classrooms were on the third floor of the Engineering Building. The posttest was given in the same rooms as the pretest.

The Lecture Group subjects received the lecture implemented by examples from the speech "The Courage to Kill: Meeting the Panthers" by Eldridge Cleaver (Campbell, 1972). Other examples of propaganda were used that came
from the structured group discussion so that the difference in material between groups would have only been from the Eldridge Cleaver speech.

The Structured Group Discussion subjects received a briefer version of the lecture which was opened up for discussion at the five steps of a motivated sequence, and by having the students give examples of propaganda techniques after the Experimenter wrote the propaganda labels on the board and gave the definition for each label. This meant that the first half of the lecture was opened for discussion five times within one half-hour, and that the second half of the lecture was opened for discussion 10 times (there were 10 propaganda labels) within one-half hour.

Following the lecture, and structured group discussion, the students viewed "Nixon's Checkers Speech." The posttest was then administered. The treatment, film, and posttest took up the total class time.

Structured Group Discussion subjects received treatment, film, and posttest on Monday, June 23, at 8 a.m. The class had 14 students present, and was comprised of all grade levels and majors. The professor appeared to run the class in a warm open style soliciting feedback from the students during instruction.

The Lecture Group subjects received treatment, film, and posttest on Monday, June 23, at 10 a.m.
had 24 students present, and was comprised of all grade levels and majors. The professor appeared to be somewhat formal with his students. The professor as well as the students took notes during the lecture. Before the film was shown, the Experimenter asked the students to put their notes away.

The Control Group subjects received the film and posttest on Wednesday, June 25, at 6 p.m. The class had 22 students present, and was comprised of all grade levels and majors. The professor conducted the class in a semi-formal fashion by lecturing, but was open for questions.

**Measures**

The pretest and posttest were structured as matching questions. This was done in an attempt to reduce the level of guessing on the part of the students since there were always more answers than there were questions on the matching pretest and posttest. The pretest included more topics than the posttest because it was ostensibly couched in a survey on rhetorical criticism. Time limitations on the pretest and posttest were 15 minutes each.

The pretest and posttest received sample testing on test subjects before actual implementation in the experiment. Information obtained at the beginning of the posttest session included: age, sex, grade point average, and whether the subject had previously been
enrolled in another Political Science course. Data on these variables was obtained in order to use them, if necessary, as control covariates in the statistical analysis of the results from the primary variables.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Analysis of Secondary and Primary Experimental Variables

Secondary Variables

The secondary variables in this study are: self-reported grade point average of subjects, age and sex of subjects, and previous experience with political science subject matter.

The groups were homogeneous in grade point average. In the Lecture Group the measures varied from 2.3 through 4.0 with a mean of 3.02 and a variance \((S^2)\) of .872. The grade point average scores of the Structured Group Discussion subjects varied from 2.0 through 3.2 with a mean of 2.71 and a variance of .141. In the Control Group the subject's scores varied from 2.0 through 4.0 with a mean of 3.14 and a variance of .306.

An analysis of variance of the mean grade point average scores showed that the three group means did not vary significantly at the .05 level. The ANOVA Table 1 is presented below.
Table 1
ANOVA
Total Scores On Grade Point Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>20.929</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.872</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F_{.05} = 3.22$

In the Lecture Group the age of subjects varied from 17 through 39 with a mean of 25.333 and a variance ($S^2$) of 39.529. The ages of the subjects in the Structured Group Discussion varied from 18 through 45 with a mean of 24.600 and a variance of 85.822. In the Control Group the age of subjects varied from 21 through 55 with a mean of 26.905 and a variance of 76.591.

An analysis of variance of the mean age of subjects showed that the three group means did not vary significantly at the .05 level. The ANOVA Table 2 is presented below.

Table 2
ANOVA
Ages of Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>43.79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.895</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>2976.21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64.700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3020.00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F_{.05} = 3.20$
The distribution of the subjects by sex within three groups was similar. Chi Square was chosen for analysis of this secondary variable (sex composition of the groups). The Chi Square results revealed no significant difference in the sex composition among groups. The Chi Square Table 3 is presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>SGD</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 2.890, df = 2, x^2_{.05} = 5.991$

The majority of all the subjects had no prior experience with a political science class. Chi Square was chosen for analysis of this secondary variable, and the results indicated no significant difference among groups. The Chi Square Table 4 follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>SGD</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 0.678, df = 2, x^2_{.05} = 5.991$
Since the three experimental groups failed to differ significantly on any of the measured secondary variables, it was thought to be unnecessary to carry out a covariate correction of the scores on the primary variables.

**Primary Variables**

**Total scores on pretest.** A total score on the pretest was obtained for each subject in each group by counting the number of correct responses on the 15 items of the pretest.

In the Lecture Group the pretest scores varied from 2 through 7 with a mean of 4.79 and a variance \((S^2)\) of 2.953. The pretest scores of the Structured Group Discussion members varied from 2 through 8 with a mean of 6.00 and a variance of 4.444. In the Control Group the pretest scores varied from 1 through 10 with a mean of 5.430 and a variance of 7.893.

An analysis of variance of the pretest scores showed that the three group means did not vary significantly at the .05 level. The ANOVA Table 5 is presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>10.267</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.133</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>266.810</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277.077</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F.05 = 2.110
Pretest-posttest difference scores. The pretest-posttest difference scores constitute the primary dependent variable in this study. These scores were obtained by subtracting each subject's pretest total score from his total score on the posttest questionnaire.

In the Lecture Group these scores varied from -1 through 5. The group mean was 2.21 and the variance 2.897. The pretest-posttest difference scores of the Structured Group Discussion subjects ranged from -3 through 3 with a mean of 0.90 and a variance of 3.656. The scores of the Control Group varied from -8 through 7 with a mean of -0.35 and a variance of 14.510.

After due consideration of the implications of the differences in group variances, it was decided to proceed with an analysis of variance of these three sets of difference scores. Although it is now recognized that the analysis of variance technique is quite robust in situations involving heterogeneity of group variances, the reader should be aware of this heterogeneity in interpreting the results of this study.

The analysis of variance indicated that the variation in the three group means reported above is significant at the .05 level. This finding indicates that in their pretest-posttest difference scores the three experimental groups do not appear to come from the same population of subjects. The ANOVA Table 6 follows:
Because the analysis of variance of the pretest-posttest means indicated that these means vary significantly, it was decided to undertake pair-wise comparisons of the group means using Sheffe's test (Klugh, 1970). The only significant difference revealed by these pair-wise tests was between the mean of the Lecture Group (2.21) and the mean of the Control group (-0.35). ($F = 8.265; F_{.05} = 6.36$).

The failure of the Structured Group Discussion subjects to obtain higher pretest-posttest difference scores than the Lecture subjects and the failure of the former group to differ significantly from the Control subjects in the Sheffe test indicates that the primary experimental hypothesis of this study was not supported by the data. The hypothesis was that in the experimental situation that the Structured Group Discussion method would be more effective than a Lecture method in this specific teaching situation. As is shown by the data, this hypothesis was not verified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>68.167</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.083</td>
<td>4.131*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>404.275</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>472.442</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item Analyses

In view of the fact that the writer found no published tests of the primary variables measured in this study, it was necessary to generate both the pretest and the posttest. It is, therefore, of interest to future researchers to use this Item Analysis as a means of refining instruments measuring similar variables. Because of the use of the Item Analysis the writer was able to have increased confidence in the results of the statistical analysis.

Item Analysis of the Pretest

Of the three groups combined, the subjects answered the following items correctly two-thirds of the time or more (See Table 7): Item No. 11, "When a speaker develops a persuasive speech a motivated sequence is used that is constructed to conform to the thinking processes of the audience. Choose five of the words below, and place them in the sequence used for a persuasive speech." The correct response to Item 11 is "Attention." Item No. 16, "Encouragement to join the group through picnics, music, and cocktail parties." The correct matching response was C. "Bandwagon Technique." Item No. 17, "A natural tendency to generalize traits into a fixed impression." The correct response was E. "Stereotypes." Item 25, "Use of language and values of the middle class." The correct response was J. "Plain Folks."
With the exception of Items 12 (37% correct answers) and 23 (48% correct answers) the remaining items of the pretest were answered correctly less than one third of the time by the combined groups.

Items 13 and 24 do not appear to differentiate among subjects because of their low correct response level. None of the subjects answered Item No. 13 correctly, and only 8% of the subjects responded correctly to Item No. 24. Item No. 13 was the third part of the motivational speech; the correct answer was G. "Satisfaction." Item No. 24 was "Emphasizing key values that are important to the audience." The correct response was A. "Glittering Generalities."
### Table 7
**Item Analysis**

Percentage of Correct Answers On 15 Pretest Items By Item and Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Group Lecture (n = 19)</th>
<th>Structured Group Discussion (n = 10)</th>
<th>Control Group (n = 23)</th>
<th>Combined Groups (n = 52)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Item Analysis of the Posttest**

Of the three groups combined, the subjects answered the following items correctly four-fifths of the time or more (See Table 8): Item No. 1, "When a speaker develops a persuasive speech a motivated sequence is used that is
constructed to conform to the thinking processes of the audience. Choose five of the quotes below, and place them in the sequence used for a persuasive speech."

The correct response to Item No. 1 is, B. "My fellow Americans, I come before you tonight as a candidate for the Vice-presidency and as a man whose honesty and integrity has been questioned." Item No. 5 is the last number in the motivated sequence, and the correct response to Item No. 5 is, A. "Wire and write the Republican National Committee whether you think I should stay or whether you think I should get off." Item No. 6, "I don't happen to be a rich man so I couldn't use that way." The correct matching response was E. "Plain Folks."

Seven of the items were answered approximately between one-third and fifty percent of the time. Only three items No. 10, 11, and 12 differentiated less among subjects because of their low correct response level of 19% and 15%.

Item No. 10 "Because you see I love my country." The correct matching response was A., "Glittering Generalities." Item No. 11 was, "And I think the only man that can save America at this time is the man that's running for President, on my ticket, Dwight Eisenhower." The correct response was H., "Transfer." Item No. 12 was, "And I say that any man who called Alger Hiss case a red herring isn't fit to be President of the United States."
The correct matching response was F., "Substitution of Names."

Table 8
Item Analysis
Percentage of Correct Answers On 13 Posttest Items By Item and Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Group Lecture (n = 19)</th>
<th>Structured Group Discussion (n = 10)</th>
<th>Control Group (n = 23)</th>
<th>Combined Groups (n = 52)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9*</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13*</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Mean Percentages
54% 53% 38%

*The items designated with an asterisk above (Table 8) show higher percentage scores for the Structured Group Discussion subjects. The subjects in the Structured Group Discussion did better on the pretest and the post-test on the five items which were pertinent to the motivational sequence of a persuasive speech.
CHAPTER V  
DISCUSSION

Findings

The pretest was scored by obtaining a total score for each subject in each group by counting the number of correct responses on the 15 items of the pretest. An Analysis of Variance of the pretest total scores showed that the three group means did not vary significantly at the .05 level.

The primary independent variable in this study was the difference between scores on the pretest-posttest. These scores were obtained by subtracting each subject's pretest total score from his total score on the posttest questionnaire.

After careful consideration of the implications of the differences in group variances, it was decided to proceed with Analysis of Variance of these three sets of scores. Although it is now recognized that the Analysis of Variance technique is quite robust in situations involving heterogeneity of group variances, the reader should be aware of this heterogeneity of interpreting the results of this study.

Analysis of Variance among the three group means was significant at the .05 level. This finding indicates that in their pretest-posttest difference scores the three
experimental groups do not appear to come from the same population of subjects. These results suggested the need for further evaluation. Therefore, it was decided to undertake pair-wise comparisons of the group means using Sheffe's test (Klugh, 1970). The only significant difference revealed by these pair-wise tests was between the Lecture group and the Control group.

The failure of the Structured Group Discussion subjects to obtain larger pretest-posttest scores differences than the Lecture subjects and the failure of the Structured Group Discussion subjects to differ significantly from the Control subjects in the Sheffe test suggests that the primary experimental hypothesis of this study was not supported by the data.

Superiority of the Lecture Group Teaching Method

The intent of this research was to determine which of two teaching methods would most effectively create awareness of persuasive techniques. It was the hypothesis of the researcher that a Structured Group Discussion method would be more effective than a Lecture method in this specific teaching situation. As the data shows, this hypothesis was not supported.

The Structured Group Discussion subjects appeared to be in an environment which was somewhat easy going. While receiving the treatment they were responsive, at ease, and laughed a lot. The Lecture Group subjects appeared to be more serious in their demeanor, and took
notes during the lecture although they were not allowed to use their notes during the posttest. Perhaps the lecture method is a superior technique for teaching a class in resistance to persuasion at the college level, or maybe taking notes versus not taking notes is a significant variable when assessing teaching techniques.

Control of Secondary Variance

The secondary variables in this study are: self-reported grade point average of subjects, age and sex, and previous experience of subjects with political science subject matter.

The subjects were homogenous in grade point average. An Analysis of Variance of the mean grade point average scores showed that the three group means did not vary significantly at the .05 level.

The distribution of the subjects by sex was similar within the groups. Chi Square was chosen for analysis of this secondary variable. The Chi Square results indicated no significant difference in the sex composition among groups.

The majority of subjects had no prior experience with a class in political science. Chi Square was chosen for analysis of this secondary variable, and the results indicated no significant difference among groups.

Since the three experimental groups failed to differ significantly on any of the measured secondary variables, it was thought to be unnecessary to carry out a covariate
correction of the scores on the primary variables.

Any future research of a similar nature might be more profitable undertaken during a regular school semester. This particular study utilized summer school students who do differ from students during a regular school semester. While this variable was not investigated by the present writer, it is generally supposed by faculty and students that there are differences which might have a bearing on research results. For example, since summer school is a self-supporting program, there is a very definite self-selection process operative which may be implicit in who elects to attend summer school. For example, it costs the summer school student as much for three units as a student in the regular session would pay for 12 or more units.

Faculty members who are familiar with the system feel that the proportion of students in academic difficulty is much higher than the regular semester. Summer school is traditionally a time when students try to make up academic deficiencies or undertake classes in which they anticipate a great deal of difficulty.

There is also a possibility that the goal oriented student or over achiever who is accelerating his academic progress might be disproportionally represented.

Since California State University, Northridge is primarily a commuter campus, the majority of students
arrange their schedules around work hours. Therefore, the classes which meet before 1 p.m. fill first at registration and are the largest classes. The offerings after 4 p.m. are also very popular with working students.

In the present study three classes with three different instructors were utilized. During the regular session there are many instructors who teach three or four sections of the same class. Any bias which might accrue from instructor differences could be eliminated by the use of classes taught by the same instructor in the same manner.

Item Analysis of the Instruments

An item analysis of the pretest and posttest was performed because the writer found no published tests of the primary variables measured in this study. The item analysis may serve as a guidepost for researchers interested in replicating this study so that they may have an increasingly refined instrument measuring similar variables.

On their pretest scores the Lecture group was the lowest of the three experimental groups. Attrition occurred in the Structured Group Discussion members where there were fewer subjects in the discussion group than the other two groups, and the rate of mortality was 11 subjects for the Structured Group Discussion subjects. Seven subjects took the pretest, but not the posttest.
Four subjects took the posttest, but not the pretest.

Eight out of thirteen items on the posttest show higher scores (percentages correct) for the Structured Group Discussion subjects. The subjects in the Structured Group Discussion did better on the pretest and the posttest on the five items which were pertinent to the motivational sequence of a persuasive speech (See Results).

If the pretest and posttest were based on the sequence of a motivated speech, and not on the traditional persuasive techniques, the hypothesis regarding the responses of the subjects in the Structured Group Discussion might have been in the expected direction, and possibly at a statistically significant level.

Item analysis of the questionnaire suggests a number of changes which might strengthen the instrument for future similar research. Those items that appear to not discriminate well might be revised or eliminated in order to obtain more meaningful results. The items which were answered incorrectly most frequently in both the pretest and posttest might also bear scrutiny.

Experimental Design

Campbell and Stanley (1963) in their monograph Experimental and Quasi Experimental Designs For Research discuss ten experimental and correlational and ex post facto designs. These are designated designs 1 through 10. Design 10 was selected as a model for this research.
The present writer feels that some degree of familiarity with design 10 from Campbell and Stanley (1963) might be useful to an understanding of this study and to future researchers who might want to conduct a similar study.

The salient feature of design 10 is that the groups constitute naturally assembled collectives such as a classroom population which might be as similar as availability permits, but not so similar that one dispenses with the pretest. The assignment of the experimental treatment to one group or the other is assumed to be random, and under the experimenter's control.

Design 10 was considered the least reactive of the other experimental designs because of its usage of intact classrooms. Taking random samples of the students of the classrooms for different experimental treatments could possibly create increased awareness of the experiment. This supports the present researchers belief that this was the most appropriate design to minimize possible bias resulting from subject's knowledge of the purpose of the experiment.
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The following are a list of definitions of imagery. Please match these definitions to their imagery labels. There are more choices than answers (one answer only for each definition).

1. Compares one thing with another, and follows a common pattern by always using either "like" or "as" in the phrasing.  
   - A. Irony  
   - B. Understatement  
   - C. Rhetorical Question  
   - D. Hyperbole

2. Compares one thing with another, but omits "like" or "as" while making the comparison.  
   - E. Simile  
   - F. Personification  
   - G. Metaphor

3. Gives an object characteristics of something else which make it human.  
   - F. Personification

4. Exaggerating certain aspects of a situation.  
   - G. Metaphor

5. Saying much less than can truthfully be said.
Match the definition to the descriptive organizational pattern. There are more choices than answers (one answer only for each definition).

___ 6. Organized according to a time sequence.  
   A. Contrast  
   B. Associational

___ 7. Sequences material by moving through physical space.  
   B. Associational  
   C. Chronological

___ 8. Always part of a larger entity, and can be broken into smaller parts.  
   D. Comparison  
   E. Spatial

___ 9. Shows relationships between two events.  
   F. Problem-Solution  
   G. Topical

___ 10. Presentation of weakest point first with strongest point presented last.  
   H. Climactic  
   I. Causal

When a speaker develops a persuasive speech, a motivated sequence is used that is constructed to conform to the thinking processes of the audience. Choose five of the words below, and place them in the sequence used for a persuasive speech.

___ 11.  
   A. Assertion  
   B. Visualization

___ 12.  
   C. Need  
   D. Comparison

___ 13.  
   E. Action  
   F. Attention

___ 14.  
   G. Satisfaction
Match the following definitions to the most appropriate propaganda label. There are more choices than answers (one answer only for each definition).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Encouragement to join the group through picnics, music, and cocktail parties.</td>
<td>A. Glittering Generalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A natural tendency to generalize traits into a fixed impression.</td>
<td>B. Pinpointing the Enemy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Applying stereotypes to other people into order to create desired audience response.</td>
<td>C. Bandwagon Technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Exchanging neutral terms for those with an emotional connotation.</td>
<td>D. Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The audience is shown only part of the picture.</td>
<td>E. Stereotypes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Refusing to argue issues by making bold statements.</td>
<td>F. Substitution of Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Associating one self with a well known or loved symbol (American Flag).</td>
<td>G. Assertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Citing the approval of someone with status or personal knowledge of the event.</td>
<td>H. Testimonial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Emphasizing key values that are important to the audience.</td>
<td>I. Downright Lying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Use of language and values of the middle class.</td>
<td>J. Plain Folks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K. Name-Calling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Card-Stacking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mass media is a major source of public affairs information for all of us. Generally, this information comes from television, newspapers, and magazines. Much of the information we receive is distorted by the selection and interweaving of images.

I would like to let you know what some of the persuasive techniques are which are being used on you by the mass media so that you will be able to recognize and analyze these techniques when some one applies them to you. Therefore, I will be telling you about the motivated sequence used in the organization of a persuasive speech, and, secondly, about the types of persuasive appeals a propagandist might use.

It has been found that there is a common pattern among people that provides a psychological basis for organizing persuasive appeals. This common pattern may be called a motivated sequence because it follows the sequential steps by which people think through problems and make decisions. The motivated sequence consists of: (1) Getting attention, (2) showing the need, and describing the problem, (3) satisfying the need and presenting the solution, (4) visualizing the results, and (5) requesting action or approval. (The Experimenter then wrote on the
blackboard: (1) Attention, (2) Need, (3) Satisfaction, (4) Visualization, and (5) Action).

Each speaking situation is unique and the persuasive speaker will not give equal time to each of the five steps in the motivated sequence, but will vary the length of the steps in the motivated sequence according to the particular speaking situation.

The motivated sequence is a flexible tool for the persuasive speaker, and I would like to show you how the five steps are developed by speakers.

Attention

In the first minute or two of a speech the speaker needs to gain the attention of the audience. In addition to gaining the audience's attention, it is necessary to win goodwill, and to lead the audience naturally into the subject of the speech.

There are a number of well-established means for gaining the attention of the audience. If the audience is already interested in the subject matter, the speaker can refer to that subject matter. Although, a speaker would not gain attention from an audience who is apathetic toward the subject matter, and a different approach might prove more feasible such as using a startling statement. Sometimes the occasion which brought the audience together is useful to mention in order to gain their attention. This becomes a necessity if the speech is prepared for some special event, ceremony, or anniversary.
Speakers who are well known can start off their speeches by referring to their own background or accomplishments to gain the attention of the audience. Sometimes they express a personal greeting to the audience such as pleasure in appearing before the audience. When personal greetings are used, there is always the risk that the speaker may not sound sincere or is immodest.

Another approach to gaining attention is to ask a rhetorical question, or a series of questions may be asked in order to get the audience to start thinking about the subject.

Imagery may be used by telling a humorous anecdote, a funny story or a humorous experience, but the speaker better be able to tell it well or the anecdote will fall flat on its face and the speaker will lose the audience's attention. Imagery can also be used by illustrating real-life situations or hypothetical illustrations.

Whenever you listen to a speech become aware of the type of attention device the speaker uses. The speaker may use any one of those just mentioned, or the speaker might use a combination of attention getting devices.

**Need**

After attention has been gained it is time for the speaker to show that a definite problem exists. This is done by pointing out what is wrong with things, and
through the use of data substantiating how bad the situation is.

The speaker may start to create the need by making a definite statement of the problem, and then give examples of the problem. The examples used should explain and clarify the problem. Additional examples of the problem may then be used to show the extent and seriousness of the problem. The number of examples used in showing the need to the audience will depend upon the amount of data required to impress the audience. Finally, the audience needs to become aware of how the problem actually affects them.

Satisfaction

Now that the audience understands the problem, the speaker has the job of persuading the audience that the proposed policy is the correct one.

This is done by proposing a solution to the problem that is practical and desirable. First, the action is stated that the speaker would like the audience to take. The solution to the problem needs to be well understood, and visual aids are sometimes used in this portion of the speech to help increase understanding of the solution to the problem. Reasoning may be used to show how the proposed solution meets the need. Reasoning alone is not strong enough to motivate most audiences to accept the proposed solution so that the persuasive speaker gives
examples to show that the proposed solution has worked in instances where it was applied. Many speakers will use testimony from expert witnesses in this part of the speech.

The last part of the development for presenting a solution to the problem deals with meeting objectives. Many objections toward the proposal might be raised in the minds of the audience. This is a good opportunity for the speaker to answer any objections which the audience might bring up. If the satisfaction step in the motivated sequence is developed properly, the audience will feel that the speaker offered a desirable and practical solution to the problem.

**Visualization**

During the visualization step of the motivated sequence the speaker tries to get the audience to picture how conditions will be in the future. There are three ways of accomplishing visualization and they are positive, negative, and contrast.

When a speaker uses the positive method of visualization, conditions are described as they will be in the future as long as the speaker's proposal is carried out. The speaker creates a picture for the audience where they are enjoying the conditions which are proposed.

The negative method of visualization describes conditions in the future as they will be if the proposal
is not carried out. Again, imagery is used to create a picture for the audience where dangers arise from failure to implement the proposed solution to the problem.

The method of contrast combines positive and negative visualization in such strong contrast that the audience is led to the conclusion that the only desirable solution will do. The persuasive speaker is able to do this by using the negative approach first, and then using the positive approach. Of course, the more clearly the situation is depicted, the more strongly the audience will react.

**Action**

If the visualization step has worked well, the speaker will try to transfer the audience's solution to the problem into action.

Stimulating the audience to action can be done by issuing a challenge or appeal which is vivid and compelling. Sometimes a speaker's personal intention to act on his own recommendations induces the audience to action. In such a case, it is best for the speaker to have high prestige with the audience.

Now you have the development of a motivated sequence for a persuasive speech. Remember that the speaker will use the five steps in developing a persuasive appeal. (1) Attention, (2) Need, (3) Satisfaction, (4) Visualization, and (5) Action (at this time the
Experimenter erased the five steps off the board.

Now that you can recognize a motivated sequence, I would like to discuss with you the various types of propaganda techniques used in a persuasive speech.

(The Experimenter then gave the ten definitions for the traditional propaganda labels. After each definition the Experimenter gave examples of the use of the propaganda technique. The definitions were the same that were used in the pretest and can be found in Appendix A. During the structured group discussion the subjects gave examples of the propaganda techniques, and these same examples were again used during the lecture).

**Glittering Generalities**

Emphasizing key values that are important to the audience.

**Bandwagon Technique**

Encouragement to join the group through picnics, music, and cocktail parties.

**Transfer**

Associating one self with a well known or loved symbol (American Flag).

**Stereotypes**

A natural tendency to generalize traits into a fixed impression.
Substitution of Names
Exchanging neutral terms for those with an emotional connotation.

Assertion
Refusing to argue issues by making bold statements.

Testimonial
Citing the approval of someone with status or personal knowledge of the event.

Plain Folks
Use of language and values of the middle class.

Name-Calling
Applying stereotypes to other people in order to create desired audience response.

Card-Stacking
The audience is shown only part of the picture.
APPENDIX C

PERSUASIVE TECHNIQUES

Name________________________ Age___ Sex___ SAT score___

What is your current Grade Point Average?___ Is this your first college level Political Science Course?___

When a speaker develops a persuasive speech a motivated sequence is used that is constructed to conform to the thinking processes of the audience. Choose five of the quotes below, and place them in the sequence used for a persuasive speech.

_1. A. "Wire and write the Republican National Committee whether you think I should stay or whether I should get off."

_2. B. "My fellow American, I come before you tonight as a candidate for the Vice-presidency and as a man whose honesty and integrity has been questioned."

_3. C. "But she does have a respectable Republican cloth coat, and I always tell her that she would look good in anything."

_4. D. "And I am proud of the fact that the taxpayers by subterfuge or otherwise have never paid one dime for expenses which I thought were political and should not be charged to the taxpayers."

_5. E. "It was a little cocker spaniel dog, in a crate that he had sent all the way from Texas, black and white spotted, and our little girl, Tricia, the six-year-old named it Checkers."

F. "And I feel confident that with great Americans like you and General Eisenhower in the White House, lonely Americans like myself will be united with their loved ones now in Korea."

G. "Why do I feel so deeply? Why do I feel that in spite of the smears, the misunderstanding, the necessity for a man to come up here and bare his soul, as I have..."
PERSUASIVE TECHNIQUES

Match the following quotes to the most appropriate propaganda label. There are more choices than answers (one answer only for each quote).

____ 6. "I don't happen to be a rich man so I couldn't use that way."
   A. Glittering Generalities
   B. Testimonial
   C. Assertion

____ 7. "Not one cent of the $18,000 or any other money of that type ever went to me for my personal use."
   D. Bandwagon
   E. Plain Folks
   F. Substitution of Names

____ 8. "...and the legal opinion by Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher, lawyers in Los Angeles, the biggest law firm and, incidentally, one of the best in Los Angeles."
   G. Name-Calling
   H. Transfer
   I. Card-Stacking
   J. Stereotypes

____ 9. "I am going to campaign up and down America until we drive the crooks and the Communists and those that defend them out of Washington..."

____ 10. "Because, you see I love my country."

____ 11. "And I think the only man that can save America at this time is the man that's running for President, on my ticket, Dwight Eisenhower."

____ 12. "And I say that any man who called Alger Hiss case a red herring isn't fit to be President of the United States.

____ 13. "After all, her name was Patricia Ryan and she was born on St. Patrick's Day, and you know the Irish never quit."
APPENDIX D
THE EXPENSE FUND SPEECH
Richard M. Nixon

My fellow Americans, I come before you tonight as a candidate for the vice-presidency and as a man whose honesty and integrity has been questioned. Now, the usual thing to do when charges are made against you is to either ignore them or to deny them without giving details. I believe we have had enough of that in the United States, particularly with the present administration in Washington, D.C. To me the office of the vice-presidency of the United States is a great office, and I feel that the people have got to have confidence in the integrity of the men who run for that office and who might attain them. I have a theory, too, that the best and only answer to a smear or to an honest misunderstanding of the facts is to tell the truth. And that is why I am here tonight. I want to tell you my side of the case.

I am sure that you have read the charge, and you have heard it, that I, Senator Nixon, took $18,000 from a group of my supporters. Now, was that wrong? And let me say that it was wrong...I am saying it, incidentally, that it was wrong, not just illegal, because it isn't a question of whether it was legal or illegal: that isn't enough. The question is, was it morally wrong?...I say that it was morally wrong—if any of that $18,000 went to Senator Nixon,
for my personal use. I say that it was morally wrong if it was secretly given and secretly handled. And I say that it was morally wrong if any of the contributors got special favors for the contributions that they made.

And to answer those questions, let me say this: Not one cent of the $18,000 or any other money of that type ever went to me for my personal use. Every penny of it was used to pay for political expenses that I did not think should be charged to the taxpayers of the United States.

It was not a secret fund. As a matter of fact, when I was on "Meet the Press? - some of you may have seen it, last Sunday - Peter Edson came up to me, after the program, and he said, "Dick, what about this fund we hear about?" And I said, "Well, there is no secret about it. Go out and see Dana Smith, who was the administrator of the fund," and I gave him his address. And I said, "You will find that the purpose of the fund simply was to defray political expenses that I did not feel should be charged to the government."

And, third, let me point out, and I want to make this particularly clear, that no contributor to this fund, no contributor to any of my campaigns, has ever received any consideration that he would not have received as an ordinary constituent. I just don't believe in that, and I can say that never, while I have been in the Senate of the United States, as far as the people that contributed to this fund
are concerned, have I made a telephone call for them to an agency, nor have I gone down to an agency in their behalf. And the records will show that, the records which are in the hands of the administration.

Well, then, some of you will say, and rightly, "well, what did you use the fund for, Senator? Why did you have to have it?" Let me tell you in just a word how a Senate office operates. First of all, the senator gets $15,000 a year in salary. He gets enough money to pay for one trip a year - a round trip, that is - for himself and his family, between his home and Washington, D.C.: and then he gets an allowance to handle the people that work in his office to handle his mail. And the allowance for my state of California is enough to hire thirteen people. And let me say, incidentally, that this allowance is not paid to the senator. It is paid directly to the individuals that the senator puts on his payroll, but all of these people and all of these allowances are strictly official business---business, for example, when a constituent writes in and wants you to go down to the Veterans' Administration and get some information about his GI policy---items of that type, for example. But there are other expenses which are not covered by the government. And I think I can best discuss those expenses by asking you some questions.

Do you think that when I or any other senator makes a political speech, has it printed, should charge the
printing of that speech and the mailing of that speech to the taxpayers? Do you think, for example, when I or any other senator makes a trip to his home state to make a surely political speech, that the cost of that trip should be charged to the taxpayers? Do you think when a senator makes political broadcasts or political television broadcasts, radio or television, that the expense of those broadcasts should be charged to the taxpayers?

I know what your answer is: it is the same answer that audiences give me whenever I discuss this particular problem. The answer is no. The taxpayers should not be required to finance items which are not official business but which are primarily political business.

Well, then the question arises: You say, "Well, how do you pay for these, and how can you do it legally?" And there are several ways that it can be done, incidentally, and it is done legally in the United States Senate and in the Congress.

The first way is to be a rich man. I don't happen to be a rich man. So I couldn't use that.

Another way that is used is to put your wife on the payroll. Let me say, incidentally, that my opponent, my opposite number for the vice-presidency of the Democratic ticket, does have his wife on his payroll and has had her on his payroll for the past ten years. Now, just let me
say this: That is his business, and I am not critical of him for doing that. You will have to pass judgment on that particular point, but I have never done that for this reason: I have found that there are so many deserving stenographers and secretaries in Washington that needed the work that I just didn't feel it was right to put my wife on the payroll--my wife sitting over here.

She is a wonderful stenographer. She used to teach stenography and she used to teach shorthand in high school. That was when I met her. And I can tell you folks that she has worked many hours nights and many hours on Saturdays and Sundays in my office, and she had (sic) done a fine job, and I am proud to say tonight that in the six years I have been in the House and in the Senate of the United States, Pat Nixon has never been on the government payroll.

What are other ways that these finances can be taken care of? Some who are lawyers, and I happen to be a laywer, continue to practice law, but I haven't been able to do that. I am so far away from California and I have been so busy with my senatorial work that I have not engaged in any legal practice: and also, as far as law practice is concerned, it seemed to me that the relationship between an attorney and the client was so personal that you couldn't possibly represent a man as an attorney and then have an unbiased view when he presented his case
to you in the event that he has one before the government.

And so I felt that the best way to handle these necessary political expenses of getting my message to the American people and the speeches I made—the speeches that I had printed, for the most part, concerned this one message, of exposing this administration, the Communism in it, the corruption in it—the only way that I could do that was to accept the aid which people in my home state of California, who contributed to my campaign and who continued to make these contributions after I was elected, were glad to make.

And let me say I am proud of the fact that not one of them has ever asked me for a special favor. I am proud of the fact that not one of them has ever asked me to vote on a bill other than my own conscience would dictate. And I am proud of the fact that the taxpayers by subterfuge or otherwise have never paid one dime for expenses which I thought were political and should not be charged to the taxpayers.

Let me say, incidentally, that some of you may say, "Well that is all right, Senator; that is your explanation, but have you got any proof?" And I would like to tell you this evening that just an hour ago we received an independent, audit of this entire fund. I suggested to Governor Sherman Adams, who is the chief of staff of the
Eisenhower campaign, that an independent audit and legal report be obtained, and I have that audit in my hand. It is an audit made by Price Waterhouse & Co. firm, and the legal opinion by Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher, lawyers in Los Angeles, the biggest law firm and, incidentally, one of the best ones in Los Angeles.

I am proud to report to you tonight that this audit and this legal opinion is being forwarded to General Eisenhower, and I would like to read to you the opinion prepared by Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher, based on all the pertinent laws and statutes, together with the audit report prepared by the certified public accountants:

It is our conclusion that Senator Nixon did not obtain any financial gain from the collection and disbursement of the funds by Dana Smith; that Senator Nixon did not violate any federal or state law by reason of the operation of the fund; and that neither the portion of the fund paid by Dana Smith directly to third persons, nor the portion paid to Senator Nixon, to reimburse him for office expenses, constituted income in a sense which was either reportable
or taxable as income under income
tax laws.

(signed)
Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher,
by Elmo H. Conley

That is not Nixon speaking, but that is an independent audit which was requested because I want the American people to know all the facts, and I am not afraid of having independent people go in and check the facts, and that is exactly what they did.

But then I realized that there are still some who may say, and rightly so—and let me say that I recognize that some will continue to smear, regardless of what the truth may be—but that there has been understandably, some honest misunderstanding on this matter, and there are some that will say, "Well, maybe you were able, Senator, to fake this thing. How can we believe what you say—after all, is there a possibility that you might have feathered your own nest?" And so now what I am going to do—and, incidentally, this is unprecedented in the history of the American politics—I am going at this time to give to this television and radio audience a complete financial history, everything I have earned, everything I have spent, everything I own, and I want you to know the facts.

I will have to start early. I was born in 1913. Our family was one of modest circumstances, and most of
my early life was spent in a store, out in East Whittier. It was a grocery store, one of those family enterprises. The only reason we were able to make it go was because my Mother and Dad had five boys, and we all worked in the store. I worked my way through college and, to a great extent, through law school. And then, in 1940, probably the best thing that ever happened to me happened. I married Pat, who is sitting over here.

We had a rather difficult time, after we were married, like so many of the young couples who might be listening to us. I practiced law. She continued to teach school.

Then, in 1942, I went into the service. Let me say that my service record was not a particularly unusual one. I went to the South Pacific. I guess I'm entitled to a couple of battle stars. I got a couple of letters of commendation. But I was just there when the bombs were falling. And then I returned. I returned to the United States, and 1946, I ran for Congress. When we came out of the war, Pat and I--Pat during the war had worked as a stenographer, and in a bank, and as an economist for a government agency--and when we came out, the total of our savings, from both my law practice, her teaching, and all the time that I was in the war, the total for that entire period was just a little less than $10,000. Every cent of that, incidentally, was in
government bonds. Well, that's where we start, when I go into politics.

Now, whatever I earned since I went into politics—well, here it is. I jotted it down. Let me read the notes. First of all, I have had my salary as a congressman and as a senator. Second, I have received a total in this past six years of $1,600 from estates which were in my law firm at the time I severed my connection with it. And, incidentally, as I said before, I have not engaged in any legal practice, and have not accepted any fees from business that came into the firm after I went into politics. I have made an average of approximately $1,500 a year, from nonpolitical speaking engagements and lectures. And then, fortunately, we have inherited a little money. Pat sold her interest in her father's estate for $3,000, and I inherited $1,500 from my grandfather. We lived rather modestly.

For four years we lived in an apartment in Parkfairfax, Alexandria, Virginia. The rent was $80 a month. And we saved for the time that we could buy a house. Now, that was what we took in.

What did we do with this money? What do we have today to show for it? This will surprise you, because it is so little, I suppose, as standards generally go of people in public life. First of all, we've got a house in Washington, which cost $41,000 and on which we owe
$20,000. We have a house in Whittier, California, which cost $13,000, and on which we owe $3,000 (see par. 25). My folks are living there at the present time. I have just $1,000 in life insurance, plus my GI policy, which I have never been able to convert, and which will run out in two years. I have no life insurance whatever on Pat. I have no life insurance on our two youngsters Patricia and Julie. I own a 1950 Oldsmobile car. We have our furniture. We have no stocks and bonds of any type. We have no interest of any kind, direct or indirect, in any business. Now, this is what we have. What do we owe?

Well, in addition to the mortgage, the $20,000 mortgage on the house in Washington, a $10,000 one on the house in Whittier, I owe $4,500 to the Riggs Bank, in Washington, D.C., with interest at 4 per cent. I owe $3,500 to my parents, and the interest on that loan, which I pay regularly because it is a part of the savings they made through the years they were working so hard--I pay regularly 4 per cent interest. And then I have a $500 loan, which I have on my life insurance.

Well, that's about it. That's what we have. And that's what we owe. It isn't very much. But Pat and I have the satisfaction that every dime that we have got is honestly ours.

I should say this, that Pat doesn't have a mink coat. But she does have a respectable Republican cloth
coat, and I always tell her that she would look good in anything.

One other thing I probably should tell you, because if I don't they will probably be saying this about me, too. We did get something, a gift, after the election. A man in Texas heard Pat on the radio mention the fact that our two youngsters would like to have a dog, and, believe it or not, the day before we left on this campaign trip we got a message from Union Station in Baltimore, saying they had a package for us. We went down to get it. You know what it was?

It was a little cocker spaniel dog, in a crate that he had sent all the way from Texas, black and white, spotted, and our little girl, Tricia, the six-year-old, named it Checkers. And, you know, the kids, like all kids, loved the dog, and I just want to say this, right now, that regardless of what they say about it, we are going to keep it.

It isn't easy to come before a nation-wide audience and bare your life, as I have done. But I want to say some things before I conclude, that I think most of you will agree on.

Mr. Mitchell, the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, made the statement that if a man couldn't afford to be in the United States Senate, he shouldn't run for the Senate. And I just want to make my
position clear. I don't agree with Mr. Mitchell when he says that only a rich man should serve his government, in the United States Senate or in the Congress. I don't believe that represents the thinking of the Democratic party, and I know it doesn't represent the thinking of the Republican party.

I believe that it's fine that a man like Governor Stevenson, who inherited a fortune from his father, can run for President. But I also feel that it is essential in this country of ours that a man of modest means can also run for President, because, you know--remember Abraham Lincoln--you remember what he said--"God must have loved the common people, he made so many of them."

Nixon indicates (par. 24) that the mortgage on the $13,000 home in Whittier is $3,000, and here that it is $10,000. The latter figure is correct, Nixon's secretary, James Bassett, told reporter later, explaining the discrepancy as "a verbal error."

And now I'm going to suggest some courses of conduct.

First of all, you have read in the papers about funds, now, Mr. Stevenson apparently had a couple. One of them in which a group of business people paid and helped to supplement the salaries of state employees. Here is where the money went directly into their pockets, and I
think that what Mr. Stevenson should do should be to come before the American people, as I have, give the names of the people that contributed to that fund, give the names of the people who put this money into their pockets, at the same time that they were receiving money from their state government and see what favors, if any, they gave out for that.

I don't condemn Mr. Stevenson for what he did, but until the facts are in there is a doubt that would be raised. And as far as Mr. Sparkman is concerned, I would suggest the same thing. He's had his wife on the payroll. I don't condemn him for that, but I think that he should come before the American people, and indicate what outside sources of income he has had. I would suggest that under the circumstances both Mr. Sparkman and Mr. Stevenson should come before the American people, as I have and make a complete financial statement as to their financial history, and if they don't it will be an admission that they have something to hide.

And I think you will agree with me--because, folks, remember, a man that's to be President of the United States, a man that is to be Vice-President of the United States, must have the confidence of all the people. And that's why I'm doing what I'm doing, and that is way I suggest that Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Sparkman, if they are under attack, that should be what they are doing.
Now, let me say this: I know that this is not the last of the smears. In spite of my explanation tonight, other smears will be made. Others have been made in the past. And the purpose of the smears, I know, is this, to silence me, to make me let up. Well, they just don't know who they are dealing with. I'm going to tell you this: I remember, in the dark days of the Hiss trial, some of the same columnists, some of the same radio commentators who are attacking me now and misrepresenting my position, were violently opposing me at the time I was after Alger Hiss. But I continued to fight, because I knew I was right, and I can say to this great television and radio audience that I have no apologies to the American people for my part in putting Alger Hiss where he is today. And as far as this is concerned, I intend to continue to fight.

Why do I feel so deeply? Why do I feel that in spite of the smears, the misunderstanding, the necessity for a man to come up here and bare his soul, as I have—why is it necessary for me to continue this fight? And I want to tell you why. Because, you see, I love my country. And I think my country is in danger. And I think the only man that can save America at this time is the man that's running for President, on my ticket, Dwight Eisenhower.

You say, why do I think it is in danger? And I say, look at the record. Seven years of the Truman-Acheson
Administration, and what's happened? Six hundred million people lost to the Communists. And a war in Korea in which we have lost 117,000 American casualties, and I say to all of you that a policy that results in a loss of 600,000,000 people to the Communists and a war which costs us 117,000 American casualties isn't good enough for America, and I say that those in the State Department that made the mistakes which caused that war and which resulted in those losses should be kicked out of the State Department just as fast as we can get them out of there.

And let me say that I know Mr. Stevenson won't do that, because he defends the Truman policy, and I know that Dwight Eisenhower will do that, and that he will give America the leadership that it needs.

Take the problem of corruption. You have read about the mess in Washington. Mr. Stevenson can't clean it up because he was picked by the man, Truman, under whose administration the mess was made. You wouldn't trust the man who made the mess to clean it up. That is Truman. And, by the same token you can't trust the man who was picked by the man who made the mess to clean it up, and that is Stevenson. And so I say, Eisenhower, who owes nothing to Truman, nothing to the big-city bosses--he is the man who can clean up the mess in Washington.

Take Communism. I say that as far as that subject
is concerned the danger is great to America. In the Hiss case they got the secrets which enabled them to break the American secret State Department code. They got secrets in the atomic-bomb case which enabled them to get the secret of the atomic bomb five years before they would have gotten it by their own devices. And I say that any man who called the Alger Hiss case a red herring isn't fit to be President of the United States.

I say that a man who, like Mr. Stevenson, has pooh-poohed and ridiculed the Communist threat in the United States--he said that they are phantoms among ourselves--he has accused us, that have attempted to expose the Communists, of looking for Communists in the Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife. I say that a man who says that isn't qualified to be President of the United States. And I say that the only man who can lead us into this fight to rid the government of both those who are Communists and those who have corrupted this government is Eisenhower, because General Eisenhower, you can be sure, recognizes the problem, and knows how to handle it.

Let me say this, finally. This evening I want to read to you just briefly excerpts from a letter that I received, a letter which after all this is over no one can take away from us. It reads as follows:

Dear Senator Nixon: Since I am only nineteen years of age, I can't vote
in this presidential election, but believe me, if I could, you and General Eisenhower would certainly get my vote. My husband is in the Fleet Marines in Korea. He is in the front lines. And we have a two-months-old son he has never seen. And I feel confident that with great Americans like you and General Eisenhower in the White House, lonely Americans like myself will be united with their loved ones now in Korea. I only pray to God that you won't be too late. Enclosed is a small check to help you in your campaign. Living on $85 a month, it is all I can afford at present, but let me know what else I can do.

Folks, it is a check for $10, and it is one that I shall never cash. And just let me say this: We hear a lot about prosperity these days, but I say why can't we have prosperity built on peace, rather than prosperity built on war? Why can't we have prosperity and an honest government in Washington, D.C., at the same time? Believe me, we can. And Eisenhower is the man that can lead the crusade to bring us that kind of prosperity.
And, now, finally, I know that you wonder whether or not I am going to stay on the Republican ticket or resign. Let me say this: I don't believe that I ought to quit, because I am not a quitter. And, incidentally, Pat is not a quitter. After all, her name was Patricia Ryan and she was born on St. Patrick's Day, and you know the Irish never quit.

But the decision, my friends, is not mine. I would do nothing that would harm the possibilities of Dwight Eisenhower to become President of the United States. And for that reason I am submitting to the Republican National Committee tonight through this television broadcast the decision which it is theirs to make. Let them decide whether my position on the ticket will help or hurt. And I am going to ask you to help them decide. Wire and write the Republican National Committee whether you think I should stay or whether I should get off. And whatever their decision is, I will abide by it.

But just let me say this last word. Regardless of what happens, I am going to continue this fight. I am going to campaign up and down America until we drive the crooks and Communists and those that defend them out of Washington, and remember, folks, Eisenhower is a great man, and a vote for Eisenhower is a vote for what is good for America.