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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The past decade has witnessed a plethora of research into the psychological and educational factors that affect the highly creative individual. At the forefront of this examination have been those educators attempting to devise innovative and effective methods of nurturing latent creative talent. In line with this trend, the focus of the present thesis will be devoted to ways of encouraging the need for novelty, which is hypothesized to be a significant component of creativity. Specifically, the antecedent conditions that serve to promote a need for novelty, in both high- and low-creative individuals, were explored in terms of their effects on Ss receptivity to novelty as a stimulus with positive reinforcing properties.

READINESS AND THE NEED FOR NOVELTY

In a study investigating the reinforcing properties of associative novelty for high-creative Ss, Houston and Mednick (1963) tested the hypothesis that the highly creative person has a strong need for novelty. Supported by research on the personality and life-styles of creative people, they contended that the high-creative had a definite preference for novelty, but that manifestations of preference alone did
not necessarily establish the existence of a need. Houston and Mednick attempted to satisfy the need for novelty and observe whether the consequent reinforcement produced by satisfying this need, would increase the elicitation of the behavior immediately preceding the reinforcement. They assumed that if high-creative do have a need for novel stimulation, the receipt of such stimulation, should reduce the need thereby resulting in a reinforcing state of affairs.

Houston and Mednick employed verbal operant conditioning in their procedure: A series of cards was presented to each subject on an individual basis. On each card was printed a noun and a nonnoun. When the S selected a noun, the E responded with a novel and somewhat unlikely association. When the S chose a nonnoun, the E's response was a highly probable association.

The main finding from their study was that high-creative Ss selected significantly more nouns than did low-creative Ss, thus suggesting a stronger need for novelty. Nouns, with their resulting verbal responses, produced a satisfying reinforcing state of affairs for high-creatives.

The present investigator made an analysis of the Houston and Mednick findings by considering individual creativity as it appears in more realistic contexts. In encounters with the environment, the person is often in a choice-position of either being able to select (i.e., approach) or to reject (i.e., avoid) novel experiences. But, more importantly, entrance into this choice situation is from a previous condition where creativity and novelty may have been present.
or absent. Although varying degrees of novelty could have existed in the previous condition, the concern in the present study was only with the more general assumption that novelty was or was not experienced whereas Houston and Mednick were unconcerned with their S's "entering characteristics" (i.e., readinesses). It would be ludicrous to even consider the possibility of classifying each S's pre-experiment experiences and cognitions as being either novel or nonnovel. Nevertheless, it is interesting to ponder the differences in the Houston and Mednick measures of novelty that might have arisen between two Ss, if Subject "X" had participated in a creative writing seminar and Subject "Y" had attended an introductory typing class immediately prior to the experiment. Would Subject "X" or Subject "Y" be more likely to respond to novelty after preliminary exposure to these respective environments?

In attempting to answer this question, it was reasoned that more precise conclusions, than those drawn from earlier studies about the high-creative's strong need for novelty, could be obtained by exposing Ss to either of two conditions prior to the experimental task. In one condition, S would be given a series of creative and novel tasks. Conversely, in the other condition, Ss would be exposed to a series of uncreative and unimaginative activities which were void of novelty. Following one of these experiences an S would be administered a task similar to the one employed by Houston and Mednick. Hopefully, this procedure would yield an extended description of the high-creative's need for novelty.
GENERAL PLAN AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

On the basis of the rationale briefly described above, the present experiment was designed to determine differential effects if any, on high- and low-creative Ss' need for novelty after being satiated with experiences requiring convergent and divergent thinking. High- or low-creative Ss were identified by the Remote Associates Test (Mednick, 1962). The S was assigned to either a divergent satiation thinking condition or to a convergent satiation thinking condition and performed the requisite tasks in each. Following satiation, the S performed a task which enabled E to identify differences in Ss responsiveness to novelty. Half of the Ss were given novel associations to nonnouns, while the other half were given novel associations to nouns. This procedure was another departure from that employed by Houston and Mednick.

The general hypothesis of the present study was that high-creative Ss who were satiated with convergent thinking tasks would choose significantly more words of the class (nouns or nonnouns) of words which lead to novel associations than would high-creative Ss who were satiated with divergent thinking tasks. Among the low-creative Ss, those Ss who were satiated with convergent thinking experiences were hypothesized to choose more words of the class of words which led to novel associations than the low-creative Ss who were satiated with divergent thinking experiences. However, since low-creative Ss are assumed to have a generally weaker need for novelty than high-creative Ss, the differences between low-creative Ss in the two satiation
conditions were hypothesized to be not as great as the differences between high-creatives in the two satiation conditions. It was also hypothesized that there would be a significant difference on total need for novelty between those Ss having nouns associated with novel responses and those Ss having nonnouns associated with novel responses. This hypothesis was grounded on the evidence of Cofer and Shvitz (1952), Lambert (1955), and Mednick, Mednick, and Jung (1964) who collectively demonstrated that nouns elicited more responses than adjectives. The latter study is particularly important in that it illustrated the strong preference for nouns among high scorers on the RAT.

Support for these hypotheses would have implications for instructional strategies. Thus, an instructor who wishes to encourage imaginative and novel thinking among high-creatives, might temporarily satiate them with uncreative activities, prior to the time when novelty was sought. The same procedure might also be effective for low-creative persons although, perhaps, less so. Confirmation of the hypothesis might indicate to those educators who totally immerse their students with creativity inducing teaching strategies, that a re-evaluation of their procedures might well benefit the high-creative. Thus, the need for novelty itself is enhanced by occasional departures from novelty; continual experiences with divergent thinking situations tend to make them ordinary, everyday matters to which one becomes accustomed and by which he becomes satiated.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter, studies in which the relationship between creativity and the need for novelty were investigated will be reviewed first. Then studies in which notions of novelty and curiosity have been related will be reviewed. These topics necessarily involve the issues of need and arousal as motivational constructs and, thus will be taken up next. Finally, investigations which attempted to apply some of the theoretical assumptions concerning the need for novelty to the context of creativity development will be considered.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CREATIVITY AND THE NEED FOR NOVELTY

In any research related to testing theoretical assumptions about creativity, the first obstacle encountered is that of delineating the nature of creativity, and of characterizing creative people. The simplest means of defining creativity, is to list the characteristics of creative individuals as found in the studies of creative people. According to Gallagher (1966, p. 46), these characteristics are:

1. Self-assertive, dominant, leading, initiative, self-sufficient.

2. Less repressed, less inhibited, less formal, less conventional, Bohemianly unconcerned, radical, low authoritarian values.
3. Persistence of motive, liking and capacity for work, self-discipline, perseverance, high energy output.

4. Independence and autonomy.

5. Constructively critical, less contented, dissatisfied.


7. Openness to feelings and emotions, "feeling more important than thinking," more subjective, vitality, enthusiasm.

8. Aesthetic intelligence, aesthetic judgement, higher aesthetic values.

9. Low economic values, poor businessman.

10. Freer expression of what has been called feminine interests and lack of masculine aggressiveness (in men).

11. Little interest in interpersonal relationships, do not want much social interaction, introverted, low on social values, reserved.

12. Emotionally unstable, but capable of using their emotional instability effectively; not well adjusted by psychological definition, but adjusted in the broader sense of being socially happy and useful in work.

Becoming sensitive to these twelve characteristics of the high-creative leads one to the conclusion that the concept of novelty is closely related. If novelty is viewed as a combination of newness, unusualness, or an original way of dealing with the environment, the affinity between the high-creative and novelty becomes apparent. Stein and Heinze (1960) contend that among the elements that comprise the creative process is novelty which results from the relationship between a unique individual and his environment. They further point out that among the nine factors that Guilford contends affect creativity, one factor is that of ideational novelty. Novelty, then,
must be thought of as a product of creative imagination and as such, it is somewhat removed from the limitations that might be placed on it by logic and reason. It is only after a novel idea is regarded as promising and unique, that reason or logic is applied.

Barron (1963) interprets the creative's need for novelty as a strong attraction to "phenomenal fields" which cannot be reduced to an ordered set of principles. High-creatives, he argues, attempt to create new perceptual schemata that will render these "phenomenal fields more intelligible." Thus, the creative individual is willing to abandon systems and structures from the past, and will accept the tenet that reality offers countless possibilities for restructuring and transforming one's life and other lives as well. Golovin (1963) states that the essential characteristic of a creative contribution is that it transcends prior experience, and to some extent, contains a revolt against it. Creative people also prefer to experience and express their individuality and thus prefer stimuli which allow for individualized reactions.

In specific research concerning creativity, the need for novelty is repeatedly found to be a significant factor. Barron (1958) claims that the need for novelty was strongly manifested in highly creative artists and doctoral students. These Ss preferred drawings on the Barron-Welsh Art Scale that were complex and asymmetrical. They also exhibited a preference for the complex in the Rorschach Ink-bLOTS. Their novelty was further revealed in their independence of judgment and non-conformity on the Asch lines experiment. Golarn (1962) using
the Revised Art Scale (RA), which was derived from the Barron-Welsh Art Scale, sought to determine if creative people try to experience their fullest perceptual, cognitive, and expressive potentials in "their interaction with their environment." After administering the RA scale to various occupational groups and classifications of people, Golann was able to point out that among high-scoring groups on the RA scale, were artists and writers, and among the extreme low-scoring groups were military personnel and neuro-psychiatric inpatients. These results, according to Golann, implied that artists and writers strive to experience encounters with their environment and their selves, in novel ways. Both military personnel and neuropsychiatric inpatients defend against the environment, or deal with it in such a way as to maximize predictability, comprehensibility, and stability. Golann also found that the 30 RA items liked most by the artists were significantly more ambiguous than the 30 RA items disliked most by the artists. This seems to indicate that ambiguity, which can be defined as one source of novelty, was valued highly by the high-creatives.

There appears to be sufficient evidence that creativity and the need for novelty are inextricably bound together. It can even be argued that a strong need for novelty is a necessary prerequisite for creativity to manifest itself. The question that must now be attended to is "how best can the need for novelty be augmented and aroused so as to induce optimal levels of creative behavior?"
NOVELTY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO CURiosity

NoWelt is inescapably linked with curiosity. Both represent an urge to remove oneself from monotony and boredom and to seek some new form of stimulation. Curiosity, like novelty, is an essential ingredient for creativity. As early as 1908 McDougall claimed that curiosity "is at the base of many of man's most splendid achievements, for rooted in it are his speculative and scientific tendencies." Both novelty and curiosity are needed to induce exploratory behavior, so necessary for exploration of the unknown, the untested, and the unfamiliar. The curiosity drive is increased in strength by unfamiliar and novel surroundings (Taylor, 1949). In other studies to be reviewed below the mutual dependence of novelty and curiosity are accentuated, and are at times conceptually indistinguishable.

THE NEED FOR NOVELTY AND CURiosity IN BEHAVIOR

Of great importance are the motivational aspects of novelty and curiosity upon creative functioning. Maddi (1965) describes novelty as a "purposeful surging that leads in the direction of creative acts." He notes two motives that lead to the consistent production of novel and valuable acts, the need for quality and the need for novelty. For the person with a need for novelty, the unusual, the rare, the unlikely, and the unexpected, will all be highly rewarding. In two research studies correlating novelty with other variables, Maddi found that the correlations between novelty of productions and the tendency to prefer novel endings to the stems of well-known similes were both significant;
Maddi concluded that people who produce creative acts have the need for novelty as part of their motivational complex.

White (1961), too, points to novelty as a basic need; as a constant desire to raise one's level of stimulation and excitement. Such notions explain in part, why people engage in such dangerous sports as auto racing and mountain climbing. A child at play seems to need frequent novelty in his stimulus field in order to maintain his interest. Even typically conservative people usually seek a stimulus field characterized by at least some minor differences in sameness, along with certain features that are decidedly novel. In commenting on the essential human need for novelty Platt (1961, p. 410) says:

> The mind seeks to escape from the certainties of the diffuse light that remains during stimulus deprivation. It is bored by the certainties of any humdrum job or routine entertainment . . . What it seeks is the variable light signals, and what it processes and responds to on all levels, is information - the changing, the novel, the surprising, and the uncertain.

Platt cautions that the "mind" also demands pattern, for there is a need for regularity in input information. However, these patterns must develop into new patterns, or else they too will become boring.

**THEORETICAL BASIS FOR AROUSING THE NEED FOR NOVELTY**

How can the need for novelty be aroused in order that it may find a productive outlet in creative activity? A particularly invaluable study concerning this question was done by Maddi et al. (1962). Their work was primarily concerned with measuring desire for novelty and the
tendency to think in novel ways, as reflected by plots and character
treatment in original stories produced by their Ss. Maddi et al.
compared two theories for arousing novelty. On the one hand, Hull’s
deprivation model held that monotony increases both desire for novelty
and novelty of production. On the other hand, McClelland’s (Atkinson,
1956) theory suggested that it is novel stimulation that increases
desire for novelty and novelty of productions. There was some evidence
to support both views. Some creative writers for example, consider
constant unstimulating conditions as most likely to whet their appetite
for novelty, while others suggest that creative achievement was
nurtured by pursuit of a wide range of changing conditions.

Their study involved dividing the Ss into either a monotony or a
novelty activity group. The Ss in the monotony group were told to
listen to a recording which was a detailed description of streets,
buildings, and stores of a typical small town. They were further
instructed that later in the experiment, they would be asked questions
about the kinds of factors that influence the quality of radio programs.
The Ss in the novelty group were given the same instructions about the
questions to be asked, but they were first allowed to listen to a 12
minute recording that was intended to be novel. The recording was an
interpretation of contemporary American culture made on the basis of
presumed archaeological finds in the year 3500. After their respective
activities, both groups composed stories, for television directors,
suggested by various pictures shown to them.
The novelty of their productions was evaluated on such factors as unusual roles designated to the characters, the characters that were introduced, the novelty of the plots, and the novelty or unexpectedness of their endings. A scoring system devised by McClelland (Atkinson, 1958) was used to measure desire for novelty. Scores of 1, 0, and -1 were assigned to such categories as novelty, imagery, doubtful imagery, and unrelated imagery.

The results indicated that the monotony satiated group desired significantly more novelty than the novelty satiated group. However, the "novelty of production" scores were significantly higher for the novelty satiated group than for the monotony group. Thus, monotonous stimulation increased the desire for novelty in imaginative productions, but it decreased the degree to which the productions were novel, thereby suggesting that perhaps the period of incessant monotony produced a temporary decrease in the ability to initiate the more active forms of thought.

Maddi (1961) also argues against excessive novelty. He claims that extremely novel situations, such as those in which a large proportion of the elements differ from the ones of immediately preceding situations, or those including elements which are unique in the life history of the organism, appear to produce avoidance behavior. Situations lacking in novelty, such as those in which a negligible proportion of the elements differ from those of immediately preceding situations, also tend to produce avoidance behavior. A similar point of view has been suggested by McClelland (1953) who indicates the
moderate degrees of discrepancy or change are affectively pleasant and productive of motivational states while extreme degrees of change are affectively unpleasant and do not encourage increases in motivation.

According to McClelland (1953, p. 43):

Positive affect is the result of smaller discrepancies of a sensory or perceptual event from the adaptation level of the organism; negative affect is the result of larger discrepancies.

McClelland cites a classic study by Angler (1903) to illustrate this theory. Angler asked his Ss to divide a 160 mm line unequally at the most pleasing place on either side of the midpoint. The average frequencies of choices per 5 mm unit between 5-25 mm, 25-45 mm, 45-65 mm, and 65-75 mm on both sides of the midpoint were plotted. The data from this study clearly illustrates that Ss did not like to divide the line near its extremities on either side. It is assumed that this same type of reaction occurs when Ss are exposed to markedly novel stimuli; an aversive contrast to the normal perceptual field.

In research with animals, Welker (1961) proposed that an excessive degree of novelty will be avoided and only moderate amounts of novel stimuli are approached. He also discovered that prolonged exposure to highly novel stimuli resulted in aversive and discomfort reactions in animals. Particularly noteworthy was the fact that an organism from a restricted environment, where novelty was minimal, was more apt to avoid a stronger level of novelty than was an organism with previous novel experience.

Berlyne's is probably the most thorough investigation of the means by which novelty and curiosity may be aroused. In work with rats,
Berlyne (1950) postulated that "as a curiosity-arousing stimulus continues to affect an organism's receptors, curiosity will diminish." This postulate was defended in accordance with Hull's (1943) statement of reactive inhibition ($I_r$) that as a response continues or is repeated, there occurs a motivation towards its cessation. The curiosity response, too, will succumb to increasing reactive inhibition until it falls below a reaction threshold ($S^R$). These assumptions were confirmed in Berlyne's experimentation with rats. He found significantly less exploratory behavior among rats who were satiated with novel stimuli than among rats who were satiated with monotonous stimuli. They spent more time exploring a novel stimulus, than they did exploring stimuli which they had been previously allowed to explore. Furthermore, the rats spent less time exploring stimuli the second time they were encountered, thereby implying that novelty wears off quite rapidly. In describing the characteristics of novel stimuli, Berlyne (1960) notes that they have not yet had a chance to lose the qualities that all stimuli originally possess. All stimuli are novel at some time, but lose their novelty with repeated occurrence.

It follows from the work of Berlyne, Maddi, and McClelland, reviewed above, that to motivate a person to seek out novelty, the stimuli in his environment must be changed suddenly from monotonous to novel. An individual who is continually exposed to novel stimuli, will lose his desire for novelty. One who is satiated with monotonous stimuli, lacking in novelty, surprisingness, uncertainty, and complexity, will react positively to novel experiences to escape from
boredom. Such a person can be relieved of high arousal state by specific exploratory responses.

**DIVERGENT AND CONVERGENT THINKING AS ANALOGOUS CONSTRUCTS TO NOVELTY AND MONOTONY**

The theories on the arousal of the need for novelty must now be integrated into the context of creativity. Keeping in mind that the ultimate objective of this thesis is to investigate methods to arouse the need for novelty so as to promote creative behavior, the question that must be answered is, "What conditions or manipulations can be imposed to maximize the need for novelty?"

In studies of creativity, two types of thinking are inevitably discussed and examined: convergent thinking and divergent thinking (Guilford, 1959). Convergent thinking tends toward retention of the known, learning the predetermined, and conserving what is; it is a process of intellectual acquisitiveness and conformity. Divergent thinking tends toward revising the known, exploring the undetermined, and constructing what might be; it is a type of intellectual inventiveness and innovation. Convergent thinking may be compared to boring, monotonous stimulation, since it is normative, common, highly familiar, and usual. It is a type of thinking which lacks short-term novelty. Conversely, divergent thinking is highly similar to novel stimulation in that it is in some degree new, unusual, strange, odd, or different.

By extrapolation, the principles of arousal, developed in conjunction with studies of novelty and curiosity, appear to apply
equally to both convergent and divergent thinking. Thus, if an individual is satiated with convergent thinking experiences his curiosity drive should be aroused and he should seek out novelty until this drive is reduced. If an individual is satiated with divergent thinking activities, it would seem likely that the divergent tasks would gradually lose their novelty and due to the reactive inhibition principle, the individual would avoid novelty.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

DESIGN

The overall design implied a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ factorial analysis of variance with two of the factors representing treatments and one representing levels. The high- and low-creatives comprised the two levels of the creativity dimension. Each level of creativity was divided into two treatment conditions; Ss were either satiated with convergent thinking tasks or divergent thinking tasks, thus constituting one of the treatment variables. These were orthogonally crossed with the third dimension, word class. The word class dimension was introduced to determine whether Ss would select more nouns when E responded with novel associations to either nouns or nonnouns which were visually presented to each S individually. Thus for half of the Ss, the selection of a noun served to elicit a novel response from E, while for all other Ss, nonnouns elicited the novel response. In certain of the analyses the effect of trials was also analyzed by blocking the responses to the 180 slides into nine trials of 20 items each. Since the filler items in each block were eliminated for this analysis, the total possible score for each block was 18.
SUBJECTS

The Ss were undergraduate students enrolled in the introductory educational psychology course at The Pennsylvania State University. Extra credit toward the course grade was earned by participation in the experiment. A total of 181 took the RAT. Of this group there were 80 Ss in the main experiment. All Ss were administered Form 1 of the Remote Associates Test (RAT) according to standardized procedures described in the manual for the test (Mednick and Mednick, 1967). None of the Ss had taken the RAT before. The native language of all Ss was English. Total scores were based on the number of correct answers to the 30 test items, thereby allowing for a maximum score of 30 and a minimum score of 0. The Ss with the 40 highest and 40 lowest scores on the RAT were then selected to participate in the experiment in order to ensure extreme groups for the levels variable. In cases where there were several Ss obtaining the same cut-off score in either the high or low groups, the Ss were selected at random.

The mean RAT score for all Ss was 14.59 and the standard deviation was 4.83. The whole range of scores was from 6 to 28, with the scores for the 40 high-creatives ranging from 19-28, and the scores for the 40 low-creatives ranging from 6-12. The means and standard deviations for the high- and low-creative groups are summarized in Table 1. The reader will note that the variance for scores in the high group is nearly twice that of the variance of scores for the low group. This fact reflects the greater heterogeneity of the high RAT scorers probably
Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Remote Associates Test Scores for 40 Highest and 40 Lowest Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAT Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...because there are fewer of such people in the population from which this sample was drawn.

The high- and low-creative groups were each broken down into four treatment groups. The Ss were assigned to each condition by reference to a table of random digits. Thus, there were four groups of ten Ss each among the high-creatives and the same for the low-creatives. The means and standard deviations of RAT scores for all experimental groups are summarized in Table 2.

Although the homogeneity of the groups at each creativity level was apparent by inspection, a simple randomized analysis of variance was made to compare results of the high- and low-creatives in the four different treatment groups at each level. The resulting F-test proved to be nonsignificant with F values less than 1 (as shown in Table 3), thereby supporting the assumption that all groups at each level of creativity were similar after Ss were assigned at random.
Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of the Remote Associates Test Scores for All Experimental Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAT Group</th>
<th>Satiation Condition</th>
<th>Word Class</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Creative</td>
<td>Convergent</td>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonnouns</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divergent</td>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonnouns</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Creative</td>
<td>Convergent</td>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonnouns</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divergent</td>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonnouns</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Summary of Analysis of Variance:
RAT Scores between Ss in Different Treatment Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>High Creatives</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Low Creatives</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE SATIATION TASKS

In order to satiate each S with convergent or divergent thinking, two series of tasks were developed: one set was designed to elicit common, unoriginal, and monotonous responses; the other set demanded imagination, originality, ingenuity, and variety from the S. These tasks are described, as they were presented to the S, in Appendices A and B.

Divergent-Thinking Tasks

A series of five different tasks were used to satiate divergent thinking. In the first task S was required to construct an imaginative crossword puzzle. He was provided a blank, 5-space by 5-space puzzle matrix with sufficient writing area to record the clues to each word in the puzzle. Instructions concerning how best to produce the puzzle were printed at the top of the sheet.
The second task required the construction of unique designs with plastic tiles. The materials consisted of the contents of a Halsam Playtiles children's game, set number 21. The set contained a 9-inch x 12-inch pegboard on which the tile constructions could be assembled. The individual tiles measured 3/8-inch x 7/8-inch. There were 120 tiles used for the experiment; 30 red, 30 yellow, 30 white, and 30 blue. Each tile had two prongs on its underside which fit securely into the pegboard holes.

The third task was the suffixes test. The directions at the top of the sheet, called for the S to write as many words as possible ending with the suffix ABLE. A sample word was given, below which were empty spaces for Ss to list their words.

The fourth task was the consequences test. It required the S to list possible consequences of the following hypothetical situation: "What would the results be if people no longer needed or wanted sleep?" There was sufficient space below the directions for Ss to record their responses.

The fifth task was the utility test, in which Ss listed as many different uses of a brick and a pencil as possible. The paper was divided in half by the directions for listing the uses of a pencil, and thus there were two separate areas on the paper for Ss to record their answers.

Convergent-Thinking Tasks

In the convergent satiation thinking condition, four tasks, paralleling those used for divergent thinking, were employed. The
first task called for the solution to a simple crossword puzzle, mimeographed on an 8-1/2 x 11 inch sheet of paper. The puzzle was 8 blocks across and 7 blocks down. The clues for the "across" words were printed on the upper left-hand portion of the sheet and the clues for the "down" words were printed on the lower right-hand portion of the sheet. All spaces on the puzzle were numbered as were the clue words.

The second task was a plastic tile construction task using the same materials as those used in the satiation of divergent thinking condition. In this task, however, the S was asked to place all of the tiles of each color, into the same group at one of the designated corners of the pegboard in order to form four large rectangles of the following colors: red, yellow, white, and blue.

The third task was the sentence order test. The directions called for the S to arrange 10 sets of three sentences in a meaningful order. An example was given, beneath which were the test sentences. This test was derived from Reports from the Psychological Laboratory, the University of Southern California (1965).

The fourth task was the word-group naming test, also derived from reports from the Psychological Laboratory (1965). The directions instructed the S to give a class or category name to each of 10 sets of five words. The word sets were listed below the directions, with an answer blank beneath each set of words.

THE EXPERIMENTAL TASKS

In order to determine the relative strength of each S's need for novelty after the respective satiation conditions, 180 2" x 2" slides
were presented by means of a Kodak Carousel 800 slide projector. On each was a pair of words, centered and typed one above the other, in capital letters.

The words for the slides were taken from the Palermo and Jenkins (1964) and from the Gerow and Pollio (1965) word association norms. Both sets of norms contain words most frequently occurring in the English language, associations to each of these words, and frequency of these associations. On 160 of the slides there was a pair of words consisting of a noun and a nonnoun. Words from each category were paired by a random number procedure. Once paired, the noun or nonnoun was randomly assigned to the top position on the slide.

The remaining 20 slides, or every ninth slide in the series of 180, was printed with a pair of nouns. These filler items were disregarded in the final results. They were used to prevent the S from gaining insight into the experimental method. These words were selected in the same manner as the words used for the 160 slides described above.

To each of the 160 critical items S responded with either novel or common associations. The common associations were primary associates of the word (Palermo and Jenkins, 1964; Gerow and Pollio, 1965). Novel associations were defined as words with very low or no probability of association to the stimulus word. (In the latter case E supplied the word.) To each of the 20 filler items, E responded with common associates. These common associations were also taken from the Palermo and Jenkins and the Gerow and Pollio norms. The word pairs
that appeared on the slides, and the novel and common associations that were given verbally by the E to each word are presented in Appendix C.

PROCEDURE

The high-creative and low-creative Ss were each randomly assigned to one of four experimental groups. The divergent thinking tasks were assigned to half the Ss in each group and the convergent-thinking tasks were assigned to the other half of the group. These two treatments were crossed orthogonally with the kind of feedback provided by E, i.e. E orally presented either a novel or common associate to S's response depending on the nature of the S's response and on whether the class of nouns or nonnouns was being reinforced.

All Ss were seen individually in an experimentation room designed to keep outside interference and noise at a minimum. The room was approximately 8' x 10'. In the center of the room was a utility table on which the S performed the assigned tasks, and which also served as a base from which to project the slides. The E sat to the rear of the room in order to prevent distraction of S during the experiment.

When the S performed the divergent thinking tasks he was given the directions for each task before he began, and then was allotted a specific time period in which to complete the task. The E used a Brenet Number 5 stopwatch for this purpose. A time limit was placed on these tasks because of their open-ended nature; otherwise an indefinite period of time might have been used by Ss to complete them. These limits were derived for each of the tasks from the performance of Ss in an earlier pilot study. The E left the experimentation room once
the S was prepared to begin the task and all questions and problems had been resolved. This procedure was intended to minimize distraction and experimenter influence, and to maximize, thereby, the potency of the satiation condition while S performed the task. The E then returned to the room when time had expired.

The time limits for the tasks were as follows: (1) construction of an original crossword puzzle - 8 minutes; (2) construction of an imaginative design using Playtiles - 5 minutes; (3) suffixes test - 5 minutes; (4) unusual consequences test - 5 minutes; (5) utility test or test of unusual uses - 7 minutes.

The procedure employed in administering the convergent thinking tasks was similar except for the fact that no time limit was imposed on the Ss. The results of an earlier pilot study revealed that all Ss completed these tasks in about the same amount of time, apparently due to the hit or miss nature of the tasks and the restricted range of possible answers. As in the performance of the divergent thinking tasks, the E left the room when the S was prepared to begin each task and returned when the task was completed. The E determined when each task was completed by observing the S through a small glass window on the door of the experimentation room. The Ss were given the following four tasks: (1) solving a crossword puzzle; (2) constructing a specified design with Playtiles; (3) answering the sentence order test; and (4) answering the word-group naming test.

Following performance of either set of tasks, the E read the following instructions:
I am going to show you some slides, one at a time, on the wall facing you. On each slide there are two words. I want you to look at both words and say the one you like best out loud. In response to the word that you select, I will say a word or give you an association. For example, if the words "farm" and "pencil" appear on a slide and you choose "pencil," I might respond with "paper." If instead you chose "farm," I might say "barn." So for each slide you will choose one of the two words and say it out loud. Then I will give you a response word. Are there any questions?

The E then told each S to move his chair up closer to the wall of the room in order to better see the projected slides. This was also done so that the S would not be distracted or influenced by cues from E during the slide series. It was believed that this procedure eliminated experimenter influence over the choice of words by the S. The series of 180 slides was then presented. The number of nouns and nonnouns selected by S was recorded by underscoring either "noun" or "nonnoun" for each pair of words to indicate the S's choice of words.

As indicated above, E responded with a novel association when nouns were chosen by Ss in half of the groups and with a novel association when nonnouns were chosen by Ss, the other half of the groups. As an example, assume that nouns were to be reinforced by novel associations, and that if the S had chosen the noun "baby" the E would have responded with "automobile." On the other hand, if S had chosen the nonnoun "green," the E would have responded with "grass." The procedure was reversed, when nonnouns were to be reinforced with novel associations. Thus, for the same pair described above, if S had chosen "baby," the E would now respond with the common associate "cry." Conversely, if the S had chosen "green," the E would respond with the novel associate "lake."
There were 20 filler items comprised of noun pairs included in the set of 180 slides. Regardless of which word the S chose on these pairs the E always responded with a common associate of that word.

After the experimental task was completed the E interviewed the S to determine the S's perception of the purpose of the experiment and the intent of the E (see Appendix D).
A repeated measures analysis of variance of the number of nouns selected by S over trials was made. A summary of this analysis is presented in Table 4. There it may be seen that the main effects of Trials was significant ($p < .01$) as were the Creativity x Trials interaction ($p < .05$) and the Satiation x Word Class x Trials interaction ($p < .01$). It should be noted, however, that the significant main effect due to Trials does not imply, in this case, that Ss acquired the principle that governed E's reinforcement rule i.e., which class of words led to the evocation of novel associations. Thus, while there were differences among trials there was no significant difference between the mean number of nouns selected for the first and ninth-trials indicating that the overall trend was not significantly different from zero. The post-experiment interviews lend credence to these results. None of the Ss suggested that they were conscious of the contingent relationship of nouns or nonnouns to novel or common associations.

Although the Creativity x Trials interaction was significant, there was no significant difference between first and ninth-trial
Table 4
Summary of Analysis of Variance of Nouns Selected over Trials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Ss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.05</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satiation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity x Satiation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98.27</td>
<td>4.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity x Word Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>5.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satiation x Word Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>906.76</td>
<td>41.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity x Satiation x Word Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>149.42</td>
<td>6.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error_b</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Within Ss  |    |     |     |
| Trials     | 8  | 14.36 | 3.84** |
| Creativity x Trials | 8  | 8.29  | 2.22* |
| Satiation x Trials | 8  | 4.43  | 1.18  |
| Word Class x Trials | 8  | 2.19  | 0.59  |
| Creativity x Satiation x Trials | 8  | 7.44  | 1.99  |
| Creativity x Word Class x Trials | 8  | 3.01  | 0.80  |
| Satiation x Word Class x Trials | 8  | 19.09 | 5.11** |
| Creativity x Satiation x Word Class x Trials | 8  | 9.00  | 2.41* |
| Error_w    | 576| 3.74  |     |

* p < .05
** p < .01
means for both high- and low-creative Ss (see Figure 1). However, the significant Creativity x Trials x Word Class interaction when plotted (see Figure 2) shows discernible differences between treatment groups. There was a general increase in the number of nouns selected over trials for both the Convergent Satiation-Nouns Novel group and the Divergent Satiation-Nonnouns Novel group. On the other hand, both the Divergent Satiation-Nouns Novel group and the Convergent Satiation-Nonnouns Novel group tended to select fewer nouns over trials.

To fully comprehend the implications of the results in Figure 2 and all other portions of the data analysis, it is important that the reader recognize the artifacts of the method of reporting the score per trial and total score for each S. The score for each S was always based on the number of nouns selected, regardless of whether nouns or nonnouns elicited novel responses. Thus, for example, if S was reinforced with novel associations to nonnouns, and if his responses suggested a preference for novel associations, his total score would be lower than that of an S reinforced with novel associations to nouns under the same circumstances. In effect, Ss who were reinforced with novel associations to nouns, and who obtained relatively high total scores were exhibiting a similar need for novelty as Ss who were reinforced with novel associations to nonnouns and who thus obtained low total scores.

Returning to the interpretation of the data displayed in Figure 2, it becomes apparent that the Convergent Satiation-Nouns Novel and Convergent Satiation-Nonnouns Novel groups acquired a preference for
Figure 1 - Mean number of nouns selected per trial for each level of creativity.
novel associations. In the former group, preference for novel associations was manifested by the selection of nouns, while for the latter group it was manifested by the tendency of not choosing nouns (i.e., the Ss chose nonnouns). The opposite effect is inferred from the data generated in the two Divergent Satiation groups; that is, the Ss in these groups tended to select the type of word which led to non-novel associations from E.

As can be seen in Table 4, the interaction between Creativity x Satiation yielded $F (1, 72) = 5.07, p < .05$; the interaction due to Creativity x Word Class yielded $F (1, 72) = 5.51, p < .05$; that due to Satiation x Word Class yielded $F (1, 72) = 38.87, p < .01$; and the triple interaction of Creativity x Word Class x Satiation yielded $F (1, 72) = 7.52, p < .01$. The mean number of nouns selected by Ss in the groups represented in the Creativity x Satiation interaction are presented in Figure 3. In the partitioning of the sums of squares for analyzing main effects in the analysis of variance, the effects of these two factors (creativity and satiation) would tend to counteract each other thus leading to no significant differences. However, it was expected that if the hypothesized effects were obtained they should be reflected in the interaction, as they were low-creatives, satiated with convergent thinking tasks, selected more nouns ($\bar{X} = 96.7$) than did high-creatives ($\bar{X} = 85.3$). Under divergent satiation conditions, however, high-creatives chose more nouns ($\bar{X} = 91.4$) than did low-creatives ($\bar{X} = 88.5$). Overall, there was a preference for nouns by all Ss, with the mean number of nouns selected being 90.43 and the mean number of
Figure 3 - Mean number of nouns selected by high- and low-creative Ss satiated on convergent- and divergent-thinking tasks.
nouns selected being 69.6. This finding confirms the prediction that Ss prefer to select nouns over nonnouns and justifies the incorporation of this factor into the design of the study.

The significant Creativity x Word Class interaction indicates that high-creatives responded more to novel associations than low-creatives. The data in Figure 4 shows that when nouns were novel, high-creatives selected more nouns (\( \bar{X} = 93.75 \)) than did low-creatives (\( \bar{X} = 90.6 \)). When nonnouns were novel, low-creatives chose more nouns (\( \bar{X} = 94.6 \)) than high-creatives (\( \bar{X} = 82.9 \)). These data imply that the low-creatives were less influenced by novelty than were the high-creatives, who chose more nonnouns when E responded to nonnouns with novel associations.

The data for groups represented in the Satiation x Word Class interaction are summarized in Figure 5. These data support the major hypothesis that Ss satiated with convergent thinking tasks would respond more to novel associations than would those Ss satiated with divergent thinking tasks. Thus, the Convergent Satiation-Nouns Novel group chose more nouns (\( \bar{X} = 102.5 \)) than did the Divergent Satiation-Nouns Novel group (\( \bar{X} = 81.8 \)). Likewise, the Convergent Satiation-Nonnouns Novel group chose fewer nouns (\( \bar{X} = 79.4 \)) and therefore, more nonnouns, than the Divergent-Satiation Nouns Novel group (\( \bar{X} = 81.8 \)).

If the choice of words reinforced with novel associations is accepted as an index of the need for novelty, then it can be inferred from these data that the strength of this need was differentially influenced by the divergent and convergent thinking tasks. It is also noteworthy
Figure 4 - Mean number of nouns selected by high- and low-creative Ss where nouns or nonnouns elicited novel responses from E.
Figure 5 - Mean number of nouns selected by Ss in convergent and divergent satiation conditions and where nouns or nonnouns elicited novel responses from E.
that the difference between the "nouns" and "nonnouns" groups, when reinforced with novel associations, was greater in the convergent satiation treatment (difference = 23.1) than in the divergent satiation treatment (difference = 16.3).

In order to facilitate interpretation of the Creativity x Satiation x Word Class interaction (see the between Ss analyses summarized in Table 4) an analysis of variance for simple effects was made. The results of this analysis are summarized in Table 5. For the high-creatives, the main effects due to the Satiation treatments yielded $F(1,36) = 34.41$, $p < .01$, and that due to Word Class yielded $F(1,36) = 5.72$, $p < .05$. The Satiation x Word Class interaction yielded $F = 6.96$, $p < .05$. In the analysis of the data for the low-creatives, only the interaction was significant, yielding $F(1,36) = 6.22$, $p < .05$. The data for all groups represented in the triple interaction are presented in Table 6. The Ss in the Convergent Satiation-Nouns Novel groups and the Divergent Satiation-Nonnouns Novel groups chose nouns equally often, but for different reasons. The former groups presumably prefer nouns because they are novel, and the latter groups prefer nouns because they are common. When the Convergent Satiation-Nonnouns Novel groups are compared with the Divergent Satiation-Nouns Novel groups, it is apparent that the low-creative Ss chose not to select novel words when they were satiated with convergent thinking tasks and when nonnouns were novel. Where divergent satiation thinking tasks were employed and nouns were novel, both high- and low-creative Ss appeared to be relatively indifferent to the novel nouns, presumably because
Table 5
Summary of Separate Analyses of Variance for Each Level of Creativity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Creatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satiation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7017.70</td>
<td>34.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1666.40</td>
<td>5.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satiation x Word Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1420.00</td>
<td>6.96*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>203.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Creatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satiation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>664.23</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>164.03</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satiation x Word Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1221.03</td>
<td>6.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>196.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
**p < .01
Table 6
Means and Standard Deviations of Nouns Selected by Each Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Condition</th>
<th>Level of Creativity</th>
<th>Overall Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>14.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergent</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>11.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonnouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergent</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>9.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergent</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>19.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82.95</td>
<td>94.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they had been satiated with imaginative, flexible, and originality inducing tasks.

The analysis was further extended to compare the differences between obtained subgroup means at each level of creativity (see Table 6) utilizing the Fisher-Behrens t-test,* the results of which were as follows: Among the high-creative groups, specifically Ss satiated with convergent thinking tasks, those who were in the nouns-novel group selected more nouns (X = 104.9) than those in the nonnouns novel group (X = 65.7), t (18) = 6.97, p < .001. In a comparison of groups satiated with divergent thinking tasks, the nonnouns-novel group selected more nouns (X = 100.2) than did those in the nouns-novel group (X = 82.6), t (18) = 2.49, p < .05. In the comparison between the groups which received convergent satiation with nouns-novel and that which received divergent satiation with nouns-novel, the former chose more nouns than did the latter group, t (18) = 3.77, p < .01. Where Ss were given novel reinforcement for nonnouns, those who were in the divergent satiation group showed a greater preference for nouns than those in the convergent satiation group, t (18) = 5.05, p < .001.

Among the low-creative groups, the differences were less dramatic; while the Ss in the nouns-novel group, when satiated with convergent thinking tasks, selected more nouns (X = 100.2) than those who were in

*Selection of the Fisher-Behrens t-test over the conventional t-test was predicated on the existence of marked heterogeneity of variance among experimental groups. The Fisher-Behrens t, as opposed to the conventional t, is robust to violations of the assumption of homogeneity of variance (Kirk, 1968).
the nonnouns-novel group ($\bar{X} = 93.2$). The difference between them was not significant, $t (18) = 1.27, p >.05$. Comparing Ss satiated with divergent thinking tasks, the nonnouns-novel group selected more nouns ($\bar{X} = 96.1$) than the nouns-novel group ($\bar{X} = 81.0$), $t (18) = 2.17, p <.05$.

In the comparison between Ss who received convergent satiation with nouns-novel and those who received divergent satiation with nouns-novel, the former group chose more nouns than did the latter group, yielding $t (18) = 3.44, p <.01$. Where Ss were given novel reinforcement for nonnouns, there was no significant difference between those in the convergent and divergent satiation conditions. An analysis of these data yielded $t (18) = 0.42, p >.05$.

The results of the above comparisons clearly imply the important influence of word class reinforcement on the selection of words by high-creative Ss. The optimal condition for arousing a preference for novel associations was convergent satiation in combination with nouns eliciting the novel responses. The combination which produced the least influence on receptivity to novel associations as reinforcing stimuli was satiation on divergent thinking tasks with nonnouns eliciting the novel responses. For the low-creative Ss the results are somewhat more ambiguous. It is clear that where nouns elicit novel responses, Ss satiated with convergent thinking tasks manifest a greater need for novelty than those who are satiated with divergent tasks. But no greater need for novelty was shown between the two satiation conditions when nonnouns elicited novel responses.

Concerning the effect of type of word class reinforcement, it appears
to be an unimportant factor in the need for novelty for Ss in the convergent satiation condition. However, for Ss in the divergent satiation condition, the inferred need for novelty was greatly increased when novel associations were given to nouns.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The results of this investigation provide substantial support for the notion that the inferred need for novelty is related to the antecedent conditions which precede the measurement of this need. When Ss are satiated with convergent thinking tasks they seek divergent conditions and conversely, when satiated with divergent thinking tasks they seek convergent conditions. This process appears to be very much like the adaptation level (AL) theory proposed by Helson (1966). It can be inferred from Helson that if a learning activity is repeated, pupils adapt to it and become indifferent to it. Eventually, with undue repetition, people will dislike this activity so much, they will attempt to avoid it. Thus, Helson (1966, p. 178) indicates:

"In explaining why people behave as they do or what makes them tick - it may be asked: "How do you explain persistence toward future goals and accomplishments? What keeps individuals on a constant course toward certain ends, such as becoming a doctor, a lawyer, or a psychologist?" Predominant ideas serve as inciters to courses of action over extended periods of time. There are emotional and intellectual frames of reference as well as perceptual frames of reference, and they are found in much the same way. Just as background anchor, or predominant stimuli exercise influence on sensory ALs, so do predominant ideas and emotions exercise influence on ideational and emotional frames of reference . . . . Individuals do better with difficult items of intelligence tests in a difficult context than in an easy one because of
the upward adaptation to level of difficulty induced by the preponderance of harder items, thus, proving the existence of cognitive ALs.

It is, then, the relative nature of the two states of the S, rather than absolute characteristics that are important in the motivations of human Ss. This interpretation differs somewhat from the conclusion reached by Houston and Mednick (1963). On the basis of the present results, it does not appear that high-creatives necessarily possess a greater need for novelty than low-creatives as suggested by Houston and Mednick (1963). In fact, the differences between the need for novelty of high- and low-creatives in the same treatment groups were exceedingly small. The most important factor in arousing the need for novelty was found to be the satiation treatment.

This is not to imply that the level of creativity was an unimportant consideration in this study. Personality variables are certain to interact with the peculiar circumstances of each experimental situation as they did in the present study. This reasoning is analogous to that employed by Taylor (1956) in her description of the role of anxiety, as measured by the Manifest Anxiety Scale (MAS), in the behavior of the individual. Taylor, in describing the MAS, states two alternative hypotheses concerning the conditions under which emotionality is evoked by Ss. The first hypothesis is that MAS test scores reflect differences in a chronic emotional state so that individuals scoring high on the MAS tend to bring a higher level of emotionality or anxiety "in the door" with them than do Ss scoring at lower levels. The alternative hypothesis suggested by Taylor is that
MAS scores reflect different potentialities for anxiety arousal, with high-scoring Ss tending to react more emotionally to novel or threatening situations than do low scoring Ss.

These two alternative hypotheses are somewhat analogous to the present interpretation of the RAT as a measure of creativity. On the one hand, it may be hypothesized that the RAT reflects trait differences; that is, Ss scoring high on the RAT are more creative than Ss scoring low. Conversely, it can be hypothesized that high RAT scores indicate predispositions to respond creatively to certain stimulation while low scores indicate lesser predispositions to respond to novel stimulation. There are, then, two interpretations of the RAT: it can be thought of as a measure of the personality trait of creativity, or it can be thought of as the tendency to respond, or not to respond, creatively in certain situations. The present study appeared to tap the latter tendency, in that the effects of the satiation conditions (situational factors) were more important determiners of creative preference than the classification of Ss as high- or low-creatives based on their RAT scores (trait factors).

The results of this study also require that some explanation be given for the fact that the learning curves (see Figures 1 and 2) do not illustrate any significant increase in the number of nouns or nonnouns selected over trials, although Ss did, in fact, tend to select significantly more or fewer words associated with novel responses, as indicated by their total scores. The explanation for this case, where Ss actually did exhibit a preference for certain word
types in order to augment or decrease their novel stimulation, can be attributed as an example of learning without awareness as described more than three decades ago by Thorndike who contended that rewards and punishments can influence the formation of stimulus-response connections, even while the S remains unaware of what it is he is learning. Postman (1966) cites a study by Thorndike and Rock (1935) which focused on learning free associations without awareness. A series of 320 words were read to Ss, and they were instructed to respond with the first association that came to mind. The Ss were previously told that associations had been arbitrarily designated as either "right" or "wrong." In actuality, the announcement of "right" and "wrong" was made according to a rule: sequential or rote associations were called "right," and denotative associations were called "wrong." In cases where S's association was not easily classified, no announcement was made by E. The results of this study revealed that there was a gradual increase in the number of "right" associations, i.e., Ss learned to give the class of associations for which they were rewarded. From the fact that the improvement was gradual, Thorndike and Rock concluded that the Ss had not been aware of what they were learning. The concept of learning without awareness seems to be an appropriate explanation for the present study. Had there been insight into the principle of novel associations, a sudden increase in correct responses would have occurred. Instead, gradual improvement was the rule.
Before proceeding any further in the discussion, it is necessary to distinguish between the preference for novelty and the actual performance resulting from novel behavior, when reference is made to the need for novelty. Throughout this report, the need for novelty has been equated with the number of words selected (either nouns or nonnouns, depending on which class elicited novel associations) in the experimental task. This, in itself, manifests the degree to which Ss preferred novel responses. The question which remains to be answered is this, "Is novel performance, or the tangible products of behavior, stimulated by the manipulation of various antecedent conditions?" For example, if an instructor desired the production of creative stories by his learners, he would satiate them, according to the theories discussed previously, with convergent thinking tasks. If it is assumed that the preference for novelty is augmented, can it still be argued that the stories produced will reflect a high level of novelty? The present investigator believes that novelty of performance will also be increased. This belief is grounded on Helson's adaptation level theory and Hull's notion of reactive inhibition, both of which were discussed earlier.

Turning to the practical applications of the study it is concluded that the basic implications from this study for use in instructional settings are twofold:

(1) A need for novelty can be aroused in any learner, whether a high or low creative person, by adequate control of the antecedent conditions. Conversely, the need for novelty may be hampered or the need for normative behavior encouraged by overexercise on tasks requiring creative effort.
Moderate emphasis on creativity ought to be adopted by those actively involved in the instructional process, since any attempt to satiate learners with creative stimulation will only serve to decrease the need for novelty.

These implications will be scrutinized and evaluated below in the light of the present research and other relevant considerations in the study of creativity.

It is apparent from the results that during the satiation treatment preferences for novelty are either increased or decreased depending on the type of satiation. Under convergent satiation, Ss become excessively bored with the monotonous stimulation which they are provided. Such tasks as inserting plastic tiles into pegboards to form rectangles and solving simple crossword puzzles where the answer is common knowledge, do not tend to keep motivation or attention at a high level. An escape from the banality of the tasks used for satiation of convergent thinking is the opportunity to select words which will elicit unusual or novel responses from E. The E's responses, as stimuli which follow S's responses, are, presumably, highly reinforcing to the S who has been exposed to convergent satiation tasks for over half an hour. Conversely, the S who has been performing in a situation where he is virtually being forced to produce imaginative, unusual, and hypothetical responses will seek to avoid this cognitively taxing situation, even if only temporarily, and will desire to return to the common everyday realities. He will tend to avoid selecting words which lead to the evocation of novel responses by E, i.e., he will tend to select words followed by common associates as reinforcing stimuli.
What is so convincing about this type of behavior is that it was characteristic of high- as well as low-creative Ss. This finding underscores the fact that novel stimuli lose their unique attributes when presented to S to the point of satiation, regardless of the personality characteristics of S. Referring now to the two implications stated previously, instructors are admonished that overzealous techniques to develop creative thinking in learners may be self-defeating.

With regard to the first implication, a question that must be answered is whether creativity was adequately measured by administering the Remote Associates Test. Jackson and Messick (1954) are among many psychologists who sharply reject the value of the RAT, arguing that this test might be measuring intelligence. According to Jackson and Messick (1964, p. 311):

"In this test the S is presented with three words, such as "rat," "blue," and "cottage," and is required to supply a fourth word to serve as a kind of associational link between the other three stimulus words. For the example given the answer is "cheese." Now it is argued that this answer reflects a degree of creativity because it is "remote" and "useful," at least in the sense of meeting specified requirements. We would insist that the answer reflect an aspect of intelligence because it is correct."

Since there are no other answers keyed to the items on the RAT, it may not be an effective measure of divergent thinking. The problem of adequately defining creativity in an operational manner that is widely acceptable is a critical one but it is beyond the scope of the present study. Thus, the present results are limited to the conclusion that,
If the RAT is employed as a measure of creativity, there are no inherent differences between high and low creatives concerning the need for novelty.

The second implication regarding the instructor's role in nurturing creative potential is also subject to careful examination and criticism. It is clear that in most situations very few instructors come even close to satiating their students with divergent thinking activities. Getzel and Jackson (1962) and Torrance (1963) offer sizeable evidence to show that teachers not only dislike the creative student but they also refrain from teaching in a creative and flexible manner. Many teachers persist in teaching for convergent thinking, that is, they seek the correct answer, the proper method or principle, or the normative behavior from the students and reward such behavior to the exclusion of divergent behaviors. Departures from expected norms of classroom performance and behavior are frowned upon and the potential for originality that a student may have is, more often than not, stifled. The discouragement of creativity by teachers according to some authors (e.g., Kozol, 1967) is especially prevalent in schools for the culturally disadvantaged. Middle class white teachers, shocked by the cultural and cognitive systems of a different ethnic group, often times openly resent the novel expressions of cultural identity of their students. Kozol (1967, p. 179) in describing the list of character traits to be developed in the Boston Public Schools commented:
You look in vain through this list for anything that has to do with an original child or with an independent style. You look also in vain for any evaluation or assessment or conception of the human personality as a full or organic or continuously living and evolving firmament rather than as a filing cabinet of acceptable traits.

But it may not be solely a matter of fully satiating students on one kind of activity or another. Rather, the implication of this study is that the relative contrast of two conditions is important.

Despite these numerous instances where creativity is being thwarted, the more progressive of contemporary educators has advocated the policy of nurturing creative activity as one of the primary objectives in instructional activity. Goodman (1964) contends that a few educators have overemphasized the notion that creative learning is the best learning. He is highly critical of Bruner's (1960) notions in *The Process of Education* which (1) counsels practical "learning by doing," (b) encourages an inordinate amount of guesswork and fantasy, and (c) suggests that there is no point in learning answers, for very soon there will be different answers. Although Goodman does not explicitly suggest a superabundance of creativity to decrease a student's need for novelty, he contends that the methods proposed by Bruner will so burden the learner with discovery work that "discovery will be greeted not by a cheer but by a razz." Thus, it is evident that satiation with creative methods may not be the "great leap forward" that many progressives believe it to be.

Contrary to the arguments of Goodman, there is some evidence to support the idea that the desire for novelty might not be impaired by excessive exposure to creative tasks. Flanagan (1967), matched pairs
of undergraduates on Form 1 of the Remote Associates Test and assigned each member of a pair to one of two groups. In the experimental group, the Ss worked at a highly creative task for a one hour period (the Test of Original and Creative Thinking [TOCT]). The control group worked for an hour on a noncreative task, which involved naming the 50 states and their capitals. The results indicated that the experimental group performed significantly better ($p < .01$) on Form 2 of the RAT which was given after the interpolated activity. Apparently, practice in the creative tasks did not impair the ability of Ss to be creative. This result does not refute the findings of the present study, for the satiation with convergent tasks in the Flanagan study would probably impair performance on the RAT, but it would not necessarily reduce the need for novelty among Ss in the control group. Meichert (1967) theorized that exposure to novel stimulation would arouse the perceptual curiosity of children in a subsequent task. He divided a class of fifth grade children into three groups. One group was shown a high-novelty movie, the second group an average-novelty move, and the third group was shown a low-novelty movie. All Ss were then given a tachistoscopic viewing task, which consisted of light colored slides and which were exposed at 0.2 seconds each. Some of the slides were complex and novel, while others were common and unoriginal. The Ss were instructed that they could view the slides as many times as they preferred. The results of the study showed that there were no significant differences between the three experimental groups on the amount of time spent looking at the complex slides. Thus, the novel
film did not produce any notable preference for novel stimulation. Such studies must be viewed with skepticism, however, since the definitions of novelty by the adult Ss and the child Ss may not be congruent.

Although the work of Berlyne (1950) and Maddi (1965) suggest strong psychological support for the theory that satiation in novelty produces avoidance behavior, the literature applying these principles to the educational milieu is scant. It does appear that there is a curvilinear relationship between the amount of divergent thinking which a learner is exposed to and his subsequent desire for novelty. It is suggested that more research is needed in an attempt to delineate the quantitative (levels) and qualitative characteristics of divergent thinking that serve to sustain the need for novelty for optimal periods of time. If such research as the present is to find utility in instructional strategies other studies will be required which attempt to satiate Ss with convergent and divergent thinking over longer periods of time. This investigator does not intend to question the generalizability of the present study merely because the satiation lasted for 30 minutes; for 30 minutes might be sufficient time in a class period to effect performance of a pupil in school for the whole of the next period. However, it does appear evident that satiation or deprivation of divergent thinking for extended periods of time might be a fruitful endeavor, at least on an exploratory basis. In further research it would appear that a quasi-naturalistic study comparing the subsequent preference for novel stimulation of students who are taught
by a convergently oriented teacher could provide useful supplementary data. This type of experiment could best be undertaken in an elementary school, where one teacher is with the same learners all day long.

The investigation of the effects of both brainstorming and synectics on the need for novelty of learners would also appear to be a fruitful area for further investigations to extend the present one. Brainstorming, which is the uninhibited outpouring of ideas without evaluation, and synectics, which is the joining together of different and apparently irrelevant elements, are both procedures which could be artificially introduced to the classroom situation and manipulated to varying degrees (Barron, 1969). The effects of need for novelty on these processes as well as the effect of engaging in these activities on later need for novelty would appear to be especially relevant investigations for instruction.

Recognizing that the present study employs an aptitude X treatment interaction (ATI) orientation, this type of research could be instrumental in ascertaining the effect of convergent or divergent satiation upon high and low IQ groups, for example. Perhaps different aptitude groups might develop a need for novelty under certain types of satiation. In this sense, it may be found that the results of the present study apply to differences in intellectual ability (i.e., that the RAT measures intelligence) rather than "creativity." Further investigations are thereby suggested in which these two constructs are separated more precisely than in the present study. Closely related to
this type of research, and of equal value, would be a study of the effect of these satiation conditions upon the need for novelty of learners in various socioeconomic and ethnic groups. Such a study might reveal the proper use of satiation procedures as a motivating device, particularly for culturally disadvantaged learners.

In summary then, the results of this study bring to light a variety of suggestions for the development and maintenance of a need for novelty. As a general rule, satiation of subjects with divergent thinking experiences has an undermining effect on their need for novelty. Refinements in the measurement techniques and extension of the results to specific problem areas in learning, will hopefully result in an augmentation of the value of this investigation.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

Previous experiments have shown that high-creative individuals possess a strong need for novelty. High-creatives prefer to experience the uniqueness and complexity of their perceptual environment. They also seek out original and individualized ways of dealing with people, places and things. It has been found that satisfying the need for novelty for high-creatives is reinforcing, and that the probability of emitting the behavior which immediately preceded the reinforcement is thus increased.

Several experiments have illustrated that when Ss are satiated with novel stimuli, that they lose their curiosity drive and that their exploratory behavior is minimal. Also, novel responses when presented too frequently lose their novelty. In Hullian terms, this phenomenon is explained as an example of reactive inhibition, where avoidance behavior is manifest due to the boredom caused by repeated exposure to the same stimuli. It was reasoned that if an S was satiated with novel thinking experiences, he would probably tend to display a very low need for novelty. If an S were deprived of novel stimulation, his need for novelty might be aroused to escape the boredom of his lack of
novelty. If novel stimulation can be equated with divergent thinking and nonnovel stimulation can be equated with convergent thinking, it can then be hypothesized that satiation with divergent thinking tasks will produce a weak need for novelty, while satiation with convergent thinking tasks will have the opposite effect.

In this experiment, high- and low-creative Ss were divided into divergent satiation and convergent satiation treatment groups. The divergent satiation groups were given a series of creative, imaginative, and flexible tasks, while the convergent satiation groups were given a series of highly structured, common simple tasks, that called for one and only one appropriate response. Following the satiation condition, each Ss inferred need for novelty was measured. Ss were shown 160 slides. On each of 160 slides was a pair of words, a noun and a nonnoun. For half of the high- and low-creatives, when a noun was selected, the E responded verbally with a novel association of that noun. When a nonnoun was selected by S, the E responded with a common association. For the other half of the Ss the procedure was reversed, with nouns eliciting common responses, and nonnouns eliciting novel responses. The remaining 20 slides were filler items used to prevent S from gaining insight into E's intent. It was predicted that high-creatives satiated with convergent thinking tasks would show a stronger need for novelty than high-creatives satiated with divergent thinking. The same predictions were made for low-creatives, but to a lesser degree, since low-creatives have a lower need for novelty than high-creatives. The results confirmed both of these predictions. The
creativity variable proved to be an unimportant factor in determining the strength of S's preference for novelty. Thus, the antecedent conditions prior to measuring the inferred need for novelty are important components to be considered, if creative potential is to be nurtured. The suits also suggest the possibility that excessive use of techniques to promote divergent thinking may be a self-defeating instructional strategy.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

SATIATION OF DIVERGENT THINKING TASKS

Crossword Puzzle

Directions: Construct your own crossword puzzle using words for both down and across positions. Feel free to make use of blank squares to separate words or to fill in unnecessary spaces. Be sure to number your squares when you are through. Be as imaginative as possible in your choice of words. Please fill in the correct answers when you have completed the puzzle.
Construction Task

Directions: You are to create an imaginative design using any color and shape of plastic tile that you possess. You should strive to produce a design that no one else would ever think of making. You may fill in any area of the pegboard that you wish.
Suffixes Test

Directions: Write as many words as you can ending with the suffix ABLE.

Example: likable

_______  _______  _______  _______  _______  _______  _______
Consequences Test

Directions: List many different results that would be associated with the following new and unusual situation. Be as imaginative as possible.

What would the results be if people no longer needed or wanted sleep?
Utility Test

Directions: List as many different uses of a brick that you can think of. Be as imaginative as possible.

Now list as many different uses of a pencil that you can think of. Once again be as imaginative as possible.
APPENDIX B
SATIATION OF CONVERGENT THINKING TASKS

Crossword Puzzle

Directions: Solve this crossword puzzle as accurately as possible. There is only one correct letter for each empty space.

Across

1. Vice-president of United States
6. Abbreviation of Pennsylvania
10. Short for Edward
13. Fruit used to make jelly
18. Certain
22. Abbreviation of Kentuck
25. Organization of American States (Abbreviation)
29. American League (Abbreviation)
32. Opposite of near

Down

1. State where eskimos live
3. Slave
6. Sneaking a look
7. Short for advertisement
14. He his book
23. New City
30. Los Angeles (Abbreviation)
Construction Task

Directions: You are to fill in the designated areas of the empty pegboard with the appropriate colored plastic tiles to form four different colored rectangles. All tiles must be placed horizontally on the pegboard. All tiles of each color must be used.
Sentence Order Test

Directions: Arrange the following sets of three sentences in a meaningful order.

Example:

3. The airplane lifted off the ground.
1. The passengers boarded the airplane.
2. The passengers were seated in the airplane.

1. She bought some food at the market.
   She returned home and cooked some of the food she had bought.
   She went to the market.
2. The pitcher threw the ball.
   The batter hit the ball.
   The baseball game began.
3. The leaves changed in color.
   The winter snows began.
   The leaves fell.
4. The sun set over the mountains.
   The hot sun beat down on the travellers.
   The sun rose slowly over the horizon.
5. The temperature dropped sharply.
   The water was placed in the pan.
   The ice in the pan was thick.
6. The boy finished his homework.
   The boy read his assignment.
   The boy opened his textbook.
7. The man woke up at 7 a.m.
   The man was late for work.
   The man ate breakfast.
8. A new home was built in the city.
   A highway was constructed where the new home once stood.
   The new home was torn down.
9.  The gunman handed the bank teller a note.
    The gunman entered the bank.
    The gunman ran from the bank.

10. The robin built its nest.
    The eggs were hatched.
    The young robins learned to fly.
Word-Group Naming Test

Directions: Give a class name to each of the following groups of five words.

Example:

knife pen bowl rolling pin strainer
cooking utensils

1. tornado hurricane flood typhoon drought

2. pen pencil blotter envelopes paper

3. tires engine windshield brakes steering wheel

4. apples oranges pears grapes plums

5. tennis racket football baseball glove bat ice skates

6. ham steak liver veal pork

7. fish horse eagle dog snake

8. hammer chisel screwdriver pliers saw

9. cottage apartment castle trailer cabin

10. train airplane car bus ship
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Ellicit Novel Response</th>
<th>Nonnouns</th>
<th>Ellicit Novel Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>bring</td>
<td>take</td>
<td>song</td>
<td>song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trunk</td>
<td>hips</td>
<td>tree</td>
<td>tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>sheep</td>
<td>lame</td>
<td>lamb</td>
<td>lamb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>white</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>tie</td>
<td>tie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>broken</td>
<td>arm</td>
<td>jar</td>
<td>jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trees</td>
<td>love</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>trouble</td>
<td>family</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bristly</td>
<td>brush</td>
<td>pine</td>
<td>pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>flea</td>
<td>joke</td>
<td>dog</td>
<td>dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scalding</td>
<td>hot</td>
<td>harm</td>
<td>harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>thirsty</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>turn</td>
<td>turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brother</td>
<td>nice</td>
<td>sister</td>
<td>sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>earth</td>
<td>river</td>
<td>dirt</td>
<td>dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>playing</td>
<td>working</td>
<td>poker</td>
<td>poker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>something</td>
<td>foot</td>
<td>foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sour</td>
<td>sweet</td>
<td>stale</td>
<td>stale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>sickness</td>
<td>health</td>
<td>health</td>
<td>health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>village</td>
<td>town</td>
<td>town</td>
<td>town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>winter</td>
<td>round</td>
<td>cold</td>
<td>cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adorned</td>
<td>decorated</td>
<td>praised</td>
<td>praised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>frosty</td>
<td>cold</td>
<td>smoky</td>
<td>smoky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>python</td>
<td>grace</td>
<td>snake</td>
<td>snake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>clearer</td>
<td>fuzzy</td>
<td>steer</td>
<td>steer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comfort</td>
<td>miserable</td>
<td>chair</td>
<td>chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>whiskey</td>
<td>key</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td>drink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>Nonnouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>silk</td>
<td>ear</td>
<td>smooth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>even</td>
<td>odd</td>
<td>six</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>shiny</td>
<td>bright</td>
<td>flowing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>farm</td>
<td>acreage</td>
<td>house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>apple</td>
<td>crowd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>over</td>
<td>under</td>
<td>more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>quiet</td>
<td>loud</td>
<td>person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>street</td>
<td>noisy</td>
<td>road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>snail</td>
<td>slow</td>
<td>slow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stove</td>
<td>hot</td>
<td>hot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>appear</td>
<td>see</td>
<td>where</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cheese</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>mouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>telephone</td>
<td>bell</td>
<td>cell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>now</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>tornado</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>storm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clean</td>
<td>dirty</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>charming</td>
<td>baby</td>
<td>cold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>time</td>
<td>newspaper</td>
<td>clock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>sunlight</td>
<td>night</td>
<td>bright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>finish</td>
<td>over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>soldier</td>
<td>iron</td>
<td>man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intermittent</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>puppies</td>
<td>helpless</td>
<td>dogs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>glaring</td>
<td>bright</td>
<td>dark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>clumsy</td>
<td>awkward</td>
<td>lazy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thief</td>
<td>nut</td>
<td>steal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>justice</td>
<td>law</td>
<td>law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bible</td>
<td>book</td>
<td>book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>king</td>
<td>lord</td>
<td>queen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>sky</td>
<td>house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>Elicit Novel Response</td>
<td>Nonnouns</td>
<td>Elicit Novel Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>memory smooth</td>
<td>person rough</td>
<td>mind short</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>foot salty</td>
<td>part sweet</td>
<td>show strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>quickly priest</td>
<td>fast worship</td>
<td>car church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>always fruit</td>
<td>never goodles</td>
<td>done apple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>town calm</td>
<td>west lake</td>
<td>city nervous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>bath beautiful</td>
<td>good ugly</td>
<td>clean adorable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>sister elegant</td>
<td>adore beautiful</td>
<td>brother skinny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>boulder base</td>
<td>rock ball</td>
<td>rock ball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>lagging mother</td>
<td>behind glasses</td>
<td>beer father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>scientist feverish</td>
<td>worthy hot</td>
<td>Einstein sweat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>leisurely money</td>
<td>time matter</td>
<td>cool green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>mosquito late</td>
<td>thing early</td>
<td>bit sorry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>wagon brave</td>
<td>tongue strong</td>
<td>wheels football</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>anger afraid</td>
<td>heaven fear</td>
<td>hate country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>bleak war</td>
<td>house roses</td>
<td>weak peace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>Nonnouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>stout</td>
<td>fat</td>
<td>sound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>devil</td>
<td>smart</td>
<td>Satan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>month</td>
<td>day</td>
<td>day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stork</td>
<td>baby</td>
<td>baby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>divorce</td>
<td>horrid</td>
<td>marriage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>steel</td>
<td>take</td>
<td>cow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>tobacco</td>
<td>food</td>
<td>smoke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>soft</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>ball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>doors</td>
<td>wide</td>
<td>windows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rough</td>
<td>smooth</td>
<td>walk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>him</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>therefore</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>dough</td>
<td>boys</td>
<td>bread</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stagnant</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>gin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>sit</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>couch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>citizen</td>
<td>tax</td>
<td>man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>mile</td>
<td>town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>short</td>
<td>tall</td>
<td>gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>lion</td>
<td>rough</td>
<td>tiger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bitter</td>
<td>sweet</td>
<td>sea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>candy</td>
<td>sweet</td>
<td>sweet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>barn</td>
<td>yard</td>
<td>yard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>stem</td>
<td>smoke</td>
<td>flower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>green</td>
<td>grass</td>
<td>lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>however</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>butter</td>
<td>bum</td>
<td>bread</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>color</td>
<td>duck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>window</td>
<td>washer</td>
<td>glass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>luscious</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>great</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lizard</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>snake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>Elicit Novel Response</td>
<td>Nonnouns</td>
<td>Elicit Novel Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>round food</td>
<td>square destruction</td>
<td>sharp</td>
<td>eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>mild leper</td>
<td>soft sad</td>
<td>dove disease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>lemon narrow</td>
<td>draw wide</td>
<td>sour close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>jump religion</td>
<td>high cousin</td>
<td>track God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>hammer bird</td>
<td>nail fly</td>
<td>nail fly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>severe feather</td>
<td>hard kind</td>
<td>nerve bird</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>obscure leadership</td>
<td>dim rank</td>
<td>might president</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>woman younger</td>
<td>work older</td>
<td>man one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>hot nail</td>
<td>cold scar</td>
<td>hurt hammer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>become bed</td>
<td>became morning</td>
<td>career sleep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>obvious lake</td>
<td>easy butter</td>
<td>wrong water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>mold lenient</td>
<td>change easy</td>
<td>bread bad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>doctor closer</td>
<td>witch nearer</td>
<td>nurse see</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>fingers art</td>
<td>hand beauty</td>
<td>hand beauty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>lady overcast</td>
<td>prim cloudy</td>
<td>woman glow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Nouns Elicit Novel Response</td>
<td>Nonnouns Elicit Novel Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>dream have play not sleep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>wise house smart lawn stable home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>criminal sweeping derelict broom bad all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>speak spider talk shoe eat web</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>kitchen pungent spotless odor sink fresh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>income radiant status light money rock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>music interior string superior song bashful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>cabbage arches vegetable back vegetable back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>find bread lose cut your butter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>loveable millionaire girl hope odd money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>graceful pigment swan creamy snob color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>piano gradual pretty slow music school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>flaming root fire hold bush tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>gloomy progress dark limb wet forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>color ugly vivid pretty blue gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Nouns Elicit Novel Response</td>
<td>Nonnouns Elicit Novel Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>indifferent whistle</td>
<td>careless</td>
<td>sly sound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>hit</td>
<td>ball</td>
<td>ball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ink</td>
<td>pen</td>
<td>pen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>under coal</td>
<td>over organic</td>
<td>door black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>agile web</td>
<td>quick school</td>
<td>belong spider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>tall courage</td>
<td>short free</td>
<td>straight brave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>mind lofty</td>
<td>none high</td>
<td>brain bowling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>head faster</td>
<td>fat slower</td>
<td>hair Christmas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>sweet chair</td>
<td>sour setting</td>
<td>work table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>mallet luminous</td>
<td>gun bright</td>
<td>hammer bug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>truth brilliant</td>
<td>tooth bright</td>
<td>lie day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>dirt scissors</td>
<td>mud cut</td>
<td>mud cut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>flower rugged</td>
<td>smile strong</td>
<td>rose tender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>sudden cushion</td>
<td>quick protect</td>
<td>change soft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>hardly moon</td>
<td>ever shiny</td>
<td>faint star</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>shoes thinner</td>
<td>cloth fatter</td>
<td>foot bread</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Nouns Elicit Novel Response</td>
<td>Nonnouns Elicit Novel Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td>stars</td>
<td>objects</td>
<td>sky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>curved</td>
<td>road</td>
<td>arm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>starving</td>
<td>hungry</td>
<td>pain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>danger</td>
<td>sighting</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>lift</td>
<td>raise</td>
<td>tote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minister</td>
<td>bore</td>
<td>preacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td>socialism</td>
<td>money</td>
<td>communism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deformed</td>
<td>crippled</td>
<td>mutation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>butterfly</td>
<td>moth</td>
<td>moth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>America</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>sorrow</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shady</td>
<td>tree</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>think</td>
<td>mind</td>
<td>must</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>controversy</td>
<td>side</td>
<td>argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>happy</td>
<td>sad</td>
<td>today</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pig</td>
<td>hairy</td>
<td>hog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>liquor</td>
<td>fine</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mad</td>
<td>angry</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>delayed</td>
<td>reaction</td>
<td>clock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>snow</td>
<td>slick</td>
<td>white</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>spicy</td>
<td>cake</td>
<td>gum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>effort</td>
<td>just</td>
<td>try</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>deep</td>
<td>shallow</td>
<td>loft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>song</td>
<td>note</td>
<td>sing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>dawn</td>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>morning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>study</td>
<td>book</td>
<td>match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>egg</td>
<td>chicken</td>
<td>chicken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cow</td>
<td>milk</td>
<td>milk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>God</td>
<td>nonsense</td>
<td>religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relaxed</td>
<td>tense</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>Elicit Novel Response</td>
<td>Nonnouns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>stench</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>smell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>crude</td>
<td>rough</td>
<td>nasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>cop</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tense</td>
<td>nervous</td>
<td>time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>stiff</td>
<td>board</td>
<td>still</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discomfort</td>
<td>tension</td>
<td>pain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>leg</td>
<td>share</td>
<td>arm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nice</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>fake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>health</td>
<td>run</td>
<td>sickness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>heavy</td>
<td>light</td>
<td>smoker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>shout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>needle</td>
<td>nail</td>
<td>thread</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>cottage</td>
<td>age</td>
<td>house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all</td>
<td>buy</td>
<td>away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>politician</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cat</td>
<td>dog</td>
<td>dog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>easier</td>
<td>harder</td>
<td>math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>her</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>rose</td>
<td>wonderful</td>
<td>red</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>firm</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>angry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>coiled</td>
<td>snake</td>
<td>wind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sword</td>
<td>draw</td>
<td>knife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>fiery</td>
<td>flame</td>
<td>fog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scene</td>
<td>fuss</td>
<td>picture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>rich</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>furs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>glove</td>
<td>need</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>scarf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cars</td>
<td>machine</td>
<td>trucks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td>pliable</td>
<td>soft</td>
<td>pry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>knife</td>
<td>flash</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Elicit Nouns</td>
<td>Novel Response</td>
<td>Elicit Nonnouns</td>
<td>Novel Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.</td>
<td>crooked</td>
<td>straight</td>
<td>slick</td>
<td>hot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stove</td>
<td>league</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td>blossom</td>
<td>flowers</td>
<td>flowers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rust</td>
<td>metal</td>
<td>metal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.</td>
<td>success</td>
<td>height</td>
<td>money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>constant</td>
<td>ring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td>constant</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td>symphony</td>
<td>pity</td>
<td>music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coarse</td>
<td>rough</td>
<td>way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.</td>
<td>only</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>something</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>guns</td>
<td>shout</td>
<td>shoot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.</td>
<td>pain</td>
<td>sorry</td>
<td>hurt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>toll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.</td>
<td>swift</td>
<td>fast</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>table</td>
<td>book</td>
<td>chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td>heartless</td>
<td>cruel</td>
<td>dead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>patriot</td>
<td>why</td>
<td>country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.</td>
<td>abrupt</td>
<td>quick</td>
<td>curvy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>youngster</td>
<td>lucky</td>
<td>child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.</td>
<td>numbers</td>
<td>letters</td>
<td>letters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cabinet</td>
<td>desk</td>
<td>desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.</td>
<td>lamp</td>
<td>road</td>
<td>light</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drop</td>
<td>glass</td>
<td>letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>slowly</td>
<td>fast</td>
<td>movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.</td>
<td>live</td>
<td>die</td>
<td>man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kittens</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>cats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.</td>
<td>somber</td>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>older</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>faith</td>
<td>whale</td>
<td>religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>Elicit Novel Response</td>
<td>Nonnouns</td>
<td>Elicit Novel Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149.</td>
<td>mountain</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hungry</td>
<td>food</td>
<td>cow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.</td>
<td>elevated</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>alone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sin</td>
<td>dumb</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151.</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>can</td>
<td>drink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>fun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152.</td>
<td>home</td>
<td>heart</td>
<td>house</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rapid</td>
<td>fast</td>
<td>boat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.</td>
<td>mutton</td>
<td>lamb</td>
<td>lamb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frog</td>
<td>toad</td>
<td>toad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154.</td>
<td>fragrant</td>
<td>smell</td>
<td>nice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rage</td>
<td>subtle</td>
<td>mad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.</td>
<td>quota</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>frightful</td>
<td>scared</td>
<td>sorrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.</td>
<td>edged</td>
<td>sharp</td>
<td>away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>slack</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>give</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157.</td>
<td>family</td>
<td>traits</td>
<td>love</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>small</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>pin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158.</td>
<td>refined</td>
<td>cultured</td>
<td>policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grief</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>sorrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159.</td>
<td>peace</td>
<td>truth</td>
<td>war</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hasty</td>
<td>fast</td>
<td>retreat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>fashion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>man</td>
<td>cute</td>
<td>woman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161.</td>
<td>fire</td>
<td>glowing</td>
<td>hot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scorching</td>
<td>hot</td>
<td>ruin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162.</td>
<td>dogs</td>
<td>cats</td>
<td>cats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voyage</td>
<td>trip</td>
<td>trip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163.</td>
<td>rancid</td>
<td>odor</td>
<td>dry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hospital</td>
<td>big</td>
<td>sick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164.</td>
<td>child</td>
<td>nephew</td>
<td>baby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>loud</td>
<td>soft</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide</td>
<td>Nouns Elicit Novel Response</td>
<td>Nonnouns Elicit Novel Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165.</td>
<td>curled statue</td>
<td>hair</td>
<td>warm (of) Liberty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166.</td>
<td>cold eagle</td>
<td>hot</td>
<td>bed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167.</td>
<td>ocean hotter</td>
<td>wavy</td>
<td>water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168.</td>
<td>putrid jelly</td>
<td>smell</td>
<td>scene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169.</td>
<td>foreigner ripe</td>
<td>away</td>
<td>stranger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170.</td>
<td>Negro holy</td>
<td>individual bible</td>
<td>Black people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171.</td>
<td>children army</td>
<td>kids</td>
<td>kids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172.</td>
<td>engine sparkling</td>
<td>steam</td>
<td>motor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173.</td>
<td>bright vision</td>
<td>light</td>
<td>sharp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174.</td>
<td>slime dreary</td>
<td>spit</td>
<td>green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175.</td>
<td>although baby</td>
<td>because</td>
<td>sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176.</td>
<td>garment right</td>
<td>heavy</td>
<td>clothes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177.</td>
<td>rigid fraud</td>
<td>stiff</td>
<td>upright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178.</td>
<td>carpet tell</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>rug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179.</td>
<td>church wet</td>
<td>together</td>
<td>relation (of)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180.</td>
<td>joy book</td>
<td>happy</td>
<td>happy read</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

POST EXPERIMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What do you think the purpose of this experiment was?
2. On what basis did you select words?
3. Did you notice anything about the words I said other than the fact that they followed your response?
4. What do you think was the purpose of my words?