THE UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT

THE CONSTRUCTION OF A CHECK-LIST

FOR USE AS

AN ATTITUDE SURVEY

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

BY

GABRIEL D. BOLDUC

DETROIT, MICHIGAN

JANUARY, 1955

141 30 9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE

PREFACE

For the past few years, the writer has been professionally engaged in attitude survey work in industry. The principal technique used has been the written questionnaire composed of some questions with multiple-choice check responses and some open-end questions. Although this tool has been extremely useful, an eagerness to devise more effective techniques of attitude study prompted research into and applications of various methods introduced into the field. Guttman's scaling technique was applied to the conventional questionnaire. Responses were analysed by applying Wherry's method for factoring large numbers of items. Questions with faces for check responses instead of words, showing expressions from favorable to unfavorable, were tested. (See Appendix A)

While these efforts were rewarded with considerable success, there were always questions which were not entirely answered. When the responses are listed on a gradient scale, how much "halo" effect is there in the employee's responses? In spite of guaranteed anonymity, to what extent do the employees answer the way they think they are expected to answer, rather than the way they really feel? How difficult is it for employees first to analyse their feelings, and then to express them adequately?

The literature on current research in this field of attitude study makes it very clear that these are common uncertainties which have not

as yet been resolved to everyone's satisfaction.

With American industry today placing more and more stress on the human-relations approach to dealing with employees, there is little doubt of the importance of effective attitude techniques. With these considerations in mind, the writer offers this work in the hope it will contribute in some measure to the accuracy and usefulness of attitude surveys in industry.

CHAPTER I

THE ROLE OF ATTITUDE SURVEYS IN INDUSTRY

For some time now, a gradual revolution has been taking place in
American industry. In the past, American industrial management concen-
trated on effecting technological developments to improve efficiency and
increase production at lower costs, without due consideration for one
of the most important factors in the total operation, namely, man.
In more recent years, management has begun to realize that, just as a
machine can operate best under only certain conditions, so man attains
greater efficiency under conditions that are more conducive to the
satisfaction of those needs which are related to the job situation. It
has been scientifically established that worker morale today is not
dependent solely on pay or steady work but on a myriad of factors, some
of which may be only remotely related to the job. As Kingsbury puts it,

> The old view, that workers are interested only in high pay
> and keeping their jobs, has given way to recognition that
> conditions influencing worker-attitudes are complex, varied,
> poorly understood by the worker himself and by no means
> confined to shop and working hours.[1]

With this new trend in mind, it becomes obvious that research must
be directed to the study of employee motivation and better morale. Just
as technological designs are subjected to engineers' critical analysis

to discover needs for improvement, so must the efforts of psychologists be directed toward the better understanding of men and their needs in industry. According to Viteles,

> It is increasingly recognized that the solution of problems of production and morale in industry involves the close consideration of the wants of the worker which reflect either previously established tension systems in the individual or the effect upon him of the immediate social situation.[2]

The big problem, however, is that of devising means to identify and measure these wants of the worker. Viteles points out this difficulty when he says,

> The possibility of identifying such wants is complicated by the fact that motivation as such - or more specifically motives, drives, and needs - cannot be observed directly. Experimental inquiries have disclosed tissues, glandular mechanisms, and hormones which are involved in motivated behavior. In general, however, it is possible only to infer the existence of drives, needs, and wants, in part, from observed changes in behavior, especially in controlled experimental situations; in part, from "measurements of attitudes" which express the way in which and the extent to which given objects or situations are felt to satisfy wants, needs, desires, etc.[3]

Rigidly controlled experimental situations are all but impossible in industrial situations. There are too many variables that cannot be completely accounted for and that, if controlled, generate a less realistic situation, besides sometimes seriously hampering production. From a practical standpoint, measurements of attitudes are apt to be much more feasible.

According to Remmers, attitude surveys can be a distinct help to management in fulfilling its responsibility of maintaining efficient production.

> Management must know what the worker thinks about his job
> and his company for purposes of self-defense in the role
> of an operating industrial organization which is trying
> to maintain efficient production . . . . If constructive
> management action based on the attitude survey follows,
> morale will be improved.[4]

Viteles concurs with this opinion when he says,

> It is apparent that employee-attitude surveys are viewed
> by management as a practical tool which can be used to
> help uncover and solve plant personnel problems.[5]

Remmers further states that,

> The role of attitude studies in industry is that of an
> instrument for the procurement of high production
> efficiency and the attainment of greater satisfaction
> and social welfare for industrial workers. Employee
> attitudes are an integral factor of production and
> must be identified and properly reckoned with in per-
> sonnel and production policies and practices.[6]

However true this may be, there can be found in the ranks of management today those who are most hesitant to admit the potential good of attitude surveys. Many of these are, so to speak, "of the old school," who feel that employees should be held in submission with a strong hand. They feel that if management gives the employees an inch, they will take a mile. They speak of not catering to the whims of employees who are never satisfied anyway. Remmers throws some light on such reasoning when he says,

Modern management in its effort to improve production should look favorably upon attitude studies as a means of improving the human element in production. But experience has shown that often the greatest opposition to such studies has come from members of management.

This situation casts light on the attitudes of management itself. From the reasons given for opposition to attitude surveys it becomes evident that much insecurity is felt by executives, and they fear what attitude studies might reveal about their effectiveness as managers.

Typical of the conditions a poll is apt to reveal are: (1) poor operating methods; (2) undesirable working conditions; (3) weaknesses in supervision; (4) inconsistencies and inequalities in company policies; and (5) hostilities toward top management. Inasmuch as many of these reflect directly on management's competence, it is obvious that many executives are not eager to have them brought to light.[7]

It is fortunate, however, that this defensive attitude is not character-istic of all management today. Viteles describes the healthier and more realistic attitude that is gradually spreading throughout American industry:

Many companies expressed a desire to learn about the minor troublesome situations so that measures could be taken to prevent their growing into major ones. In general, state-ments made by the companies show clearly an expectation that the attitude survey would provide management with a measure of its own success or failure in personnel matters and, at the same time, locate unsatisfactory feelings and sources of irritation requiring remedial action.[8]

Irwin lists seven major benefits of attitude surveys:

1. They have provided measurements of the trends of employee thought and knowledge about the company. Thus, they indicate the strengths and weaknesses in the company's program of closer relationship.

2. They have increased the pride and confidence of the employee in his company. These qualities have been greatly augmented by quick action on the company's part in remedying unsatisfactory conditions.

3. They have stimulated employee suggestions for more improvement.
4. They have strengthened training programs. Frequently a program has certain aspects which, in theory, sound fine but in practice are wide of the target. More realistic training is now possible.
5. They have put supervision on its toes. Supervisors have taken new account of human relations and are getting to know their people better.
6. They have assisted management and union to know one another better and to appreciate the fact that the other group is just as desirous as themselves of building a sounder industrial commonwealth.
7. They have produced better working conditions. Not only do these spell greater efficiency, but by removing a major cause for discontent they lessen the possibility of strikes and costly slowdowns.[9]

WORKS CITED

1 Kingsbury, Forrest A. "Industrial Morale." The American Peoples Encyclopedia, 1950. Vol. 7, p. 90.

2 Viteles, Morris S. Motivation and Morale in Industry. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1953. p. 73.

3 Ib.

4 Remmers, H. H. Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Methodology. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. p. 342.

5 Viteles, p. 222.

6 Remmers, p. 335.

7 Remmers, p. 352.

8 Viteles, p. 61.

9 Irwin, J. W. "Sampling Workers' Opinions." Management Review, 1946, 35, p. 118f.

CHAPTER II

ATTITUDE SURVEYS OF THE PAST

Although public opinion polls in the United States started as
far back as 1904 with the New York Herald survey of that year,[1]
industrial attitude studies did not come into prominence until some
twenty years later. The famous Hawthorne experiments,[2] begun in
1927, although not originally aimed at the study of workers'
attitudes, made some unexpected discoveries that aroused interest
in such research. With an impetus of this kind, American industry
began dabbling in attitude surveys but was slow to admit the potential
merits of such investments. The exigencies of the Depression stunted
progress in this as well as other research fields. However, the
return of prosperity allowed industry to attend to more than just the
absolutely necessary activities, and attitude research began a slow
climb to a state of relative popularity. World War II occasioned
further developments in attitude research, when it was deemed advisable
to study the morale of our armed forces.[3] Since that time, American
industry has been trying more and more to learn the many attitudinal
factors that affect efficiency among employees.

In the history of attitude research can be found examples of
numerous survey techniques ranging from the most rigidly controlled

experiments to the most unstructured and informal observations.
As Kingsbury puts it,

> Attitudes of employees toward their work, company,
> foremen, and working conditions have been investigated
> by various means, such as supervisors' reports, en-
> couragement of voluntary criticisms and suggestions,
> and spontaneous or periodic interviews and question-
> naires.[4]

Indirect Methods of Attitude Measurement

The most scientifically controlled experiments in this field
have been directed toward the discovery and verification of various
indirect measures of attitudes. Horowitz[5] pioneered the use of
pictorial materials in attitude measurement by using pictures to get
at the attitudes of white children toward Negroes. Seeleman[6] followed
a similar approach with adults. Murray and Morgan[7] studied attitudes
toward war, religion, parents, and sex by various indirect techniques.
Proshansky[8] investigated attitudes toward organized labor by means of
a modified version of the Thematic Apperception Test. Loeblowitz-
Lennard and Riesman[9] developed a social perception test to study
attitudes toward various areas of social interaction. Sollenberger
and Pulford[10] did a similar study with white and Negro children, using
the Thematic Apperception Test along with questionnaires and interviews.
Rosenzweig[11] and Fromme[12] developed the cartoon technique for studying
attitudes, and Brown[13] modified the method to measure the presence of
hostile racial attitudes.

Among those who used play and dramatic material as indirect means of studying social attitudes are Baruch,[14] Evans and Chein,[15] Lowenfeld,[16] and Buhler and Kelly,[17] all of whom attempted to analyse attitudes from play behavior; and Homburger,[18] Moreno,[19] and Bell,[20] who studied attitudes by placing a subject in a dramatic situation and observing his behavior.

The fact that an individual's overt behavior frequently does not correspond to his stated attitude led a legion of researchers to use verbal and written materials as indirect techniques in the study of attitudes. Morgan[21] and Morgan and Morton,[22] by comparing answers to syllogisms of neutral emotional value with answers to similar syllogisms involving controversial issues, succeeded in showing that the reasoning process of a person may be modified by underlying viewpoints which may or may not agree with the opinions he expresses overtly. Allport and Postman,[23] in studying verbal distortions in the transmission of rumors, felt that these distortions are greatly influenced by underlying attitudes.

Of all the verbal devices used to elicit attitudes in a more or less indirect manner, the word association technique is probably the oldest. Somewhat related to it in principle is the sentence completion test developed by Tendler.[24] One method that seems to have gained considerable acceptance is the "error-choice" method developed by Hammond[25] and pursued by Weschler.[26] This method is based on the assumption that underlying attitudes tend to produce errors in perception and recall.

In spite of the apparent promise of some of these techniques, Viteles reflects his scepticism in these terms:

It is apparent that a variety of indirect methods have been explored in the effort to develop techniques which will avoid dependence upon "voluntary self-description" and tap the "deeper levels" of attitudes. Nevertheless, indirect methods have not yet attained the applicability of the conventional methods or (in spite of the many inadequacies of the latter) achieved the same status in the methodological terms of reliability, validity, and, as McNemar would require, unidimensionality.[27]

Direct Methods of Attitude Measurement

The proponents of the more direct techniques of attitude measurement have been expending considerable effort toward the refinement of their methodology. The problems of validity and reliability have presented a real challenge to them. Men like Thurstone,[28] Likert,[29] Guttman,[30] Lazarsfeld,[31] Katz,[32] McNemar,[33] Ballin,[34] Remmers,[35] Ghiselli,[36] Ferguson,[37] Seashore,[38] and many others have worked at improving sampling techniques, have developed unique and promising scoring and scaling techniques, have made use of factor analysis and many other techniques too numerous to mention, all in order to establish a more scientific basis for drawing more reliable and valid conclusions from attitude studies.

While the work of these men is indeed commendable, the writer has often wondered whether the Law of Parsimony has not frequently been ignored in some of their more sophisticated projects. In many cases it would seem appropriate to quote, "Thou art anxious and troubled about many things; and yet only one thing is necessary."[39]

This is not to say, however, that the study of human attitudes does not involve many variables that tend to be extremely elusive to scientific measurement and evaluation. Nevertheless, at times it would seem that simpler methods of evaluation might be as useful to a greater understanding of attitudes as some involved and complicated experiments that have been hailed as true progress. However, it is not the purpose of this paper to present a critique of the sincere efforts made in this field of research.

WORKS CITED

1 Esterquest, Frank L. "Public Opinion." The American Peoples Encyclopedia. Chicago: The Spencer Press, 1950. Vol. 16, p. 285.

2 Roethlisberger, F. J. and William J. Dickson. Management and the Worker. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943. xxiv, 615 p.

3 Continuities in Social Research. ed. Robert K. Merton and Paul F. Lazarsfeld. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1950. 255 p.

4 Kingsbury, Forrest A. "Industrial Morale." The American Peoples Encyclopedia, 1950. Vol. 7, p. 90.

5 Horowitz, E. L. "The Development of Attitudes Toward the Negro." Archives of Psychology, 1936, 28, 1-47.

6 Seeleman, V. "The Influence of Attitude Upon Remembering Pictorial Materials." Archives of Psychology, 1940, 32, 1-69.

7 Murray, H. A. and C. D. Morgan. "A Clinical Study of Sentiments." Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1945, I, 1-154; II, 155-309.

8 Proshansky, H. M. "A Projective Method for the Study of Attitudes." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1943, 38, 393-395.

9 Loeblowitz-Lennard, H. and F. Riesman, Jr. "A Proposed Projective Attitude Test." Psychiatry, 1946, 9, 67-68.

10 Sollenberger, R. T., and E. H. Pulford. "Attitudes of White Children Toward Negroes in Social Situations as measured by a Thematic Apperception Technique." Inventory of Research in Racial and Cultural Relations, 1948, Bulletin 2, 61-62.

11 Rosenzweig, S. "The Picture Association Method and Its Application in a Study of Reactions to Frustration." Journal of Personality, 1945, 14, 3-23.

12 Fromme, A. "On the Use of Certain Qualitative Methods of Attitude Research." Journal of Social Psychology, 1941, 13, 429-459.

13 Brown, J. F. "A Modification of the Rosenzweig Picture Frustration Test to Study Hostile Interracial Attitudes." Journal of Psychology, 1947, 24, 247-272.

14 Baruch, D. W. "Aggressions During Doll Play in a Pre-School." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1941, 11, 252-260.

15 Evans, M. C. and I. Chein. "The Movie Story Game." Inventory of Research In Racial and Cultural Relations. New York: Commission on Community Interrelations, 1948, Bulletin 2, 6 p.

16 Lowenfeld, M. "The Theory and Use of Play in the Psychotherapy of Childhood." Journal of Mental Science, 1938, 84, 1057-1058.

17 Buhler, C. and G. Kelly. The World Test: A Measurement of Emotional Disturbance. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1941. xi, 240 p.

18 Homburger, E. "Section on Play Therapy." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1938, 8, 507-510.

19 Moreno, J. L. Psychodrama. Vol. 1. New York: Beacon House, 1946. viii, 279 p.

20 Bell, J. K. Projective Techniques. New York: Longmans-Green, 1948. xvi, 533 p.

21 Morgan, J. B. "Distorted Reasoning as an Index of Public Opinion." School and Society, 1943, 57, 333-335.

22 Morgan, J. B. and J. T. Morton. "The Distortion of Syllogistic Reasoning Produced by Personal Conviction." Journal of Social Psychology, 1944, 20, 39-59.

23 Allport, G. W. and L. Postman. "The Basic Psychology of Rumor." Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences, Series II, 1945, 8, 61-81.

24 Tendler, A. D. "A Preliminary Report on a Test for Emotional Insights." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1930, 14, 123-136.

25 Hammond, K. "Measuring Attitudes by Error-Choice." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1941, 13, 429-459.

26 Weschler, I. R. "An Investigation of Attitudes Toward Labor and Management by Means of the Error-Choice Method." To be published in the Journal of Social Psychology.

27 Viteles, Morris S. Motivation and Morale in Industry. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1953. p. 227.

28 Thurstone, L. L. "Attitudes Can Be Measured." American Journal of Sociology, 1928, 33, 529-554.

29 Likert, Rensis. "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes." Archives of Psychology, 1932, 22, 1-55.

30 Guttman, Louis. "A Basic for Scaling Qualitative Data." American Sociological Review, 1944, 9, 139-150.

31 Lazarsfeld, Paul F. "The Controversy Over Detailed Interviews." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1944, 8, 38-60.

32 Katz, Daniel. "Morale in War Industries." Readings in Social Psychology. ed. Theodore M. Newcomb. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1947. pp. 437-447.

33 McNemar, Quinn. "Opinion-Attitude Methodology." Psychological Bulletin, 1946, 43, 289-374.

34 Ballin, M. R. "A Graphic Rating Method for Determining the Scale Values of Statements in Measuring Social Attitudes." Journal of Social Psychology, 1941, 13, 323-327.

35 Remmers, H. H. Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Methodology. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. viii, 437 p.

36 Ghiselli, Edwin E. "All or None Versus Graded Response Questionnaires." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1939, 23, 405-413.

37 Ferguson, L. W. "A Study of the Likert Technique of Attitude Scale Construction." Journal of Social Psychology, 1941, 13, 51-57.

38 Seashore, Carl E. "A Time Saving Device for the Construction of Attitude Scales." Journal of Social Psychology, 1933, 4, 366-372.

39 Luke, 10: 41-42.

CHAPTER III

THE CHECK-LIST SYSTEM

Most of the attitude surveys of the past (especially the more direct
approaches) have been intended to elicit opinion or feeling responses
of an individual to certain policies or situations. One of the major
limitations of this technique arises from the difficulty that many
respondents have in analysing and verbalizing their feelings. Moreover,
negative feelings are often repressed or not admitted in certain
situations. This is particularly true in industrial attitude surveys.
Although respondents are guaranteed anonymity, many are still skeptical
about their privilege of immunity. Besides, they may tend to feel that
in expressing an unfavorable opinion or attitude, they are not condemning
the situation so much as themselves for having such a feeling.

While the more indirect approaches to the investigation of employee
attitudes compensate for some of these shortcomings, they are often too
involved and costly to be of practical use to industry.

However, certain aspects of both the direct and indirect approaches
have merit. The direct approaches are usually characterized by simplicity
of design and ease of analysis while the indirect seek out hidden attitudes
in such a way that the respondent is not aware to what extent he is
committing himself.

The check-list system is presented as an effort to merge the advantages of both approaches. In this system, as conceived by the writer, a list of sentences describing favorable and unfavorable job situations is presented to the employee. All the employee is asked to do is check those sentences that describe the situations on his own job. It is intended that the items or sentences be so phrased as to describe objectively behavior or situations rather than obviously reflect feelings or attitudes. In effect, the employee is asked, "Does this or that situation exist in your job?" rather than, "How do you feel about this or that?" It is felt that such an approach will circumvent the respondent's cumbersome problem of analysing his feelings. At the same time, however, although the responses would, to all appearance be objective, one might expect a significant projection of attitudes in these answers, since most people are notoriously subjective in their interpretations of the most objective facts.

To construct the questionnaire, it was imperative to obtain realistic descriptions of job situations, phrased in the language of the worker. It was also necessary that the descriptive sentences cover a wide range of favorable and unfavorable situations. To meet these objectives, personal interviews were held with a random sample of 75 hourly employees working in two large manufacturing plants in the Detroit area, viz., Cadillac Motors Co. with over 8,000 hourly employees and Detroit Transmission Co. with over 7,000. The interviews were conducted in the employees' homes and therefore, although a 2 per cent sample was originally drawn from each plant roster, the final sample was

determined to a great extent by the accessibility of the employes and
their willingness to be interviewed. It thus came about that 38
Cadillac employees and 37 Detroit Transmission employees were
interviewed.

Two types of interviews, structured and unstructured, were conducted
to obtain the desired descriptive statements. In the structured
interviews a schedule (see Appendix B) was adapted from one developed
by Dr. Arthur Kornhauser of Wayne University for a Mental Health study
of factory workers in the Detroit area. In the unstructured interview,
the interviewee was encouraged to discuss his job with as little
prompting as possible. The structured interviews lasted from one to two
hours with an average of about one hour and a half. The unstructured
interviews ranged from forty-five minutes to one hour and a half with
an average of one hour. Of the 75 interviews, 39 were structured and
36 were unstructured.

The two interview approaches were used because it seemed opportune
to test the fruitfulness of both in parallel situations. The unstruc-
tured interviews were found to be much more productive for the purposes
of this study, providing more than 70% of the statements that could be
used as questionnaire items.

A preliminary analysis and tabulation of the data made it immediately
evident that the construction of a check-list questionnaire covering
all the areas pertinent to the job situation would not be feasible.
Such a questionnaire, if it included all the descriptive sentences
obtained in the interviews, would contain several hundred items. Such

an instrument would be impractical in the industrial situation.

Thought was given, therefore, to the possibility of constructing a questionnaire covering a few of the more important areas. Further research, however, disclosed the fact that, all other factors being equal, the supervisor is the most important factor in the job situation. As evidence of this, Edsall, in discussing General Motors' famous "My Job Contest," states that the 175,000 employees who wrote on "My Job and Why I Like It" indicated "a strong conviction that if one's boss knew his work and treated those under him as human beings, giving recognition for good work done and helping those in a jam, these facts alone were the most important source of job happiness."[1] Nagel further states that:

> The high relationship between attitude toward supervisor and rated productivity of the department supports the widely-held opinion that the supervisor is one of the most important determinants of productivity.[2]

Stagner adds:

> When morale in a given department is found to be low, wages, supervision, personalities in the group, and working conditions are studied. Surprisingly enough, bad supervision seems to be a more consistent cause of low morale than is inadequate pay.[3]

Finally, Viteles says:

> Experimental studies . . . clearly indicate that the quality of supervision exercises a significant influence upon employee production, satisfaction and morale. Employee attitude surveys provide additional evidence that job satisfaction and morale are dependent upon the extent to which supervisors take into consideration employees' needs for recognition and status.[4]

It seemed appropriate, therefore, to construct a check-list question-naire on supervision. Accordingly, all the statements about supervision

were drawn from the interview records. These totaled 72.

At this point, it was necessary to attempt a scaling of the items on the basis of degree of favorableness or unfavorableness. The ideal method, of course, would be to submit the items to an adequate sample and compare the responses with some criterion. From such a process, it would be possible to establish the scaling or value of each item. Since this technique was not feasible, it seemed reasonable to obtain some index as to the weight or value of each item by submitting them in random order to seven judges and asking them to rank these items according to the degree of favorableness and unfavorableness they felt each one reflected. After each sorting, a record was kept of the order and the items were reshuffled for the next judge. The results of the sortings are shown on the following table. The items judged most favorable were given a rank of 1, the second most favorable, a rank of 2 and so on through the list to the most unfavorable item, ranked 72.

TABLE I

RANKS* ASSIGNED TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS
BY SEVEN JUDGES

ITEM	JUDGES							AVERAGE RANK
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
He makes a good friend.	4	1	1	5	4	3	2	2.8
He works hard for us men.	6	5	7	4	8	1	3	4.8
He's fair and square and treats us all alike.	8	2	8	3	7	5	1	4.8
The way my foreman treats me helps me like my job.	7	4	6	1	6	2	10	5.1
If I have a grievance, I just talk it over with my foreman.	3	12	5	10	2	9	6	6.7
If you ask for help, he'll listen.	5	10	2	11	10	13	8	8.4
He talks to higher supervision for us.	1	6	20	8	18	4	5	8.8
He lets you use your own ideas and helps you work them out.	2	8	10	16	3	20	4	9.0
He encourages you to come to him.	11	9	13	2	13	6	14	9.7
He treats the men as men.	20	7	3	15	1	12	11	9.8
My foreman cooperates with suggestions for easier work.	9	3	22	20	17	8	7	12.2

* The numbers in this table represent the ranks given the questionnaire
items by each judge.

ITEM	JUDGES							AVERAGE RANK
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
If he doesn't know an answer, he'll send you to someone who does.	17	18	4	12	16	7	19	13.2
If you have a personal problem at home he'll advise you on it.	18	15	19	13	5	10	20	14.2
He's not like a watch-dog but checks the job to see if he can help.	12	22	18	6	20	21	9	16.0
He's a regular fellow and easy to talk to.	25	24	11	21	9	14	12	16.5
The other guys say he's good too.	19	11	24	14	21	24	15	16.5
My foreman shows me what I need to know	15	23	15	9	15	18	22	16.7
My supervisor works for quality instead of quantity.	10	20	12	29	11	15	21	16.8
He tries to take care of things before they become serious.	13	21	17	7	30	19	17	17.7
He's good about answering questions.	14	17	14	18	23	17	25	18.2
He stops to think before he acts.	16	16	16	27	22	16	16	18.4
I go to him often with job problems	30	32	9	17	19	11	13	18.7
If the machine breaks down and you can't make production he understands.	21	14	34	24	14	23	30	22.8
He is generous in giving time off.	36	19	26	19	28	26	18	23.1

ITEM	JUDGES							AVERAGE RANK
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
He talks with you in a nice way.	26	26	28	22	25	28	24	25.5
He shows no favoritism	24	29	21	31	12	32	23	26.0
He doesn't keep harping on you.	28	25	27	26	24	31	26	26.7
My foreman is on the job all the time.	23	13	35	32	31	29	28	27.2
He knows that I'm a good worker and we get along.	37	28	23	33	29	22	31	29.0
He doesn't drive the men.	27	31	30	23	32	27	35	29.2
I've had no trouble with him.	33	34	31	30	27	25	27	29.6
He's rough and tough but a good man to work for.	31	39	25	28	26	30	32	30.1
He doesn't carry a whip or show a strong arm.	29	27	29	25	33	33	37	30.4
He never hollers or swears at us.	32	30	36	34	35	34	33	33.4
He is always busy.	22	33	38	39	38	38	36	34.9
He's all right as long as you get the work done.	35	36	40	37	36	39	29	36.0
He leaves me pretty much alone.	40	37	32	38	34	35	38	36.3
He is about average in talking to you.	41	38	33	36	37	36	34	36.4
My foreman is nervous.	34	35	34	43	45	43	42	39.4
If he's in a good mood he's OK, but otherwise not.	39	40	42	40	39	37	48	40.7
He blows up easily, but forgets it ten minutes after.	43	41	39	35	44	46	54	43.2

ITEM	JUDGES							AVERAGE RANK
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
My supervisor frowns on people standing around.	42	47	35	44	50	49	41	44.0
He's never around.	45	45	56	46	40	40	40	44.6
My supervisor works for quantity instead of quality.	60	49	37	41	51	42	39	45.6
I'd never go to him with personal problems.	38	46	48	42	43	52	58	46.7
He doesn't know his job too well.	50	42	52	49	46	47	43	47.0
He babies the men.	44	43	51	48	42	44	60	47.4
My foreman is rough because he is worried about getting the work done.	46	63	43	51	48	45	53	49.9
He's too lenient.	51	50	62	47	41	41	62	50.6
He never talks to us	48	44	63	45	53	56	55	52.0
He brings his family troubles to work with him.	47	62	45	56	61	48	52	53.0
My foreman is around all the time telling me to hurry up.	49	54	47	53	65	60	44	53.2
The guys seem scared of him.	55	53	58	52	60	59	45	54.6
The foreman doesn't know as much as the operators.	58	65	54	50	47	53	57	54.9
He gets hot when things go wrong.	52	58	41	59	58	58	59	55.0
My foreman can't make decisions	54	48	59	66	49	51	65	55.9
My foreman drives his people.	65	55	44	55	66	61	46	56.0

ITEM	JUDGES							AVERAGE RANK
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
If you don't make production, he chews you out.	62	68	46	54	57	62	47	56.6
He acts too cocky.	53	64	66	64	52	54	49	57.4
If anything goes wrong, he blames us.	61	56	64	62	56	63	50	58.9
He uses favoritism in promotions.	56	57	57	67	59	65	51	58.9
You've got to go in mad to talk to him or else he won't listen to you.	64	61	50	58	64	50	68	59.3
He tells you to do something and that's it; you can't talk to him.	57	60	67	57	54	57	67	59.9
The guys are scared to make grievances because the foreman will hold a grudge.	59	52	55	65	55	68	69	60.4
He acts like a king.	68	59	68	63	68	55	56	61.7
He won't give a guy a break.	67	51	65	61	69	64	63	62.9
He's a slave driver and won't let you stop to smoke.	66	71	49	60	67	67	64	63.4
He crossed me when I turned in a suggestion for the Suggestion Plan to him.	68	68	60	69	63	66	61	64.7
The more he can get the men mad at each other, the better he likes it.	70	69	53	70	70	69	70	67.3
He'll cut your throat if he can.	71	67	61	68	71	71	66	67.9
My foreman lies to me.	72	70	70	71	62	70	71	69.4
My foreman treats me like a dog.	69	72	71	72	72	72	72	71.4

A quick glance at these tabulations makes it clear that there is insufficient basis for any precise weighting of most of the items, since there are so many discrepancies in the ranks assigned by the various judges for each item. However, it is possible to establish a tentative coarse weight for blocks of items on a standard 100 point scale. For instance -

Average Rank of Item	Weight
2.9 - 9.0	100
9.7 - 16.5	90
16.7 - 22.8	80
23.1 - 29.2	70
29.6 - 36.3	60
36.4 - 45.6	50
46.7 - 53.0	40
53.2 - 56.6	30
57.4 - 61.7	20
62.9 - 71.4	10

With such a system, it would be possible to obtain an "attitude score" for each questionnaire by adding the weights of the items checked by an employee and dividing by the number of items checked. It is felt, however, that this weighting of the items should be only temporary until actual employee responses can be checked against a valid criterion.

With the favorable and unfavorable items scattered throughout the questionnaire, there will be no scale effect apparent to the respondent. This should help to overcome a fault so common to scales of various types, viz., the so-called "halo effect."

The questionnaire, as it might be constructed for use, can be found in Appendix C.

WORKS CITED

1 Edsall, F. S. Success and What It Takes. New York: William Morrow
     and Company, 1954. p. 202f.

2 Nagle, Bryant F. "Productivity, Employee Attitudes and Supervisor
     Sensitivity." Personnel Psychology, 1954, 7, p. 234.

3 Stagner, R. "Psychological Aspects of Industrial Conflict."
     Personnel Psychology, 1948, 1, p.139.

4 Viteles, Morris S. Motivation and Morale in Industry. New York:
     W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1953. p. 325.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND PROPOSALS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The check-list system recently has been effectively used as a merit rating tool. It occurred to the writer that there is a close relationship between attitude studies and merit rating. When a person is asked to rate another, it is the same as asking him, "How do you feel about him? What is your attitude toward or opinion of him?" Argelander[1] points out that when a man judges another, he does so in terms of his own experience and standards and on the basis of his contact or observance of the other's behavior. The same can be said of people responding to attitude surveys except that they are asked their attitudes toward not only people but also policies or situations.

It therefore seemed appropriate to borrow the check-list technique from merit rating and apply it to attitude research. It is hoped that the method will be as effective in attitude studies as it has been in its original context.

There is yet, of course, a great deal of research to be done to prove the usefulness and effectiveness of the questionnaire described in this paper. It must be administered to an adequate sample of factory employees and compared with a criterion in order to determine accurate weights for each item.

Beyond this, it should be worthwhile to attempt the construction of a similar questionnaire covering not only supervision, but all the various factors in a job situation. This, of course, would necessitate limiting the number of items for each area. Otherwise, the questionnaire would be too long to be practical. With such a questionnaire it would be possible to conduct a quick attitude survey periodically and thus perhaps to forecast possible strikes or other major crises in employee-management relations.

It is further recommended that similar questionnaires be constructed for specialized groups of employees (such as office workers, technical and professional personnel). Eventually a comprehensive group of questionnaires could be designed to serve any industrial group that might be interested.

The discovery of the relationship between merit rating and attitude studies has led the writer to believe that it may be profitable to investigate the relationships of other techniques to attitude research. Much has already been done along this line by those applying projective techniques to this field. However, much more could be done. Would it not be possible, for instance, to introduce into management, supervisory, or employee meetings, which are normally used as a communication devices, some systematic technique for currently studying the attitudes of the group?

The field of attitude research is relatively new and stands in need of more and more study to provide the management of American

industry with the information needed to inspire the kind of employee satisfaction that makes for smoother and more efficient operations.

WORK CITED

1 Argelander, Annelies. "The Personal Factor in Judging Human Character." Character and Personality, 1937, 5, 285-295.

APPENDIX A

AN ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE ILLUSTRATING THE USE

OF FACES AS RESPONSE CATEGORIES

APPENDIX B

THE STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN THIS STUDY

1. a. In what year were you born? _____

   b. Where were you born? _____

      City or town   State

   c. Where did you live most of your boyhood?

      _____
      City or town   State

   d. (If not a well-known city) Was that on a farm ____, in a small

      town ____, or a medium sized city ___?

2. Now which of these statements here (show card 1) comes nearest to saying
   how you feel about your life in general: Would you say you are . . . . .
   (Read all five)

   ☐ completely satisfied
   ☐ well satisfied
   ☐ neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   ☐ a little dissatisfied
   ☐ very dissatisfied

   Comments:

3. a. What things give you a lot of satisfaction in your life as it is now?

   b. What kinds of things would you say you aren't well satisfied with in
      your life?

   c. What kind of things do you ever worry about?

4. a. What would you say you really want most out of life?

    b. How do you expect things to turn out for you in the future?
        (How do you mean? In what way?)

5. Here is a list of some things people say they want in their lives.
    Which three or four of these things would you say you personally want
    most? Please look at all of them before you decide. (Show card 2)

        1. To have people thing highly of you and appreciate what you do.
        2. To have things settled and secure in your life, and not have
            to worry about the future.
        3. To have a lot of good friends.
        4. To enjoy the work you are doing and be able to do a good job
            of it.
        5. To have a satisfying home life.
        6. To get ahead in the world and rise to a higher position and
            be better off.
        7. To be treated as an independent human being, and not be
            pushed around and made to do things.
        8. To help people - to do things for other people.
        9. To have a lot of spare time to do the things you enjoy the
            most.

Which one of these things is most important to you? ____ (item number)

Which one of these things is least important to you? ____ (item number)

Comments:

Now I'd like to hear about your work.

6. a. What kind of work do you do? (Specific occupation. If more than one,
      record both and ask: Which is your
      <u>main</u> job?)

   b. Where do you work? _____

   c. How long have you worked there? _____

7. a. How long have you been on this job as a (specify main job named in 6 a)

      _____

   b. How did you happen to go into this kind of work rather than something
      else?

8. What do you think of your job? (In what way, etc.)

9. Would you look at this card (show Card 1) and say which of these statements
   tells best how you feel about your job? Which would you say . . . (Read
   all 5)

   ☐ completely satisfied
   ☐ well satisfied
   ☐ neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   ☐ a little dissatisfied
   ☐ very dissatisfied

   Comments:

10. What things do you particularly like about the job?

11. What things don't you like about the job?

12. Do you every worry about your work? (If yes) What do you worry about?

13. When you start off for work, do you usually feel that you want to go to work or that you don't want to? (Why is that?)

14. a. On the whole would you say that your job is (Show card 3) really interesting and enjoyable ___(1), or would you say that it is all right but not very interesting ___(2), or would you say that it is dull and monotonous ___(3)?

    b. (If 1) In what way is it interesting?

       (If 2) Why isn't it interesting?

       (If 3) What makes it dull and monotonous?

15. Would you say your job gives you a chance to use your abilities or is the job too simple to let you use your abilities?

16. On your job do you feel you are doing something important, or do you feel that you are just putting in time?

18. Now will you tell me just a few more things about your job?

    a. How are you paid - on hourly rate, piece rate, bonus, weekly salary, or what?

    b. What shift are you on? _____

    c. If you had your choice, how much overtime would you like to put in on your job?

19. a. How do you feel about your chances for getting ahead?

    b. Taking the general run of men on jobs like yours, what chance would you say they have for getting ahead in their work?

20. How do you feel about your present wages? Would you say you are (Show Card 1, read all 5)

    ☐ completely satisfied
    ☐ well satisfied
    ☐ neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
    ☐ a little dissatisfied
    ☐ very dissatisfied

Comments:

21. a. How do you like the people who work with you where you are now?

    b. Do you care much whether men who work with you are people you like or not?

    c. Do you talk and kid around while you are at work?

22. a. Is there anyone directly in charge of your work?

    b. Does he come around often to look things over or tell you what to do?

    c. What kind of a man is he to work for?

23. a. On the whole, what do you think of the company where you work?

    b. What do you think of the way they treat their employees?

24. On the whole, how do you feel about what the labor union does at the company where you work?

25. a. Do you think th men where you work could turn out more work or better work if they really wanted to? (How do you mean?)

    b. (If yes) What are the reasons why they don't do as much as they could?

26. a. About how often are you absent from work? (approx. number of days in past year)

    b. What are the reasons you miss work?

27. a. Earlier in our talk you told me about the work you are doing now. Are there times when you think about leaving this kind of work?

    ☐ Yes   ☐ No

    Comments:

    (If yes, ask b to f; if no, ask g. etc.)

IF YES on 27a

    b. What do you think of doing?

    c. Why do you want to leave the kind of work you are doing?

    d. Are you doing anything about plans to get into some other kind of work?

IF NO on 27a

    e. Why is that?

    f. Have there been times in the past when you thought about leaving this kind of work?

            ☐ Yes   ☐ No

Comments:

(If yes on f, ask g to k; if no on g, go to Q. 28.)

    g. When was it you thought of changing?

    h. What did you think of doing?

    i. Why did you want to leave the kind of work you are doing?

    j. What did you do about getting into some other kind of work at that time?

    k. Why did you decide to stay on the job you're on instead of changing?

Comments:

28. a. How do you feel about factory work in general as compared with other kinds of work?

    b. What effects do you think production jobs have on men – does it do anything to them? (In what way?)

(Ask all persons now in factory manual jobs.)

    c. What effects do you think working in a factory has had on you?

29. a. What would you say it takes for people who manage industrial companies to get into those top positions?

    b. Do you think the people who manage companies actually have more brains and general ability than most employees?

Now I'd like to ask a few more questions on how you feel about people and things.

30. a. Over the years there are a lot of things a man has to learn about other people in the world. What are some of the main things you have learned about people?

    b. What would you say most people want out of life?

31. As you see it, what are the qualities that make a man a really worthwhile person?

32. Some people push hard to change things and make their lives more like
what they want; other people are content to take life as it comes.
What about you - do you push hard to change things in your life, or
are you content to take life as it comes?

33. a. Do you feel that you are accomplishing the sorts of things you would
like to in your life?

   b. (If yes) What are the main things you mean?

   c. (If no) What things aren't you accomplishing?

34. Do you ever go to a doctor or clergyman or anyone like that about your
personal problems, or nervousness or such things?

35. a. How has your health been over the past few years - would you say it
was excellent ____, good ____, fair ____, or poor ____?

   Comments:

   b. Is there anything at all about your health that ever bothers you?

36. Are you ever bothered with headaches, indigestion or any of the common
ailments you see on this card? Please look at all of them and tell me
which ones ever bother you. (Show card 3)

   ☐ Headaches   ☐ Neuralgia
   ☐ Indigestion or stomach trouble   ☐ Hemorrhoids or piles
   ☐ Constipation or diarrhea   ☐ Nervousness
   ☐ Sleeplessness   ☐ Nose, throat, or sinus trouble
   ☐ Tiredness without knowing why   ☐ Many colds or coughs
   ☐ Heartburn   ☐ Allergies
   ☐ Backaches   ☐ Do you have any other ailments
   ☐ High blood pressure   like these?
                                         _____

37. a. Have you gone to a doctor in the past few years? _____

   b. (If yes) How often have you gone? _____

   c. For what? _____

Earlier you told me that you spent most of your boyhood in (name of town) (Q. 1c, page 1). Now I would like to ask you a few more questions about your early life. You know, when we get all this information together that you and the other folks give us, it can be mighty useful to parents and teachers and everyone trying to help young people work out their lives.

38. a. Would you tell me where your parents were born? Father _____

    Mother _____

    b. (If foreign born) Did they move to the U.S.? Yes _____ No _____

    Other _____

    c. (If yes) When was that? Father _____ Mother _____

    d. How far did your parents go in school?

    Father _____   Mother _____

    e. What did your father do for a living? (Just what did he do? Get specific occupation)

    f. Did your mother work outside the home? (If yes) What did she do?

39. a. Now as you think back to your childhood days, how do you feel about the way your life was then?

    b. What would you say your biggest problems were as a child?

40. Which one of these statements here (Show card 5) best describes how happy your childhood was? (Read all 5)

    ☐ completely happy
    ☐ very happy
    ☐ fairly happy
    ☐ a little unhappy
    ☐ very unhappy.

41. How well off would you say your family was (the family in which you grew up)? (Show card 4)

        ☐ well above average financially
        ☐ a little above average
        ☐ above average
        ☐ a little below average
        ☐ very poor

42. As far as you know were you a healthy child ____ or rather sickly ____?

43. a. How far did you go in school?

    b. (H.S. Grad, or more) Did you think about going on further in school?

    c. (Not H.S. graduate) What made you decide to leave school then?

    d. How well did you do in school - did you make very good marks ____, fairly good marks ____, or marks that weren't so good ____?

    e. Did you like school or not?

44. a. Before you started working did you have any ideas and wishes about what kind of work you wanted to do?

    b. What kind of work did you want?

45. a. What was your first full-time job?

    b. How old were you then?

46. a. About how many different places have you worked altogether? (Get number, not detailed listing)

    b. What do you consider to be your main line of work?

47. If you could go back to the age of 15, and start all over again, would you choose the same kind of work you are in now ____, or a different kind of work ____?

Comments:

48. Have you been unemployed much?

49. a. How long have you lived in (around) Detroit?

   b. How did you happen to come here?

50. How do you feel about living in (around) Detroit?

51. How long have you lived in this part of the city?

52. What do you think of this neighborhood as a place to live?

53. How do you usually spend your time when you're not working - what kind of things do you do, both at home and away from home?

54. What about the people you work with, do you spend any time with them away from work?

55. a. Do you have any hobbies or other specific interests?

   b. (If yes) What are they? (Get specific activities)

58. a. (If respondent does not belong to church or church group)
What is your religious preference?

P _____ C _____ J _____ Other _____

b. Do you go to church? _____ c. About how often? _____

59. a. Are there certain groups or organizations you'd like to belong to
that you aren't a member of now?

b. (If Yes) What ones are they?

60. a. Are you registered to vote?

b. How often do you vote?

c. (If votes) What party do you usually vote for?

d. (If doesn't vote) If you voted, what party would you vote for?

61. a. In which one of these general parts of your life would you most like
to have things different than they are? (Show card 6 and read)

☐ Your spare time activities
☐ Your friendships
☐ Your home and family
☐ Your job
☐ Your religious life

b. Why did you pick that one?

c. Which one of these are you best satisfied with in your life?

d. Now looking at the list again, which one do you feel is most
important to you?

62. Now we have just a few more questions here about your home and family.

a. Do you rent here or do you own the house? (Specify if rents a room)

b. (If owns) Are you making payments on it?

62. c. Who lives here with you? Anyone else?

     d. Do you have a car? Yes _____ No _____

         (If yes) What make is it? _____ What year? _____

63. a. Are you single ____ or married ____?

     b. Have you ever been divorced, separated, or widowed _____?

64. a. Thinking about your family and home life as they are now, which of
         these statements come nearest to saying how you feel? (Show card 1
         and read it).

              ☐ Completely satisfied
              ☐ Well satisfied
              ☐ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
              ☐ A little dissatisfied
              ☐ Very dissatisfied

     b. (If not completely satisfied) Would you tell me why you don't feel
                                        completely satisfied?

65. What advice would you give a young fellow just getting married about
     getting along with his wife?

66. How do you think children should be brought up - what is most important
     for parents to teach their children?

FOR MEN NOT NOW MARRIED

67. a. As you see it now, do you expect to get married?

     b. Have you thought seriously of getting married?

68. a. Would you look at this card and tell me which of these is nearest
         your total income for 1952? (Show card 7)

              ☐ Under $2000   ☐ $5000 to $6000
              ☐ $2000 to $3000   ☐ $6000 to $8000
              ☐ $3000 to $4000   ☐ $8000 to $10,000
              ☐ $4000 to $5000   ☐ $10,000 or more

     b. Do you support other people on this income?

         (If yes) Whom do you help support?

     c. Do you have any other kind of income? (From what source)

FOR MEN NOW MARRIED

69. Would you say that your married life is happier than most of your friends or not as happy as theirs?

70. a. Would you look at this card and tell me which of these is nearest your total family income in 1952? (Hand Card 7) I mean your family living here with you.

☐ Under $2000   ☐ $5000 to $6000
☐ $2000 to $3000   ☐ $6000 to $8000
☐ $3000 to $4000   ☐ $8000 to $10,000
☐ $4000 to $5000   ☐ $10,000 or more

b. How many are there in your family who live on this income? _____

c. What was your own income from your main job in 1952? _____

d. (If c is less than a) Do you have any other jobs? (What other jobs?)

e.   Does anyone else in your family work ____ that is, your family living here with you? Who?

f.   Does your family have any other kind of income – that is, your family living here? (From what source?)

71. a. Does your wife work? Yes ____ No ____

Other:

b. (If wife works) What kind of work does your wife do?

c.   How do you feel about her working?

d. (If wife does not work) Would you want her to take a job?

72. a. Do you have children?

b. (If yes) How old are they?

c.   How do (did) you want their life to be different from yours? (Use "did" if all children are over 18)

d. (If working children) What do they do for a living (each)? How far did they go in school (each)?

Now I'd like to get your opinion on a few more questions.

73. In general, how do you feel about the way things are going in this country: do you want things to go along pretty much the way they are or are there some important changes you'd like to see made? (What changes do you mean?)

74. a. Do you think the ordinary workingman can do anything to make things more the way he wants them?

   b. (If yes or doubtful) What can he do?

   c. (If no) Why is that?

75. a. It is sometimes said that all people don't have an equal chance to get ahead. Do you think that all people in this country do have an equal chance to get ahead or not?

   b. (If "no" or doubtful in a, and not answered) What people don't have an equal chance to get ahead?

   c. Why is it that all people don't have an equal chance to get ahead?

   d. What things do you think help people to get ahead?

76. a. How do you feel about what the government should do to see that people have better housing and medical care and that old people unemployed and others like that are taken care of?

   b. Should the government do more than it's now doing in helping people, or is it already doing too much?

   c. Why do you feel that the government (should do more) (is doing too much)?

77. Now I'd like your opinion about labor unions: Taking the unions as a whole, how do you feel about them and the things they do?

78. a. In disputes between companies and labor unions, do you usually side with the company or the union?

    b. Why do you feel this way?

    c. Why do you think companies and unions often disagree and have trouble getting along with each other?

    d. Some people say neither the union nor management cares much about the common worker -- he gets squeezed in between. What do you think about this statement?

79. I'd like to ask you what you think about government control over business and industry. Would you say the government has too much to say about how business and industry are run _____, just about the right amount to say _____. or that the government ought to have more to say about how business and industry are run _____?

    Comments:

80. a. Should a person be allowed to speak in public for things that most people believe are completely wrong and definitely bad?

    b. Should people be allowed to speak in public against our democratic form of government?

    c. Should people be allowed to speak in public against all religion?

    d. What about colleges and universities -- do you think that it is a good thing to have colleges where people study all kinds of ideas even if many of these are ideas that most of us believe are untrue and harmful?

81. a. Are there any racial, religious, or nationality groups in this country that you think we would be better off without?

   (Which ones? Are there any others?)

   b. (If any named in a ask for each:) Why do you believe we would be better off without _____?

82. What do you think ought to be done about race relations in this country -- that is, between whites and negroes? (How do you mean? Would you make that a little clearer to me?)

83. a. What do you think should be America's position in world affairs -- what should this country do about the way things are going in the rest of the world?

   b. What do you think the United States should do about working with the United Nations? (How do you mean? In what way?)

\# _____

Interviewer_____   Date_____

Time_____

APPENDIX C

AN EXAMPLE OF THE CHECK-LIST ATTITUDE

QUESTIONNAIRE ON SUPERVISORS

ABOUT YOUR SUPERVISOR

In the following list of statements about supervisors, check ☐ those that describe your supervisor or that apply to your particular situation.

☐ If you don't make production, he chews you out.

☐ He lets you use your own ideas and helps you work them out.

☐ My foreman drives his people.

☐ He's a regular fellow and easy to talk to.

☐ He doesn't keep harping on you.

☐ If somethings goes wrong he blames us.

☐ He uses favoritism in a promotion.

☐ He tells you to do something and that's it; you can't talk to him.

☐ If the machine breaks down and you can't make production, he understands.

☐ He leaves me pretty much alone.

☐ My foreman is around all the time telling me to hurry up.

☐ He encourages you to come to him.

☐ He makes a good friend.

☐ My foreman is on the job all the time.

☐ My foreman treats me like a dog.

☐ If I have a grievance, I just talk it over with my foreman.

☐ He never talks to us.

☐ The guys are scared to make grievances because the foreman will hold a grudge.

☐ He gets hot when things go wrong.

☐ If he's in a good mood he's O.K., but otherwise not.

- [ ] He talks to higher supervision for us.
- [ ] He blows up easily, but forgets it ten minutes after.
- [ ] He tries to take care of things before they become serious.
- [ ] He knows that I'm a good worker and we get along.
- [ ] The more he can get the men mad at each other the better he likes it.
- [ ] If you have a personal problem at home, he'll advise you on it.
- [ ] He'll cut your throat if he can.
- [ ] He crossed me up when I turned in a suggestion for the Suggestion Plan to him.
- [ ] He won't give a guy a break.
- [ ] He's a slave driver and won't even let you stop to smoke.
- [ ] My foremen lies to me.
- [ ] He treats the men as men.
- [ ] My foreman shows me what I need to know.
- [ ] You've got to go in mad to talk to him or else he won't listen to you.
- [ ] He acts too cocky.
- [ ] My foreman is nervous.
- [ ] He's too lenient.
- [ ] He's not like a watch dog but checks the job to see if he can help.
- [ ] The other guys say he's good too.
- [ ] My supervisor works for quantity instead of quality.
- [ ] He doesn't carry a whip or show a strong arm.
- [ ] He stops to think before he acts.
- [ ] He doesn't drive the men.
- [ ] I've had no trouble with him.
- [ ] He's never around.

- [ ] He's all right as long as you get the work done.
- [ ] The guys seem scared of him.
- [ ] He brings his family troubles to work with him.
- [ ] My foreman cooperates with suggestions for easier work.
- [ ] He acts like a king.
- [ ] He's rough and tough but a good man to work for.
- [ ] My supervisor works for quality instead of quantity.
- [ ] The way my foreman treats me helps me like my job.
- [ ] If you ask for help, he'll listen.
- [ ] My foreman is rough because he is worried about getting the work done.
- [ ] He doesn't know his job too well.
- [ ] He is generous in giving time off.
- [ ] He shows no favoritism.
- [ ] I'd never go to him with personal problems.
- [ ] He is always busy.
- [ ] He's good about answering questions.
- [ ] He babies the men.
- [ ] If he doesn't know an answer he'll send me to someone who does.
- [ ] My supervisor frowns on people standing around.
- [ ] He's fair and square and treats us all alike.
- [ ] He never hollers or swears at us.
- [ ] The foreman doesn't know as much as the operators.
- [ ] He works hard for us men.
- [ ] My foreman can't make decisions.
- [ ] I go to him often with job problems.
- [ ] He is about average in talking to you.
- [ ] He talks with you in a nice way.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackoff, Russell L. and Leon Pritzker. "The Methodology of Survey Research." International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research, 1951, 5, 313-334.

Adams, H. F. "The Good Judge of Personality." Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1927, 22, 172-181.

Allport, G. W. and L. F. Postman. "The Basic Psychology of Rumor." Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences, Series II, 1945, 8, 61-81.

Annual Review of Psychology. ed. Calvin P. Stone and Donald W. Taylor. Stanford: Annual Reviews, Incorporated, 1952. Vol. 3. x, 462 p.

Argelander, Annelies. "The Personal Factor in Judging Human Character." Character and Personality, 1937, 5, 285-295.

Ballin, M. R. "A Graphic Rating Method for Determining the Scale Values of Statements in Measuring Social Attitudes." Journal of Social Psychology, 1941 13, 323-327.

Baruch, D. W. "Aggressions During Doll Play in a Pre-School." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1951, 11, 252-260.

Bell, J. E. Projective Techniques. New York: Longmans-Green, 1948. xvi, 533 p.

Bellows, Roger M. Psychology of Personnel in Business and Industry. New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1949. xii, 499 p.

Brayfield, A. H. and H. F. Rothe. "An Index of Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1951, 35, 307-311.

Brown, J. F. "A Modification of the Rosenzweig Picture Frustration Test to Study Hostile Interracial Attitudes." Journal of Psychology, 1947, 24, 247-272.

Buhler, C. and G. Kelly. The World Test: A Measurement of Emotional Disturbance. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1941. xi, 240 p.

Cantril, H. "Do Different Polls Get the Same Results." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1945, 9, 61-69.

Cantril, H. Public Opinion, 1935-1946. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951. lix, 1191 p.

Conrad, H. S. "Some Principles of Attitude Measurement." Psychological Bulletin, 1946, 43, 570-589.

Conrad, H. S. "The Personal Equation in Ratings: A Systematic Evaluation." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1933, 24, 39-46.

Continuities in Social Research. ed. Robert K. Merton and Paul F. Lazarsfeld. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press. 1950. 255 p.

Edsall, F. S. Success and What it Takes. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1954. xiii, 256 p.

Esterquest, Frank L. "Public Opinion." The American Peoples Encyclopedia. Chicago: The Spencer Press, 1950. Vol. 16, 286-287.

Evans, Chester E. and Laverne N. Laseau. "My Job Contest." Personnel Psychology Monograph No. 1. Washington, 1950. xiv, 141 p.

Evans, M. C. and I. Chein. "The Movie Story Game." Inventory of Research in Racial and Cultural Relations. New York: Commission on Community Interrelations, 1948, Bulletin 2, 6 p.

Ferguson, L. W. "A Study of the Likert Technique of Attitude Scale Construction." Journal of Social Psychology, 1941, 13, 51-57.

Fromme, A. "On the Use of Certain Qualitative Methods of Attitude Research." Journal of Social Psychology, 1941, 13, 429-459.

Ghiselli, E. E. "All or None Versus Graded Response Questionnaires." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1939, 23, 405-413.

Guttman, L. "A Basis for Scaling Qualitative Data." American Sociological Review, 1944, 9, 139-150.

Greene, Edward B. Measurements of Human Behavior. New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc. 1941. xxi, 777 p.

Hammond, K. "Measuring Attitudes by Error-Choice." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1941, 13, 429-459.

Harris, Frank J. "The Quantification of an Industrial Employee Survey." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1949, 33, 103-111.

Homburger, E. "Section on Play Therapy." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1938, 8, 507-510.

Horowitz, E. L. "The Development of Attitudes Toward the Negro." Archives of Psychology, No. 194, 1936, 28, 1-47.

Irwin, J. W. "Sampling Workers' Opinions." Management Review, 1946, 35, 118-119.

Katz, D. "Morale in War Industries." Readings in Social Psychology. ed. Theodore M. Newcomb. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1947. pp. 437-447.

Kingsbury, Forrest A. "Industrial Morale." The American Peoples Encyclopedia. Chicago: The Spencer Press, 1950, Vol. 7, 90-91.

Kornhauser, A. W. "Psychological Studies of Employee Attitudes." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1944, 8, 127-143.

Laney, Jr., Arthur R. "Should Employees Rate Their Supervisors?" Personnel Journal, 1953, 32, 255-257.

Lazarsfeld, P. F. "The Controversy Over Detailed Interviews." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1944, 8, 38-60.

Likert, Rensis. "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes." Archives of Psychology, 1932, 22, 1-55.

Loeblowitz-Lennard, H. and F. Riesman, Jr. "A Proposed Projective Attitude Test." Psychiatry, 1946, 9, 67-68.

Lowenfeld, M. "The Theory and Use of Play in the Psychotherapy of Childhood." Journal of Mental Science, 1938, 84, 1057-1058.

McNemar, Quinn. "Opinion-Attitude Methodology." Psychological Bulletin, 1946, 43, 289-374.

Moreno, J. L. Psychodrama. Vol. 1. New York: Beacon House, 1946. viii, 279 p.

Morgan, J. B. "Distorted Reasoning as an Index of Public Opinion." School and Society, 1943, 57, 333-335.

Morgan, J. B. and J. T. Morton. "The Distortion of Syllogistic Reasoning Produced by Personal Conviction." Journal of Social Psychology, 1944, 20, 39-59.

Murray, H. A. and C. D. Morgan. "A Clinical Study of Sentiments." Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1945, I, 1-154; II, 155-309.

Nagle, Bryant F. "Productivity, Employee Attitudes and Supervisor Sensitivity." Personnel Psychology, 1954, 7, 219-234.

Proshansky, H. M. "A Projective Method for the Study of Attitudes." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1943, 38, 393-395.

Remmers, H. H. Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Methodology. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. viii, 437 p.

Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences. ed. Leon Festinger and Daniel Katz. New York: The Dryden Press, 1954. xi - 660 p.

Richardson, Marion W., "Forced-Choice Performance Reports." Rating Employee and Supervisory Performance, ed. M. Joseph Dooher and Vivienne Marquis. New York: American Management Association, 1950, 35-42 p.

Roethlisberger, F. J. and William J. Dickson. Management and the Worker. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943. xxiv, 615 p.

Rosander, A. C. "An Attitude Scale Based upon Behavior Situations." Journal of Social Psychology, 1937, 8, 3-15.

Rosenzweig, S. "The Picture Association Method and its Application in a Study of Reactions to Frustration." Journal of Personality, 1945, 14, 3-23.

Seashore, R. H. "A Time-Saving Device for the Construction of Attitude Scales." Journal of Social Psychology, 1933, 4, 366-372.

Seeleman V. "The Influence of Attitude upon Remembering Pictorial Materials." Archives of Psychology, 1940, 32, 1-69.

Sollenberger, R. T. and E. H. Pulford, "Attitudes of White Children Toward Negroes in Social Situations as Measured by a Thematic Apperception Technique." Inventory of Research in Racial and Cultural Relations, 1948, Bulletin 2, 61-62.

Stagner, R. "Fascist Attitudes: An Exploratory Study." Journal of Social Psychology, 1936, 7, 309-319.

Tendler, A. D. "A Preliminary Report on a Test for Emotional Insights." Journal of Applied Psychology, 1930, 14, 123-136.

Thurstone, L. L. "Attitudes Can Be Measured." American Journal of Sociology, 1928, 33, 529-554.

Viteles, Morris S. Motivation and Morale in Industry. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1953. xvi, 510.

Weschler, I. R. "An Investigation of Attitudes Toward Labor and Management by Means of the Error-Choice Method." To be published in the Journal of Social Psychology.

Weschler, Irving R. and Raymond E. Bernberg. "Indirect Methods of
    Attitude Measurement." International Journal of Opinion and
    Attitude Research, 1950, 4, 209-229.

Wortham, Mary Harper. Rating of Supervisors. Industrial Relations
    Section, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Bulletin
    No. 11, 1944, 52 p.

Worthy, James C. "Attitude Surveys as a Tool of Management." General
    Management Series #145. New York: American Management Association,
    1950, 17 p.

Worthy, James C. "Discovering and Evaluating Employee Attitudes."
    Personnel, 1948, 25, 166-175.