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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between self-monitoring, need for cognition, and intolerance. Past research has demonstrated that the more a person enjoys complex thinking (higher need for cognition), the less likely they are to engage in simplifying their thinking in relation to individuals, i.e. exemplifying the principles of social categorization and least effort - and are therefore, less likely to be prejudiced/intolerant. The current study hypothesized that self-monitoring (social adaptation level) would be positively related to need for cognition, due to the voluntary investment of cognitive effort high self-monitors exhibit in addressing and interacting with their social audiences and environments. Need for cognition was hypothesized to be negatively related to intolerance and would ultimately mediate the relationship between self-monitoring and intolerance. Two hundred thirteen undergraduate psychology students participated in an online survey designed to gauge each participants’ self-monitoring, need for cognition, intolerance, and social desirability levels. This study’s investigation into the relationships between self-monitoring, need for cognition, and intolerance revealed a strong link between self-monitoring and need for cognition and provided partial support for a mediating relationship between the variables. The results present an opportunity for future research into the relationship between personality and prejudice.
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Chapter I: Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Examination of intolerance is an important area of research for social scientists, as its ramifications have been found to manifest themselves in the form of prejudice, discrimination, and stereotyping (Aosved, Long, & Voller, 2009). These destructive social tendencies have historically resulted in harm to and subjugation of perceived out-group members. Increased attention has recently been given to personality characteristics as explanatory factors of expressions of intolerance, specifically in the area of prejudice (Reynolds, Turner, Haslam, & Ryan, 2009). Many relationships between variables of intolerance and personality have yet to be examined, prompting the need for further research in this field.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to elaborate on previous research by examining the relationship between self-monitoring, need for cognition, and intolerance in order to shed further light on the dimensions composing the prejudiced personality.

Definition of Terms

**Intolerance.** Composed of multiple facets, including discrimination, stereotypes, and prejudice, intolerance is defined as a general lack of tolerance for individuals who are members of “out-groups;” defined as those who are different from the majority (Allport, 1954; Aosved et al., 2009).

**Prejudice.** The possession of negative attitudes toward specific out-groups and members of said out-groups. Operates off of stereotypes and exhibited through discriminatory attitudes and behaviors (Allport, 1954; Aosved et al., 2009).
Principle of social categorization. Psychological principle that explains the tendency to categorize others into groups based on sexual orientation, religion, race, gender, and/or socioeconomic status (Hewstone, Hantzi, & Johnson, 1991).

Principle of least effort. Psychological principle that explains the tendency to simplify identification of and interactions with others by creating categories that allow for classifications of individuals with others with whom they presumably share similar qualities (Allport, 1954).

Self-monitoring. The regulation of one’s impression on others by monitoring the situational appropriateness of both verbal and non-verbal behaviors (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000).

Need for cognition. The extent to which an individual enjoys engaging in complex thinking (Cacioppo, Petty, & Kao, 1984).

Social desirability. The tendency for study participants to respond to questions in a way that may be perceived as more socially favorable, as opposed to an honest response (Reynolds, 1982).

Limitations of the Study

The results of this study are primarily limited by the use of self-report measures. Due to the sensitive nature of the topics covered throughout the survey, it is possible that participants felt the urge to respond in a manner that was deemed more socially acceptable than perhaps their natural inclinations would be. The impact of social desirability on participant responses was controlled for with the use of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability (MCSD) Scale – Short Form C (Reynolds, 1982). Results from this measure indicated no significant correlation between social desirability and participant’s responses to the measures used in this study, demonstrating little to no impact of social desirability bias on the results. Even so, it is important to take the potential influence of social desirability into account. The generalizability of the
results are limited by a primarily Caucasian population that is, however reflective of the Dunn County area, not reflective of the diversity present in the general United States’ population. The scope of this study was limited by a lack of survey questions pertaining to intolerant attitudes regarding mentally ill, disabled, and/or overweight individuals, all of whom are also subject to intolerant attitudes and behavior in addition to more commonly studied populations.

**Methodology**

This study examined the responses of undergraduate students to a number of measures in order to examine the relationships between the personality variables of self-monitoring, need for cognition, and intolerance. An online survey was distributed to participants that included Snyder and Gangestad’s (1986) Self-monitoring Scale; Cacioppo, Petty, and Kao’s (1984) Need for Cognition Scale; Aosved, Long, and Voller’s (2009) Intolerant Schema Measure; Reynold’s (1982) Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability (MCSD) Scale – Short Form C, and a number of demographic questions. Results from the survey were analyzed by means of descriptives, frequencies, and linear regressions, through the use of SPSS statistical software.
Chapter II: Literature Review

The prejudiced personality is the subject of increasing interest in the field of psychological research, as researchers seek to understand how to predict, prevent, and change the intolerant attitudes that result in discriminatory behavior today (Reynolds at al., 2009). The psychological principles of social categorization and least effort help explain the cognitive foundation that leads individuals to tend towards the categorization of others and the resulting oversimplification of their identities, based on psychological heuristics (Hewstone et al., 1991). These principles build upon Allport’s theory that those who are more intolerant reflect more limited thinking styles (Allport, 1954). Need for cognition is a personality aspect that reflects an individual’s interest in engaging in more cognitively demanding activities and has been directly linked to lower levels of prejudice (Caccioppo et al., 1996). Potentially related to need for cognition is self-monitoring: the personality characteristic that is reflected by a person’s tendency toward social adaptation in order to better appeal to their target audience (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986). High self-monitors, like those with high need for cognition, demonstrate high levels of cognitive investment in their adaptive tendencies (Ickes, Holloway, Stinson, & Hoodenpyle, 2006). Establishing a link between need for cognition and self-monitoring could reveal another part of the personality puzzle that is behind an individual’s inclination towards intolerance.

The Principles of Social Categorization and Least Effort

Peoples’ tendency to categorize others into groups based on sexual orientation, religion, race, gender, and/or socioeconomic status is explained by the psychological principle of social categorization. Categorization is a natural function of the human mind which allows for more efficient use of cognitive resources without overwhelming individuals’ capacity to think.
Social categorization is the process of sorting people into categories (such as race, gender, religion, and/or income) based on initial information such as skin color, speech, clothing, and facial attributes (Hewstone et al., 1991). This type of classification results in the creation of perceived in-groups (“us”) and out-groups (“them”) and leads to in-group/out-group bias wherein individuals tend to support and perceive their fellow in-group members more favorably than members of out-groups (Smith & Weber, 2005). In-group preference is not necessarily tied to hate and hostility of out-groups, but is, in its simplest form, a sort of favoritism (Brewer, 1999). It does, however, provide the “platform” for out-group prejudice (Brewer, 1999, p. 434). This mentality is also connected to out-group homogeneity bias which leads people to assume that all members of an out-group possess the same qualities, behaviors, and appearance (Smith & Weber, 2005).

Perceiving others as unique individuals takes more cognitive effort than does thinking of them as members of groups (Hewstone et al., 1991). As such, people unconsciously create categories that allow for them to classify individuals with others that they presumably share similar qualities and behaviors with. These categories and associated impressions influence how people can dictate their interactions with less effort than if they were to perceive each individual as unique. The principle of least effort explains the occurrence of prejudice as a result of peoples’ desire to simplify their identification of and interactions with people as individuals (Allport, 1954). This principle allows for a further understanding of the principle of social categorization, as it reflects the differing amounts of effort individuals are able to invest in more complex ways of thinking in order to understand other people for the individuals they are, not simply as members of groups.
**Allport’s Theory of Prejudice**

Allport defined a tolerant person as one who “is on friendly terms with all sorts of people [...] (with) no distinction of race, color, or creed” (Allport, 1954, p. 425). This term is broadly used to describe individual levels of openness to the differences and rights of people who belong to perceived out-groups; put simply, to be un-prejudiced (Jackman, 1977; Miller & Sears, 1986). This definition of tolerance in the context of being un-prejudiced is drawn from a Miller and Sears’ (1986) study that examined environmental norms and changes in attitudes on racial prejudice, women’s role in society, and acceptable sexual practices. Allport theorized that the differences between tolerant and prejudiced (intolerant) thinking is a reflection of cognitive operation. Specifically, individuals with more restricted and rigid cognitive styles would ultimately demonstrate more intolerant attitudes towards out-group members than those with more flexible and differentiated modes of thinking. Over 50 years have passed since Allport’s groundbreaking work on psychology and prejudice; today, researchers continue to examine prejudice and intolerance by operating off of Allport’s initial conclusions regarding the cognitive styles that form the foundation of the prejudiced personality (see Devine, 1989; 1998).

**Need for Cognition**

Need for cognition, defined by Cacioppo, Petty, and Kao (1984), refers to “an individual’s tendency to engage in and enjoy effortful cognitive endeavors” (p. 306). Need for cognition is not a reflection of cognitive ability, but rather the motivation to process information (Kearney, Gebert, & Voelpel, 2009). Individuals with high need for cognition are naturally more inquisitive, probing and reflective, whereas individuals with low need for cognition often rely on the opinions of others and other social comparison processes in order to configure their own attitudes. Need for cognition has been shown to be positively related to open-mindedness and
conscientiousness, reflecting the curious and detail-oriented nature of those who enjoy cognitively-intensive activities (Sadowski & Cogburn, 1997). Those with high need for cognition are also more resourceful and more effective problem solvers (Cacioppo, Petty, Feinstein, & Jarvis, 1996).

In research concerning diversity-related issues, need for cognition has been shown to moderate the relationship between diversity (specifically, age and education) and team performance (Kearney et al., 2009). In other words, a team composed of members with a high average need for cognition allowed for the prospective benefits of a diverse team to be expressed with regard to collective group identification as a team and overall performance (Kearney et al., 2009). This is likely due to the fact that individuals with high need for cognition are more willing to discuss and seek to understand the differences of others and the wide variety of “task-relevant knowledge and perspectives” they bring to a team (Kearney et al., 2009, p. 12). Though attitudes of those with high need for cognition have been shown to be more resistant to change, as they are less susceptible to persuasion (Haugtvedt & Petty, 1992), research has also shown a negative relationship between need for cognition and prejudice (Hogan & Mallott, 2005; Waller, 1993) as well as higher levels of stereotyping behaviors for those low in need for cognition (Crawford & Skowronski, 1998; Schaller, Boyd, Yohannes, & O’Brien, 1995). For example, Carter, Hall, Carney, and Rosip (2006), showed that individuals with lower need for cognition demonstrated greater acceptance of stereotyping.

These findings reflect the overreliance of individuals with low need for cognition on the use of psychological heuristics (shortcuts) and stereotypes when evaluating others and interpreting different situations (Petty, Brinol, Loersch, & McCaslin, 2009). All people engage in biased means of interpretation to some extent, but when made aware of their biases,
individuals with high need for cognition make more of an effort to correct their initial judgments than those with low need for cognition (Petty & Wegener, 1993). These findings directly contribute to the validity of Allport’s Theory of Prejudice as well as the principles of social categorization and least effort by demonstrating that those who do not enjoy and engage in complex ways of thinking are more likely to exhibit tendencies towards more simplistic, intolerant cognitive patterns when referring to individuals in out-groups. This theoretical foundation supported the prediction that people high in need for cognition would be less intolerant and therefore, more tolerant.

**Self-Monitoring**

The extent to which people attempt to simplify others’ identities may be related, not only to need for cognition, but also to another personality trait called self-monitoring. Self-monitoring is defined as the act of regulating one’s impression on others by monitoring the situational appropriateness of verbal and nonverbal behaviors. This may be a significant factor in explaining the differences in people’s approaches to thinking about social differences, primarily their willingness to engage in tolerance (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). Those who score high on self-monitoring scales are shown to be greatly concerned with the impression they make on others and seek to personify an image that best wins approval from their audience. These individuals do so by paying special attention to the situational and social demands of each interaction and adapting their affect and behavior as needed. Low self-monitors, on the other hand, are mostly consistent across interactions – they find value in being true to themselves and are far less concerned with their public image and reception by others (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986).
High self-monitors are commonly referenced in self-monitoring literature as “social chameleons,” given their ability to change the way they present themselves in a wide variety of social situations and environments (see Mehra, Kilduff, & Brass, 2001; Snyder, 1974). Researchers have come to discourage this comparison, as the flexibility high self-monitors personify is not executed without considerable cognitive effort (Ickes et al., 2006). Recent examination of self-monitoring has included investigations into the cognitive effort that is involved in the adaptability that characterizes self-monitors. In 2006, Ickes et al. concluded that high self-monitors actually dedicate a significant amount of cognitive resources to their social performances, contrary to the popular belief that high self-monitors adapt with little effort.

Not only do high self-monitors cognitively invest themselves into social interactions with great effort, but they do so willingly. This distinction is key in making the connection between self-monitoring and need for cognition, because this willingness may translate to overall engagement and enjoyment of cognitively intensive activities, not solely performance. It was expected that there would be a positive relationship between self-monitoring and need for cognition, reflecting the enjoyment of and tendency to engage in intensive information processing on the part of higher-level self-monitors.

Very few studies have explored the relationship between self-monitoring and factors relating to intolerance (prejudice, stereotypes, and/or discrimination). Terkildsen (1993) examined the differences in subjects’ cognitive processing when evaluating pictures of both light and dark-skinned African American candidates said to be running for governor. While the focus of this research was not necessarily an examination of the relationship between self-monitoring and prejudice, the authors nevertheless found that racially intolerant subjects with higher levels of self-monitoring and who were made aware of the social consequences of expressing their
prejudice restrained themselves from doing so (Terkildsen, 1993). Research supporting a direct relationship between self-monitoring and any factors relating to intolerance (prejudice, stereotypes, or discrimination) is extremely limited, offering up an avenue for future research. As such, it was hypothesized that self-monitoring would only be related to intolerance as long as it was related to need for cognition.

Of course, it is possible that high self-monitors might become cognitively consumed by their social endeavors, rendering them unable to exert more effort into other higher forms of processing, such as suppression of stereotypes. It is also possible that high self-monitors regulate their expression of stereotypes and prejudiced behaviors based on the audience. In other words, when interacting with a group that expresses egalitarian views they may express similar views and these views may change when interacting with a group that expresses prejudiced views. There is no research that has yet explored the extent to which self-monitoring behavior takes up cognitive resources, so that aspect of the study was exploratory.

**Research Statements and Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis 1: Self-monitoring will be positively related to need for cognition.** Due to the cognitively intense nature of high self-monitors’ socially adaptive efforts, it would stand to reason that their tendency to “engage in and enjoy” cognitively demanding activities might be higher than that of low self-monitors (Cacioppo, Petty, Feinstein, Blair, & Jarvis, 1996, p. 197; Deeter-Schmeltz & Sojka, 2007). As such, it is hypothesized that there will be a positive relationship between self-monitoring and need for cognition. However, it should be noted that a link between these two factors has yet to be established in the literature. It is possible that the cognitive engagement and enjoyment a high self-monitor derives from thinking about social interactions is restricted solely to a social context and does not extend to other activities.
Hypothesis 2: Need for cognition will be negatively related to intolerance. Past research has revealed a negative relationship between need for cognition and prejudice. Thus, it is hypothesized that a negative association will also be demonstrated between need for cognition and intolerance (see Carter, Hall, Carney, & Rosip, 2006; Hogan & Mallott, 2005; Petty, Brinol, Loersch, & McCaslin, 2009; Waller, 1993). For the purposes of this study, intolerance was chosen as the key outcome variable as it both a) represents a wide array of discriminatory topics (e.g. sexism, racism, ageism) and b) encompasses the many facets of intolerance as expressed through discrimination, prejudice, and stereotyping (Aosved et al., 2009). Support for this hypothesis could add further support for the negative relationship between prejudice and need for cognition already established in the literature though in a broader fashion, as its definition is inclusive of prejudice, discrimination, and stereotyping.

Hypothesis 3: Need for cognition will mediate the relationship between self-monitoring and intolerance. If self-monitoring and need for cognition are in fact positively correlated, it is expected that the tie between self-monitoring and intolerance will be made through an individual’s need for cognition. Due to the existing negative relationship between need for cognition and prejudice, it is expected that self-monitoring will only be related to intolerance as long as it is related to need for cognition; specifically, self-monitoring will only be negatively related to intolerance as long as it is positively related to need for cognition (Hogan & Mallott, 2005; Waller, 1993).

Alternative hypothesis: Self-monitoring will mediate the relationship between need for cognition and intolerance. It is possible that lower individual levels of intolerance are not necessarily explained by enjoyment of complex thinking, but rather are more of a function of social desirability. As opposed to need for cognition facilitating a relationship between self-
monitoring and intolerance, it is possible that self-monitoring, motivated by social desirability, would be the explanatory factor between need for cognition and intolerance. This model was used for comparison in order to determine the model that best fit the data (see Figure 1).

Self-monitoring $\rightarrow$ Need for Cognition $\rightarrow$ Intolerance

Need for Cognition $\rightarrow$ Self-monitoring $\rightarrow$ Intolerance

*Figure 1.* Comparison of Hypothesis 3 and Alternative Hypothesis Mediation Models.
Chapter III: Methodology

An online survey was distributed to undergraduate psychology students which included multiple scales used to measure 1) self-monitoring level; 2) need for cognition level; and 3) intolerance level. It also included a measure of social desirability in order to control for social desirability bias as well as a number of demographic questions which were used to report the characteristics of the sample. Results from the survey were analyzed by means of descriptives, frequencies, and linear regressions, through the use of SPSS statistical software. Information pertaining to participants, procedures, measures, and data analysis will be described in the following section.

Participants

Two hundred and thirteen University of Wisconsin-Stout (UW-Stout) undergraduate students participated in this study. This sample was recruited through the UW-Stout Psychology Department Participant Pool website, with the option to participate in the survey for credits to apply towards their undergraduate psychology research requirements. This sample was relatively evenly distributed between males \((n=97)\) and females \((n=116)\), primarily ranging in age from 18-21 \((n=184)\) and Caucasian \((n=195)\).

Procedures

Undergraduate participants who elected to participate in the study via the UW-Stout Psychology Department Participant Pool website were sent an email invitation to the survey through the UW-Stout email network. As an incentive, participants who completed the entire survey were granted course credit toward their introductory psychology research requirement. After giving their informed consent, the participants proceeded to fill out the online survey via Qualtrics Survey Software. Each participant received an identical survey, with all items
presented in the same order. After completion, they were debriefed and thanked for their participation.

**Measures**

**Self-monitoring.** Participants’ self-monitoring orientation was assessed using Snyder and Gangestad’s (1986) 18-item Self-monitoring Scale (α = .70). The measure is comprised of 18 true or false items that allow for the participant to indicate the relevance of each statement to their own feelings and behaviors in responding to social demands. An individual’s score on this scale ranges from 0 to 18 and reveals the extent to which they concern themselves with adjusting their behaviors to fit the context of a situation, with higher scores indicating higher levels of self-monitoring. Sample items include “I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people” and “I’m not always the person I appear to be.” This scale has been very commonly used throughout self-monitoring research and has strong validity and reliability (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000; Snyder & Gangestad, 1986).

**Need for cognition.** Participants’ need for cognition was measured using Cacioppo, Petty, and Kao’s (1984) 18-item Need for Cognition Scale (α = .90). In this measure, participants rate how characteristic each statement is of their personal attitudes on items such as “I would prefer complex to simple problems” on a scale from 1 (extremely uncharacteristic) to 5 (extremely characteristic). Higher scores indicate higher need for cognition, with the highest possible score equaling 90 and the lowest possible score equaling 18. This scale is well-established with strong validity and reliability (Cacioppo & Petty, 1982; Cacioppo et al., 1996; Carter et al., 2006).

**Intolerance.** Participants’ intolerance was gauged using Aosved, Long, and Voller’s (2009) 54-item Intolerant Schema Measure (α = .94). This measure incorporates key elements of
six different constructs, namely: sexism, racism, sexual prejudice, ageism, classism, and religious intolerance. Each item is rated on a 5-point scale, on which participants indicate how descriptive each statement is of their personal beliefs from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Sample items include “Marriages between two lesbians should be legal” and “Complex and interesting conversation cannot be expected from most old people.” Scores are averaged, with higher scores indicating higher levels of intolerance. As this scale is relatively new, the reliability has yet to be confirmed outside of the original two studies conducted, but it has demonstrated strong internal consistency and criterion-related validity in its initial use (Aosved et al., 2009).

**Social desirability.** Participants’ levels of social desirability were measured using the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability (MCSD) Scale – Short Form C, developed by Reynolds (1982) from the original 33-item scale ($\alpha = .76$). This measure consists of 13 true or false items that gauge an individual’s concern with presenting themselves in a favorable way. Sample items include “No matter who I’m talking to, I’m always a good listener” and “I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.” Higher scores indicate higher levels of social desirability, with zero being the lowest possible score (zero social desirability) and 13 being the highest possible score (total social desirability). This scale is commonly used to measure social desirability and has strong validity and reliability (Aosved et al., 2009; Reynolds, 1982).

**Demographics.** Participants were also asked to respond to a number of demographic questions including education level, race, age, employment status, religious orientation, household income, gender, and GPA.
Data Analysis

Data was gathered from the participants’ responses to the aforementioned measures as well as responses to various demographic items. Twelve cases were omitted from analysis due to missing data, leaving 213 valid responses for analysis. Reverse-scored items for the Intolerance Schema Measure and Need for Cognition Scale were re-coded (i.e. a score of 5 re-coded to equal a score of 1, a score of 4 to equal a score of 2, and vice versa) prior to analysis. Total scores for each measure were also computed by adding participant responses and, in the case of the Intolerant Schema Measure, averaged. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated for each of the four measures used in this study; analysis of three out of the four measures resulted in Cronbach alpha’s with values equal to or greater than .70, which demonstrated high levels of survey item reliability for those measures. The only scale with a Cronbach’s alpha value of less than .70 was Snyder and Gangestad’s Self-monitoring Scale (1986) which came to .63, lower than the acceptable levels of reliability found in numerous previous studies for the same scale (see Table 2 for Cronbach’s alpha values).

Summary data regarding sample characteristics was analyzed through the use of descriptive statistics (measures of central tendency and dispersion). Direct relationships between self-monitoring, need for cognition, and intolerance scores were examined through the use of Pearson’s bivariate correlations. The predicted mediation models were tested using linear regression analyses (Baron & Kenny, 1986). Social desirability scores were also compared to Intolerance scores in order to determine the extent to which participant responses were affected by social desirability bias. Significance was determined at the $p<.05$ level.
Chapter IV: Results

The purpose of this study was to expand upon previous research regarding the relationship between dimensions of personality and prejudice. Need for cognition, self-monitoring, and intolerance were deemed the variables of interest. Specifically, this study examined the relationship between self-monitoring, need for cognition, and intolerance, predicting that the relationship between self-monitoring and intolerance would be mediated by need for cognition.

Participant Characteristics

Table 1 reveals that the sample was relatively evenly distributed between females (54.5%) and males (45.5%), who were primarily Caucasian (91.5%) between the ages of 18-21 (86.4%). Participants reported predominately Christian (Non-Denominational) religious affiliation (34.3%), though a significant portion of the population also identified as Catholic (26.3%). All participants were students enrolled in an undergraduate psychology course with a research requirement at UW-Stout.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency (N)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Pacific Islander</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religious Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian (Non-Denominational)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheistic/Agnostic</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Not Listed</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 shows the basic descriptive statistics and Cronbach’s alpha values for each of the four measures. The data reveals that, on average, participants demonstrated mid-range self-monitoring levels, as opposed to tending toward lower or higher extremes. The highest score an individual could achieve on Snyder and Gangestad’s (1986) Self-monitoring Scale is that of an 18; the mean score for this sample was 9.03. The mean participant score for need for cognition was 58.85 out of a possible 90, demonstrating a slight inclination for higher need for cognition on the part of this sample. The mean score for intolerance was 2.16 on a scale of one (low levels of intolerance) to five (high levels of intolerance), revealing a lower tendency towards
intolerance on the part of the study’s population. Social desirability was found to be mid to low-range, with the mean score being 5.14 out of a possible 13.

Table 2

Basic Descriptive Statistics and Cronbach’s Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-monitoring (out of 18)</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Cognition (out of 90)</td>
<td>58.85</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intolerance (out of 5)</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability (out of 13)</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations Between Variables

Pearson’s bivariate correlation analyses were conducted in order to determine the significance and nature of the relationships between key variables in this study. These analyses also served as tests for Hypotheses 1 and 2. In general, all significant correlations demonstrated weak relationships between variables.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that self-monitoring would be positively related to need for cognition due to the cognitively intense nature of high self-monitors’ socially adaptive efforts. Pearson’s bivariate correlation analyses confirmed this hypothesis, revealing self-monitoring and need for cognition to be significantly positively correlated, $r(212) = .21$, $p = .01$. This finding indicates that, as self-monitoring scores increased, need for cognition scores also increased.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that need for cognition would be negatively related to intolerance. Correlation analyses also confirmed this finding, demonstrating a significant negative
relationship between need for cognition and intolerance, \( r(212) = -0.29, p < 0.01 \). This finding indicates that, as need for cognition scores decreased, intolerance scores increased. The correlation for self-monitoring and intolerance yielded a significantly negative relationship, \( r(212) = -0.21, p = 0.01 \). Similarly to correlations between need for cognition and intolerance, as self-monitoring scores decreased, intolerance scores increased.

Pearson’s correlation analyses were also used to examine the relationship between key variables and social desirability, as the use of a self-report measure presents the issue of social desirability bias in participant responses. The relationship between self-monitoring and social desirability was not significant, \( r(212) = -0.118, p = 0.082 \). Likewise, no significant relationship was found between social desirability and need for cognition, \( r(212) = 0.128, p = 0.063 \), nor with social desirability and intolerance, \( r(212) = 0.032, p = 0.640 \). These results suggest that social desirability bias did not have a significant impact on participant responses.

**Linear Regression Analyses**

Linear regression and Sobel analyses were used to test Hypothesis 3 in addition to the Alternative Hypothesis. Prior to analyzing results of these analyses, it was necessary to first examine the data in order to determine if the key assumptions regarding normal distribution, linearity, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity were met. A regression standardized residual histogram and scatterplot confirmed that the distribution was normal. Durbin-Watson analyses demonstrated that the assumption of homoscedasticity was met (\( d = 2.07 \)). Collinearity statistics indicated that collinearity was not a problem for the regression model, as VIF values were below 10 and Tolerance was above 0.20. No significant outliers emerged from the data and, therefore, none were removed. Residual statistics, including Mahalanobis distance and Cook’s distance,
revealed that no cases were significantly influencing the regression model, with no values for Mahalanobis distance being over 15 and none above 1 for Cook’s distance.

To test the mediation model from Hypothesis 3, the method described by Baron and Kenny (1986) was used. In Step 1, the regression of self-monitoring scores on intolerance scores was significant, $\beta = -0.03$, $t(212) = -3.09$, $p = 0.002$. Step 2 revealed that the regression of self-monitoring scores on the mediator (need for cognition) was significant, $\beta = 0.63$, $t(212) = 3.04$, $p = 0.003$. Step 3 of the analyses demonstrated that the regression of need for cognition on intolerance scores, controlling for the self-monitoring scores, was significant with $\beta = -0.01$, $t(212) = -3.83$, $p < 0.001$. Step 4 of the mediation model showed that, controlling for the mediator (need for cognition), self-monitoring was a significant predictor of intolerance scores, $\beta = -0.03$, $t(212) = -2.34$, $p = 0.020$. In order for this to qualify as a complete mediation, Step 4 needed to result in a $\beta$ value of zero, or at the very least, a value that was smaller than that of Step 1’s $\beta$ value; that was not the case for this model. However, a Sobel test was conducted which demonstrated partial mediation in the model ($z = -2.30$, $p = 0.022$). Figure 2 illustrates this relationship below.

Figure 2. Standardized Regression Coefficients for the Relationship between Self-monitoring and Intolerance Level as Mediated by Need for Cognition. The standardized regression
coefficient between self-monitoring and intolerance, controlling for need for cognition, is in parentheses.

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001.

An alternative mediation hypothesis was also presented, positing that self-monitoring would mediate the relationship between need for cognition and intolerance. This hypothesis was presented due to the possibility that intolerance levels in individuals might not necessarily be explained by enjoyment of complex thinking, but could instead be more of a function of social desirability. In Step 1 of the Alternative Hypothesis mediation model test, regression of the need for cognition scores on intolerance scores was significant, $\beta = -.01$, $t(212) = -4.35$, $p < .001$. Step 2 revealed that the regression of need for cognition scores on the mediator (self-monitoring) was significant, $\beta = .07$, $t(212) = 3.04$, $p = .003$. Step 3 of the analyses demonstrated that the regression of self-monitoring scores on intolerance scores, controlling for the need for cognition scores, was significant with $\beta = -.03$, $t(212) = -2.34$, $p = .020$. Step 4 of the mediation model showed that, controlling for the mediator (self-monitoring), need for cognition was a significant predictor of intolerance scores, $\beta = -.01$, $t(212) = -3.83$, $p < .001$. In order for this to qualify as a complete mediation, Step 4 needed to result in a $\beta$ value of zero, or at the very least, a value that was smaller than that of Step 1’s $\beta$ value. A Sobel test was conducted which further demonstrated a lack of mediation in this model ($z = -1.86$, $p = .063$). Figure 3 illustrates this relationship below.
Figure 3. Standardized Regression Coefficients for the Relationship between Need for Cognition and Intolerance Level, as Mediated by Self-monitoring. The standardized regression coefficient between need for cognition and intolerance, controlling for self-monitoring, is in parentheses.

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

Overall, neither the Hypothesis 3 model nor the Alternative Hypothesis model was found to demonstrate full mediation. However, it is apparent from the presence of partial mediation in the Hypothesis 3 model that it more appropriately fits the data than the Alternative Hypothesis model. Additionally, the strongest inter-variable relationship was revealed between self-monitoring and need for cognition in the Hypothesis 3 model, providing further support for this conclusion.
Chapter V: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between self-monitoring, need for cognition, and intolerance scores. A primary mediation hypothesis (Hypothesis 3) was presented suggesting that need for cognition would operate as a mediator between self-monitoring and intolerance. Alternatively, it was also stated that it was possible that the roles of self-monitoring and need for cognition could be switched, with self-monitoring operating as the mediator between need for cognition and intolerance. Hypothesis 3 was partially supported, reflecting the support of relationships between variables already established in the literature, but not to the degree of total mediation. Implications of the results and limitations are discussed below.

Findings

The results of this study provided support for Hypotheses 1 and 2. Self-monitoring was found to be significantly positively related to need for cognition and need for cognition was found to be significantly negatively related to intolerance. The support for Hypothesis 1 is reflective of the cognitively intense nature of self-monitoring described throughout related literature and provides a new link between self-monitoring and need for cognition not yet established in previous studies (Ickes et al., 2006). As such, it appears that the cognitive engagement and enjoyment a high self-monitor derives from social contexts does, in fact, extend to other activities. The support for Hypothesis 2 reinforces the findings of prior investigations into the relationship between need for cognition and prejudice, discrimination, and stereotyping, in which higher levels of cognition led to lower levels of each respective element of intolerance (see Carter, Hall, Carney, and Rosip, 2006; Hogan & Mallott, 2005; Petty, Brinol, Loersch, & McCaslin, 2009; Waller, 1993).
The results regarding Hypothesis 3 and the Alternative Hypothesis were mixed. Though significant relationships were established between all variables independently, each model failed to provide complete mediation support. Regarding Hypothesis 3, it was found that need for cognition partially mediated the relationship between self-monitoring and intolerance. Analyses revealed that this mediation model, in which need for cognition operated as the mediator between self-monitoring and intolerance, met three of the four criteria needed to establish full mediation (Baron & Kenny, 1986). The Alternative Hypothesis, with self-monitoring as the mediator, also met three of the four criteria, but failed to produce significant Sobel test results and therefore did not provide sufficient support for a partial mediation model, much less a complete one. This conclusion was further supported by the lack of significant relationship between social desirability and either self-monitoring or need for cognition, which was the potential motivator for participants with high need for cognition and high self-monitoring to report socially tolerant attitudes.

Though neither the Hypothesis 3 nor the Alternative Hypothesis model provided support for full mediation, the Hypothesis 3 model provided evidence of partial mediation and the strongest inter-variable relationship (between self-monitoring and need for cognition), making it the better fitting model of the two. It should be noted that it is possible that the variables in this study are related to each other in multiple ways. Future research has the opportunity to explore such potential avenues.

Limitations of the Study

Diversity. Both Dunn and Eau Claire Counties are very limited in diversity, as they are mostly White in racial composition (94.7% and 93.1%, respectively – U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). This poses an issue for this study’s sample as it may not be generalizable to a population
that is more varied in race and ethnicity. This same issue applies to the age of the sample, which was predominantly between the ages of 18-21, limiting applicability of results to populations that are more varied in age. Also, though the Intolerant Schema Measure (Aosved et al., 2009) includes many different targets of intolerant stances, it neglects to include attitudes towards the mentally ill, obese or disabled, who are other important populations of consideration.

**Self-monitoring scale.** The Cronbach’s alpha level for the Self-Monitoring Scale (Snyder & Gangestad, 1986) was lower than anticipated, resulting in a .63 and falling short of the .70 standard for acceptability. Item total statistics did not reveal any items on the measure that were significantly impacting its reliability and therefore could not be corrected. Unfortunately, no explanation was found for why a lower Cronbach’s alpha might have occurred, which is especially baffling considering the strong track record of reliability that this measure has demonstrated in past studies. Future studies might make use of alternative self-monitoring scales such as those by Briggs & Cheek, 1988 and Lennox & Wolfe, 1984. It is also recommended that survey items for all measures be randomized in future administrations. Doing so will help to control for order effects by ensuring that the measures are counterbalanced.

**Social desirability.** As the Intolerant Schema Measure (Aosved et al., 2009) is a self-report measure, social desirability must be taken into account when drawing conclusions from the results. Participants may be motivated to underreport intolerant attitudes for fear of judgment. This may be especially true in the case of examining self-monitoring, as some participants who identify as high self-monitors are especially concerned with appealing to their audience (in this case, the researcher). However, though social desirability in self-report has historically been a concern for researchers when studying self-monitoring, multiple studies have assuaged this concern, demonstrating that, though high self-monitors have a desire to appeal to
their audiences, this is not necessarily so when it comes to responding to various measures (see Day & Schleicher, 2006; Gangestad & Snyder, 2000). Even so, the use of the MCSD scale (Reynolds, 1982) was used to measure the extent to which social desirability bias impacts the data. Results demonstrated no significant impact of social desirability on participant responses.

Conclusions

Self-monitoring. The findings from this study help to reinforce findings in previous literature concerning the tie between self-monitoring and complex thought. The relationship between self-monitoring and need for cognition in Hypothesis 3 proved to be the strongest of the relationships established between any of the variables in this study, demonstrating that, as self-monitoring scores increased, need for cognition scores also increased. A significant, albeit weak, relationship was also established between self-monitoring and intolerance, though the presence of need for cognition did not serve to better explain this relationship. These findings suggest that other personality variables might be at play that could better explain the link between self-monitoring and intolerance.

Need for cognition. The findings from this study served to reinforce findings in previous literature concerning the relationship between need for cognition and elements of intolerance. Though the relationship established in this study between need for cognition and intolerance was relatively weak, it was nonetheless significant. It is possible that need for cognition may be linked more strongly to different expressions of intolerance, such as prejudice versus stereotyping, and a more generalized approach to intolerance gave the appearance of a weaker relationship. This could be investigated by testing the model using the individual variables measured by the subscales (e.g. sexism, ageism, etc.) in the place of the general
intolerance variables used in this study. Stronger correlations between these variables and need for cognition would confirm this theory.

**Recommendations**

Results of this study could be of great use to researchers specializing in diversity-related issues. Findings serve as reinforcement for past results linking need for cognition and dimensions of intolerance and provide a starting point for studies looking to further examine the combining influence of personality traits and cognitive styles on expressions of prejudice, discrimination, and stereotyping. These findings can also help to inform the future study of self-monitoring by making a more solid connection between self-monitors’ adaptive abilities and differences in cognitive motivation as well as reveal connections between self-monitoring orientation and tendencies towards tolerance. It is recommended that future studies examine combination of these and other personality variables, using different causal pathways, in order to more firmly explain participants’ tendencies toward intolerance. Future studies would also benefit from incorporating measures that explore participant attitudes toward other subjugated populations. Ultimately, further knowledge of the prejudiced personality will allow researchers to better understand the complexities of human interaction and perception, and will also hopefully inspire new ways to study and address the different facets of intolerance.
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Appendix: Personality and Prejudice Survey

This research has been approved by the UW-Stout IRB as required by the Code of Federal Regulations Title 45 Part 46.

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN UW-STOUT APPROVED RESEARCH

Master's Thesis Research Project: PERSONALITY AND PREJUDICE

You are invited to participate in a study conducted by Andrea Serum (Masters Student of Applied Psychology at the University of Wisconsin-Stout). Your informed consent is requested in order to be a participant in the project described below. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate in this study. By indicating that you are 18 years of age or older and by completing the survey, you are providing your consent to participate.

Description:

The purpose of this research is to understand how peoples' personality characteristics impact their social tolerance. In particular, the researcher is interested in the relationship between need for cognition and self-monitoring. Additional information about the study will be detailed in the debriefing after your participation in the study.

What will you be asked to do?

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to respond to a number of questions regarding your attitudes towards social groups, social settings/interactions, and problem solving. These questions will be administered through a survey. Additionally, you will be asked to provide non-identifying demographic information (e.g., age, level of education, etc.).

It is estimated that participation in this study will take no more than 30 minutes of your time.

Risks and Benefits:

While we feel the risk associated with participation in this experiment is no more than that which you would encounter in your daily life, feel free to contact us should you feel uncomfortable or
experience emotional distress. The benefits of participating include developing a further understanding of the need for cognition, self-monitoring, and tolerance personality constructs as well as receiving course credit for the introductory level psychology course research requirement.

**Confidentiality:**

Your responses are strictly confidential. The data collected will be used for research purposes only and will be reported in group format – no individual data will be reported. Data will be coded to maintain confidentiality. Your name will in no way be associated with your responses. Only the investigator will have access to your responses.

**Right to Withdraw:**

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may choose not to participate without any adverse consequences to you. You have the right to stop the survey at any time. However, should you choose to participate and later wish to withdraw from the study, there is no way to identify your anonymous document after it has been turned into the investigator. As you are participating in an anonymous online survey, once you submit your response, the data cannot be linked to you and cannot be withdrawn.

**IRB Approval:**

This study has been reviewed and approved by The University of Wisconsin-Stout's Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB has determined that this study meets the ethical obligations required by federal law and University policies. If you have questions or concerns regarding this study please contact the Investigator or Advisor. If you have any questions, concerns, or reports regarding your rights as a research subject, please contact the IRB Administrator:

*Sue Foxwell, Research Services*
Contact Information:

If you have any questions or concerns about the nature of this study, please contact Andrea Serum (Masters Student, Applied Psychology), email: ricea5129@my.uwstout.edu. You may also contact Dr. Sarah Wood (Thesis Advisor), Psychology Department, University of Wisconsin-Stout, Menomonie, WI 54751, (715)232-2283, email: woodsara@uwstout.edu.

Q1 By clicking the box below, you are confirming both your intent to participate and that you are at least 18 years of age.

I am at least 18 years old and wish to participate in the survey. (1)

Q2 It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I'm not encouraged.

True (1)
False (2)

Q3 I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.

True (1)
False (2)

Q4 On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.

True (1)
False (2)
Q5 There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.

True (1)

False (2)

Q6 No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.

True (1)

False (2)

Q7 There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.

True (1)

False (2)

Q8 I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.

True (1)

False (2)

Q9 I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.

True (1)

False (2)

Q10 I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.

True (1)

False (2)

Q11 I have never been irked when people expressed ideas different than my own.

True (1)

False (2)

Q12 There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
Q13 I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
True (1)
False (2)

Q14 I have never deliberately said something to hurt someone's feelings.
True (1)
False (2)

Q15 I find it hard to imitate the behavior of other people.
True (1)
False (2)

Q16 At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things others will like.
True (1)
False (2)

Q17 I can only argue for ideas which I already believe.
True (1)
False (2)

Q18 I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information.
True (1)
False (2)

Q19 I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain others.
True (1)
False (2)
Q20 I would probably make a good actor.
True (1)
False (2)

Q21 In a group of people I am rarely the center of attention.
True (1)
False (2)

Q22 In different situations with different people, I often act like very different persons.
True (1)
False (2)

Q23 I am not particularly good at making other people like me.
True (1)
False (2)

Q24 I'm not always the person I appear to be.
True (1)
False (2)

Q25 I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone or win their favor.
True (1)
False (2)

Q26 I have considered being an entertainer.
True (1)
False (2)

Q27 I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting.
True (1)
False (2)

Q28 I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.

True (1)
False (2)

Q29 At a party I let others keep the jokes and stories going.

True (1)
False (2)

Q30 I feel a bit awkward in public and do not show up quite as well as I should.

True (1)
False (2)

Q31 I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end).

True (1)
False (2)

Q32 I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.

True (1)
False (2)

Q33 Please indicate how descriptive each statement is of your beliefs by choosing the number that corresponds to your response.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriages between two lesbians should be legal. (1)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians are intolerant of people with other religious beliefs. (2)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who stay on welfare have no desire to work. (3)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I favor laws that permit racial minority persons to rent or purchase houses, even when the person offering the property for sale or rent does not wish to sell or rent to minorities. (4)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers. (5)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex and interesting conversation cannot be expected from most old people. (6)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't mind companies using openly lesbian celebrities to advertise their products. (7)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics have a &quot;holier than thou&quot; attitude. (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare keeps the nation in debt. (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial minorities have more influence on school desegregation plans than they ought to have. (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks. (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most old people would be considered to have poor personal hygiene. (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't think it would negatively affect our relationship if I learned that one of my close relatives was a lesbian. (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish people are deceitful and money-hungry. (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who don't make much money are generally unmotivated. (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial minorities are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights. (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men. (17)

Most old people can be irritating because they tell the same stories over and over again. (18)

Lesbians should undergo therapy to change their sexual orientation. (19)

Atheists and agnostics are more self-centered than people from other religious groups. (20)

Homeless people should get their acts together and become productive members of society. (21)

It is a bad idea for racial minorities and Whites to marry one another. (22)

In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in bringing up the children. (23)

Old people don’t really need to use our community sports facilities. (24)
I welcome new friends who are gay.  
(25)

Muslims are more treacherous than other groups of religious people.  
(26)

Too many of my tax dollars are spent to take care of those who are unwilling to take care of themselves.  
(27)

Q34 Please indicate how descriptive each statement is of your beliefs by choosing the number that corresponds to your response.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial minorities should not push themselves where they are not wanted. (1)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is best that old people live where they won't bother anyone. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be sure to invite the same-sex partner of my gay male friend to my party. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiccan and pagan people practice thinly veiled evil. (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If every individual would carry his/her own weight, there would be no poverty. (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a racial minority family with about the same income and education as I have moved in next door, I would mind a great deal. (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Amb</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women shouldn't push themselves where they are not wanted. (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company of most old people is quite enjoyable. (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's all right with me if I see two men holding hands. (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the social problems in the U.S. today are due to non-Christian religious groups. (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are more poor people than wealthy people in prisons because poor people commit more crimes. (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was wrong for the United States Supreme Court to outlaw segregation in its 1954 decision. (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's requests in terms of equality between the sexes are simply exaggerated. (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes avoid eye contact with old people when I see them. (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies that approve of male homosexuality bother me. (16)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hindu beliefs about reincarnation results in people not taking responsibility for their actions in this life since there is always the next life. (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor people are lazy. (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the past few years, racial minorities have gotten more economically than they deserve. (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the past few years, women have gotten more from government than they deserve. (20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't like it when old people try to make conversation with me. (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay men want too many rights. (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite what Buddhist people say, Buddhism isn't really a religion, but more of a philosophy. (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most poor people are in debt because they can't manage their money. (24)

Over the past few years, the government and news media have shown more respect to racial minorities than they deserve. (25)

Universities are wrong to admit women in costly programs such as medicine, when in fact, a large number will leave their jobs after a few years to raise their children. (26)

I personally would not want to spend much time with an old person. (27)

Q35 Please indicate how descriptive each statement is of you by choosing the number that corresponds to your response.
<p>| I would prefer complex to simple problems. (1) | Extremely Uncharacter-istic (1) | Uncharacter-istic (2) | Neither Character-istic nor Uncharacter-istic (3) | Character-istic (4) | Extremely Character-istic (5) |
| I like to have the responsibility of handling a situation that requires a lot of thinking. (2) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Thinking is not my idea of fun. (3) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I would rather do something that requires little thought than something that is sure to challenge my thinking abilities. (4) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I try to anticipate and avoid situations where there is likely chance that I will have to think in depth about something. (5) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I find satisfaction in deliberating hard and for long hours. (6) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I only think as hard as I have to. (7) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I prefer to think about small, daily projects to long-term ones. (8) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| I like tasks that require little thought once I've learned them. (9) | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The idea of relying on thought to make my way to the top appeals to me. (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really enjoy a task that involves coming up with new solutions to problems. (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning new ways to think doesn't excite me very much. (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer my life to be filled with puzzles that I must solve. (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The notion of thinking abstractly is appealing to me. (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would prefer a task that is intellectual, difficult, and important to one that is somewhat important but does not require much thought. (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel relief rather than satisfaction after completing a task that required a lot of mental effort. (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's enough for me the something gets the job done; I don't care how or why it works. (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually end up deliberating about issues even when they do not affect me personally. (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q36 What is your age?
- 18-21 (1)
- 22-25 (2)
- 26-30 (3)
- 31-40 (4)
- 41-50 (5)
- 51-60 (6)
- 61 or over (7)

Q37 What is your gender?
- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Transgender (3)
- Prefer Not to Answer (4)

Q38 What is your race? (You may choose more than one.)
- White (1)
- White, non-Hispanic (2)
- African-American (3)
- Hispanic (4)
- Asian-Pacific Islander (5)
- Native American (6)
- Other/Not Listed (Please Indicate Below) (7) ____________________

Q39 What is your total household income?
- Under $10,000 (1)
- $10,000-$19,999 (2)
- $20,000-$29,999 (3)
- $30,000-$39,999 (4)
- $40,000-$49,999 (5)
- $50,000-$59,999 (6)
- $60,000-$69,999 (7)
- $70,000-$79,999 (8)
- $80,000-$89,999 (9)
- $90,000-$99,999 (10)
- $100,000-$149,999 (11)
- More than $150,000 (12)

Q40 What is your religious affiliation?

- Protestant (1)
- Catholic (2)
- Christian (Non-Denominational) (3)
- Evangelical (4)
- Pentecostal (5)
- Jewish (6)
- Islamic (7)
- Atheistic/Agnostic (8)
- Hindu (9)
- Buddhist (10)
- Other/Not Listed (Please Indicate Below) (11) ____________________
Debriefing

The purpose of this research is to understand how need for cognition interacts with self-monitoring to influence tolerance levels. It is predicted that people who have higher levels of self-monitoring (i.e. high tendencies to adapt to their social environments) will also be shown to have high need for cognition (i.e. highly enjoy complex thinking). In previous studies, higher enjoyment of complex thinking has been linked to lower levels of social prejudice; as such, it is expected that individuals who enjoy complex thinking will have higher tolerance scores. Assuming these findings to be true, it is expected that high self-monitors will demonstrate higher levels of tolerance due to their enjoyment of complex thinking. Of course, these are only our predictions. Please contact us if you wish to know the results of our study.

Contact Information:

If you have any questions or concerns about the nature of this study, please contact Andrea Serum, Masters in Applied Psychology Student, University of Wisconsin-Stout, email: ricea5129@my.uwstout.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the IRB Administrator: Sue Foxwell, Research Services, 152 Vocational Rehabilitation Bldg., UW-Stout, Menomonie, WI 54751, phone: 715-232-2477, email: foxwells@uwstout.edu.

If you experience any lingering discomfort as a result of participating in this study, please contact the UW-Stout Counseling Center for further assistance: 410 Bowman Hall, UW-Stout, Menomonie, WI 54751, phone: 715-232-2468, email: counseling@uwstout.edu.