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ABSTRACT

A mass self-reporting experiment involving 15,470 men and women, published in a national circulation American popular science magazine. The experiment consisted of a six section instrument: 1) A precognition task in which participants were asked to predict an outcome couched in the form of a science fantasy story; 2) A psychological evaluation of brain hemisphere dominance measured by the well-established Torrance Style of Learning and Thinking instrument (SOLAT); 3) Job categorization as measured by the Holland Job Scale; 4) a physiological self-reporting Handedness and Writing Posture study; 5) A time perception profile defined by the Time Metaphor Test of Knapp and Garbar; 6) Gender and Age. Each participant received a custom printed four page feedback document providing their unique results. There were three hypotheses: 1) That there would be a significant number of significantly scoring precognitive individuals; 2) That there would be significant sub-populations and that those individuals defined as Dynamic, in accordance with the Time Metaphor Test would score significantly higher than individuals defined as Non-dynamics; and, 3) That the group of individuals identified as Extreme Right, in terms of the SOLAT, would contain a significantly higher number of significantly scoring individuals on the precognitive part of the test than the Extreme Left group. The results showed: Overall non-significance at the p ≤ .05 level, but a trend towards significance with odds of 16 to 1, z = 1.54; the dynamics did not attain higher scores than the Non-dynamics and, Neutrals scored higher than Dynamics; and, that Extreme Rights did not score significantly higher than Extreme Lefts, although they did score higher.

INTRODUCTION & OVERVIEW

There have been several precognitive tests conducted at the mass level. Rhine was the first in 1937-38 (1938); then Nash in 1958 (1959); Rhine again in 1961 (1962); and, Schmeidler in 1979 (1980). These tests involved populations between 4,543 and 1,613,300 people. None were positively significant, although the Rhine test in 1961 did report
some evidence of Psi-missing. This earlier work primarily focused on the occurrence of precognition, although the Schmeidler test also considered birth-order, and sheep-goat variables. Only the 1961 Rhine test provided respondents with individualized feedback. This test was also the only previous one to provide a randomly generated answer for each response. Schmeidler dealt with the stacking effect by using the Greville Formula.

**HYPOTHESES**

**HYPOTHESIS ONE:** The Null Hypothesis predicts that there will not be a significant number of significantly scoring individual test results. We predict there will be a significant number of significantly scoring precognitive individuals.

**HYPOTHESIS TWO:** The Null Hypothesis predicts that no sub-populations will be significant, and that there will be no significant difference between individuals defined by the Time Metaphor Test as Dynamics, and those defined as Non-Dynamics. We predict that there will be significant sub-populations and that those individuals defined as Dynamic, in accordance with the Time Metaphor Test will score significantly higher than individuals defined as Non-dynamics.

**HYPOTHESIS THREE:** The Null Hypothesis predicts that no sub-populations will be significant, and that there will be no significant difference between individuals identified as Extreme Right, in terms of the SOLAT, and those defined as Extreme Left. We predict that the group of individuals identified as Extreme Right, in terms of the SOLAT, will contain a significantly higher number of significantly scoring individuals on the precognitive part of the test than the Extreme Left group.

**PROTOCOL**

**DESIGN**

In 1981 OMNI Magazine commissioned Mobius to conduct a precognition test of Mobius' devising. We made the decision that the test should examine not only precognition but also seek correlates with other measurements, particularly the brain hemisphere dominance model of learning and thinking. To this end we designed the test in six sections:

1) **PRECognition:** Although the precognition portion of the test was essentially a mathematical problem it was couched in a science-fantasy story format to match the tone of OMNI's general editorial format. We wanted to disassociate the task from the usual dry numerical nature of psi-tests, and to encourage visualization. As already noted, mass-test results using straight number or card guessing had produced non-significant results. We wanted to see what effect, if any, would be obtained through the invocation of visualization. The story called for solving a forced-choice challenge: locating five "golden discs" in a circular field of twelve circles. The circular field was
used, in an attempt to circumvent positional bias. The colors used in the illustration were not complementary to avoid the possibility of retained retinal image overlay.

In accordance with Palmer's analysis of the power of suggestion and relaxation (1978) embedded commands such as “Some persons find that it is best just to relax and let the answer float to the surface of their consciousness” and, “In your mind’s eye, the five discs appear in their proper positions on the circle,” suggested relaxation and gave the respondents permission to access precognitive information. All answers were scored on the basis of correctly predicting only the actual location of a target. There was no consideration given to displacement, or psi-missing.

2) STYLE OF LEARNING AND THINKING: It was obviously impossible to utilize a physiological measurement for such a large population. For this reason we decided to use a psychological measurement. Even if there was not a direct link with human physiology, if the instrument established a correlation that was consistent, then one of our primary goals, locating psychically gifted individuals in a large population would be fulfilled. In surveying the literature we decided to utilize a 40-question, forced-choice (three choices per question) instrument developed by Torrance (1980). Since this instrument was primarily oriented towards students and was still evolving it was modified with Torrance's assistance in an attempt to both replace weaker items, and to reflect the more general audience of OMNI's readership.

The initial decision to use this instrument was made because the Torrance Brain Hemisphere Dominance Style of Learning and Thinking (SOLAT) questionnaire had been well correlated with a wide-range of other established instruments, e.g., Kirton's Adaptation-Innovation, and Originality TTCT. Additionally, the test was in its third generation and had been used and reported on in 45 earlier studies. Finally, the Torrance test was of interest because he had designed it to study the relationship between high I.Q., creativity and apparent learning style. Torrance had reported that The right hemisphere seems to relate consistently to measures of creative ability....“ Studies by Braud & Braud (1975), Broughton(1975 & 76), and Stanford & Castello (1976) suggested that psi-functioning seemed to be similarly oriented. If a connection between parapsychological studies and Torrance's work could established then there would be a link between two fields of research.

3) HOLLAND OCCUPATIONAL SCALE: It would be clearly impossible to deal with the responses of thousands of people listing their jobs by title. However, we felt that job category might provide a possible correlate with precognitive skills and lateralization. The Holland Scale (Holland, 1973) was selected not only because it has been widely reported but, also, because Torrance had already used it in relation to the SOLAT (1981). Two additional questions were added regarding student status and job satisfaction.

4) HANDEDNESS AND WRITING POSTURE: Kocel (Kocel, n.d.), and Levy & Reid (1976) have published studies relating handedness and writing posture with physiological brain hemisphere dominance. (EEG studies at Langley Porter dispute their findings (Herron, 1979) but, in our opinion, neither are conclusive) Since the SOLAT was limited to a psychological model we included these questions in hope that
a possible bridge between the psychological and physiological hemisphere models might be established.

5) **TIME PERCEPTION:** Schmeidler (1964) and Dean (1974) have both reported studies in which the Time Metaphor Test of Knapp and Garbutt (1958) positively correlated with precognitive skills. Since time perception had been advanced as the only existing correlate with precognition, we naturally included these questions.

6) **SEX AND AGE:** Based on past research -- Palmer provides a succinct summary of the issue (1978) -- we had little reason to believe that sex, or age would be significant correlates. However, we felt that not to ask these questions would have meant the loss of an unusual opportunity to explore these issues.

The test was published in the October 1981 issue of OMNI and produced a test population of approximately 18,000. All responses not properly filled out were placed in a "Group X." This left 15,470 responses as our data base.

**PROCEDURE**

1. All incoming answers were split into two groups. This was done by simply placing, in the order in which they were received, every other response in Group B, the others being Group A.

2. The targets were generated utilizing a feedback shift register pseudo-random number generator suggested by Edwin C. May. Lewis has evaluated this generator in a wide range of tests for finite random sequence (1975). An individual target was generated for each respondent, from a total target pool of 792 (5 combinatorial 12).

3. Each respondent received an individual report describing the results of their test participation.

**FEEDBACK:** Subscribing to Schmidt’s theory of feedback (1975) we carefully developed an individualized follow-up report sent to each test-taker within four to six weeks. Our goal here was to create a two-part visualization in which test-takers were first asked to precognize an event and, then, upon receipt of their feedback to post-cognize themselves at the time they took the test -- sending back down the time-line, the correct answer. We put particular emphasis on feedback because it is our belief that a key to precognition lies in emotional connections. The moment being precognized, we felt, was not the event of the computer target generation which is unemotional and abstract but instead, the test-taker’s exposure to their feedback. This exposure, in our opinion, constitutes the moment imbued with the highest personal emotional impact.

**RESULTS**

We hypothesized: There would be a significant number of significantly scoring precognitive individuals. The odds of successfully choosing 5 out of 5 correct locations were 1 in 792: 4 hits = 35/ 792; 3 hits = 210/ 792; 2 hits = 350/ 792; 1 hit = 175/ 792; 0 hits
= 21/792. As is apparent, there is a clear differentiation between 3 and 4 hits, with 4 hits being significant at .044 level, and 5 hits being significant at .001.

We found: The number of significantly scoring individuals to be within the range predicted by the null hypothesis. The results showed odds of 16 to 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>4 &amp; 5 “Hitters”</th>
<th>Chance Expectation</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15,470</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We hypothesized: That individuals defined as Dynamic, in accordance with the Time Metaphor Test would score significantly higher than individuals defined as Non-dynamics;

We found: The dynamics did not attain higher scores than the Non-dynamics and, Neutrals scored higher than Dynamics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Category</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>4 &amp; 5 Hit</th>
<th>Chance Expectation</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics</td>
<td>4213</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Dynamics</td>
<td>9728</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutrals</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We hypothesized: That the group of individuals identified as Extreme Right, in terms of the SOLAT, would contain a significantly higher number of significantly scoring individuals on the precognitive part of the test than the Extreme Left group.

We found: That Extreme Rights did not score significantly higher than Extreme Lefts. They did, however, score higher and we will explore this trend using a step-wise approach of discriminant analysis. Through the use of an item analysis we will isolate the strongest indicators defining lateralization.

In comparing Groups A and B we found no major variances between the two.

Group X will be evaluated for any major variance from the total data base.

In addition to these hypotheses an unexpected pattern bias emerged. We expected a chance distribution among the 792 target patterns and the computer provided this. However, 5,924 of 15,470 or, 38 per cent, chose patterns whose redundancy, when measured against chance expectation, produced Z-Scores of 10 or higher. These Pattern-Makers did not differ from the non-Pattern-Makers in any definable way delineated by our instrument.

Our next lines of inquiry will address post hoc possible correlations based on occupation, sex, age, lateralization, writing posture, handedness, and precognition.
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