

A STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF PROTESTANT  
SEMINARY CHRISTIAN EDUCATION UPON  
THE ATTITUDES OF CLOSED  
MINDEDNESS, PREJUDICE  
AND INTRINSIC VALUES

By

ROBERT DWIGHT PIERSON

"

Bachelor of Arts  
Northwestern Oklahoma State University  
Alva, Oklahoma  
1959

Bachelor of Divinity  
Phillips University  
Enid, Oklahoma  
1962

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
Graduate College of the  
Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for  
the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
May, 1975

Thesis  
1975 D  
P6245  
cop. 2

MAY 12 1976

A STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF PROTESTANT  
SEMINARY CHRISTIAN EDUCATION UPON  
THE ATTITUDES OF CLOSED  
MINDEDNESS, PREJUDICE  
AND INTRINSIC VALUES

Thesis Approved:

*Kenneth H. Cair*

Thesis Adviser

*Lawrence M. Myers*

*John D. Hampton*

*Carl R. Anderson*

*N. N. Dunham*

Dean of the Graduate College

938982

## PREFACE

This study of attitude change of seminary and graduate students has been prepared with the assistance of a grant from the Section on Research of the General Council on Ministries of the United Methodist Church. It has been prepared in cooperation with the American Association of Theological Schools as an attempt to gain more information on attitude and value change during the process of seminary education. I wish to express my appreciation to Allen Waltz, Director of the section on Research of the Program Council of the United Methodist Church, for his support in providing for this research, and my appreciation to the Research Foundation of Oklahoma State University for their continual support and help.

The research would not have been possible without the background concepts of Milton Rokeach. I would therefore express my deep appreciation to Dr. Rokeach for his personal support and encouragement in this project. Dr. Edgar Mills, former staff member with the Department of Ministry of the National Council of Churches, provided valuable consultation in development of this project, as did Dr. James Davis, Director of Research and Survey of the Board of Global Ministries, the United Methodist Church. To both of them I express my sincerest appreciation.

Without the support of the administrations of the 11 schools studied, this project would not have been possible. The deans, presidents, and various administrative staffs of these schools provided the open door for the project. Appreciation must therefore be expressed to the administration of Seabury Western Seminary, Northwestern University, Concordia Seminary, Washington University, the University of Missouri in Kansas City, Midwestern Baptist Seminary, Nazarene Theological Seminary, St. Paul's School of Theology, Iliff School of Theology, Concordia Conservative Baptist Seminary, and the University of Denver.

Six persons served as members of my committee during the project. Great appreciation must be expressed to these men, who were willing to give advice, consultation and encouragement throughout this research project. I would like to express particular appreciation to Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, the patient, encouraging and careful chairman of my committee; and my committee for their great help: Dr. Robert Alciatore, Dr. John Hampton, Dr. Larry M. Hynson, Dr. Gene Acuff, and Dr. Carl Anderson. Appreciation must also be expressed to the members of Christ United Methodist Church in Tulsa and Highland Park United Methodist Church in Stillwater for their support and help during this project.

Finally, special thanks must be given to my wife, Delia, for providing personal support and encouragement, and for assisting greatly in the editing and proofreading of the dissertation itself.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Summary State of the Problem . . . . .	4
General Hypotheses . . . . .	5
Research Hypotheses. . . . .	5
Definitions. . . . .	7
Extensive and Intensive . . . . .	7
Liberal Seminaries. . . . .	7
Conservative Seminaries . . . . .	8
Attitudes, Values and Beliefs . . . . .	8
The Open and Closed Mind. . . . .	9
Prejudice . . . . .	11
Extrinsic and Intrinsic Religiosity . . . . .	12
The Church and Religious Education . . . . .	14
Conclusion . . . . .	16
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE. . . . .	17
Definitions. . . . .	17
Attitudes . . . . .	17
Values. . . . .	19
Attitude and Value Change . . . . .	21
Cognitive Structures. . . . .	23
Learning Theory and Attitudes . . . . .	24
Group Experiences and Attitudes and Values. . . . .	26
Personality . . . . .	27
Authoritarianism, Dogmatism, and Prejudice. . . . .	28
Higher Education and Attitude Change . . . . .	32
Seminary Education and Attitudes. . . . .	32
General Research. . . . .	33
Research Methods . . . . .	35
Religion and the Study of Attitudes and Values . . . . .	36
III. METHODS . . . . .	45
Quasi Experimental Research Design . . . . .	45
Null Hypotheses. . . . .	46
General Experimental Procedure . . . . .	48
Selection of Students. . . . .	49
Controlling Necessary Variables. . . . .	50
Statistical Methods. . . . .	51

Chapter	Page
Instrumentation . . . . .	52
Questionnaire . . . . .	53
Limitations . . . . .	54
Special Assistance . . . . .	55
IV. RESULTS . . . . .	57
Attitude Change . . . . .	58
The Value Scale . . . . .	64
Demographic Characteristics . . . . .	73
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . .	91
Recommendations . . . . .	99
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	102
APPENDIX . . . . .	126

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Dogmatism Scale. . . . .	57
II. F Scale. . . . .	60
III. Liberal vs. Conservative Seminaries at .05 Level . . . . .	65
IV. Significant Change in Values at .05 Level. . . . .	72
V. College. . . . .	75
VI. Family Religious Strength. . . . .	77
VII. Personal Relations with Others . . . . .	79
VIII. Local Church Theology. . . . .	80
IX. Religious Training . . . . .	81
X. Activity in Local Church . . . . .	83
XI. Personal Theology. . . . .	84
XII. Ranking of Institution Values. . . . .	86
XIII. Ranking of Terminal Values . . . . .	87



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Among those academic fields that are most interested in attitudes, beliefs, and values is the field of religion. In the area of organized religion, those who deal with religious education are continually concerned with developing and changing attitudes, beliefs and values. Therefore, it is most important for the religious educator to understand something about the cognitive processes involved in attitudes, beliefs and values.

Among the values, attitudes, or beliefs which religious educators have attempted to advocate is the general attitude of non-prejudice, acceptance, brotherhood, openness or what might be characterized by the words of Jesus, to love your neighbor as yourselves. This attitude might be expressed in terms of the Biblical admonitions to judge not that we be not judged or to love one another. Though religious educators have proclaimed these goals, too often religious persons are accused of being prejudiced, bigoted, authoritarian, and dogmatic. This study attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of extensive and intensive religious education in terms of creating a non-prejudiced, open minded, compassionate individual.

In this research, a particular type of religious education is examined. Among various kinds of religious education, that which is most extensive and intensive is education of persons for the clergy, called seminary. The seminary experience usually involves three or four years of graduate education. The attempt is made in this research to see the effect, if any, of seminary education on attitudes, beliefs and values. Also, an examination is made of the type of seminary education (conservative as opposed to liberal) which has the greatest effect in creating a sense of openness, less prejudice and compassion.

Not only does this study attempt to add to the growing research on attitudes, beliefs and values; attempt to provide some information about the effect of seminary education on attitudes and values; but this research also attempts to add some information concerning certain problems that exist today in the Protestant church concerning prejudice. Research by Rokeach (1969), Allport (1954) and Start and Glock (1968) has suggested that Christians tend to be more prejudiced, more close-minded and less compassionate. This would seem contrary to basic goals taught by Jesus Christ.

Hadden (1967) suggests that there is growing evidence that in the church a new schism is developing. The schism is being created not necessarily on denominational lines, but on theological lines which particularly concern the matter of openness, non-prejudice and compassion. It seems

evident that the leaders of this new schism developing within the Protestant church are the young clergy. Young clergy find themselves alienated from their congregations and professing belief systems that seem to be different from those of the average church members. The schism is developing on the basis of a call to renewal. This renewal of the church being promoted by recent seminary graduates calls for greater social involvement, more openness, less dogmatism and removal of prejudice. If it could be shown that seminary education of a particular type is creating a certain kind of clergy, in terms of openness, compassion, and non-prejudice, then new insight, both into the growing schism within the church and into the way in which the church might re-educate itself into following a more compassionate open style would be available.

Following the Second World War and the Nazi expressions of anti-Semitism, studies were done by the Jewish community, Adorno et al. (1950) to understand the nature of anti-Semitism and associated attitudes. Their studies, now classic, resulted in the development of a test for certain types of attitudes. The "F" Scale developed by Adorno et al., which generally measures prejudice will provide for this study a method of measuring the attitudes of prejudice. Among other behavioral scientists who have developed methodology to study attitudes, beliefs and values is Milton Rokeach (1960). Rokeach has done a great deal to outline systems of values, beliefs and attitudes.

One of the concepts that Rokeach developed which relates itself to the earlier work by Adorno et al. is the concept of the "open and closed mind." Other recent work by Rokeach includes the development of a scale for evaluating the value system of persons (1969). This study makes use of Rokeach's understanding of the open and closed mind and of the scale he developed for this attitude complex and relates it to the field of religious education.

#### Summary State of the Problem

Does extensive and intensive religious education tend to create a more open-minded, less prejudiced and more extrinsic person? More specifically, would a group of first year Protestant seminary students, after one year of intensive religious education, tend to become more open-minded, less prejudiced and have more extrinsic or compassionate values than a group of graduate students in a non-seminary setting? Will seminary students in a liberal seminary tend to change more in the above categories than those in a conservative seminary? Are there certain identifiable demographic characteristics which tend to identify the persons who are more closed minded? These are the questions that are answered in the statistical examination of the data gathered.

## General Hypotheses

1. Seminary education will create a more open-minded attitude, a less prejudiced attitude and more intrinsic value systems than other graduate education.
2. The liberal seminary will create a more open-minded attitude, less prejudice and more intrinsic value systems than will a conservative seminary.
3. There are identifiable demographic characteristics of those who are close-minded.

## Research Hypotheses

- a. There will be significant, positive differences between the change scores on the Dogmatism Scale of students in conservative seminaries as compared to parallel students in other graduate education.
- b. There will be significant, positive differences between the change scores on the "F" Scale of students in conservative seminaries as compared to parallel students in other graduate education.
- c. There will be significant, positive differences between the change scores on the Dogmatism Scale of students in liberal seminaries as compared with parallel students in other graduate education.
- d. There will be significant, positive differences between the change scores on the "F" Scale of students in liberal seminaries as compared to students in other parallel graduate education.

e. There will be significant, positive differences between the change scores on the Dogmatism Scale of students in liberal seminaries as compared with students in conservative seminaries.

f. There will be significant, positive differences between the change scores on the "F" Scale of students in liberal seminaries as compared with students in conservative seminaries.

g. There will be significant, positive differences between the change scores on the Dogmatism Scale of seminary students as compared with other parallel graduate students.

h. There will be significant, positive differences between the change scores on the "F" Scale of seminary students as compared to other parallel graduate students.

i. There will be significant, positive differences between the change scores on Rokeach's Value Scale of conservative seminary students as compared to other parallel graduate students.

j. There will be significant, positive differences between the change scores on Rokeach's Value Scale of liberal seminary students as compared with other parallel graduate students.

k. There will be significant, positive differences between the change scores on Rokeach's Value Scale of students in seminaries as compared with students in other parallel graduate education.

1. There will be identifiable demographic characteristics of those who score below the mean.

### Definitions

#### Extensive and Intensive Religious Education

Extensive and intensive religious education is used in this study to indicate religious education in Protestant seminaries in the United States. This educational experience generally involves four to five three hour courses per semester with overlapping seminars, special activities, field, laboratory experience and seminary fellowship activities. Generally this form of religious education involves not only the classroom experience, but other associated experiences of the seminary environment. This form of religious education is the most extensive and intense of the various possibilities practiced by the Protestant churches.

#### Liberal Seminaries

Liberal seminary is the term used in this study to designate seminaries of the Congregationalist, Methodist and Episcopalians. These are seminaries sponsored by and in relationship to these particular denominations. Designation is as per research by Stark and Glock (1968). The definition of liberal is therefore by the denominational affiliation of the seminary, rather than testing of students, background of faculty, or analysis of curriculum.

### Conservative Seminaries

Conservative seminaries include those seminaries sponsored by the Southern Baptist and Missouri Synod Lutherans. Stark and Block (1968) define these denominations as conservative. Again, it should be noted that the only criteria for categorizing seminaries here is that of their denominational affiliation.

### Attitudes, Values and Beliefs

There are a great deal of empirical evidence and research tools to deal with attitudes, beliefs and values. It has been suggested that attitudes, beliefs and values form themselves into cognitive structures or systems. These systems are related to behaviour. An attitude is seen as a relatively enduring organization of beliefs about an object or situation predisposing one to behave in some preferential manner. Therefore attitude change would be change in the predisposition, the change being either a change of organization or structure in beliefs or a change in the content in one or more of the beliefs entering into attitude, organization or structures. Attitudes are seen as formed by beliefs about a person or things. They have to do with both the stimulus having impact upon the individual and with his past experience in reaction to that stimulus. Some recent research has dealt not only with beliefs and attitudes but also with values. Rokeach (1960)



has developed a system of value measurements called a Value Scale which attempts to identify the value systems which operate within individual cognitive structures. Attitudes are seen as being composed of three components: cognitive affective and behavioral. Others such as Festing (1951), Stagner (1951) and Heider (1958) have seen attitudes in terms of a relationship or balance theory. Though it may be difficult to delineate exactly between what is an attitude, belief or a value, it will suffice for consideration at this point to understand attitudes as cognitive structures made up of what one believes and values. These cognitive structures predispose one's tendency to behave in a certain way towards events or persons.

#### The Open and Closed Mind

Milton Rokeach (1960) has developed a cognitive system which describes a belief-disbelief system, that is, either open or closed. By belief-disbelief system he suggests that within every cognitive system there are both the ideas that are agreed with or believed and those ideas that, accordingly, are disbelieved. In this way, he defines the open mind as one in which the magnitude of rejection of the disbelief sub-system is relatively low. In the open system there is communication between the various parts of the belief-disbelief system. There is relatively little discrepancy between the systems and there seems to be a relatively high differentiation between the disbelief

system and the belief system. In terms of the closed mind's relationship to the disbelief-belief system, Rokeach suggests that the magnitude of rejection of the disbelief sub-system is relatively high, and that there is a type of isolation of the parts with the system. There seem to be great discrepancies in the degree of differentiation between the belief and disbelief system and, finally, in the closed mind, there is relatively little differentiation within the disbelief system. He discusses the open and closed mind in terms of the time perspective dimension of beliefs. The open-minded individual has a relatively broad time perspective. The closed minded person has a relatively narrow time perspective, particularly in terms of the future orientation. Rokeach, in discussing beliefs, values and attitudes, divides them into three categories: (1) Central region beliefs that are primitive; (2) Intermediate region beliefs that have to do with the formal content of our attitudes which generally are about authority and about people who hold authority; and (3) The final area of belief system is what he calls the peripheral region. In the peripheral region are the structure of beliefs and disbeliefs which are perceived to emanate from authority. Rokeach suggests that the open-minded person sees the world in which he lives or the situation he is in at a particular moment as a friendly one. The open-minded person sees that authority is not absolute and that people are not to be evaluated (if evaluated at all) according to

their agreement or disagreement with authority. Finally, the open-minded person, in terms of the peripheral region of his beliefs, develops a cognitive sub-structure in which there is a relative communication between each belief or attitude. The closed-minded person, as opposed to the open-minded in terms of the central region, sees the world and a particular moment as threatening. The closed-minded person sees authority as absolute and views that people are to be accepted or rejected according to their agreement or disagreement with authority. For him the peripheral region of beliefs is such that the beliefs are in relative isolation from each other. Rokeach (1960, 157) defines the open-minded person with the general statement, "The more open one's belief system the more he should be evaluating and acting on information proceeding independently on its own merit." He also suggests that the more open a belief system the more the person should be governed in his actions by internal self actualizing forces and less by irrational inner forces. Rokeach (1960, 157) also defines the closed-minded person in terms of "a relatively close cognitive organization of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality which provides a framework for patterns of intolerance and qualified tolerance toward others."

### Prejudice

Our definition of prejudice is defined in terms of scores on the California "F" Scale. The items included in

this test were developed following the second World War as an attempt to identify the roots of anti-Semitism. Statements on the "F" Scale have to do with how general or specific prejudice is and the general nature of prejudice. Though the scale was originally developed as an anti-Semitism scale it was soon found to measure general attitudes towards minority groups and became a broader measure of ethnocentrism. This is to say that the California "F" Scale generally evaluates the ethnocentric person, who generally rejects the "out" groups and at the same time overly accepts and glorifies the "in" group.

#### Extrinsic and Intrinsic Religiosity

Gordon Allport (1954) divided religious values into two categories - extrinsic and intrinsic. He suggested that the extrinsic value is correlated with prejudice, while the intrinsic value is correlated with low prejudice. Allport (1971, 86) defined extrinsic as:

something that the person uses for his own purposes: to make friends, influence people, sell insurance, good times, prestige in the community, comfort, or wish fulfillment. He uses his religion in the same way that he uses his social groups and memberships. It's an exclusionistic point of view that can lead to prejudice because it is part of the fact that religion is solely for his benefit and other people are not for his benefit. It's a very self-centered orientation.

Allport goes on to suggest that a majority of people who attend church today are of this type of religion. The extrinsic religious person is utilitarian, self-serving, desiring safety, status, comfort and special favors.

The person with an intrinsic value system as defined by Gordon Allport has compassion and understanding of others. His dogma is tempered with humility. He is not self-centered. He is more confident about life and he feels more control over his destiny. Allport feels that this type of religion as universalistic, distilling the ideas of brotherhood and can express empathy. He has knowledge and himself and at the same time he understands others. He is basically non-moralistic. Rokeach (1965, 29) suggests that "everyone is neither intrinsic or extrinsic, rather all range somewhere along the continuum from one end to the other." Rokeach goes on to suggest that the extrinsically oriented person develops this personality when his early childhood experiences involve more threat, anxiety and punishment, and where he sees religion as a club to discipline and control him.

For our purposes in this research, using the list of thirty-six values from Rokeach's Value Scale, we can categorize certain of these values as more extrinsic and others more intrinsic. The intrinsic, or more open-minded value system, would include the values of equality, mature love, inner harmony and a world at peace. Among the instrumental values the intrinsic personality would hold the values of broadmindedness, forgiveness, helpfulness and love.

The extrinsic personality would hold the terminal values of a comfortable life, a sense of accomplishment, national security and social recognition. He would also

hold the instrumental values of ambition, capability, independence, obedience and self-control. For our purposes, therefore, these above will be our definitions of the extrinsic and intrinsic personality according to Rokeach's Value Scale.

### The Church and Religious Education

Christian groups have long been involved in education. Since the inception of Christian faith much time and energy of the church has been used in education. Education has been the understood vehicle through which a person would come to be more faithful, more versed in the doctrines of the faith and through which one's behavior would become more Christian. Throughout the history of the church education has taken place in many different settings and through varied methodology. Presently, education in the Protestant church is handled through weekly one hour sessions of church school. These sessions are supplemented through other education activities; usually the supplemental activities are attended by few Christians. Most Protestant Christians, therefore, have little formal religious education. The one hour a week sessions are inadequate and poorly attended.

This might explain the paradox of religious belief seen in the modern church where, on one hand, religious belief is taught as compassionate, forgiving and loving, yet research by Rokeach (1969), Stark and Glock (1968) has

suggested that the contrary is actually believed by Christians. Christians seem to be not intrinsic in their beliefs. Rokeach (1969, 16) states,

the findings discussed here lead me to suggest that religious institutions are also in need of change. Religious institutions taken as a whole are indeed at best irrelevant and at worst training centers for hypocrisy, indifference and callousness.

Rokeach (1969) suggests that a change must come about in religious education. The changes should involve "prescriptive learning" where the children are taught the "thou shalls" instead of the "thou shall nots."

This need for a different system of religious education may be expressed in terms of the comparison of the education of ministers and the education of laity. It is agreed by many, both within and outside the church, that presently there is a difference in the attitudes, beliefs and values of the clergy and that of the laity in Protestant churches. Many recent graduates of the seminary are leading the renewal movement within the Protestant denominations. This renewal is calling for a new examination of the attitudes, beliefs and values of Christians in terms of the compassionate callings of the gospel. There are many theories suggested for the unrest within certain groups of the Protestant church. One possible reason is the difference in education. The three to four years of extensive and intensive religious education taking place in Protestant seminaries may be creating a different type of Christian than the arbitrary weekly one hour of laymen's

Christian education. Seminary education which includes a broad based understanding of the Bible, church history and various aspects of Christian behavior, may be creating a different style of Christian who is actually more open-minded, less prejudiced and more intent about social involvement. It is the general concern of this study then to examine the effect, if any, of seminary education on the attitudes of Protestant clergy.

### Conclusion

Through the examination of the change in attitudes, beliefs and values of Protestant seminary students in comparison to non-seminary graduate students a better understanding of the effects of religious education can be seen in terms of the dimensions of open and close-mindedness, authoritarianness and intrinsic-extrinsic value systems. This study should aid in the understanding of religious education, the effect of seminary education and in some way should add to the research on attitudes, beliefs, and values.



## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### Definitions

Much has been written about the nature of attitudes and values and how they are changed. This literature on the nature of attitudes and values and change is very relevant to this research and the development of operational definitions for this research. In recent years new interest has developed in the study of religiosity. Some research has been done concerning the effect of seminary and higher education upon attitudes and values. Literature on these studies can be helpful for providing the background for this study. Therefore this chapter includes a summary of the relevant research to the question of what are attitudes and values and how they are changed. Included is a brief review of religion and attitude change. The research in religiosity is also summarized, as it provides a behavioral science foundation for this study.

#### Attitudes

Fifty years ago attitudes were defined as a meeting place of psychology and sociology by Thomas and Znaniecki

(1918). Earlier Lange (1888) had developed a motor theory of attitudes. One year later Munsterberg (1889) suggested that attitudes related to his attention theory of action. The next year the first of the balance theories of attitudes was presented by Fere (1890). Thus began the comprehensive study of attitudes and values. Washburn (1916) discussed this as a static tendency of attitudes. Bartlett (1932) reduced the phenomena of perception, judgment, memory, learning and thought largely to the operation of attitudes. Clarke (1911) saw attitudes as completely conscious, rather than subconscious.

The definition that is most operative for this research is that by Warren. Warren (1934, 143) defined an attitude "as the specific mental disposition toward an incoming experience, whereby that experience is modified; or a condition of readiness for a certain type of activity." Droba (1933, 126) earlier said an attitude "is a mental disposition of the human individual to act for or against a definite object." Allport (1954) similarly called an attitude a mental and natural state of readiness.

Thomas and Znaniecki (1927, 121) defined attitudes and values interdependently, saying, "a value is the objective counterpart of the attitude." Krech and Crutchfield (1948, 152) called an attitude "an enduring organization of motivational, emotional, perceptual and cognitive processes."

Murphy, Murphy and Newcomb (1937, 889) stated "attitude is primarily a way of being set toward or against

certain things." Katz and Stotland (1959, 428) suggested that an attitude is "tendency or disposition to evaluate an object or the symbol of that object in a certain way." Of these definitions Warren's (1934) conclusion that an attitude is a mental disposition is most comprehensive and compatible with the other research. This definition is basic to this research and to the instruments used.

### Values

This research also examines change in values during graduate and seminary education. The value scale developed by Rokeach is used to measure the change. His scale is significant in that it seems more comprehensive than other value measurements.

The study of values has been much less intense than that of attitudes. In fact, in comparing the studies one might find that there is a ratio of from one to five or one to eight in terms of value studies as compared to attitude studies. Newcomb, Turner and Converse (1965) saw value only as a special case of an attitude. However, many other researchers have been able to define a value in a more explicit way, seeing a value as a certain kind of belief that is separately understood from that of an attitude. Robin Williams (1968, 87) sees a value as "the criterion or standards in terms of which evaluations are made." Rokeach developed his definition in terms of a value system. Rokeach (1973, 5) defines value as "an

enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct is personally or socially preferable." Rokeach defined a value system as an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or in states of existence.

Allport (1954) divided values into two categories, intrinsic and extrinsic. These definitions are considered in noting the type of change measured in this research. These definitions are particularly relevant to religious oriented value research.

Morris (1956) defined a value in terms of a conceived or believed in value, a cognition. Kluckhohn (1951) spoke of a value in terms of a conception of the desirable. Rokeach (1973) divided values into two types. These were instrumental and terminal. These two types of values are expressed in his value scale made up of 36 items, 18 instrumental and 18 terminal values. The instrumental values are divided into moral values and competency values and the terminal value into personal and social values. The value survey that Rokeach developed is simple in design and economical to administer; in a very brief way, it provides a view of the values of an individual or group. Rokeach (1971) reported a high degree of reliability and validity of his results. It is a projective test which offers a free kind of response that does not have to be disguised. It is directly understood and easily interpreted.

The relativity of Rokeach's Value Scale and Allport's Intrinsic/Extrinsic religious orientation was studied by

Tate and Miller (1971). This study suggested that the intrinsic religious person will rank salvation and forgiveness higher. Those of the extrinsic personality ranked a comfortable life, happiness and social recognition higher. Burger (1970) studied Rokeach's Value Scale particularly in terms of the matter of honesty as related to the index in his scale.

Other research on values included Tate and Miller's (1971) studies of the differences in value systems as they related to various religious orientations. Gorsuch (1970) reviewed the relationship of Rokeach's value system to the matter of social compassion. Cohn (1969) reviewed the relationship between values and social class. Handy (1970) reviewed Rokeach's method of measuring values as well as other methods of value measurement. Feather (1971) studied value differences in relationship to dogmatism and prejudice.

#### Attitude and Value Change

This research deals with the matter of change in attitudes and values. It particularly deals with change in attitudes and values associated with a certain learning experience, that of seminary education. There are several basic theories of how attitudes are changed. These include: the balance of homeostasis theories, learning theories, group process theories and personality theories. Each of these theoretical understandings of attitude change is relevant to the experience in seminary education.

A review therefore of these concepts is important to understanding the process of this study.

Hovland, Janis and Kelly (1953); Hovland and Janis (1959) and Rosenberg, et al. (1960) all discussed change in regard to a Yale program in attitude and opinion change. Brehm and Cohen (1962) did work in the relation of the theory of cognitive dissonance to attitude change. Schein (1961) and Lifton (1956) dealt with attitude change through brainwashing. Rosenberg (1960) studied change through hypnosis. Klapper (1961) summarized the research regarding the influence of mass media on attitude change. Carlson (1956) recorded evidence of change and the perceived relevance of the attitude object. Culbertson (1957) demonstrated that role-playing can change attitudes toward Negroes.

The assimilation-contrast theory of attitude change was developed by Sherif and Howland (1961) and Hovland, Harvey and Sherif (1957). The adaption-level theory of change was developed by Helson (1959, 1964). McGuire's (1962, 1964) inoculation theory dealt with how attitudes are resistant to change. Kelley and Volkort (1952) and Kelly (1955) also discussed the resistance to change of group anchored attitudes. Harvey (1970) reviewed the relationship between beliefs and behavior.

## Cognitive Structures

The balance or homeostasis theories of attitude change suggest that persons tend to change attitudes out of the basic need for congruence, homeostasis or balance. The seminary environment could provide a general set of experiences that would cause persons to change attitudes in order to keep balance, homeostasis or congruence. These concepts therefore are important to seeing the possibility of change in seminary.

Asch (1952) and others saw attitudes as cognitive structures. Among these were Stager (1951) who presented the concept of homeostasis. He suggested that homeostasis is the way of explaining development of attitudes in persons. He saw that attitudes are developed as an attempt to keep a balance. He also points out that behavior is a way of reinforcing attitudes. Heider's (1946, 1958) and Newcomb's (1953, 1959) theory on balance generally expressed the same thing. They suggested that a person develops a positive sentiment or negative sentiment in terms of interaction with persons and concepts and that a person will tend to find a balance between differing sentiments or values. Rokeach (1960) had also suggested the same general concept in the idea of belief congruence. Belief congruency, as he explained, is a tendency to value a given belief subsystem or system of beliefs in proportion to its degree of congruence with our own belief system and

further to tend to value people in proportion to the degree to which they exhibit belief congruence with our own.

Leon Festinger (1957, 1964) presented a theory of cognitive dissonance. The theory of cognitive dissonance dealt with the motivational effects on the individual or the psychological tensions which result from non-harmonious or dissonant conditions. The individual is unable to continue in a dissonant state and hence is impelled through behavioral or attitude change to reduce the distance and return to a state of balance.

Rosenberg (1953, 1956, 1960, 1960, 1960) and Abelson and Rosenberg (1958, 1960) developed the theory of Affective-Cognitive Consistency. They presented a structural theory of attitude change which proposes that affective and cognitive components of an attitude or belief are congruent with each other except when they are in the process of change. Brehm and Cohen (1962) studied the role of commitment and volition to cognitive dissonance. Zajonc (1960) related the theories of balance, congruity and dissonance.

### Learning Theory and Attitudes

Seminary education is generally a learning experience wherein beliefs and concepts are discussed, shared and learned. Different seminaries have different emphasis on the learning. However, in all the seminaries in this research project there is a strong emphasis upon cognitive and experiential learning. Research done concerning the



effect of learning or attitudes is important for consideration.

Reinforcement, conditioning and general learning theory are a part of the research in attitude development. The Yale Communication Research Program was based upon the reinforcement theory of attitude change. It drew upon principles of learning developed by Hugg (1943), Miller and Dollard (1941), and Doab (1947). The basis of this theory of attitude change is through reinforcement and learning. Staats and Staats (1957, 1958) also dealt with reinforcement research of attitudes.

Asch (1952) suggested that knowledge direct or inferred is a basis of attitudes. Doab (1947) saw attitudes as invoked by various stimulus patterns as a result of previous learning. Here attitudes are a kind of S-R relationship in terms of their development. Staats and Staats (1958) also upheld this idea of conditioning in their study of classical conditioning of attitudes by the use of words. Bostrom, Vlandis and Rosenbaum (1961) used the reinforcement theory to study the affect of grades in the classroom. Razan (1938, 1940) studied reinforcement and attitude change as did Singer (1961) and Wallace (1966). Marlowe, Frager and Nuttall (1965) dealt with conditioning attitudes toward Negroes. Hildum and Brown (1956) demonstrated the effect of verbal reinforcement, as did Insko (1965), and Krasner, Knowles and Ullman (1965).

We could conclude therefore the learning experiences in seminary education could have a significant effect in changing attitudes and values of seminary students.

#### Group Experiences and Attitudes and Values

One of the important aspects of seminary education is the development of the seminary community. The students, faculty and students' wives have many activities together in the learning community life. Some seminary groups have regular meals together, most have regular fellowship activities, and all have common worship experiences. Seminary therefore develops a group life or group experience. Research has shown that group pressure or group life does affect the development or change of attitudes.

Group pressure and experiences influence attitude development and change. Festinger, Riecken, and Schachter (1950) dealt with social support for attitude change. Group reinforcement for change was studied by Scott (1957). Mitnick and McGinnies (1958) presented evidence for group change of prejudice. That the group's approval is necessary for the development of new attitudes was suggested by Rosenberg (1960) and Carlson (1956). This was also expressed in research by Eddy (1959, 1963) and Newcomb (1964). Lehmann, Sinha and Hartnett (1956) have indicated also that changes do happen in terms of attitudes with college attendance. Research, therefore, has shown that attitudes change with the effect of education and that, contrary to

some psychological theories, attitudes, beliefs and values are not entirely set in preschool age, but can be set and changed during the period of higher education. Breer and Locke (1965) developed research along the area of attitude change. They suggest that attitudes are the creation of men and that experience provides the raw material out of which men construct these attitudes and beliefs. Their solution to attitude change, therefore, is in terms of experience, which experience they call task experience.

### Personality

The makeup of ones personality is also associated with development and change of attitudes. Seminary students approach their education out of the context of their own personality. Therefore, it is important to understand that though the seminary education itself may be significant for attitude change, still, research has shown that the personality and past experience of the individual is significant to understand change in attitudes.

Personality makeup as a factor in attitude change was suggested by Peak (1955) and Helson, Blake, Mouton and Olmstead (1956). Smith, Bruner and White (1956) attempted to state the functions that opinions and attitudes serve for personality. Katz (1960) listed functions that attitudes perform for personality, adjustment, ego defense, value expression and knowledge. Kelman (1961) also took the functional approach to attitude study. Sarnoff (1960,

1962) developed the implications of Freudian psychology for attitudes. Sherif (1965) and associates defined variations in the importance of an attitude in terms of ego involvement. Guilford's (1959) approach to personality seemed to indicate that attitudes are related to behavior traits or may be equated with these traits.

#### Authoritarianism, Dogmatism, and Prejudice

The instruments used for this study of attitudes and values include Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale and the F Scale for the authoritarian personality. In the literature concerning these scales it is indicated that the F Scale and the Dogmatism Scale are acceptable instruments for measuring dogmatism and authoritarianism. These attitudes are relevant to the understanding of seminary education. They, therefore, can be the basis for our examination of attitude change in seminary education.

The classic study in prejudice and associated attitudes is found in The Authoritarian Personality by Adorne, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson and Stanford (1950). This study, which was authorized and published by the American Jewish Committee, represents a study of anti-Semitism following the Second World War. The study of anti-Semitism grew out of the deep concern that arose from the Jewish persecution by Nazi Germany. The concern for the attitudes that created this kind of situation was expressed in the study sponsored by the Jewish community. The development

of their research resulted in a scale called the "F" Scale, the F standing for Fascism. It had a two-fold purpose: it was to be used as an indirect measure for prejudice without mentioning the names of any specific minority group, and it was to measure underlying predispositions towards a Fascist outlook on life. It was found that high scores on the "F" Scale tended to measure not only anti-Semitism but ethnocentrism, anti-Negro feeling and a tendency towards political conservatism. Adorno, et al., also suggested that the "F" Scale measures the authoritarian personality. Problems with this assumption have been that the "F" Scale measures only authoritarianism to the right. This was also discussed by Rose (1966) and Dimons (1956).

Sanford (1956) concluded that the F Scale was developed basically to measure general prejudice in the personality. Many criticisms have been made concerning the concept of the authoritarian personality. Hyman and Sheatsley (1954) made a very incisive critique of the concept of the authoritarian personality. They specifically concerned themselves with the question of the population, sampling and measuring instruments used in the development of the F Scale. As devastating as their criticism was, still the impact of the concepts involved in the authoritarian personality was pervasive. The F Scale was used over and over by researchers. Though criticisms continued, it's use and its validity has been still upheld. Titus and Humner (1957) suggested that basically the F Scale was a measure of the

response on a pencil and paper test and not necessarily a measure of interpersonal behaviors in situational conditions. Some of the strongest criticisms of the F Scale came in terms of the response bias. Carey, Rogow and Farrell (1957) argued that the scores on the F Scale measured agreement with values expressed in an authoritarian manner and do not depend upon the content of those values. The way in which the measurement in the test was written created a bias towards a positive response and therefore towards an authoritarian style. Kirscht and Dillehay (1967) prepared a helpful review of the research related to the F Scale and concept of the authoritarian personality. Here they point out the problems and criticisms as well as the validity of the continued use of the F Scale. McKinney (1973) prepared a careful inquiry into the failure of social scientists' research to produce demonstratable knowledge. He used studies on the authoritarian personality as a basis for his hypothesis. Basically he sees a failure in social science research, particularly that failure as demonstrated in the illgitimacy of the theoretical approach to the development of the research behind the authoritarian personality. His work provides an excellent summary however of the research related to the F Scale and authoritarianism.

Gordon Allport (1954) published a book on the nature of prejudice which outlined from a social psychological point of view the various aspects of a prejudiced person. The aims of the book were to clarify the nature of human

prejudice. His discussion of prejudice was an attempt to broaden the concept of prejudice to involve more than race or any single factor. He suggested that a plural causation is the primary lesson that he wished to promote.

Milton Rokeach (1960) published The Open and Closed Mind which was an attempt to outline a cognitive structure related to prejudice. Here he introduced his Dogmatism Scale as a measure of the open and closed mind. This was later revised to a short form by Schulze (1962). Rokeach suggested that the open and closed mind was a more complete way to describe the cognitive structures which exist in the general attitude of prejudice. For, though the "F" Scale measured prejudice, it only measured it for the right, in that prejudice could be expressed better in terms of closed-mindedness which can be found at either end of the political or religious left to right continuum. Other explanations of the Dogmatism Scale were amplified by Rokeach (1952, 1954, 1955, 1958, 1966). A continued study in the nature of belief systems was presented by Rokeach (1968). This was an attempt to further discuss beliefs, attitudes and values in terms of a functionally integrated cognitive system. Here he not only discussed the nature and systems of attitude beliefs and values but also the possibility of change or modification. Gordon (1971) reviewed the relationship of the F Scale and the Dogmatism Scale in terms of the response sets in the scales. Costin (1971) empirically followed up on Rokeach's

studies, examining the relationship between conservatism and dogmatism.

#### Higher Education and Attitude Change

There has been considerable research on attitude change and higher education. Studies have indicated that from the freshman through senior year changes in attitude did occur. Studies by Corey (1936), Jacob (1957), Webster (1958), Barton (1959), Freedman (1959), Nelson (1962), Plant (1962), Newcomb (1965) and Clark (1967) all agreed to this point. A study of Pilington, Poppleton and Robertshaw (1967) suggested that religiousness decreases in terms of an attitude change in the first and second years of a higher education. Lehmann, Sinha and Hartnett (1956) agreed that religious attitudes change in terms of becoming less stereotyped, less dogmatic and more outer directed in their beliefs during higher education. Green (1972) compared attitudes, values and dogmatism of college students, particularly juniors and seniors. Feldman (1972) provided a theoretical approach to the study of change and stability in college students.

#### Seminary Education and Attitudes

The research concerning the effect of seminary education on the personality characteristics of seminary students is varied. Thompson's (1974) study of 75 Southern Baptist Seminary students at Southwestern Baptist



Theological Seminary at Forth Worth indicated a difference in orthodoxy between undergraduate religion majors and graduate seminary students. The latter were less orthodox as measured by Glock and Stark's (1966) orthodoxy scale. These differences could have been caused by the effect of seminary education. Gustavus (1973) studied students in the Baptist Seminary at Baylor. His studies indicated that seminarians feel less stress or role conflict than other graduate students. Mason, Holt and Newsom (1969) studied the relationship of authoritarianism in seminary students as compared with authoritarianism in counselor trainees. They used the philosophical scale of human nature and a social maturity scale and found that seminary students do not have a more dogmatic or rigid frame of reference than do counselor trainees. Fendrich (1966) found that Catholic students did develop a more open-minded approach during church college education than non-religious students in other schools. Here too, religious education seemed to create openness. However, Hauss (1972) in his study of Lutheran Seminary students in Illinois, found that personality characteristics do not change in seminary.

#### General Research

There are many general publications on attitudes, beliefs and values. Some of these are: Secord and Backman (1964) and Triandis (1971) who provided a good review of the research in attitudes, as did Jahoda and Warren (1966).

Rosenberg et al. (1960) presented a review of attitude studies. One of the most complete reviews of the studies of attitudes, particularly attitude change was done by Insko (1967). He organizes the research on attitude change in terms of the theories of attitude change. He divides them into the categories of reinforcement, assimilation, contract, adaption level, logical effective consistency theory, congruency, belief congruency, balance, dissonance, psychoanalytic and inoculation theory. His survey of the theories of attitude change provides an excellent view of the research in the area of attitude studies.

Martin Fishbein (1967) provided a reader in the area of attitude theory. As an editor he gathered together the basis literature in the area of attitude studies. In this publication he not only provided a basic reader for the student of attitude theory, but traced this development chronologically as well as theoretically.

Cohen (1964) provided a practical summary of the theories of attitude change. His summary is particularly directed to the area of communications. Suedfield (1971) summarizes the various fields of attitude study. He categorized them in terms of consistency theories and alternatives to the consistency theories. He feels that there is a need in the future for developing alternative theories, particularly alternatives to the consistency theories expressed as cognitive dissonance, belief, congruity, etc. Davis (1964) provides a selected bibliography of the

research in attitude change. Other generalized research on attitudes was done by the following: Bruner and White (1956), Peak (1955, 1958), Defleur and Westie (1963), Katz and Stotland (1959), Brown (1965) and Turner and Converse (1965).

### Research Methods

Studies on research methods and design for attitude measurement include several different points of view. Solomon (1949) presented research concerning the choice experimental design for attitude research. Campbell (1957) recommended a post-test only control group design for attitude research. Other general publications relative to attitude research are Thurston (1929), Likert (1932), Siegal (1956), Sage (1963), Edwards (1965), Kerlenger (1965), Young and Veldman (1965), Van Dolen and Meyer (1966), and Lardall (1967). Attitude measurement was studied by Stoffer (1950), Green (1954) and Remmers (1953). Osgood, Suci and Tannedaum (1957) provided an exposition of semantic differential for attitude scaling. Kelly (1955) provided a grid technique for measurement. Edwards (1957) discussed the pitfalls in questionnaire research. Oppenheim (1966) provides a good survey of the problems of questionnaire design in attitude measurement. He carefully analyzes the problems particularly in questionnaire design as it relates to attitude measurement. Eysenck (1954) and Bauer (1964) provided examples of research design and

statistical methods for attitude research. Bostian and Tucker (1969) suggested some method of attaining evidence of attitude change. Katz (1957) suggested that belief intensity is the key to measuring public attitudes. Sherif, Sherif and Nebergall (1965) presented some new methods of attitude measurement. Summers (1970) has gathered together a group of articles on attitude measurement. These articles generally point out the problems in attitude measurement and at the same time clarify some of the accepted techniques in attitude measurement.

One could conclude from the analysis of this literature that a pre-test/post-test design is preferable for attitude research. It is also important to be careful in the use of instruments and questionnaires. Questionnaires must be laid out with awareness of the implication of questions and building bias. Therefore, for this research, the use of well accepted instruments such as Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale and Value Scale and the F Scale are an attempt to utilize good instrumentation. The questionnaire to be used is a questionnaire developed by the National Council of Churches, Department of Ministry, for the study of persons in the ministry.

#### Religion and the Study of Attitudes and Values

Rokeach (1958, 1960) has suggested that there are attitude paradoxes in religion. Though religion teaches the Golden Rule, it does in fact produce prejudiced persons.

He stated that religious people are more likely to express anti-humanitarian attitudes and bigotry. He suggested the historical examples of man's inhumanity are often the result of religious conviction. He indicates that some of the most horrible crimes in wars are in the name of religion, such as the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the Crusades, the Inquisitions and the burning of witches and heretics.

Clifford Kirkpatrick (1949) published findings that showed that there was a negative correlation between religious sentiments and humanitarian attitudes. Gordon Allport (1954), in his book The Nature of Prejudice, described many studies that have stated that religious persons tend to be less humanitarian and have more punitive attitudes towards criminals, delinquents, prostitutes, homosexuals and those who might seem to need psychological counseling or psychiatric treatment. Gordon Allport (1954, 176) stated, "On the average church-goers and professed religious people have considerably more prejudice than do non-church-goers and non-believers." Allport (1960) explained this in terms of the paradox of religion, that it both makes prejudice and unprejudice. His studies, however, indicate that the more devout Christians follow the non-prejudiced teachings of Christianity and the less devout and nominal Christians practice the more prejudiced and rigid forms of Christianity. In The Authoritarian Personality, the authors summarized the study of the California group in terms of prejudice by stating that religious affiliation does

indicate some rise in prejudice scores. The factor of the particular religious denomination does not prove to be very significant. The report stated that persons who reject organized religion tend to be less prejudiced. Rokeach's study on the closed mind indicated that certain religious groups tend to be more closed than others and that those persons who are more closed score higher on the Dogmatism Scale. Also, those scoring higher on the Dogmatism Scale tend to reject disbelief systems more strongly, thus indicating a type of bigotry. Rokeach (1968), in Beliefs, Attitudes and Values, amplifies the paradoxes of religious beliefs. Here he points out the anxiety that is created within the individual when the religious denomination, on one hand, teaches mutual love and respect, the Golden Rule, love of justice, mercy and equality of all men in the eyes of God and, on the other hand, teaches that only some persons can be saved, that certain people were chosen people.

Rokeach's (1969) recent work with the Value Scale indicated that religious persons tended to be more dogmatic and less compassionate and less concerned than non-religious persons. Rokeach (1969, 16) stated that if Christian values do indeed serve as standards of conduct "they seem to be standards more often employed to guide men's conduct away rather than toward his fellowman." Start and Glock (1968, 1966, 1965) agreed that religiousness of a conservative type tends to create a non-social compassionate attitude.

Maranell (1967, 1968) found that religiosity variables are not entirely or positively correlated with bigotry. Yet

particular items of religiosity, such as mysticism, and ritualism, are positively correlated with bigotry. This might indicate that those Protestant churches which tend to be more mystical and ritualistic practice a kind of religious education that allows bigotry to develop. He also states that fundamentalist conservative attitudes are very positively correlated with racism. Frothro and Jensen (1956) studied the relationship of religious attitudes in the South. Jones (1958) and Argyle's (1958) studies suggested that generally religious people are more prejudiced than non-religious. However, they stated the more devout are less prejudiced than non-attending members. Spoerl (1951) and Parry (1949) found that members from different denominations were prejudiced towards different groups. Ringer and Glock (1955) found that interest in social and political problems was not high in conservative religious people. Rokeach (1968) and Henriot (1966) saw a comparison between certain religious values to social change was discussed by Abramson and Noll (1966). Gray (1967) found that the closed-mindedness within Presbyterian laity was not correlated with their knowledge of the church.

Some significant work has been done in recent years to study carefully the characteristics of religious attitudes, beliefs and values. To understand the importance of religious education and the nature of attitude change one needs to have some empirical evidence about religious

attitudes, beliefs and values. A comprehensive study of this topic has been presented by Stark and Glock (1968). Their presently published volume is the first of three volumes on the patterns of religious commitment. There have been other studies on religious attitudes, beliefs and values from empirical evidence. Clayton and Gladden (1974) argued that the multi-dimensional characteristics of Glock and Stark's (1965, 1968) conception of religiosity were incorrect. Their studies indicate only one dimension. King and Hunt (1972) developed a comprehensive model for the measurement of religious beliefs and attitudes. Allen and Spelka (1967) developed the concept of "committee and consensual" religious styles. Raschke (1973) examined the relationship between the Allen and Spelka typology (1967) of two religious styles and Rokeach's (1960) open and closed cognitive orientation.

Demerath (1965) studied social class in the church. Gregory (1957) reported a positive relationship between the test of orthodox religious beliefs and the F Scale scores. Photiadis and Johnson (1963) studied church participation, orthodox beliefs, prejudice and personality variables. They found that orthodoxy was positively related to authoritarianism and prejudice. Faulkner and Delorey (1966) presented an empirical analysis of religiousness.

Gerhard Lenski (1961) had a three volume work on The Religious Factor. He attempted to look at the differences



between persons who align themselves with three basic religious groups. Stark and Glock (1966) also produced a volume on the relationship of the Christian faith to prejudice. This study indicated the relationship of particular theological ideas to anti-Semitism. Vanecka (1966, 1967) also dealt with this relationship.

Allport's (1954, 1960) study of religious characteristics divided them into two categories: extrinsic and intrinsic. Feagin (1964) developed a scale for measuring Allport's intrinsic and extrinsic religion. Allport and Ross (1967) developed a scale in two parts. Strickland and Weddell (1972) studied prejudice and the intrinsic and extrinsic personality. They concluded that Allport's measures were not helpful in non-traditional groups. Hunt and King (1971) provided a full analysis of the measurements for the two orientations to religion. Strickland and Shaffer (1971) studied the relationship of intrinsic and extrinsic orientation and the F Scale. Hood (1971) provided a study of the relationship of Feagin's (1964) and Allport and Ross' (1967) scales. Dittes (1971) sees the problem of extrinsic-intrinsic types as a sociological one. Hoge (1972) developed a revised scale for measuring "intrinsic" and "extrinsic religion."

Gilkey (1967) divided Christian attitudes into two categories: Personal holiness and ethics. Glock and Stark (1965) reported that in their beginning research in the area of religious attitudes and beliefs five dimensions

of religiosity appeared: the experiential, ideological ritualistic, intellectual and consequential dimensions.

Other analytical attempts at the classification of Christian attitudes were made by Glock, Ringer and Babbi (1967), by Milton Yinger (1967), and Kirkpatrick (1949). Hadden (1967) studied the differences within various churches. His research more than any pointed out the difference between the Protestant clergy and the Protestant laity. Work by Pallone and Banks (1968) on ministerial satisfaction and the general survey of the clergy by Gustafson (1963) added information to this general split between the clergy and laity.

Stark and Glock (1968, 157) expressed this split in these terms,

the new breed of theologians as we understand them are telling us we are wrong in that we rigidly identify Christianity with old-fashioned fundamentalism which modern Christian thought has long been discarded.

They state,

In most of the commentary on the major transformation of our religious institutions the key terms are change, renewal and improvement . . . it is not the end of the Christian era; but, the dawn of a new and more profound Christian period that they anticipate.

This renewal of the church is generally represented as a change from intrinsic or non-compassionate Christian faith to a more compassionate extrinsic faith.

Modern popular theologians continually have proclaimed this new kind of renewal, a renewal which seems to be the

creed of the young seminary graduates of liberal seminaries. Gibbs and Morton (1967) dealt with the inactivity and irresponsibility of the laity to meet social problems. Weber (1966) called for a church which would be in the service of man. Pierre Berton's (1965) now classic work struck home at the apathy of the average Protestant laity. Dolan (1967) simply called for a radical change to more open-mindedness and social responsibility in the church, as did Rose (1966) in his manifesto for Protestant renewal. Stagg (1967), Wilson (1966), Van Den Heuvel (1966), Grimes (1958), and Thielicke (1965) all called for a general renewal of the laity, particularly in terms of their attitudes of love and compassion. Peter Berger (1961) suggested the answer in terms of the breaking with the religious establishment. Rahtjen (1966) suggested the answer can be found in a re-interpretation of the scriptural proclamation for social actions.

Each of these contemporary theologians points to a problem with the church in terms of its lack of concern and involvement in the world. On one hand the religious establishment is made up of nominal Christians, empirically surveyed as being more prejudiced, closed-minded and self-centered; while on the other hand the writers and theologians within the church call for a more compassionate, open, involved religion. Both Niebuhr (1956), and Williams (1961) indicated this development. There are implications of this study to the renewal controversy, particularly in

relation to seminary education. Does seminary education create the more socially compassionate and open-minded person? Is it liberal seminary education that has created the cry for a more compassionate church? These questions are dealt with in this study.

In conclusion, it is evident that much has been written and researched in the past 25 years concerning attitudes, values, beliefs and religiosity. The literature indicates that these are usable categories and represent measurable phenomena. Particularly, it is evident that the concept of the open and closed mind as researched by Rokeach and the concept of the authoritarian personality are useable in understanding attitudes. Rokeach's Value Scale can also be used to observe changes in value patterns. The research would justify the assumption that attitudes and values are changed. They are changed by education, group process, and other effects of the learner's environment. It is also evident that religious teachings have an effect upon attitudes and values. It, therefore, can be hypothesized that religious education can change attitudes and values.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS

#### Quasi Experimental Research Design

The design of this study is according to the general definition of quasi experimental research designs. The design involves a pre-test, post-test pattern. In this case the pre-test was at the beginning of the first year of graduate education, the post-test at the conclusion of the first year. There were four groups, including two experimental groups: a conservative seminary group of students and a group of liberal seminary students. These two groups received the experimental treatment of seminary religious education. A control group was provided for each of the two experimental groups. The control group was matched to the two experimental groups as completely as possible. External validity was protected for generalization by random sampling of the seminaries. Internal validity was limited because of the inability to randomly assign subjects to groups. Though this research is not pure experimental, it is the type of research Campbell and Stanley (1959) call quasi-experimental. It has, as they suggest, the social setting limitation and the limitation

of randomization. However, it is "deemed worthy of use where better designs are not feasible." General guidelines for the research will be from Rommers' (1954) work on attitude measurement.

#### Null Hypotheses

a. There will be no significant, positive differences between the change scores on the Dogmatism Scale of students in conservative seminaries as compared to parallel students in other graduate education.

b. There will be no significant, positive differences between the change scores on the F Scale of students in conservative seminaries as compared to parallel students in other graduate education.

c. There will be no significant, positive differences between the change scores on the Dogmatism Scale of students in liberal seminaries as compared with parallel students in other graduate education.

d. There will be no significant, positive differences between the change scores on the F Scale of students in liberal seminaries as compared to students in other graduate education.

e. There will be no significant, positive differences between the change scores on the Dogmatism Scale of students in liberal seminaries as compared with students in conservative seminaries.

f. There will be no significant, positive differences between the change scores on the F Scale of students

in liberal seminaries as compared with students in conservative seminaries.

g. There will be no significant, positive differences between the change scores on the Dogmatism Scale of seminary students as compared with other parallel graduate students.

h. There will be no significant, positive differences between the change scores on the F Scale of the seminary students as compared to other parallel graduate students.

i. There will be no significant, positive differences between the change scores on Rokeach's Value Scale of conservative seminary students as compared to other parallel graduate students.

j. There will be no significant, positive differences between the change scores on Rokeach's Value Scale of liberal seminary students as compared with other parallel graduate students.

k. There will be no significant, positive differences between the change scores on Rokeach's Value Scale of students in the seminaries as compared with students in other parallel graduate education.

l. There will be no identifiable demographic characteristics of those seminary students with above the mean change scores on the F Scale and Dogmatism Scale which are different from the characteristics of those who score below the mean.

### General Experimental Procedure

Eight schools were chosen to be a part of the quasi-experimental research design of this study. Of these schools, four were seminaries, and four were graduate schools. The seminaries were chosen at random under two categories: liberal seminaries and conservative seminaries. The liberal seminaries chosen were Seabury Western Episcopal Seminary of Evanston, Illinois, and Iliff Theological School, a Methodist seminary in Denver, Colorado. The conservative seminaries were Concordia Lutheran Seminary of St. Louis, Missouri, and Mid-Western Baptist Seminary of Kansas City, Missouri.

A graduate school was matched with each of the seminaries, as follows: Northwestern University with Seabury Western of Evanston; University of Denver with Iliff; Mid-Western Baptist with University of Missouri in Kansas City; and Washington University with Concordia. Three additional schools were added to the study. Conservative Baptist in Denver, St. Pauls Methodist and Nazarene Theological Seminary in Kansas City were added because of their convenience to the researcher. Statistical data is included in the study concerning the three extra seminaries only when relevant.

Each school chosen was then visited by the research director in September of 1970 and May of 1971. Arrangements were made by mail with officials of each of the



graduate schools and full cooperation was obtained from each graduate school in the testing procedures; therefore, the testing was done by the research director himself. In a large classroom, instructions were given to each student. These instructions were read to the group, or on some occasions, read to the individual students and ample time was given for each student to complete the test and questionnaire. The instruments for pre-test and post-test were identical, though they were printed on different colors of paper. There was no attempt to hide the fact that the tests were identical. The general feeling of the student participating in the testing was good. They were interested in the results afterwards. Most students asked for an opportunity to receive an explanation of the particular materials and results of their testing. Each of the schools involved in the research project have requested reports on the project, and excellent cooperation was found in each school.

#### Selection of Students

At each school, the entire first year graduate student body was invited to participate. However, because of certain limitations on time schedule and attitude, not all persons participated fully. The number of students participating in both pre and post tests were: Conservative Baptist Seminary - 23; Nazarene Theological Seminary - 44; Midwestern Baptist Seminary - 29; Concordia Seminary - 38;

all students - 409; Iliff School of Theology - 34; Northwestern University - 16; St. Pauls School of Theology - 52; Washington University - 73; University of Missouri at Kansas City - 42; Seabury Western Theological School - 18; University of Denver - 40. With the normal independence of the graduate student, the percentage of participation in this kind of behavioral science research is good and as high as can be expected. Students in professional schools in graduate school were eliminated from the selection. For example, students in the school of dentistry at the University of Missouri in Kansas City were not invited to participate in the test.

#### Controlling Necessary Variables

In order to control for change that might happen in a year of seminary education, the graduate schools were chosen as the control group. It is felt that the graduate school pairing would serve as control for normal one-year educational maturing, any particular events that might have occurred in the city where the school was located and for age and general maturity. The control group (graduate school) and the experimental group (seminary) were both located in the same city; students were the same age; had the same educational background; they were all experiencing one year of higher education. The difference in this case was the type of higher education--seminary education (liberal or conservative) and general graduate school education.

## Statistical Methods

Four statistical methods were used on the data received. It should be noted that there were much more data than the research project demanded at this point. Data from the questionnaire and from various comparisons within the testing are quite extensive and can give a good profile of seminary students and graduate school students. On each of the eleven sample groups, a Wilcoxon Sign test, and a simple T Test was done for differences. The purpose of this test was to ascertain whether or not there were significant differences between the pre-test scores and the post-test scores.

The Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance was used on the difference scores (pre-test, subtracted from post-test) for the eight different schools of the basic research project. This was done using the scores of the Dogmatism Scale, the "F" Scale and each of the 36 scores on the Value Scale.

The Kruskal-Wallis was also used to test for significance within the seminaries as compared with the graduate schools; to test between the liberal seminaries and their matched graduate schools; the conservative seminaries and their matched graduate schools and finally it was used for comparison between the liberal seminaries and the conservative seminaries. The purpose of this was to test for significant differences between the different scores on the

various groups. This step would help discover whether there was actually any difference between the different scores. Correlations were run between the pre-test scores on the "F" Scale, Dogmatism Scale, and the 36 items on the Value Scale, as well as the different scores on each of these scales. The purpose of this was to ascertain any pattern of relationships indicated by these correlations. Finally, the seminary students and graduate students were divided into two groups (those scoring above the mean and below the mean on the Dogmatism Scale) and these groups were compared according to selected demographic characteristics.

#### Instrumentation

Three instruments were used in the study: the California "F" Scale, Milton Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale, and his Value Scale. The California "F" Scale has been used in literally hundreds of investigations. The scale is a collection of statements for each of which the subject is asked to express the degree of his agreement or disagreement. Each statement is concerned with some relatively specific opinion, attitude or value. The basis for grouping the items within a particular scale was the conception that, taken together, they express a single general trend.

The Dogmatism Scale developed by Milton Rokeach was developed in an attempt to ascertain the various defining characteristics of the open and closed system. Subjects

are asked to indicate their personal opinion on how strongly they agreed or disagreed with a particular statement on the scale. Rokeach's scale was an attempt to provide statements that were designed to transcend specific ideological positions in order to penetrate to the formal and structural characteristics. The Dogmatism Scale has gone through a number of revisions. These have been made in order to increase its reliability. The reliabilities on the scale are considered quite satisfactory, particularly when it is noted that the Dogmatism Scale contains quite a broad collection of items (Rokeach 1969).

The other instrument employed in this research is the Value Scale, also developed by Milton Rokeach, which consists of 18 terminal values and 18 other instrumental values. The terminal values refer to preferred end-states of existence; instrumental values refer to preferred modes of behavior. The respondent's task is simply to rank each of the lists of 18 values in the order of importance as guiding principles in his daily life. This instrument has been used by Rokeach in a national study of American values. Though the value definitions have difficulty in semantic interpretation, the scale does represent a major attempt to describe and evaluate value systems.

#### Questionnaire

A questionnaire was used with the seminary students. The questionnaire was the source of the various biographical

factors which will be considered in comparing the high and low group on the Dogmatism Scale. The biographical factors particularly important on the questionnaire included:

(1) under-graduate preparation, whether or not the student attended a church related college; (2) his local church theology; (3) his grade-point average; (4) the evaluation of his relationship to others; (5) the strength of his religious training; (6) his family religious background; (7) his personal theology; (8) the student's activity in the church. The last two of these categories particularly relate to Rokeach's work concerning values and religiousness.

#### Limitations

1. It must be recognized that the definitions of prejudice and open-mindedness and the inferred definitions that have to do with dogmatism and authoritarianism are related only to the "F" Scale and the Dogmatism Scale and to the research and implications that can be made from these two scales.

2. Religious education as defined in the case of this study is the total experience of a student in either a liberal Protestant seminary or a conservative Protestant seminary. This is considerably different from religious education which might be found in the church school, parochial school, Christian home or the department of religious education at a state university. Therefore, generalizations about Christian education from this study

must be limited to primarily an understanding of Christian education as expressed in a liberal Protestant seminary or a conservative Protestant seminary.

3. The control groups for each seminary will be matched with the particular seminaries chosen. They will be matched on the basis of age, intelligence, sex, geographical background, and educational experience. Yet it is not possible to match the groups by previous religious experience nor by the natural process of selection that is made by the vocational choice of individuals to go into the ministry. Therefore, it must be recognized that one limitation of this study has to do with the question of selection. The question of previous religious experience and conviction raises a variable that cannot be controlled. However, it should be noted that the current study is concerned with change. The pre-test, post-test methodology should eliminate a portion of the limitations created by the inability to randomly assign persons to experimental or control groups.

#### Special Assistance

Assistance for this study, for particular matters concerned with this research, has been obtained from Edgar M. Mills, of the Department of the Ministry, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. Mr. Mills has provided personal consultation for the consideration of seminary education in its relationship to Rokeach's research.

Dr. Milton Rokeach, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, has provided personal consultation in terms of the relationship of his general research on attitudes, beliefs and values and his recent particular research on values of religious and non-religious persons. The consultation with Dr. Rokeach has been in terms of the relationship of his research to this proposed type of study.



## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

This research project into the attitude and value changes during seminary education indicated results in three different areas of study.

First, the results to be reported deal with the attitude change as measured by Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale and the "F" Scale. These results are reported in terms of significance of change on both of those scales in seminary and graduate school and the comparison of the change of those students in liberal and conservative seminaries, as well as a comparison between the seminary students and graduate students.

The second area of reporting has to do with changes as measured by Rokeach's Value Scale. This Value Scale gives scores on each of 36 different values, thus, the results show the significant change by the seminary students on any of the 36 values. Differences of significance are also noted in the changes in the scores of seminarians as compared to the graduate students on the Value Scale.

Finally, data was obtained concerning the demographic or biographic characteristics of the students who scored above and below the mean on the Dogmatism Scale. This was

an attempt to ascertain particular characteristics of persons who were more or less dogmatic. There are, therefore, three sections of this report. Each section records the results in these three areas of the research project.

#### Attitude Change

The study sought to ascertain the change of seminary students as compared to graduate students on the Dogmatism Scale and F Scale (see Table I and II). The null hypothesis stated that there will be no significant positive differences between the change scores on the Dogmatism Scale of conservative seminaries as compared to change scores of parallel students in other graduate education. It was found that the null hypothesis could not be rejected. There were no significant differences between the changes. The second hypothesis stated there will be no significant positive differences between the change scores on the "F" Scale of students in conservative seminaries as compared to parallel students in other graduate education. Again, the null hypothesis could not be rejected. The third hypothesis stated there will be no significant positive differences between the change scores on the Dogmatism Scale of students in liberal seminaries as compared to parallel students in other graduate schools. Again, the hypothesis could not be rejected. Fourthly, it was hypothesized that there would be no significant positive differences between the change scores on the "F" Scale of students in liberal

TABLE I  
CHANGE OF STUDENT SCORES ON DOGMATISM  
SCALE DURING FIRST YEAR OF  
GRADUATE EDUCATION

N	School	Student Mean Pre-test Score	Student Mean Post-test Score	Change
23	Conservative Baptist Seminary	266.17	251.09	-15.08*
44	Nazarene Theological Seminary	252.05	246.50	- 5.55
29	Midwestern Baptist Seminary	248.31	246.86	- 1.45
38	Concordia Seminary	245.55	235.03	-10.52**
409	All Students	227.63	222.12	- 5.51
34	Iliff School of Theology	224.71	216.41	-12.30*
16	Northwestern University	223.88	218.31	- 5.57
52	St. Pauls School of Theology	217.98	216.96	- 1.02
73	Washington University	216.18	212.42	- 3.76
42	University of Missouri at Kansas City	213.71	211.55	- 2.16
18	Seabury Western Theological School	211.83	207.61	- 4.22
40	University of Denver	205.77	196.88	- 8.89**

\*Significant at .05, Wilcoxon Sign Test

\*\*Significant at .1, Wilcoxon Sign Test

TABLE II  
 CHANGE IN STUDENT SCORES ON F SCALE  
 DURING FIRST YEAR OF  
 GRADUATE EDUCATION

N	School	Student Mean Pre-test Score	Student Mean Post-test Score	Change
44	Nazarene	106.05	103.91	- 3.14
23	Conservative	105.17	100.00	- 5.17
29	Midwestern	100.52	101.83	+ 1.31
38	Concordia	96.82	93.79	- 3.03
40	University of Denver	96.07	71.65	-24.42*
409	All Students	90.00	86.49	- 3.51
34	Iliff	88.71	87.00	- 1.71
42	University of Missouri	85.83	84.74	- 1.09
16	Northwestern	84.38	84.25	- .13
73	Washington	79.29	79.36	+ .05
52	St. Pauls	79.19	74.63	- 4.56
18	Seabury Western	78.39	87.72	+ 9.33*

seminaries as compared to students in other graduate education. The null hypothesis could not be rejected. The following hypotheses also could not be rejected:

There will be no significant positive differences between the change scores on the Dogmatism Scale of students in liberal seminaries as compared with students in conservative seminaries.

There will be no significant positive differences between the change scores on the "F" Scale of students in liberal seminaries as compared with students in conservative seminaries.

There will be no significant positive differences between the change scores on the Dogmatism Scale or seminary students as compared with other parallel graduate students.

There will be no significant positive differences between the change scores on the "F" Scale of seminary students as compared to other parallel graduate students.

Included in Table I is a summary of the mean scores on the Dogmatism Scale for each of the schools.

It can be noted that some change did occur. In each case, the change was in a negative direction. The persons became more open-minded and less dogmatic. In Table I, these differences are presented. Conservative Baptist and Iliff Seminary both changed significantly at an .05 level. Concordia and the University of Denver changed significantly at a .1 level. This represents no hypothesis trend. It is interesting to note that students in the

three Denver schools all made a significant dogmatism change. Though the scores for conservative seminaries tended to be above the mean of all students to begin with (more dogmatic), they changed at about the same ratio as the liberal students and graduate students did. It can be concluded from this only that there was change during that year in the attitudes measured by the Dogmatism Scale. It can also be noted that students at conservative seminaries are more dogmatic. The change that did occur cannot be attributed through the results of this study to any particular cause. The change did not happen in the liberal conservative or graduate schools exclusively. This change is significant only in four schools indicating no hypothesized trend.

Table II for the "F" Scale indicates that again a change did happen. This change was generally negative (person became less authoritarian) with the exception of two schools. It can also be noted that the conservative schools tended to score above the average on the pre-test (more authoritarian or prejudiced) of all of the students; however, there is no significant difference between any of the groups. The University of Denver made a significant negative (non-authoritarian or non-prejudiced) change and Seabury Western made a significant positive (authoritarian or prejudice) change. Though these changes were significant at the .05 level, we could not reject the hypothesis.

The Wilcoxon Sign Test was used to test for significance of the change between pre-test and post-test for the Dogmatism Scale and the "F" Scale. There was a significant change at a .05 level on the Dogmatism Scale for Iliff School of Theology in Denver. Students moved from a mean pre-test score of 224.71 showing a negative change of 12.30. This was found to be significant and, therefore, less dogmatic. This was as projected, since the hypotheses had indicated that liberal seminaries should create a significant change in a less dogmatic direction. However, the other liberal seminaries in the study did not show that degree of change. Change for St. Paul's School of Theology was a negative 1.02 and Seabury Western a negative 4.22; neither is significant, yet both were in the direction predicted.

When the Kruskal-Wallis one way analysis of variance was used on the same data comparing the different scores (pre-test subtracted from post-test), it was found that there was no significant difference between the different scores of any of the school and any other school on the "F" Scale and Dogmatism Scale. It was also found that there was no significant difference between the difference scores of the liberals and difference scores of the conservatives on the Dogmatism Scale and "F" Scale. Finally, the Kruskal-Wallis analysis showed no significance between the seminary students difference scores and the graduate students difference scores. At this point, it can be again

concluded that seminary education, either liberal or conservative does not produce any significant differences as compared with graduate school education in terms of attitudes measured by the Dogmatism Scale and the "F" Scale.

#### The Value Scale

It was hypothesized further, concerning Rokeach's Value Scale, that: There will be no significant positive differences between the change scores on Rokeach's Value Scale of conservative seminary students as compared to other parallel graduate students; there will be no significant positive differences between the change scores on Rokeach's Value Scale of liberal seminary students as compared with other parallel graduate students; and there will be no significant positive differences between the change scores on Rokeach's Value Scale of students in seminaries as compared with students in other parallel graduate education.

Using the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance on the difference scores (that is, the pre-test subtracted from the post-test), four significant differences on the Value Scale (Table III) were found. However, no significant difference between the change scores on Rokeach's Value Scale for conservative seminary students as compared with other parallel graduate students was found. Significant positive differences between the change scores on the Rokeach's Value Scale of liberal seminary students, as compared with other parallel graduate students were not found.



TABLE III

THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CHANGE SCORE  
DISTRIBUTIONS OF THE VALUE OF HONESTY,  
BROADMINDEDNESS, NATIONAL SECURITY,  
AND INNER HARMONY AT .05 LEVEL

Differences in Change in Value of Honesty Between Liberal and Conservative Seminaries				
Category of Seminary	School	Pre-Test Mean Rank of Honesty	Post-Test Mean Rank of Honesty	Change in Rank Value of Honesty
Liberal	Seabury	3.33	4.56	+1.23
	Iliff	4.50	6.21	+1.71
-----				
Conservative	Concordia	6.03	5.05	- .98
	Midwestern	4.55	5.10	+ .55

TABLE III (cont.)

DIFFERENCES IN CHANGE IN VALUE OF BROADMINDEDNESS BETWEEN SEMINARY AND GRADUATE SCHOOL STUDENTS				
Type School	School	Pre-Test Mean Rank of Broadmindedness	Post-Test Mean Rank of Broadmindedness	Change in Rank of Value of Broadmindedness
Seminary	Seabury	7.56	6.22	-1.34
	Iliff	7.74	6.56	-1.18
	Concordia	7.13	6.26	- .87
	Midwestern	9.86	9.03	- .83
Graduate School	U. of Denver	7.57	8.50	+ .93
	Northwestern	6.13	7.31	+1.18
	U. of Missouri	7.31	7.31	+1.14
	Washington	6.34	6.34	- .25

TABLE III (cont.)

DIFFERENCES IN CHANGE IN VALUE OF NATIONAL SECURITY BETWEEN SEMINARY AND GRADUATE SCHOOL STUDENTS				
Type School	School	Pre-Test Mean Rank of National Security	Post-Test Mean Rank of National Security	Change in Rank Value of National Security
Seminary	Seabury	16.00	16.28	+ .28
	Iliff	15.62	14.74	- .88
	Concordia	15.24	14.79	- .45
	Midwestern	16.83	15.00	-1.83
Graduate School	U. of Denver	14.72	16.85	+2.13
	Northwestern	15.38	15.38	.00
	U. of Missouri	13.86	14.52	+ .66
	Washington	14.44	15.22	+ .78

TABLE III (cont.)

DIFFERENCES IN CHANGE IN VALUE OF INNER HARMONY BETWEEN SEMINARY AND GRADUATE SCHOOL STUDENTS				
Type School	School	Pre-Test Mean Rank of Inner Harmony	Post-Test Mean Rank of Inner Harmony	Change in Rank Value of Inner Harmony
Seminary	Seabury	6.17	6.94	+ .77
	Iliff	5.59	6.00	+ .41
	Concordia	7.21	7.00	- .21
	Midwestern	7.28	6.79	- .49
Graduate School	U. of Denver	5.88	6.07	+ .19
	Northwestern	7.94	6.56	-1.38
	U. of Missouri	7.71	6.24	-1.47
	Washington	6.42	6.45	- .02

Only one significant difference on the change scores on the Rokeach's Value Scale for students in conservative seminaries, as compared with liberal seminaries were found. At the .05 level, there was significant difference between the change scores of the liberal schools, as compared with those of the conservative schools for the value "honesty." This is shown on Table III along with the pre-test and the post-test mean scores. It should be noted that the lower the score, the more important the value is to the student. It was found that the liberal seminary students valued honesty more on the pre-test than the conservative students did. Honesty showed a mean value ranking of 3.33 and 4.50 for the liberal students, as compared with the mean ranking of 6.03 and 4.55 for conservative students. The effect of seminary education in the case of the liberal students was to lower the importance of honesty, moving to 4.56 and 6.21. This is a change in the direction of less importance, as represented on the scale as a positive change. Students of Concordia Seminary found that honesty became more important, moving from 6.03 to 5.05. Those at the Midwestern Baptist Seminary, however, found it became slightly less important, moving from 4.55 to 5.10. The change scores for "honesty" were found to be significantly different between the liberal and conservative seminary students.

In comparing the seminary students with the graduate students, it was found that there was a significant

difference in the change scores on three items in the Value Scale. These were broadmindedness, national security and inner harmony. Of the three, the change in broadmindedness is more important for our consideration, and the change scores are more easily understood. Previous research has shown some relationship between low scores on "F" Scale (non-prejudiced) and holding the value of broadmindedness. The seminary students all changed in a negative direction; that is, broadmindedness became more important. The graduate students indicated that broadmindedness became less important with the exception of those at Washington. However, these Washington students changed to indicate broadmindedness slightly more important. Broadmindedness has been defined as one of the intrinsic personality characteristics and can be understood as related to open-mindedness and non-prejudice. Therefore, it should be noted that seminary students came to value broadmindedness under the impact of Christian education more than did the general graduate students.

When the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was applied, a significant difference between the change scores of the seminaries versus graduate schools appeared at a .05 level on the value of national security. Both seminary and graduate students ranked national security as less important. They ranked it between 14 and 16 on an 18 rank scale. There is significant difference between the scores and the direction of change. In general the seminary

students became more interested and the graduate students less interested in national security. National security was seen as an extrinsic value according to our earlier definition, that is, it is related with prejudice and close-mindedness. It ranked low on the ranking of all the graduate and seminary students. However, it should be noted that among the seminary students it became important, and therefore, they became more extrinsic.

There was also found significant difference in the change scores on the Value Scale for inner harmony. Both graduate schools and seminaries ranked inner harmony as somewhat important, ranking it between 5 and 7 on the 18 item scale. In examining the direction of the change score, one may find difficulty in interpretation. However, there is a change in the direction of valuing inner harmony more by seminarians than graduate students. Inner harmony was defined as neither extrinsic or intrinsic. Though seminary students did value inner harmony more, they did not become more extrinsic or intrinsic according to this scale.

The Wilcoxon Sign Test for matched pairs and a simple "T" test were used to test for significant change on the various items on the Value Scale for each one of the schools. The items which were found to be significant are included in Table IV. On this table, note that two schools had at least four items on which significant change appeared: Nazarene Theological Seminary at Kansas City, and St. Paul's United Methodist School of Theology at Kansas City.

TABLE IV  
SIGNIFICANT CHANGE IN VALUES AT .05 LEVEL  
OF STUDENTS IN FIRST YEAR OF  
GRADUATE SCHOOL

School	Value on Rokeach's Scale	The Value Became More or Less Important
Seabury Western	Mature Love	Less
Seabury Western	Independent	Less
Seabury Western	Family Security	More
Seabury Western	Honesty	More
Concordia	Mature Love	More
Concordia	True Friendship	More
Midwestern	An Exciting Life	Less
Midwestern	A Sense of Accomplishment	Less
Midwestern	Clean	More
Nazarene	A World of Peace	More
Nazarene	Happiness	More
Nazarene	Social Recognition	Less
Nazarene	Forgiving	Less
St. Pauls	A Sense of Accomplishment	More
St. Pauls	Equality	More
St. Pauls	Family Security	More
St. Pauls	Happiness	Less
Conservative	Happiness	More
Conservative	Mature Love	Less
Conservative	Courageous	More
Univ. of Denver	A Comfortable Life	Less
Univ. of Denver	Pleasure	Less
Univ. of Denver	Capable	Less
Northwestern	Responsible	Less
Univ. of Missouri	Inner Harmony	Less
Univ. of Missouri	Social Recognition	Less
Washington Univ.	Equality	More
Washington Univ.	National Security	More
Washington Univ.	Imaginative	Less
All Schools	Equality	More
All Schools	Family Security	More
All Schools	Social Recognition	Less
All Schools	Clean	More
All Schools	Obedient	More
All Schools	Polite	More



All of the schools made certain kinds of identifiable changes that were found to be significant on six of the value items. Equality, family security, cleanliness, obedience, and politeness became more important. Social recognition became less important for all of the schools. Of the values in the above list, only equality could be understood as intrinsic or less prejudiced. All the rest of these values tend to be more extrinsic, dealing with the self. The effect then of graduate education and seminary education was to develop more extrinsic value systems.

We can summarize by noting that certain values do change in a significant way. There were differences in change between seminary students and non-seminary students. There was at least one identifiable difference between change in liberal seminary students and conservative seminary students. However, it should be noted that the changes do not develop as hypothesized under our definitions of extrinsic and intrinsic values.

#### Demographic Characteristics

The final hypothesis indicated that there will be identifiable demographic characteristics of those seminary students with above the mean, average change score on the Dogmatism Scale, which are different from the characteristics of those who score below the mean. The demographic or biographic characteristics chosen for examination were: grade-point average, family-religious strength, personal

relations with others, religious training, local church theology, personal theology, and activity in local church.

It is important to remember that a high score (above the mean) on the Dogmatism Scale indicates more dogmatic personalities, while a low score (below the mean) represents less dogmatic characteristics.

One of the clearest indications found in the demographic characteristics has to do with the undergraduate college from which the students come. Fifty-three per cent of those seminary students who scored below the mean came from public institutions of higher education. Only fifteen per cent of those scoring below the mean came from religious institutions. Of those scoring above the mean, sixty-seven percent came from either private or religious institutions of higher education. This could indicate the significance of the background of the seminary students. Having already noticed that there was not a great deal of change happening at the seminary, one can conclude that attitudes and values were already established.

Though there is no clear indication as to how they were established or when they were established, the significance of the type of college these seminarians attended would indicate that dogmatism was established long before seminary.

Personal attitudes and values may have been established before undergraduate school therefore directing the students selection of undergraduate school or the student may have

TABLE V  
 UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE SEMINARY AND  
 OTHER GRADUATE STUDENTS ATTENDED

	Large Public		Small Public		Large Private		Small Private		Large Religious		Small Religious	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Seminary students below the means on Dogmatism Scale	15	33%	9	20%	7	16%	7	16%	1	2%	6	13%
Seminary students above the mean on Dogmatism Scale	15	20%	9	12%	0	0%	32	43%	3	4%	15	20%
University graduate students below the means on Dogmatism Scale	39	39%	16	16%	16	16%	16	16%	8	8%	4	4%
University graduate students above the mean on Dogmatism Scale	32	44%	11	15%	10	14%	15	21%	2	3%	2	3%

been molded by the effect of undergraduate school. It can be concluded that there is an important difference between the undergraduate background of seminarians who score below the mean as opposed to those who score above the mean. Below the mean, or less dogmatic students, attend public institutions. Above the mean, more dogmatic students attend religious or other private institutions.

The trend was not necessarily established in the statistics concerning the university students. Here the profile of college background is similar between those who score above and below the mean. However, it is important to note that the majority of students in the non-seminarian graduate schools attended only public institutions.

In examining the chart on Family Religious Strength, it can be noted that the seminarians do indicate a much stronger family religious strength than do non-seminarians. However, there is little difference between those who score below and above the mean. Among the university students, there is also little difference between those who score above and below the mean, and generally, university students have less family religious strength.

In examining the student's relationship with others, it should be noted that there is little difference between university and seminary students, nor between those who score below or above the mean. Most students in graduate school feel that they have had some difficulty in relating to other persons.

TABLE VI

FAMILY RELIGIOUS STRENGTH OF STUDENTS IN  
SEMINARIES AND OTHER GRADUATE SCHOOLS

(Scale of 1 to 6 indicating: 1. family hardly active in religious life to, 6. very active family religious life)

	1		2		3		4		5		6	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Seminary students below mean on Dogmatism Scale	1	2%	4	9%	11	24%	7	16%	3	7%	19	42%
Seminary students above mean on Dogmatism Scale	0	0%	10	14%	9	12%	16	22%	7	9%	32	43%
University graduate students below mean on Dogmatism Scale	2	2%	32	32%	17	17%	24	24%	10	10%	14	14%
University graduate students above mean on Dogmatism Scale	1	1%	17	24%	20	28%	18	25%	9	13%	7	10%

The local church theology may have some relationship to the attitudes of graduate and seminary students. Seminarians who score below the mean (less prejudiced) show somewhat less conservative theological background than do those who score above the mean. Local church theology of the seminarian scoring below the mean was moderate conservative to moderate liberal. Those scoring above the mean were conservative to moderate conservative. This, again, supports the general impression that attitudes and values are set before seminary, rather than during seminary. The graduate students scoring below the mean generally have a more liberal local church background, while those scoring above the mean have a strongly conservative background.

In regard to the religious training of the students, it was found that those scoring above the mean, both seminarian and graduate students, generally indicate a stronger religious training; while those scoring below the mean indicate a slightly weaker religious training. The indication of this is consistent with research by Allport and Rokeach, indicating that religious training tends to create a more dogmatic understanding of life, while weaker religious training creates a less dogmatic outlook.

In looking at personal theology, it may be noted that those scoring below the mean are generally more liberal. Forty-nine percent of the seminarians scoring below the mean designated themselves as liberals, while only twenty-six percent of those scoring above the mean did.

TABLE VII  
 SEMINARY AND OTHER GRADUATE STUDENTS  
 ASSESSMENT OF THEIR PERSONAL  
 RELATIONS WITH OTHERS

	Popular		A Few Close Friends		Hardly Any Friends		Distant Alone	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Seminary students below mean on Dogmatism Scale	0	0%	2	4%	31	69%	12	27%
Seminary students above mean on Dogmatism Scale	0	0%	4	5%	50	68%	20	27%
University graduate students below mean on Dogmatism Scale	0	0%	7	7%	68	68%	24	24%
University graduate students above mean on Dogmatism Scale	1	1%	3	4%	53	74%	15	21%

TABLE VIII

THE LOCAL CHURCH THEOLOGY OF STUDENTS  
IN SEMINARY AND GRADUATE SCHOOLS

	Liberal		Moderate Liberal		Moderate Conservative		Conservative	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Seminary students below mean on Dogmatism Scale	2	4%	10	22%	21	47%	12	27%
Seminary students above mean on Dogmatism Scale	2	3%	12	16%	27	36%	33	45%
University students below mean on Dogmatism Scale	16	16%	21	21%	26	26%	32	32%
University students above mean on Dogmatism Scale	4	6%	11	16%	25	36%	29	42%



TABLE IX

RELIGIOUS TRAINING OF SEMINARY AND OTHER  
GRADUATE STUDENTS

(Scale 1 to 6 indicating: 1. inadequate religious  
training to, 6. adequate religious training.)

	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Seminary students below mean on Dogmatism Scale	2	4%	3	7%	8	18%	20	44%	8	18%	4	9%
Seminary students above mean on Dogmatism Scale	0	0%	10	14%	13	18%	21	29%	20	27%	9	12%
University graduate students below mean on Dogmatism Scale	3	3%	14	14%	25	25%	32	32%	11	11%	7	7%
University graduate students above mean on Dogmatism Scale	6	9%	6	9%	11	16%	32	48%	6	9%	6	9%

Twenty-three percent of the seminarians scoring above the mean saw themselves as conservative and thirty-five saw themselves as moderate. This may indicate a trend toward conservatism among the more dogmatic personalities. This is also true in the university population; however, it is less graphically shown.

Activity in the local church was only tested among university students; most university students saw themselves as having a low level of involvement in a local church.

The grade point average is an interesting statistic. Those seminarians and graduate students scoring above the mean made better grades, seminarians 2.91, graduates 3.16 as compared to those scoring below the mean (less dogmatic) seminarians 2.75 and graduates 3.15. The grade difference is only slight; however, there is some difference between those who are more dogmatic and those who are less dogmatic.

In summary, one may tentatively conclude, from the demographic characteristics examined, that more dogmatic persons tend to be from religious or private undergraduate schools. They tend to see their local church theology as very conservative. They see their religious training as stronger, and their personal theology tends to be conservative. Those less dogmatic individuals in both seminary and university graduate students are those persons whose theology is more liberal, whose local church theology tends

TABLE X

ACTIVITY IN LOCAL CHURCH OF  
GRADUATE STUDENTS  
(Seminararians were not asked this question)

(Scale of 1 to 4 indicates opinion of students:  
1. active to, 4. very active

	1		2		3		4	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Seminary students below mean on Dogmatism Scale	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Seminary students above mean on Dogmatism Scale	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
University students below mean on Dogmatism Scale	48	48%	21	21%	18	18%	12	12%
University students above mean on Dogmatism Scale	33	46%	17	24%	12	17%	9	13%

TABLE XI  
PERSONAL THEOLOGY OF SEMINARY AND  
OTHER GRADUATE STUDENTS

	Liberal		Moderate		Conserva- tive		Funda- mental		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Seminary students below mean on Dogmatism Scale	22	49%	13	29%	6	13%	1	2%	3	7%
Seminary students above mean on Dogmatism Scale	19	26%	26	35%	17	23%	1	1%	11	15%
University students below mean on Dogmatism Scale	53	53%	25	25%	4	4%	1	1%	16	16%
University students above mean on Dogmatism Scale	29	42%	16	23%	10	14%	4	6%	10	14%

to be more liberal, and who come from public undergraduate school. Their religious training is generally less active than those who score more dogmatic.

The responses to Rokeach's Value Scale are analyzed in terms of the value prioritizing. As indicated on the chart, the highest value for all the students in the eight graduate schools was wisdom; the second highest value was mature love; the third, harmony; and the fourth, self-respect. These findings can be compared to those of Rokeach (1969) on the same set of terminal values. In Tables XII and XIII some difference is seen between the graduate students and a national sample of the general population examined in 1969.

The prioritizing of the values on Rokeach's Instrumental Scale of Values was also examined. Here it was found that the highest value was honesty. The next highest value was that of loving; the third, responsibility; the fourth, forgiveness; and the fifth, broadmindedness. Again, there is a difference in the profile of the graduate students as compared to the general population surveyed by Rokeach (note the Table XII and Table XIII).

Correlations were calculated between family religious training, personal theology, scores on the "F" Scale pre-test, the Dogmatism pre-test, the grade point average, activity in the local church, and the 36 values of Rokeach's Value Scale. In the correlations, a profile of the graduate students developed through the grouping together of

TABLE XII  
 RANKING OF INSTRUMENTAL VALUES BY  
 STUDENTS IN EIGHT GRADUATE  
 SCHOOLS AND ROKEACH'S  
 NATIONAL SAMPLE

Rank	8 Graduate Schools		Rokeach's National Sample of Protestants	
	Item	Median Score	Item	Median Score
1	Honest	4.84	Honest	3.2
2	Loving	5.50	Ambitious	6.5
3	Responsible	6.5	Responsible	6.6
4	Forgiving	7.18	Forgiving	6.8
5	Broadminded	7.23	Broadminded	7.6
6	Helpful	7.80	Courageous	7.7
7	Capable	9.00	Helpful	8.0
8	Courageous	9.10	Clean	8.4
9	Intellectual	9.6	Self controlled	9.5
10	Self controlled	9.56	Loving	9.6
11	Independent	9.81	Capable	9.8
12	Cheerful	10.53	Cheerful	10.0
13	Ambitious	10.58	Polite	10.7
14	Imaginative	10.71	Independent	10.7
15	Logical	11.58	Obedient	13.1
16	Polite	12.49	Intellectual	13.2
17	Clean	14.33	Logical	14.7
18	Obedient	14.64	Imaginative	15.7

TABLE XIII  
 RANKING OF TERMINAL VALUES BY STUDENTS  
 IN EIGHT GRADUATE SCHOOLS AND  
 ROKEACH'S NATIONAL SAMPLE

Rank	8 Graduate Schools		Rokeach's National Sample of Protestants	
	Item	Median Score	Item	Median Score
1	Wisdom	6.09	A world at peace	3.3
2	Mature love	6.67	Family security	4.0
3	Inner harmony	6.7	Freedom	5.6
4	Self respect	7.21	Salvation	6.7
5	True friendship	7.22	Happiness	7.7
6	Freedom	7.26	Wisdom	7.7
7	Family security	7.97	Self respect	7.8
8	Sense of accomplishment	7.99	Equality	8.7
9	Equality	8.07	Comfortable life	8.7
10	Happiness	8.44	True friendship	9.2
11	A world at peace	8.94	Sense of Accomplishment	9.3
12	Salvation	9.51	National security	9.8
13	An exciting life	10.94	Inner harmony	10.7
14	A world of beauty	11.88	Mature love	12.5
15	Social recognition	13.69	A world of beauty	13.5
16	A comfortable life	13.91	Social recognition	14.5
17	Pleasure	14.34	Pleasure	14.7
18	National security	1.02	An exciting life	15.5

particular values, attitudes and experiences. This profile is a type of factor analysis and indicates some reason for the differences and conclusions that have already been shown.

As had been suggested by previous research, there was a type of linking together of attitudes and values in terms of a more intrinsic personality. Using Allport's concepts (1954) it was postulated that the values of equality, forgiveness, loving and mature love were values of an intrinsic nature and a low score on the "F" Scale was considered indicative of an intrinsic personality. The values that correlated positively with low scores on the "F" Scale were examined first. It was found that high scores for equality and being independent related significantly with low scores on the "F" Scale. Those scores correlating significantly and positively with equality were a world of peace, a world of beauty, broadmindedness, helpfulness, forgiveness, and courage. Correlating significantly and positively with forgiveness was equality, cheerfulness, helpfulness, honesty, loving, mature love, family security, and obedience. Relating positively with loving was mature love, friendship, cheerfulness, forgiveness, and helpfulness. Scoring positively with mature love was lovingness, honesty, forgiveness, social recognition, self-respect, pleasure, national security, harmony and freedom.

In examining these correlations, there seems to be a relationship between values of mature love, loving,



forgiveness, helpfulness and equality. These all tend to be intrinsic values - values that Rokeach spoke of as having to do with caring about other people.

There was a linking together of other scores and values (high "F" Scale scores, high dogmatism scores, salvation, cleanliness and obedience) in terms of being more extrinsic, or, being more concerned about one's self. These were shown in the positive correlations between salvation and self-control, politeness, obedience, cleanliness, forgiveness, national security, family religious strength and high scores on Dogmatism tests and "F" Scale tests. Cleanliness correlated positively with high "F" Scale and Dogmatism Scale scores, and comfort. Obedience scored high in correlation with self-control, social recognition, politeness, cleanliness, forgiveness, salvation, family security, family religious strength, and high scores on the "F" Scale and Dogmatism Scale. Negative correlations were seen between salvation, cleanliness, politeness, obedience, self-control, social recognition, ambition, and the values of lovingness, mature love, helpfulness, forgiveness and equality. It could be concluded that there tends to be a grouping of such values as salvation, cleanliness, politeness, obedience, self-control, social recognition and ambition as an extrinsic personality. Persons with these values scored high on the "F" Scale.

There seem to be two styles indicated in these sets of correlations. One is an intrinsic style that involves

the personality who believes in forgiveness, love, helpfulness, and equality, and scores low on the "F" Scale. The other is an extrinsic person who scores high on the "F" and Dogmatism Scale and upholds cleanliness, obedience and salvation. Here, the religious variable of salvation is linked with a more extrinsic, self-centered, or self-concerned individual.

It can also be noted in the correlations that there seems to be another set of groupings in the values. This set involves those persons who are more open-minded. Correlating positively with less dogmatic scores were high scores on broadmindedness, lovingness, freedom, equality, a world of peace, a world of beauty, an exciting life, imagination and independence. Correlating positively with intellectual was independent, imaginative, logical, wisdom, world of beauty, an exciting life, high grade point average, and activity in the local church. The negative correlations with the pre-dogmatism test were salvation, family security, self-control, politeness, cleanliness, obedience, ambition. From this it could be concluded that there is another grouping of less dogmatic, or more open-minded persons who value wisdom, imagination, independence, intellectualism, logic and broadmindedness.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study attempts to relate some of the research in the area of attitude and value change to the field of religious education, particularly that of seminary education, or education for the ministry including training in Bible, theology and practices, will change the attitudes and values of an individual student more than general graduate education. Seminary education will develop a more open-minded, less prejudiced individual, with certain identifiable value changes that will be consistent with the goals of seminary education. The research also hypothesizes that liberal seminaries would make greater change in these directions than conservative seminaries. Eight schools were chosen for the research project, four seminaries and four graduate schools. They were matched according to geographic location. The seminaries were chosen at random and were categorized into two liberal and two conservative seminaries. The "F" Scale was used to measure prejudice and general authoritarianism, the Dogmatism Scale to measure close-mindedness and Rokeach's Value Scale was used as a profile of personal values and value change.

It was hypothesized that seminary education did create significant change, and that the change could be identified through testing. It was felt that liberal seminaries created more change in an open, less dogmatic direction than did conservative seminaries, and that seminary education, in general, created a more open attitude than graduate education. These projections were represented in the stated hypotheses. However, it was found that there were no generalized significant differences. The null hypotheses could not be rejected. The research did not show evidence for expecting seminary education (either liberal or conservative) to create attitude or value changes significantly different than other graduate education.

There are some other kinds of conclusions that can also be made. First, it should be noted from the Tables I and II that change does happen in graduate education, whether seminary or secular, and this change can be measured and identified. On the Dogmatism Scale, all of the students became less dogmatic, whether graduate or seminary. On the "F" Scale (Table I) change did happen, and most of the change was in a less authoritarian direction. Significant changes were found in several values for students in the eleven schools. It was found that all of the groups changed in their valuing of equality, family security, social recognition, cleanliness, obedience, and politeness. Therefore it can be noted that during the year of graduate education, change does happen to the student and this change can be measured. It should be noted that there

was not significant change on either the "F" Scale or Dogmatism Scale, with the exception of the change of students in the Iliff School of Theology. Although change did happen, as represented by those two scales, the change was not significant, or above that which might have happened by chance. It can be concluded that graduate education does create change in certain values, but these values do not represent any specific trend. Therefore, no generalization about the kind of change can be concluded.

Therefore it can be further speculated that the attitudes and values of students by and large are set as they enter graduate school or seminary, and that graduate school or seminary does not significantly change those attitudes and values of the students in the first year. Persons, therefore, concluding about the effect of graduate education should not assume that graduate education has a value and attitude change effect. Values and attitudes appear to be set before graduate education.

As noted earlier, Jeffrey Hadden in his book, The Gathering Storm In The Church, indicates the difference between the laity and clergy within main-line Protestant denominations, particularly in the liberal denominations. Many have indicated that the reason for the difference between clergy and laity in the church is because of the effect of seminary education. In this study it is shown that there is no significant change created in attitude and values through seminary education as compared to other types

of graduate educations. This would indicate that any difference between clergy and laity exists before the student goes to seminary and not after. Noting the chart for the Dogmatism Scale (Table II) it is seen that the students in conservative schools scored high on this scale, and those in the liberal schools scored low before seminary education, that is, on the pre-test scores. These students were already conservative or liberal before they went to seminary, not afterwards.

Some significant change was found in particular values and certain values did change significantly for particular schools. In analyzing this, a general trend toward intrinsic or extrinsic values cannot be seen. For example, it can be noted that while the matter of mature love became less important (see Table IV) for the Episcopal seminary, Seabury Western, it also became less important for the Conservative Baptist Seminary in Denver. Here both the liberal and very conservative seminaries showed an intrinsic value change but the other schools did not. In noting this (Table III) it is evident that we cannot conclude that seminaries (liberal or conservative) are becoming more intrinsic or extrinsic. Similarly, there can be no particular conclusions drawn from the other statistical changes in value rank (Table IV). It is interesting to note that all of these graduate students found equality, cleanliness, family security, obedience, and politeness becoming more important, while for students at graduate school social

recognition became less important. This is interesting; however, for our purposes it has no particular significance.

The change in the area of broadmindedness as an extrinsic value (Table III) has significance for this study. It was found that seminary students valued broadmindedness more after one year in seminary than did their graduate student counterparts. There was a significant difference between the way that seminary students and graduate students changed in the valuing of broadmindedness. The change was directional; that is, in general, seminary students tended to value it more, while graduate students tended to value it less. It has been hypothesized that seminary education and, particularly, liberal seminary education would create a more open-minded, non-authoritarian and extrinsic person. Therefore, it is important to note that seminary students did not come to value broadmindedness more. By our definition broadmindedness is an extrinsic value.

It is noted that on Table I the seminary students did make changes in their scores on the Dogmatism Scale. Students at Iliff became less dogmatic by a score of 12.30, at Seabury Western - 4.22, at Midwestern Baptist - 1.45, and at Concordia - 10.52. This is all in the direction of becoming less dogmatic. However, graduate students in the control group also became less dogmatic, by the scores of 5.57, 3.76, 2.16 and 8.89. It only can be seen by these scores that, in general, the seminary students tended to change more than the graduate students, yet this difference in change was not statistically significant.

When the change on the "F" Scale (Table I), which measures authoritarianism, is examined, it is found that there is not necessarily a parallel kind of change. Some seminary students changed in a negative way, and some in a positive way. Positive changes are represented by both a liberal and a conservative school. Graduate students also changed, but their change was not in a particular direction. The University of Denver showed the greatest change at a negative change of -24.42. However, Washington University in St. Louis had a positive change of +.05 and Northwestern University showed only a slight negative change of -.13.

When the demographic characteristics of the students in the research project are examined, it can be seen that there are certain identifiable demographic characteristics in regard to those who scored above and below the mean on the Dogmatism Scale. There is a kind of profile outlined in the description. It was noted that those who are more dogmatic have stronger religious training, come from conservative local churches, and have attended a private institution of higher education. Whether they were private or religious, the designated colleges all generally had a more conservative nature. Those persons scoring above the mean (or those who are dogmatic), generally designated themselves as more conservative. It can be concluded from this that conservative theological training from the local church and undergraduate school affects the attitudes and



values of students in terms of developing a more dogmatic individual. While individuals who attend large public institutions in a more liberal environment come from a more liberal church, and incidentally, are less involved in the church, develop a more open-minded understanding of life.

It can be concluded that conservative backgrounds seem to be the most significant factor in setting the values and attitudes of dogmatism. Persons develop dogmatism at a time other than graduate school; the attitudes of dogmatism are developed not as a function of seminary or graduate education, but are developed as a function of either undergraduate school or family and local church environment.

In summary, it must be concluded that it seems evident there is not major value and attitude change happening at graduate school. Seminary students do not really change differently than other graduate students. Most of the attitudes and values expressed by the graduate students in this study were already established and were not changing. It should also be particularly noted that there was a pattern in the background of those students who had certain types of values and attitudes. That is, those who represented a more dogmatic, authoritarian value system, and were more extrinsic, tended to come from a certain type of background - a conservative, highly religious childhood. They generally attended private, religious colleges. Those who were more open-minded, less dogmatic and less prejudiced, and tended to have more intrinsic values, were students

who had a more liberal Christian background, attended a more liberal church, and attended large public undergraduate schools. One may conclude from this that the background of a student sets his values rather than the experience at seminary.

However, in further summarizing, there was some change happening at seminary. Seminarians became less dogmatic, less prejudiced or less authoritarian while at school as did other graduate students. There was not major difference in the change between the liberal and conservative seminarians. In fact, only in the area of the value of honesty was there a difference. Liberals raised this value significantly more than conservatives. Seminarians did as a group raise the value of broadmindedness and national security and lowered the value of inner harmony significantly more than graduate students. The significant difference in the change for broadmindedness should be noted. As hypothesized, this intrinsic value did become significantly more important for the seminarians. The Christian education affected the valuing of broadmindedness, yet it did not affect in the same manner all the other intrinsic values such as loving, helpfulness, etc.

In an attempt to learn more about the students in this study, correlations were run and value scales were summarized. It was found that the students in this study tended to value mature love, wisdom, inner harmony, self-respect and true friendship more than did the general population in

the initial study by Rokeach with his Value Scale. These correlations seemed to create a grouping of values that might suggest that there are several kinds of students. Two particular groups that were suggested by this research were: first, the more extrinsic students who are more concerned about themselves, interested in salvation, cleanliness and obedience, an authoritarian student; secondly, a group of intrinsic students who are concerned with love, forgiveness, mature love, equality and low authoritarianism.

In final summary, it can be noted that there was not radical change in seminary education nor in graduate education in terms of the attitudes and values of the students. The most important result of this study is to indicate that seminary and graduate education agencies do not appear to be significantly responsible for the types of attitudes and values held by graduates of seminary and graduate school. Early childhood and undergraduate school both contribute to the development of attitudes and values.

#### Recommendations

The results of this study were not conclusive in any particular direction in terms of noting changes in the area of dogmatism, authoritarianism, and particular value systems. However, there needs to be further study concerning the effects of seminary education.

The data obtained from the seminary students included further biographical data and data concerning the type of

course work taken during the year of seminary education. The kinds of changes that happen during seminary education may reflect the type of courses seminarians took, rather than the environment of the seminary, itself. It is recommended that some study be made as to the effects of particular types of course work upon seminary students.

It is also recommended to have a study of seminary students for more than the one year. The effects of seminary education may not be felt necessarily in the first year. In fact, it is possible that seminary education in terms of its change effect may not be really felt until the last year. It should be noted that some change was made in one year, and this may simply be the beginning of a larger change that would occur over a longer period of time. Further study of seminary students during the total period of seminary education is recommended.

Finally, the director of this research feels that the life and teachings of Jesus Christ represented a particular life-style which could be measured by low score on the Dogmatism Scale and the "F" Scale, a holding of such values as mature love, equality, inner harmony, world peace, broad-mindedness, honesty, etc. These values have generally been upheld as the ethical values affirmed by Jesus Christ. With this assumption, it would be interesting to sort out those students who most clearly represented that model, then, through process of interviews and historical tracing, follow their life development and analyze what people who have the

Christ-like values do in their ordinary behavior. Twenty of these students were found in the research. Further research concerning their lives, ambitions, and behavior would be of value.

**SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY**

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abelson, R. P., and M. J. Rosenberg.

- 1958 "Symbolic Psychology: A Model of Attitudinal Cognition." Behavior Science, Vol. 3, pp. 74-79.

Abramson, Harold J. and C. Edward Noll.

- "Religion, Ethnicity, and Social Change." Review of Religious Research, Vol. 8 (1), pp. 11-26.

Adorno, T. W.; Else Frenkel-Brunswik; J. J. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford.

- 1950 The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper.

Allen, R. O. and B. Spilka.

- 1967 "Committed and Consensual Religion: A Specification of Religion Prejudice Relationships." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 6, pp. 191-206.

Allport, G. W., P. E. Vernon, and G. Lindzey.

- 1951 Study of Values. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Allport, G. W.

- 1954 Handbook of Social Psychology. G. Lindzey (ed.). Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

- 
- 1954 The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.

- 
- 1960 Religion in the Developing Personality. New York: Univ. Press.

- Allport, G. W. and J. M. Ross.
- 1967 "Personal Religious Orientation and Prejudice."  
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,  
Vol. 5, pp. 432-443.
- Argyle, M.
- 1958 Religious Behavior. London: Routledge.
- Asch, Salomon E.
- 1952 Social Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.:  
Prentice-Hall.
- Bartlett, F. C.
- 1932 Remembering. Cambridge: Univ. Press.
- Barton, A. H.
- 1959 Studying the Effects of a College Education: A  
Methodological Examination of Changing Values in  
College. New Haven, Conn: Edward W. Hazen  
Found.
- Berger, E. M.
- 1952 "The Relation Between Expressed Acceptance of  
Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others." J.  
Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., Vol. 47, pp. 778-782.
- Berger, Peter L.
- 1961 The Noise of Solemn Assemblies. Garden City,  
N. Y.: Doubleday.
- Berton, Pierre.
- 1965 The Comfortable Pew. Philadelphia: J. B.  
Lippincott.
- Booth, G.
- 1960 "The Psychological Examination of Candidates for  
the Ministry." The Ministry and Mental Health.  
H. Hoffman (ed.). New York: Assoc. Press,  
pp. 101-124.
- Bostian, Robert and Roy Tucker.
- 1969 "Evidence, Personality and Attitude Change."  
Speech Monographs, Vol. 1 (March), pp. 94-96.



Bostrom, R.; J. Vlandis, and M. Rosenbaum.

- 1961 "Grades as Reinforcing Contingencies and Attitude Change." J. Educ. Psychol., Vol. 52, pp. 112-115.

Breer, Paul E. and Edwin A. Locke.

- 1965 Task Experience as a Source of Attitudes. Homewood Ill.: Dorsey Press.

Brehm, J. W. and A. R. Cohen.

- 1962 Explorations in Cognitive Dissonance. New York and London: Wiley.

Brown, R.

- 1963 "Models of Attitude Change." New Directions in Psychology. T. M. Newcomb (ed.). New York: Holt.

Campbell, D.

- 1957 "Factors Relative to the Validity of Experiments in Social Settings." Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 54, pp. 297-312.

Campbell, D. T.

- 1959 "Acquired Behavioural Dispositions." Psychology: A Study of a Science. S. Koch (ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Carlson, E. R.

- 1956 "Attitude Change Through Modification of Attitude Structure." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 52, pp. 256-261.

Childers, R. D. and W. F. White.

- 1966 "The Personality of Select Theological Students." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 44, pp. 507-510.

Christie, R. and Marie Jahoda.

- 1954 Studies in the Scope and Method of "the Authoritarian" Personality. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

Clark, Alice T.

- 1967 "A Comparison of Measured Personality Change in Students at a Non-denominational Public University and a Denominational Private University." Religious Education, (May-June), pp. 256-65.

Clarke, H. M.

- 1911 "Conscious Attitudes." Amer. J. Psychol., Vol. 32, pp. 214-249.

Clayton, Richard R., and James W. Gladden.

- 1974 "Five Dimensions of Religiosity: Toward Demythologizing a Sacred Artifact." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 13 (2), pp. 135-143.

Cockrum, L.

- 1952 "Personality Traits and Interests of Theological Students." Religious Education, Vol. 47, pp. 28-32.

Cohen, Arthur R.

- 1964 Attitude Change and Social Influence. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Cooper, J. B. and J. L. McGaugh.

- 1948 Integrating Principles of Social Psychology. New York: Schenkman.

Corey, S. M.

- 1936 "Attitude Differences Between College Classes: A Summary and Criticism." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 27, pp. 321-330.

Costin, F.

- 1971 "Dogmatism and Conservatism: An Emperical Follow Up of Rokeach's Findings." Education and Psychology Monographs, Vol. 31, pp. 1007-1010.

Culbertson, F.

- 1957 "Modification of an Emotionally Held Attitude Through Role Playing." J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., Vol. 54, pp. 230-233.

Davis, E. E.

- 1965 Attitude Change: A Review and Bibliography of Selected Research. Paris: UNESCO.

Defleur, M. L. and F. R. Westie.

- 1963 "Attitude as a Scientific Concept." Social Forces, Vol. 41, pp. 17-31.

- 
- 1958 "Verbal Attitudes and Overt Acts." American Sociological Association, Vol. 23, pp. 667-673.

Demerath, M. J., III.

- 1965 Social Class in American Protestantism. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Dittes, James E.

- 1971 "Typing and Typologies: Some Parallels in the Career of Church Sect and Extrinsic-Intrinsic." Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 10 (4), pp. 375-383.

Doab, L. W.

- 1947 "The Behavior of Attitudes." Psychological Review, Vol. 54, pp. 135-156.

Dolan, Rex R.

- 1967 The Big Change. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Droba, D. D.

- 1933 "The Nature of Attitude." J. Soc. Psychol., Vol. 4, pp. 444-463.

Dunlap, K.

- 1956 Religion: Its Function in Human Life. New York: McGraw Hill.

Early, C. Joan.

- 1968 "Attitude Learning in Children." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 59 (3), pp. 176-180.

Eddy, E. D., Jr.

- 1957 "Changing Values and Attitudes on the Campus." Long Range Planning for Education. Washington, D.C.: Council on Education, pp. 137-150.

- 
- 1959 The College Influence on Student Character. Washington, D.C.: Am. Council on Education.

Edwards, Allen L.

- 1965 Experimental Design in Psychological Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Eysenck, H. J.

- 1960 The Structure of Human Personality. London: Methuen.

Fairs, E.

- 1925 "The Concept of Social Attitudes." J. Applied Soc., Vol. 9, pp. 404-409.

Faulkner, Joseph E. and Gordon R. DeJong.

- 1966 "Religiosity in 5-D: An Empirical Analysis." Social Forces, Vol. 45 (2), pp. 246-254.

Feagin, J. R.

- 1964 "Prejudice and Religious Types: A Focused Study of Southern Fundamentalists." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 4, pp. 3-13.

Feather, N. T.

- 1971 "Value Differences in Relation to Ethnocentrism, Intolerance of Ambiguity and Dogmatism." Personality, Vol. 2, pp. 349-366.

Feldman, K. A.

- 1972 "Some Theoretical Approaches to Study of Change and Stability of College Students." Review of Religious Education, Vol. 42, pp. 1-26.

Fendrich, James M.

- 1966 "Open-Minded Catholic Students." School and Society, Vol. 95, pp. 518.

Festinger, L.; S. Schachter, and K. Back.

1950 Social Pressures in Informal Groups. New York: Harper.

Festinger, L.

1957 A Theory of Cognitive Dissonances. Stanford: Univ. of Stanford Press.

---

1964 Conflict, Decision, and Dissonance. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.

Fielding, Charles Rudolph; Ihamas W. Klink; John W. Minter; and James D. Glasse.

1966 Education for Ministry. New York: American Assoc. of Theological Schools.

Fishbein, Martin (ed.).

1967 Attitude Theory and Measurement. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Freedman, Mervin B.

1959 "A Half-Century of Vassar Opinion." Vassar Alumnae Magazine, Vol. 44, pp. 3-6.

Gage, N. L. (ed.).

1963 Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Gibbs, Mark and T. Ralph. Morton.

1967 God's Frozen People. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Gilkey, Langdon.

1967 "Social and Intellectual Sources of Contemporary Protestant Theology in America." Daedalus, Vol. 4, pp. 73-79.

Glock, Charles Y.; Benjamin B. Ringer; and Earl Babbie.

1967 To Comfort and to Challenge. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of Calif. Press.

Glock, Charles Y. and Rodney Stark.

- 1965 Religion and Society in Tension. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- 

- 1968 American Piety: The Nature of Religious Commitment. Berkely and Los Angeles: Univ. of Calif. Press.
- 

- 1966 Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism. New York: Harper and Row.

Good, Carter V.

- 1963 Introduction to Educational Research. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.

Gordon, L. V.

- 1971 "Are There Two Extreme Response Sets? California F-Scale and Rokeach's D-Scale." Education and Psychology Monographs, Vol. 31, pp. 867-873.

Gorden, R. L.

- 1952 "Attitude and the Definition of the Situation." American Sociological Review, Vol. 17, pp. 50-58.

Gough, H. G.

- 1951 "Studies of Social Intolerance: I. Some Psychological and Sociological Correlates of Anti-Semitism." J. of Soc. Psychol., Vol. 33, pp. 237-246.

Gray, David Bryce.

- 1967 "Factors Related to a Conception of Church Held by Presbyterian Laymen." Religious Education, Vol. 3, pp. 268-259.

Gregory, W. E.

- 1954 "The Orthodoxy of the Authoritarian Personality." Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 45, pp. 217-232.

Green, G.

- 1972 "Comparison of Attitudes, Values and Dogmatism of College Juniors and Seniors." Journal of Teachers Education, Vol. 23, pp. 343-347.

Grimes, Howard.

1958 The Church Redemptive. Nashville: Abingdon.

Guilford, J. P.

1959 Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gustavus, William T.

1973 "The Ministerial Student: A Study in the Contradiction of a Marginal Role." Review of Religious Research, Vol. 14 (Spring), pp. 187-193.

Gustofoson, James M.

1963 "The Clergy in the United States." Daedalus, Vol. 3, pp. 724-743.

Hadden, Jeffrey K.

1967 "A Protestant Paradox; Divided they Merge." Transaction, Vol. 4, pp. 63-69.

Handy, R.

1970 The Measurement of Values. St. Louis: Green.

Harman, Franklyn S.

1964 "A Revision Scale for the Measurement of Open-Mindedness." Speech Monograph, Vol. 31, pp. 97-102.

Harvey, O. J.

1970 "Beliefs and Behaviour: Some Implications for Education." Scientific Teacher, Vol. 37, pp. 10-14.

Heider, F.

1958 The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: Wiley.

Helson, H. R. R. Blake; Jane S. Mouton; and J. A. Olmstead.

1956 "Attitudes as Adjustments to Stimulus, Background, and Residual Factors." J. of Abnorm. and Soc. Psychol., Vol. 52, pp. 314-322.

- 
- 1964 Adaptation-level Theory. New York: Harper and Row.
- Henriot, Peter J.
- 1966 "The Coincidence of Political and Religious Attitudes." Review of Religious Research, Vol. 8 (1), pp. 50-58.
- Hildrum, D. and R. Brown.
- 1956 "Verbal Reinforcement and Interview Bias." J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., Vol. 53: pp. 108-111.
- Hoge, Dean R.
- 1972 "An Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 11 (4), pp. 369-375.
- Hood, Ralph W., Jr.
- 1971 "A Comparison of the Allport and Feagin Scoring Procedures for Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religious Orientation." Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 10 (4), pp. 370-374.
- Hovland, C. I.; I. L. Janis; and H. H. Kelley.
- 1953 Communication and Persuasion. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hovland, C. I.; O. Harvey; and M. Sherif.
- 1957 "Assimilation and Contrast Effects in Reactions to Communication and Attitude Change." J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., Vol. 55, pp. 244-252.
- Hull, C.
- 1943 Principles of Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Hunt, Richard A., and Morton King.
- 1971 "The Intrinsic-Extrinsic Concept." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 10 (4), pp. 357-364.



Hyman, H. H. and P. B. Sheatsley.

- 1954 "The Authoritarian Personality: A Methodological Critique." Studies in the Scope and Method of The Authoritarian Personality. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Insko, C.

- 1965 "Verbal Reinforcement of Attitude." J. Pers. Soc. Psychol., Vol. 2, pp. 621-623.

- 
- 1967 Theories of Attitude Change. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Jacob, P. E.

- 1957 Changing Values in College: An Exploratory Study of the Impact of College Teaching. New York: Harper.

Johnson, Wayne G.

- 1973 "Religion, Racism, and Self-Image." Religious Education, Vol. 47, pp. 620-629.

Johoda, Marie and Warren Neil.

- 1966 Attitudes. Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books.

Jones, M. B.

- 1958 "Religious Values and Authoritarian Tendency." J. of Soc. Psychol., Vol. 48, pp. 83-89.

Katz, D. and E. Stotland.

- 1959 "A Preliminary Statement to a Theory of Attitude Structure and Change." Psychology: A Study of a Science. New York: McGraw-Hill, pp. 33-36.

- 
- 1960 "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes." Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 24, pp. 163-204.

Katz, E.

- 1957 "The Two-Step Flow of Communication: An Up-to-Date Report on a Hypothesis." Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 21, pp. 61-78.

Kehmann, Irwin J; Rendra K. Sinha; and Rodney T. Hartmatt.

- 1966 "Changes in Attitudes and Values Associated with College Attendance." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 57 (2), pp. 89-98.

Kelly, G. A.

- 1955 The Psychology of Personal Constructs. New York: Norton.

Kelley, H. H. and E. H. Volkart.

- 1952 "The Resistance to Change of Group Anchored Attitudes." American Sociological Review, 17, pp. 453-465.

- 
- 1952 "Salience of Membership and Resistance to Change of Group-Anchored Attitudes." Human Relations, Vol. 8, pp. 275-789.

Kelman, H.

- 1961 "Processes of Opinion Change." Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 25, pp. 57-58.

Kerlinger, Frederick N.

- 1965 Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

King, Morton B. and Richard A. Hunt.

- 1972 Measuring Religious Dimensions. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press.

Kirkpatrick, C.

- 1949 "Religion and Humanitarianism: A Study of Institutional Implications." Psychological Monographs, Vol. 63, pp. 304-306.

Kirscht, John P. and Ronald C. Dillehay.

- 1967 Dimensions of Authoritarianism. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.

Kluckhohn, C.

- 1952 "Values and Value Orientations in the Theory of Action." Toward a General Theory of Action.

T. Parsons and E. A. Thils (eds.). Cambridge:  
Harvard University Press.

Kohn, M. L.

1969 Class and Conformity: A Study in Values. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey.

Krasner, L.; J. Knowles; and L. Ullman.

1965 "Effects of Verbal Conditioning of Attitudes on Subsequent Motor Performance." J. Pers. Soc. Psychol., Vol. 1, pp. 407-412.

Krech, D. and R. S. Crutchfield.

1948 Theory and Problems of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kutner, B.; Carol Wilkins; and Penny Yarrow.

1952 "Verbal Attitudes and Overt Behaviour Involving Racial Prejudice." J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., Vol. 47, pp. 649-652.

Lapierre, R. T.

1934 "Attitudes vs. Actions." Social Forces, Vol. 13, pp. 230-237.

Lehmann, I. J. and P. L. Dressel.

1962 Critical Thinking, Attitudes, and Values in Higher Education. East Lansing: Mich. State Univ. Press.

Lehmann, I. J. and Isabelle K. Payne.

1963 "An Exploration of Attitude and Value Changes of College Freshmen." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 41, pp. 403-408.

Lehmann, I. J.; Birendra K. Sinha; and Rodney T. Hartnett.

1956 "Changes in Attitudes and Values Associated with College Attendance." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 57 (2), pp. 99-101.

Lenski, Gerhard.

1961 The Religious Factor. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday.

Lifton, Robert J.

- 1956 "Thought Reform of Western Civilians in Chinese Communists Prisons." Psychiatry, Vol. 19, pp. 173-195.

Likert, R.

- 1932 "A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes." Archives Psychology, Vol. 140, pp. 122-130.

Lordahl, Daniel S.

- 1967 Modern Statistics for Behavioural Sciences. New York: Ronald Press.

Maranell, Gary M.

- 1967 "An Examination of Some Religious and Political Attitude Correlates of Bigotry." Social Forces, Vol. 45 (3), pp. 355-362.

- 
- 1968 "A Factor Analytic Study of Some Selected Dimensions of Religiosity." (An unpubl. paper).

Mason, Robert; Fred D. Holt; and George Newsome.

- 1969 "Human Nature and Authoritarianism in Seminary Students and Counselor Trainees." Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 3, pp. 689-692.

McGuire, W.

- 1964 "Inducing Resistance to Persuasion." Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. New York: Academic Press.

McKinney, David W., Jr.

- 1973 The Authoritarian Personality Studies. The Hague: Mouton.

Menges, R. J. and J. E. Dittes.

- 1965 Psychological Studies of Clergyman. New York: Nelson.

Morris, C. W.

- 1956 Varieties of Human Value. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Murphy, G. and L. B. Murphy.

1931 Experimental Social Psychology. New York: Harper.

Murphy, G.; L. B. Murphy; and T. Newcomb.

1937 Experimental Social Psychology. New York: Harper.

Nauss, A.

1972 "Personality Stability and Change Among Ministerial Students." Religious Education, Vol. 67, pp. 469-475.

Nelson, Erland N. P.

1962 "Patterns of Religious Attitude Shifts from College to Fourteen Years Later." Psychological Monographs, Vol. 70 (17), pp. 1-15.

Newcomb, T. M.

1950 Social Psychology. New York: Dryden Press.

---

1953 "An Approach to the Study of Communicative Acts." Psychol. Rev., Vol. 60, pp. 393-404.

---

1959 "Individual Systems of Orientation." Psychology: A Study of a Science. New York: McGraw-Hill.

---

1964 A Dictionary of the Social Sciences. London: Tavistock.

Niebuhr, H. Richard.

1956 The Purpose of the Church and its Ministry. New York: Holt.

Oppenheim, A. N.

1966 Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books.

Osgood, C. E.; G. J. Suci; and P. H. Tannenbaum.

1957 The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana, Ill.: Univ. of Ill. Press.

Pallone, Nathaniel J. and Richard R. Banks..

1968 "Vocational Satisfaction Among Ministerial Students." APGA Journal, Vol. 46 (9), pp. 870-874.

Parry, H. J.

1949 "Protestants, Catholics and Prejudice." International Journal of Opinion and Attitude, Research, Vol. 3, pp. 205-213.

Peak, Helen.

1955 "Attitude and Motivation." Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln, Nebr.: Univ. of Nebraska Press.

---

1958 "Psychological Structure and Psychological Activity." Psychol. Rev., Vol. 65, pp. 325-347.

Photiadis, J. and A. Johnson.

1963 "Orthodoxy, Church Participation and Authoritarianism." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 69, pp. 244-248.

Pilkington, G. W.; Pamela K. Poppleton; and Gilligan Robertshaw.

1967 "Changes in Religious Attitudes and Practices Among Students During University Degree Courses." British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 35, pp. 150-157.

Plant, W. T.

1962 "Personality Changes Associated with a College Education." Final Report, U.S. Office of Education. Coop. Res. Branch Project No. 318.

Prothro, E. T. and J. A. Jensen.

1959 "Interrelations of Religious and Ethnic Attitudes in Selected Southern Populations." J. of Soc. Psychol., Vol. 32, pp. 45-49.

Pruyser, P. W.

- 1958 "Toward a Doctrine of Man in Psychiatry and Theology." Pastoral Psychology, Vol. 9 (82), pp. 9-13.

Rahtjen, Bruce D.

- 1966 Scripture and Social Action. Nashville: Abingdon.

Ranck, J. G.

- 1962 "Religious Conservatism-liberalism and Mental Health." Pastoral Psychology, Vol. 12 (112), pp. 34-40.

Raschke, Vernon.

- 1973 "Dogmatism and Religiosity." Journal for Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 12 (3), pp. 339-344.

Razran, G.

- 1938 "Conditioning Away Social Bias by the Luncheon Technique." Psychol. Bull., Vol. 35, p. 693.

Remmers, H. H.

- 1959 Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Measurement. New York: Harper.

Ringer, B. J. and C. Y. Glock.

- 1955 "The Political Role of the Church as Defined by its Parishioners." Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 18, pp. 337-347.

Rokeach, M.

- 1952 "Dogmatism and Opinionation on the Left and on the Right." Amer. Psychologist, Vol. 7, p. 310.

- 
- 1954 "The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism." Psychol. Rev., Vol. 61, pp. 194-204.
- 

- 1958 "Political and Religious Dogmatism and Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality." Psychological Monographs, Vol. 70, pp. 1-43.

---

1960 The Open and Closed Mind: Investigations into the Nature of Belief Systems and Personality Systems. New York: Basic Books.

---

1964 The Three Christs of Ypsilanti: A Psychological Study. New York: Knopf.

---

1965 "Paradoxes of Religious Belief." Trans-action, Vol. 2, pp. 9-12.

---

1968 Beliefs, Attitudes and Values. San Francisco: Joeffey-Books.

---

1969 "Religious Values and Social Compassion." (an unpublished paper presented as part of the H. Paul Douglass Annual Lecture to the Religious Research Association, June.)

---

1969 "The Measurement of Values and Value Systems." (an unpublished paper.)

---

1969 "Value Systems and Religion." (an unpublished paper presented as part of the H. Paul Douglass Annual Lecture to the Religious Research Association, June.)

---

1973 The Nature of Human Values. New York: The Free Press.

Rose, Arnold M.

1966 "Prejudice, Anomie, and the Authoritarian Personality." Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 1, pp. 141-147.



Rose, Stephen C.

- 1966 The Grass Roots Church. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Rosenberg, M.

- 1956 "Cognitive Structure and Attitudinal Affect." J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., Vol. 53, pp. 367-372.

- 
- 1960 Attitude Organization and Change. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.

Sanford, R. N.

- 1954 "Recent Developments in Connection with the Investigation of the Authoritarian Personality." Social. Rev., Vol. 2, pp. 11-33.

Sanford, N.

- 1956 "The Approach of the Authoritarian Personality." Psychology of Personality: Six Modern Approaches. J. L. McCary (ed.). New York: Logos Press.

Sarnoff, I.

- 1960 "Psychoanalytic Theory and Social Attitudes." Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 24, pp. 251-279.

- 
- 1962 Personality Dynamics and Development. New York: Wiley.

Suedfeld, Peter (ed.).

- 1971 Attitude Change: the Competing Views. Chicago: Aldine Atherton.

Schank, R. L.

- 1932 "A Study of a Community and its Groups and Institutions Conceived of as Behaviours of Individuals." Psychological Monographs, Vol. 43 (2), pp. 72-74.

Schulze, Rolf H. K.

- 1962 "A Shortened Version of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale." Journal of Psychological Studies, Vol. 13, pp. 93-97.

Schein, E. H.

- 1961 "The Chinese Indoctrination Program for Prisoners of War: A Study of Attempted 'Brainwashing.'" Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Holt.

Scott, W.

- 1957 "Attitude Change Through Reward of Verbal Behavior." J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., Vol. 55, pp. 72-75.

Sherif, M. and Carolyn W. Sherif.

- 1953 Groups in Harmony and Tension. New York: Harper.

Sherif, M.; Carolyn W. Sherif; and Roger E. Nebergall.

- 1965 Attitude and Attitude Change. Philadelphia: W. B. Sanders.

Shotland, R. L. and W. G. Berger.

- 1970 "Behavioural Validation of General Values from Rokeach's Value Scale as an Index of Honesty." Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 54, pp. 433-435.

Siegel, Sidney.

- 1956 Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Simons, R.

- 1961 "Verbal Conditioning and Generalization of Prodemocratic Responses." J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., Vol. 63, pp. 43-46.

Spoerl, D. T.

- 1951 "Some Aspects of Prejudice as Affected by Religion and Education." Jour. of Soc. Psychology, Vol. 33, pp. 69-67.

Staats, C. and A. Staats.

- 1957 "Meaning Established by Classified Conditioning." J. Exp. Psychol., Vol. 54, pp. 74-80.

Staats, A. W. and C. K. Staats.

- 1958 "Attitudes Established by Classical Conditioning." J. of Abnorm. and Soc. Psychol., Vol. 57, pp. 37-40.

Staag, Paul L.

- 1957 The Converted Church. Valley Forge: The Judson Press.

Stagner, Ross.

- 1951 "Homeostasis as a Unifying Concept in Personality Theory." Psychological Review, Vol. 63, pp. 5-17.

Strickland, Bonnie R. and Sallie Cone Weddell.

- 1972 "Religious Orientation and Prejudice Among Baptists and Unitarians." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 11 (4), pp. 395-399.

Summers, Jean F.

- 1970 Attitude Measurement. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Tate, Eugene D. and Gerald R. Miller.

- 1971 "Differences in Value Systems of Persons with Varying Religions Orientations." Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 10 (4), pp. 357-364.

Thielicke, Helmut.

- 1965 The Trouble with the Church. New York: Harper.

Thompson, Robert C.

- 1974 "A Research Note on the Diversity Among American Protestants: A Southern Baptist Example." Review of Religious Research, Vol. 15 (Winter), pp. 87-92.

Thurston, L. L.

- 1929 "Theory of Attitude Measurements." Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 36, pp. 222-241.

Titus, H. E. and E. P. Hollander.

- 1957 "The California F Scale in Psychological Research: 1950-1955." Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 54, pp. 47-64.

Triandis, Harry C.

- 1971 Attitude and Attitude Change. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Van Dalen, Deobold B. and William J. Meyer.

1966 Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Van Den Heuvel, Albert H.

1966 The Humiliation of the Church. Philadelphia: Westminister Press.

Vanecko, James J.

1966 "Religious Behavior and Prejudice: Some Dimensions and Specifications of the Relationship." Review of Religious Research, Vol. 8 (1), pp. 27-37.

---

1967 "Types of Religious Behavior and Levels of Prejudice." Sociological Analysis, Vol. 28 (3), pp. 111-122.

Walker, Daniel D.

1967 Enemy in the Pew? New York: Harper & Row.

Wallace, J.

1966 "Role Reward and Dissonance Reduction." J. Pers. Soc. Psychol., Vol. 3, pp. 305-312.

Warren, H. C. (ed.).

1936 Dictionary of Psychology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Washburn, M. F.

1916 Movement and Mental Imagery. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Webber, George W.

1960 God's Colony in Man's World. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Webster, H.

1958 "Changes in Attitudes During College." Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 49, pp. 109-117.

Williams, Daniel Day.

1961 The Minister and the Care of Souls. New York: Harper.

Winer, B. J.

1962 Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wuthnow, Robert and Charles Y. Glock.

1973 "Religious Trends at Berkeley." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 12 (2), pp. 157-180.

Yinger, J. Milton.

1967 "Pluralism, Religion, and Secularism." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 6 (1), pp. 17-28.

Young, K. (ed.).

1931 Social Attitudes. New York: Holt.

Young, Robert K. and Donald J. Veldman.

1965 Introductory Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Zajonc, R. B.

1960 "Balance, Congruity and Dissonance." Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 24, pp. 280-296.

APPENDIX

TESTS AND QUESTIONNAIRE

USED IN RESEARCH

## VALUE SURVEY

### Instructions

On the next page are 18 values listed in alphabetical order. Your task is to arrange them in order of their importance to YOU, as guiding principles in YOUR life. Place a number from 1 to 18 on the lines on the left-hand side of the page, indicating their order of importance to you.

Study the list carefully and pick out the one value which is the most important for you. Place a 1 on the line.

Then pick out the value which is second most important for you. Mark it. Then do the same for each of the remaining values. The value which is least important should be marked 18.

Work slowly and think carefully. If you change your mind, feel free to change your answers. Erase or mark out to change your answers. The end result should truly show how you really feel.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ A COMFORTABLE LIFE  
(a prosperous life)
2. \_\_\_\_\_ AN EXCITING LIFE  
(a stimulating, active life)
3. \_\_\_\_\_ A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT  
(lasting contribution)
4. \_\_\_\_\_ A WORLD AT PEACE  
(free of war and conflict)
5. \_\_\_\_\_ A WORLD OF BEAUTY  
(beauty of nature and the arts)
6. \_\_\_\_\_ EQUALITY (brotherhood, equal opportunity  
for all)
7. \_\_\_\_\_ FAMILY SECURITY  
(taking care of loved ones)
8. \_\_\_\_\_ FREEDOM  
(independence, free choice)
9. \_\_\_\_\_ HAPPINESS  
(contentedness)
10. \_\_\_\_\_ INNER HARMONY  
(freedom from inner conflict)
11. \_\_\_\_\_ MATURE LOVE  
(sexual and spiritual intimacy)
12. \_\_\_\_\_ NATIONAL SECURITY  
(protection from attack)
13. \_\_\_\_\_ PLEASURE  
(an enjoyable, leisurely life)
14. \_\_\_\_\_ SALVATION  
(saved, eternal life)
15. \_\_\_\_\_ SELF-RESPECT  
(self-esteem)
16. \_\_\_\_\_ SOCIAL RECOGNITION  
(respect, admiration)
17. \_\_\_\_\_ TRUE FRIENDSHIP  
(close companionship)
18. \_\_\_\_\_ WISDOM  
(a mature understanding of life)

Below is another list of 18 values. Arrange them in order of importance, from 1 to 18, the same as before.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ AMBITIOUS  
(hard-working, aspiring)
2. \_\_\_\_\_ BROADMINDED  
(open-minded)
3. \_\_\_\_\_ CAPABLE  
(competent, effective)
4. \_\_\_\_\_ CHEERFUL  
(lighthearted, joyful)
5. \_\_\_\_\_ CLEAN  
(neat, tidy)
6. \_\_\_\_\_ COURAGEOUS  
(standing up for your beliefs)
7. \_\_\_\_\_ FORGIVING  
(willing to pardon others)



8. \_\_\_\_\_ HELPFUL  
(working for the welfare of others)
9. \_\_\_\_\_ HONEST  
(sincere, truthful)
10. \_\_\_\_\_ IMAGINATIVE  
(daring, creative)
11. \_\_\_\_\_ INDEPENDENT  
(self-reliant, self-sufficient)
12. \_\_\_\_\_ INTELLECTUAL  
(intelligent, reflective)
13. \_\_\_\_\_ LOGICAL  
(consistent, rational)
14. \_\_\_\_\_ LOVING  
(affectionate, tender)
15. \_\_\_\_\_ OBEDIENT  
(dutiful, respectful)
16. \_\_\_\_\_ POLITE  
(courteous, well-mannered)
17. \_\_\_\_\_ RESPONSIBLE  
(dependable, reliable)
18. \_\_\_\_\_ SELF-CONTROLLED  
(restrained, self-disciplined)

## F SCALE

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one. Write +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3 depending on how you feel in each case.

+1: I AGREE A LITTLE	-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE
+2: I AGREE ON THE WHOLE	-2: I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE
+3: I AGREE VERY MUCH	-3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Nobody ever learned anything really important except through suffering.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. What the youth needs is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. An insult to our honor should always be punished.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment, such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

- \_\_\_ 14. Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked, and feebleminded people.
- \_\_\_ 15. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.
- \_\_\_ 16. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.
- \_\_\_ 17. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
- \_\_\_ 18. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places.
- \_\_\_ 19. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.
- \_\_\_ 20. Some day it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.
- \_\_\_ 21. Wars and social troubles may someday be ended by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world.
- \_\_\_ 22. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.
- \_\_\_ 23. It is best to use some prewar authorities in Germany to keep order and prevent chaos.
- \_\_\_ 24. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.
- \_\_\_ 25. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.
- \_\_\_ 26. Familiarity breeds contempt.
- \_\_\_ 27. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around and mix together so much, a person has to protect himself especially carefully against catching an infection or disease from them.
- \_\_\_ 28. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
- \_\_\_ 29. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.

## DOGMATISM SCALE

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

Make each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one. Write +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

+1: I AGREE A LITTLE	-1: I DISAGREE A LITTLE
+2: I AGREE ON THE WHOLE	-2: I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE
+3: I AGREE VERY MUCH	-3: I DISAGREE VERY MUCH

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Communism and Catholicism have nothing in common.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. The principles I have come to believe in are quite different from those believed in by most people.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. In a heated discussion people have a way of bringing up irrelevant issues rather than sticking to the main issue.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. While the use of force is wrong by and large, it is sometimes the only way possible to advance a noble ideal.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Even though I have a lot of faith in the intelligence and wisdom of the common man I must say that the masses behave stupidly at times.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. There are certain 'isms' which are really the same even though those who believe in these 'isms' try to tell you they are different.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. Most people just don't give a 'damn' for others.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.

- \_\_\_ 15. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.
- \_\_\_ 16. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.
- \_\_\_ 17. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.
- \_\_\_ 18. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.
- \_\_\_ 19. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.
- \_\_\_ 20. In a discussion I sometimes interrupt others too much in my eagerness to put across my own point of view.
- \_\_\_ 21. It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.
- \_\_\_ 22. My hardest battles are with myself.
- \_\_\_ 23. At times I think I am no good at all.
- \_\_\_ 24. I am afraid of people who want to find out what I'm really like for fear they'll be disappointed in me.
- \_\_\_ 25. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.
- \_\_\_ 26. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.
- \_\_\_ 27. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.
- \_\_\_ 28. If I had to choose between happiness and greatness, I'd choose greatness.
- \_\_\_ 29. It's all too true that people just won't practice what they preach.
- \_\_\_ 30. Most people are failures and it is the system which is responsible for this.
- \_\_\_ 31. I have often felt that strangers were looking at me critically.
- \_\_\_ 32. It is only natural for a person to have a guilty conscience.
- \_\_\_ 33. People say insulting and vulgar things about me.
- \_\_\_ 34. I am sure I am being talked about.
- \_\_\_ 35. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.
- \_\_\_ 36. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.
- \_\_\_ 37. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.
- \_\_\_ 38. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.
- \_\_\_ 39. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.
- \_\_\_ 40. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty 'wishy-washy' sort of person.

- \_\_\_ 41. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.
- \_\_\_ 42. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.
- \_\_\_ 43. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.
- \_\_\_ 44. To compromise with our political opponents is to be guilty of appeasement.
- \_\_\_ 45. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.
- \_\_\_ 46. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.
- \_\_\_ 47. A group which tolerates too much differences of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.
- \_\_\_ 48. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.
- \_\_\_ 49. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.
- \_\_\_ 50. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.
- \_\_\_ 51. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.
- \_\_\_ 52. I sometimes have a tendency to be too critical of the ideas of others.
- \_\_\_ 53. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.
- \_\_\_ 54. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.
- \_\_\_ 55. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.
- \_\_\_ 56. There's no use wasting your money on newspapers which you know in advance are just plain propaganda.
- \_\_\_ 57. Young people should not have too easy access to books which are likely to confuse them.
- \_\_\_ 58. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.
- \_\_\_ 59. It is by returning to our glorious and forgotten past that real social progress can be achieved.
- \_\_\_ 60. To achieve the happiness of mankind in the future it is sometimes necessary to put up with injustices in the present.

61. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."
62. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.
63. Most people just don't know what's good for them.
64. There is nothing new under the sun.
65. To one who really takes the trouble to understand the world he lives in, it's an easy matter to predict future events.
66. It is sometimes necessary to resort to force to advance an ideal one strongly believes in.

## QUESTIONNAIRE

Please fill in the blanks or circle the letter next to your closest answer.

1. Please print your name. \_\_\_\_\_
2. Address \_\_\_\_\_
3. Indicate today's date \_\_\_\_\_, your age \_\_\_\_\_ your sex \_\_\_\_\_  
race \_\_\_\_\_
4. Name of the Graduate School in which you are enrolled  
\_\_\_\_\_
5. Degree working toward \_\_\_\_\_
6. Field of major \_\_\_\_\_
7. Name of the college from which you have graduated  
\_\_\_\_\_
8. Indicate the two subjects you liked most in college  
(e.g., biology, history, French, philosophy, etc.)  
\_\_\_\_\_
9. Indicate the two subjects you liked least in college  
\_\_\_\_\_
10. If you have been actively engaged in any full-time  
vocation, indicate the type of work and the number of  
years \_\_\_\_\_
11. What is your marital status? S. Single, M. Married,  
W. Widowed, divorced or separated.
12. If married, indicate how many years you will have been  
married on your next anniversary. \_\_\_\_\_ How many chil-  
dren do you now have? \_\_\_\_\_
13. Name of the church denomination in which you now hold  
membership \_\_\_\_\_
14. If you have been a member of another church denomina-  
tion, indicate what other denomination to which you  
have belonged \_\_\_\_\_
15. Is your father living? \_\_\_\_\_
16. Is (was) your father a college graduate? \_\_\_\_\_
17. How active was your father in church as you were grow-  
ing up (through high school)? V. Very active,  
M. Moderately active, H. Hardly active at all.
18. Is your mother living? \_\_\_\_\_
19. Is (was) your mother a college graduate? \_\_\_\_\_
20. How active was your mother in church as you were grow-  
ing up (through high school)? V. Very active,  
M. Moderately active, H. Hardly active at all
21. What is (was) your father's occupation? \_\_\_\_\_
22. Was your father away from home for any reason for  
prolonged or extended periods of time? \_\_\_\_\_
23. If your mother has had any regular employment (other  
than homemaker) indicate her occupation \_\_\_\_\_
24. Did your parents ever separate, or divorce each  
other? \_\_\_\_\_
25. If the answer to 24 is "yes", indicate your age at the  
time of their separation. \_\_\_\_\_



26. List by M (male) and F (female) from the oldest to the youngest the children born to your parents. Put a circle around the one which represents yourself.
- 
27. How active were you in the church as you grew up (through high school)? V. Very active and was a leader, P. Participated but not particularly prominent, O. Participated occasionally, N. No activity.
28. In what state, territories, or foreign countries did you grow up (age 4 through 16? (Indicate your age at each place) \_\_\_\_\_
- 
29. How would you describe your personal relations with others your own age during your school years?  
 A. Quite close and easy - many good friends and generally popular.  
 B. Satisfactorily close and easy - a few good friends.  
 C. Difficult or uneasy frequently - hardly any really close friends.  
 D. Distant - felt a lone wolf most of the time.
30. In your school years were you elected to office in school organizations, such as school government, clubs, etc?  
 A. Constantly - nearly every available opportunity.  
 B. Frequently. C. Occasionally. D. Seldom or never.
31. What do you consider your physical health to be?  
 G. Good, F. Fair, P. Poor.
32. What do you consider your present emotional adjustment to be?  
 G. Good, F. Fair, P. Poor.
33. How would you describe the religious training you received in your home? O. Outstanding, A. Adequate, I. Inadequate, ? Cannot say.
34. How would you describe the religious training you received from your church? O. Outstanding, A. Adequate, I. Inadequate, ? Cannot say.
35. What would you consider to be the theological position of the local church in which you received most of your religious training? C. Conservative, MC. Moderately conservative, ML. Moderately liberal, L. Liberal.
36. Although there are difficulties associated with describing oneself in terms of theological positions, would you please select the category listed below which best describes your own theological position.  
 F. Fundamentalist, C. Conservative, M. Moderate, L. Liberal, O. Other
- 
37. Approximate grade point in undergraduate school \_\_\_\_\_
38. How active are you now in the church? V. Very active and a leader, P. Participate but not particularly prominent, O. Participate occasionally, N. No activity
39. What is your political party choice? \_\_\_\_\_

40. Though it is difficult, describe yourself politically. U. Ultra-conservative, C. Conservative, M. Moderate, L. Liberal, N. New left, O. Other \_\_\_\_\_
41. Your position on the war in Viet Nam. I. Immediate withdrawal, G. Graduate withdrawal, M. Military Victory, O. Other \_\_\_\_\_
42. Your position on civil rights. A. Actively involved, M. Moderately involved, C. Concerned, D. Disinterested, P. Opposed, O. Other \_\_\_\_\_
43. Your position on women's liberation. A. Actively involved, M. Moderately involved, C. Concerned, D. Disinterested, P. Opposed, O. Other \_\_\_\_\_

VITA <sup>2</sup>

Robert Dwight Pierson  
Candidate for the Degree of  
Doctor of Education

Thesis: A STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF PROTESTANT SEMINARY  
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION UPON THE ATTITUDES OF  
CLOSED MINDEDNESS, PREJUDICE AND INTRINSIC VALUES

Major Field: Education Administration

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Woodward, Oklahoma, June 21,  
1936, the son of Mr. and Mrs. R. W. Pierson.

Education: Graduated from Woodward High School, May  
of 1954. Received Bachelor of Arts degree in  
History from Northwestern Oklahoma State University,  
May, 1959; received the Bachelor of Divinity degree  
from Phillips University in 1962; completed re-  
quirements for the Doctor of Education degree at  
Oklahoma State University in May, 1975.

Professional Experience: Pastor of Methodist Church  
in Kafran, Oklahoma, 1958-1959; pastor of Metho-  
dist Church in Hennessey, Oklahoma, 1959-1962;  
associate pastor of 1st Methodist Church in Tulsa,  
Oklahoma, 1962-1965; pastor of Highland Park  
Methodist Church in Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1965-1969;  
pastor of Christ Methodist Church in Tulsa, Okla-  
homa, 1969-present; consultant to Board of Global  
Ministries, United Methodist Church, section on  
Research and Survey, 1971-present.