

This dissertation has been  
microfilmed exactly as received

68-17,490

SPRADLIN, Bonnie Ann, 1940-  
AUTHORITARIANISM IN A POPULATION OF  
MINISTERS.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1968  
Psychology, experimental

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA  
GRADUATE COLLEGE

AUTHORITARIANISM IN A POPULATION OF MINISTERS

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY  
BONNIE ANN SPRADLIN  
Norman, Oklahoma  
1968

**AUTHORITARIANISM IN A POPULATION OF MINISTERS**

**APPROVED BY**

William R. Hood

Thomas E. Miller

Paul D. Jacobs

John D. Hensley

Carl R. Aubrey

**DISSERTATION COMMITTEE**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank each member of the dissertation committee for his patient assistance and helpful advice. Special thanks go to Dr. William R. Hood, dissertation director, without whose patience and guidance this dissertation would not have been possible.

Special thanks go to Bruce Gainsley, whose suggestions proved valuable in the formulation of the Results section of this dissertation.

Finally, the author wishes to thank her husband, Bill, for his understanding, his direction and his sensitivity; all of this gave the author the endurance necessary for the completion of such a piece of research.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. PROBLEM.....	59
III. METHOD.....	65
IV. RESULTS.....	71
V. DISCUSSION.....	81
VI. SUMMARY.....	93
REFERENCES.....	95

# LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Chi Squares for the Semantic Differential for the Two Groups.....	72
2.	t Tests for the Semantic Differential for the Two Groups.....	73
3.	t Test of FCF Scale Scores for the Two Groups.....	74
4.	t Test of FCD Scale Scores for the Two Groups.....	76
5.	t Test for the Conservatism Scale for the Two Groups.....	79
6.	Mean Scores for Petition-Signing Ministers.....	120
7.	Mean Scores for Non-Signing Ministers.....	121
8.	FCF Scale Scores for the Two Groups.....	123
9.	FCD Scale Scores for the Two Groups.....	125
10.	Conservatism Scale Scores for the Two Groups.....	127

# AUTHORITARIANISM IN A POPULATION OF MINISTERS

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The major aim of this study is to obtain measures of authoritarianism, dogmatism, and liberalism-conservatism in two populations of ministers, one of which signed a petition requesting the removal of prayer from the public schools, and the other which opposed the petition.

Major theoretical views concerning the nature and scope of the authoritarian personality were offered by Erich Fromm (1941, 1947) who presented two basically different views of "the authoritarian man." One of the perspectives was the historical aspect which traced the ways man had sought to flee from freedom. The other was the social and psychological perspective which he showed by pointing to the ways conditions in a child's home can determine his character.

History determines cultural patterns, and cultural patterns of responding tend to influence individual patterns of response. It is Fromm's contention that we can trace, since the breakdown of the medieval closed social system, the ways in which man has sought to escape the responsibility and challenges of a freer society. Anti-democratic behavior is a result of both social pressure and childhood training.

The freedoms and the economic and personal challenges which came with the decay of the medieval feudal system.

brought feelings of insecurity and inadequacy to the majority of Western Europe's populace. Few preferred the fight for survival and the challenges of economic free enterprise to the old feelings of security. Lutheranism and Calvinism both answered these feelings of helplessness and powerlessness that a freer way of life and a capitalistic ethic were producing in the people.

Lutheranism directly reflected the people's ambiguous feelings toward the new freedom. Luther preached that man could rebel against the organized church, but he must acquiesce to the authority of God. Luther saw both a new kind of God and a different relationship between man and God. Man was intrinsically evil and could do no good by himself. Man's hope for salvation did not come through being virtuous but only through renouncing his free will and completely surrendering himself to God. The Lutheran man placed himself completely in the hands of God. Fromm (1941) believed this was his answer to his feelings of powerlessness and aloneness. The Lutheran man also fled from competition by believing that one's own efforts could in no way assure salvation. Some found new security in Lutheranism from the new social and economic freedoms. In the Lutheran man, Fromm saw patterns of dominance over the organized church and submission to God; similar patterns were evident in the recent studies of the authoritarian personality which are reviewed later in this dissertation.



Calvin, who preached in other parts of Europe, broadcast a doctrine not dissimilar to Luther's, one designed to ease the same sort of feelings of insecurity. His doctrine had one important difference. It was based on the assumption that men are unequal in the sight of God. The Calvinists believed that they were the chosen ones and everyone else was damned. They also believed that men could not gain heaven through virtuous deeds, but felt that success on earth (measured in economic and moral terms) was indicative of one's favor with God. The fear of not being one of the chosen ones pushed Calvinists at a frenzied pace to be successful. In this way they could escape the anxiety of not knowing whether or not they were chosen. "Success became the sign of God's grace; failure, the sign of damnation" (Fromm, 1941, p. 92).

The authoritarian personality type was a natural product of Calvinist thinking. The assumption that men are created unequal, which the Calvinists made when they assumed that they were blessed and others were damned, was a manifestation of authoritarian hostility to the outgroup. Fromm (1941) also saw in this concept the roots of a system of justifying the exploitation of others, a belief basic to authoritarian attitudes and to capitalistic beliefs. Fromm further commented on the corrosive and authoritarian patterns of both Lutheranism and Calvinism: "In making the individual feel worthless and insignificant as far as his own merits are concerned, in making him feel like a powerless tool in the

hands of God, he deprived man of self confidence and of the feeling of human dignity" (Fromm, 1941, p. 83).

But man's submission to Lutheranism and Calvinism, while of historical interest and some importance in terms of present day cultural patterns, may not have been as important as capitalism, which developed in Western Europe after the fall of feudal society. Capitalism, Fromm (1941) believed, was at the root of many of modern man's ills, and it certainly reinforced authoritarian patterns of behavior.

Submission to God had been replaced by submission to the corporation. Calvinism emphasized achievement, and both Lutheranism and Calvinism denied man's intrinsic worth. These things cleared the way for a belief system in which man got his self-esteem through productivity. Furthermore, submission to God was simply a prelude to submission to the almighty corporation. Both of these were forms of submitting to a power removed from the self. Man was then ready to take a role in which his life became a means to purposes outside of himself, such as economic productivity and accumulation of capital.

The man who saw his worth in economic terms was similar to the authoritarian man in that he was driven by ego-alien forces. He was also forced to submit or sacrifice himself to the corporation. But this submission was not done without ambiguous feelings. Fromm (1941) felt that this was evidenced in the lack of close personal relationships

among employees of corporations, similar to the lack of closeness among authoritarian families whose feelings of being exploited were accompanied by a generalized hostility. Usually this hostility could not be vented at the object of hostility; the Calvinist man could only show his hostility to the social order by projecting it onto God and making Him an unforgiving figure who damned most people. In a corporate structure, hostility towards superiors usually was channeled into "indirect and rationalized forms. One is a person's active emphasis on his own wickedness and insignificance, . . . another appears under the guise of conscience or duty" (Fromm, 1941, p. 97). Duty led to actions which often were self humiliating and pleasure forbidding and to self righteousness which had supplanted mercy and love. In essence, Fromm saw the corporation as leading into a very vicious circle. The corporation forced a man to submit and lose integrity; this caused him to hate himself, which resulted in further feelings of submission and loss of integrity and increased generalized hostility. And the circle repeated itself.

Fromm (1947) also presented a social and psychological interpretation of the authoritarian character. He believed that the authoritarian conscience or personality was formed by childhood fears, suppressions, guilt, and parental transgressions. The telling characteristic of this personality was that the ego and super-ego were not integrated, and personal goals and desires were ego-alien.

According to Fromm (1947), submission was the key to the formation of the authoritarian man. Parental domination forced the child to submit without question or criticism to parental values and ways. Unquestioned submission was the key to the lack of integration in the personality.

The authoritarian conscience was merely an extension of the wishes of the external authority figure. The authoritarian child's conscience was not governed by an appraisal of right or wrong, or even consistent thought patterns, but by what was in accordance with the commands of his authority figure. "The contents of the authoritarian conscience are derived from the commands and tabus of the authority; its strength is rooted in the emotions of fear of, and admiration for, the authority" (Fromm, 1947, p. 146). The child, or the grown authoritarian man, through his absolute and unquestioned identity with the authority figure, acted according to the authority's wishes, or at least his conception of these wishes.

The child submitted, rather than rebelled, for rebellion might result in the authority figure deserting him. Submission, unpleasant as it was, was better than being abandoned or rejected by the father. The child felt that being forced to submit indicated that the father cared about the child. Fear of rejection or desertion was often used by parental authorities to coerce submission of the child.

In addition to fear, guilt helped keep the child submissive. The child's conscience told him that he was bad

when he was not obedient and dependent upon the authority figure. Thus the child experienced feelings of guilt if he asserted himself in unapproved channels. When he rebelled, he felt the necessity of punishing himself. In atoning for his "crime" he became even more submissive, lost even more self respect, became, in essence, even more authoritarian and under the control of authoritarians. Fromm's description of how the authoritarian needs were filled through attachment contained the essence of his feelings:

He has found inner security by becoming, symbiotically, part of an authority felt to be greater and more powerful than himself. As long as he is part of that authority--at the expense of his own integrity--he feels that he is participating in the authority's strength. His feeling of certainty and identity depends on this symbiosis; . . . (Fromm, 1947, p. 146).

During and immediately following World War II a group of social scientists (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford, 1950) conducted studies on authoritarianism. They were primarily interested in political manifestations of personality. More specifically they were concentrating on anti-Semitism, fascism, ethnocentrism, and political-economic conservatism. Their research tools consisted of depth interviews, projective tests and questionnaires. The F scale which Adorno et al. (1950) devised was the major instrument used to ascertain antidemocratic characteristics. The major aims of the F scale were stated thus: (1) "Measure prejudice without appearing to have this aim and without mentioning the name of any minority group" (Adorno, et al., 1950, p. 222).

(2) "The quantification of antidemocratic trends at the level of personality" (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 223).

A number of sources were used in the construction of the F scale. The Anti-Semitism (A-S), Ethnocentrism (E), and Politico-Economic Conservatism (PEC) scales, Thematic Apperception Tests (TAT) and numerous studies at the University of California concerning war morale contributed to the sorting out of variables underlying the concept of authoritarianism. The Anti-Semitism scale and the Ethnocentrism scale employed too many direct references to minority groups to be used for measuring prejudice without appearing to have this aim. The Politico-Economic Conservatism scale was constructed to give an approximation of the subject's general willingness to express conservative ideology and at the same moment to differentiate the pseudo-conservatives from the others. Adorno stated:

The PEC scale might have commended itself as an index of prejudice, but its correlations with the A-S and E scales did not approach being high enough. Moreover, the items of this scale were too explicitly ideological, that is, they might be too readily associated with prejudice in some logical or automatic way. What was needed was a collection of items each of which was correlated with A-S and E but which did not come from an area ordinarily covered in discussions of political, economic, and social matters (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 222).

These three scales, although they were not suitable for measuring prejudice in this specified way, provided information which led to the construction of the F scale. The prejudiced responses given by the subjects were analyzed and compared,

and central underlying variables began to emerge from this analytic process. The authors stated:

In the same way, a number of such variables were derived and defined, and they, taken together, made up the basic content of the F scale. Each was regarded as a more or less central trend in the person which, in accordance with some dynamic process, expressed itself on the surface in ethnocentrism as well as in diverse psychologically related opinions and attitudes. These variables are listed below, together with a brief definition of each.

- a. Conventionalism. Rigid adherence to conventional, middle-class values.
- b. Authoritarian submission. Submissive, uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities of the ingroup.
- c. Authoritarian aggression. Tendency to be on the lookout for, and to condemn, reject, and punish people who violate conventional values.
- d. Anti-intraception. Opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tender-minded.
- e. Superstition and stereotypy. The belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate; the disposition to think in rigid categories.
- f. Power and "toughness". Preoccupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension; identification with power figures; overemphasis upon the conventionalized attributes of the ego; exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness.
- g. Destructiveness and cynicism. Generalized hostility, vilification of the human.
- h. Projectivity. The disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outwards of unconscious emotional impulses.
- i. Sex. Exaggerated concern with sexual "goings-on" (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 228).

A rather lengthy section in this study was devoted to an examination of the individuals through the interview. High-scoring subjects were inclined to see sexuality as a means to attain status, and they also needed to see themselves as very adequate in this area. There was also indication

that these subjects were very denying of their sexual impulses; the sensual element was ignored in favor of a competitive view of sexuality. Adorno et al. (1950) stated that there was a definite split in the thinking of the high scorers concerning sexuality. Women were seen as either "bad" or "good" in the traditionally dichotomous thinking of these subjects. The split was a result of the surface adulation of the mother with the accompanying underlying resentment for her. The moral restriction along with the sexual denial in the home was also involved in the development of this attitude of a split between sex and affect. These men seemed to feel that the love they had for women was centered around the sexually chaste ones, who were considered to be suitable partners for marriage. The others were the more promiscuous women for whom they harbored contempt. The authors found that the high scorers often hid their resentment for members of the opposite sex behind the usual glorified terms and glowing feelings of admiration. Their relationships in reality were dominated by an exploitative manipulation for power. These authoritarians saw the world as a jungle where they had to fight to survive. They saw people in a very distrustful way and tended to project malicious intent on their behavior.

Projection of one's inner impulses, particularly of aggression, onto others will naturally lead to a conception of a dangerous and hostile world and consequently to a general suspiciousness of others. Thus, it was found that typical high-scoring subjects tend to manifest



distrust and suspicion of others (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 411).

The high scorers' views of themselves were conceptualized in glorified terms. They saw themselves in pseudo-masculine and feminine roles where the emphasis was upon the conventional, acceptable pattern. Authoritarian men had an image of themselves which incorporated such concepts as independence, will power, lack of passivity, and determination. The authoritarian women seemed to view themselves in the stereotype forms of the mother and wife who adhere to the socially acceptable conventions surrounding such roles. The authors summarize their findings in this area in a passage where they state:

High-scoring subjects, especially men, tend to succumb to the temptation of displaying independence, ability for decisions, and leadership qualities, probably as a defense against a possible "breakthrough" of their underlying passivity and anxiety (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 425).

In view of this unrealistic image of themselves, the high-scoring people saw their real and ideal self as identical. The ego-ideal described by the high-scoring people was the pseudo-image they attributed to themselves. Low-scoring subjects saw differences between their real and ideal self. They acknowledged discrepancies between the two because they, according to the authors, were more secure people. The authors stated that non-authoritarians tended more toward objective self appraisals. They did not see themselves as mirrors for the conventional morality; instead, they

recognized humanitarianism and understanding in their ideal selves. They admitted their fallability in reaching this ideal.

Adorno et al. (1950) devoted a large portion of their study to explanations of why the differences in thought and behavior patterns occurred. The authors used material based on retrospective reports from their subjects and did not view the home environment of their subjects. The homes of the high-scoring subjects were seen as very conventional. The values were oriented toward what was socially acceptable; this was designated as "good" while what was different or socially unacceptable was viewed as "bad." A reservoir of unacceptable feelings were present in the high scorers, since the feelings, because they don't conform to parents' ideas, must be split off from the ego. The authors felt that these unacceptable impulses were expressed to the outside world in the form of social and political prejudice. The discipline which the subjects got at home was, according to them, rigid and very restrictive; this discipline made the child's submission a necessity. The subjects saw the discipline as inconsistent and arbitrary.

The high-scoring subjects had definite negative feelings about themselves as children. The men conceptualized themselves as "unmanageable, stubborn, aggressive, spoiled and/or sensitive" (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 437), and women saw themselves as "difficult, nervous, and frail" (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 437).

Their views of their parents were mostly quite idealistic and conventional. The high-scoring subjects did not openly express their feelings to or around their parents because of their fear of negative responses from the parents. Consequently, the parents were viewed in very glorified and idealistic ways. The low scorers, on the other hand, were able to express their feelings honestly at home and as a result had more objective appraisals of their parents. Along with expressions of glorification, the high scorers often expressed deep feelings of resentment towards their parents; they verbalized that they felt victimized at home and harshly treated. However, they seemed to express the need for dependence on these figures for material things and security. They spoke of their family as a unit against the elements of the outside world; they dwelled heavily upon heritage and background with the omission of the individual people involved in this unit. If the high scorers did speak of individuals, they usually mentioned that one who seemed to dominate the family. Authoritarian men tended to view the father as the dominant figure; women saw either a strict division of labor (Father's job was providing, and Mother's job was taking care of the home), or viewed the mother as being most dominant. The authors stated that this hierarchical view carried over into the jungle view of life. The authors stated:

His orientation in interpersonal relationships is thus toward getting power by associating with the powerful and influential, or at least toward participating

in the power of those who have it. Admiration for the strong and contempt for the weak accompany this attitude. Thus, high-scoring subjects show predominantly what may be called hierarchical conception of human relationships whereas those who score low conceive of an equalitarian mutuality in such relationships (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 413).

The high-scoring subjects saw their parents not only in glorified terms but in very distant terms. They had an image of their father as a harsh, distant provider instead of an image of a human with many mixed traits and qualities. Once again, the stereotyped and conventional responses exceeded the spontaneous. The mother was seen as the moral, sacrificing, and submissive counterpart. The relationship between these two figures was seen as smooth and without conflict, a view which further embellished the denying picture of family existence presented by these subjects.

Non-authoritarians stressed the love aspects of their parents. The men saw their fathers as moral models who stood for deep and consistent principles. They had much less social anxiety than the authoritarians as to whether their father was a success, and they did not appear to feel threatened by their fathers. They gave very few reports of being made to submit or of being robbed of their integrity by their parents. They tended to feel very affectionate toward their mothers; they depicted her as being loveable and loving, understanding, intellectual, and aesthetic. Non-authoritarian women saw their fathers in much the same way as the non-authoritarian men saw their mothers. He was seen as intellectual, artistic,

warm, loveable, and understanding. The mother was seen as having almost the same qualities, but she was also a model of deep moral principles.

Adorno et al. delved thoroughly into personality organization within a Freudian framework. Dependence was one of the central characteristics in the personality construction of the high-scoring subjects. The root of this characteristic, as mentioned, is the childhood environment.

Adorno et al. stated:

The attitude of submission to and the absence of real rebellion against the parents, found primarily in high-scoring subjects, appears to be connected with a kind of materialistic dependence on them which is not recognized as such. It may thus be termed ego-alien dependence for things and support. This dependence, is essentially an exploitive-manipulative, externalized relationship (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 353).

The authors found that this pattern continued through life and that parent substitutes were always being sought to supply the tangible support that they needed. The low scorers had a quite different orientation. The authors stated:

In line with this, high scorers tend to be oriented toward persons in positions of authority or power, or toward support; low scorers tend to be longing for someone who will really love them without reservation the way they happen to be and "in spite of shortcomings." Low-scorers also tend to place emphasis more on expectations of receiving love, understanding, and companionship from their friends (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 415).

Adorno et al. also commented on religion as a means of support that the high scorers depend upon:

The dependence on support in high-scoring subjects is furthermore clearly evident in their particular type of attitude toward religion. It is primarily when in need

that they turn to the Bible; and it is support in the face of need rather than a system of ethics that they seek in religion. Frequently they become religious whenever "dependence on people" conflicts with suspicion, leading to isolation (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 449).

In Adorno's study, aggression was thought to be one of the significant aspects of the prejudiced person's personality. They found that "prejudice seems to be but one of a number of manifestations of aggression" (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 450). The authors noted several distinctions in the area of content and purpose of aggression which distinguished the high from the low scorer. One of the prime distinctions concerned was whether or not the aggression was indicative of a general reservoir of suppressed rage which surged up from the individual in an impulsive manner. Contrary to this was appropriate aggression, which was displayed for a more definite reason, such as the basic violation of values or beliefs. Another distinction centered around whether the anger was directly expressed at the source of discomfort or whether it was displaced onto surrogate objects who were less threatening. It was found that the high-scoring subjects released aggression in blind rage, temper tantrums, and bad temper in general. This was pertinent to the first distinction of aggression mentioned above, in that the aggression seemed to come from a "well" of suppressed rage. The low scorers, on the other hand, showed a greater awareness of the underlying cause of their aggression and directed the aggression against this specific person or violation of principles.

Closely associated with the issue of aggression was the issue of ambivalence.

The problem of ambivalence is related to that of aggression. In discussing attitudes toward parents and sex, the comparative inability of high-scoring subjects to verbalize aggression and thus to face ambivalence was pointed out in detail. It was also intimated that it may be precisely the inability to face ambivalence toward the powerful which leads to socially dangerous forms of displacement of aggression (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 451).

Adorno et al. discussed the personality dynamics of the superego of high scorers and low scorers. They saw the superego as the central factor in the formation of both groups' orientations toward authority.

It seems to be the lack of genuine identification with, and the fear of, the parents which leads in the high scorers to an externalization of the superego, with the punishing and rewarding authority seen as being outside rather than inside of oneself. By contrast, low scorers tend toward an internalized conscience; their behavior is primarily oriented toward genuine, intrinsic values and standards rather than toward external authorities (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 454).

Submission to parental authority to avoid rejection caused the high scorers to split off their real feelings because they were not in accord with the values of the parental authority figures. The surface identification was a result of the restrictive environment. Adorno et al., in accordance with Freudian theory, stated:

According to psychoanalytic theory, the development of ethical principles normally proceeds from outside values, as first represented by standards upheld by adults, to an internalization of these values. High scorers, due apparently to lack of genuine identification with the parents, do not succeed in making the important developmental step from mere "social anxiety" to real

conscience. Fear of punishment by external authorities rather than self-chosen and ego-assimilated principles continue to be the primary determinant of their behavior (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 455).

The authors stated that this type of superego development produced a weak ego. The instinctual impulses were repressed and a heavy guard was put on them to insure that they did not break through the ego defenses. The defenses had to be numerous and constant to avoid the possibility of impulse eruption. This state consumed a lot of energy and the ego of the high scorer was weakened by such demands. Low scorers had stronger, more integrated egos. Adorno et al. stated:

However, the adult individual, like the child, has to pay a heavy price for the comfort he draws from stereotypy. The stereotype, while being a means of translating reality in a kind of multiple-choice questionnaire where every issue is subsumed and can be decided by a plus or minus mark, keeps the world as aloof, abstract, "nonexperienced" as it was before. Moreover, since it is above all the alienness and coldness of political reality which causes the individual's anxieties, these anxieties are not fully remedied by a device which itself reflects the threatening, streamlining process of the real social world. Thus, stereotypy calls again for its very opposite: personalization. Here, the term assumes a very definite meaning: the tendency to describe objective social and economic processes, political programs, internal and external tensions in terms of some person identified with the case in question rather than taking the trouble to perform the impersonal intellectual operations required by the abstractness of the social processes themselves (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 665).

In line with the psychological findings, Adorno et al. found a pseudoconservative ideology among the high scorers. "The psychological structure that corresponds to pseudoconservatism is conventionality and authoritarian submissiveness



on the ego level, with violence, anarchic impulses, and chaotic destructiveness in the unconscious sphere" (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 675). The authors made the distinction between the "genuine" and the "pseudo," and they made attempts to define these concepts operationally. They commented:

This would imply that the "genuine" conservative characters would be those who essentially or at least temporarily succeeded in their identification with authoritarian patterns without considerable carry-overs of their emotional conflicts--without strong ambivalence and destructive countertendencies. Conversely, the "pseudo" traits are characteristic of those whose authoritarian identification succeeded only on a superficial level. They are forced to overdo it continuously in order to convince themselves and the others that they belong, to quote the revolution-hater of San Quentin, to the right strata of society. The stubborn energy which they employ in order to accept conformist values constantly threatens to shatter these values themselves, to make them turn into their opposite, just as their "fanatical" eagerness to defend God and Country makes them join lunatic fringe rackets and sympathize with the enemies of their country (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 683).

In Adorno's study, the authors covered some aspects of religious ideology; however, they stated that the connection between religion and prejudice did not play a significant part in their research. The authors stated:

Yet, there is reason enough to devote some close attention to our data on religion, scarce though they may be. The considerable part played by actual or former ministers in spreading fascist propaganda and the continuous use they make of the religious medium strongly suggest that the general trend toward religious indifference does not constitute altogether a break between religious persuasion and our main problem. Although religion may no longer stimulate open fanaticism against those who do not share one's own belief, we are led to suspect that, on a deeper, more unconscious level the religious heritage, the carry-over of old belief and the identification with certain denominations, still make themselves felt (Adorno et al., 1950, pp. 727-728).

Adorno's study speculated that religion played a smaller part in the lives of the subjects today than in the distant past. The authors felt that Christianity was faced with an "indifference" that had made it much less a part of our culture. The scientific spirit and Enlightenment had both added to the reduction of its position. The authors stated:

However, some of the formal properties of religion, such as the rigid antithesis of good and evil, ascetic ideals, emphasis upon unlimited effort on the part of the individual, still exercise considerable power. Severed from their roots and often devoid of any specific content, these formal constituents are apt to be congealed into mere formulae. Thus, they assume an aspect of rigidity and intolerance such as we expect to find in the prejudiced person (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 729).

This dissolving process had resulted in religion being transformed into "social cement." Pressure had to be exerted within the religious groups to keep some semblance of cohesiveness. The authors stated:

The transformation of religion into an agency of social conformity makes it fall in line with most other conformist tendencies. Adherence to Christianity under such conditions easily lends itself to abuse; to subservience, overadjustment, and ingroup loyalty as an ideology which covers up hatred against the disbeliever, the dissenter, the Jew. Belonging to a denomination assumes an air of aggressive fatality, similar to that of being born as a member of one particular nation (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 730).

The authors found in their study that: "High scorers, more often than low scorers, seem to make use of religious ideas in order to gain some immediate practical advantage or to aid in the manipulation of other people" (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 733).

Review of Experimental Literature  
Criticisms of the Authoritarian  
Personality

Almost simultaneous with publication, the methodology and the conclusions of Adorno's study were under close scrutiny and attack. Christie and Jahoda (1954) probably did the best critique of its methodology. Here the F scale by which Adorno et al. (1950) measured their subjects' authoritarianism and the subsequent research and conclusions were closely examined by several different authors. Adorno et al. (1950) were criticized for their tests measuring authoritarianism. These tests contained, for the most part, ideological items of right-wing authoritarianism and were insensitive to communist or other left-wing types of authoritarianism. This may account, in part, for the number of types of authoritarian subjects. The sample populations were socio-economically very limited; most of them were from the urban middle class. Also, Adorno's study assumed that authoritarianism and non-authoritarianism were linearly related and that those who fell in the middle would exhibit traits and childhood backgrounds which were a combination of those of the authoritarian and non-authoritarians. Even though the sample was a biased one, Christie and Jahoda concluded that broad generalizations were made upon the rather inadequate sample. Three basic improper generalizations were cited:

- (1) In spite of initial disclaimers, the incidence of sentiments in the sample population is often projected to other populations or (as with prisoners) to an entire

subgroup of the total population; (2) The nature and degree of organization of sentiments and the relationship to personality traits found in this sample are often generalized to other populations; and (3) The findings obtained from interviews with opposing extreme groups are generalized to the non-extreme middle groups (Christie and Johoda, 1954, p. 69).

Adorno's study was criticized for its statistical techniques:

A positive correlation between authoritarianism and political conservatism is claimed, although the contents of the two scales which produce the correlation are clearly overlapping and therefore inflate the value. A positive correlation between authoritarianism and anti-Semitism is claimed, although in the process of building the authoritarianism scale, several items which failed to correlate with anti-Semitism were omitted although they were good measures of potential Fascism. Again the magnitude of the correlation is thereby exaggerated (Christie and Jahoda, 1954, pp. 119-120).

Christie and Jahoda (1954) made some critical statements about the methods in Adorno's study. Apparently no control was used concerning the variable of formal education and consequently the conclusions may be partially due to the subject's educational level. They also noted that the statistical tables presented were explained on the basis of the authors' views and theories.

Christie and Jahoda (1954) felt that the scientific method was primarily ignored in Adorno's work. They mentioned that the retrospective reports of subjects were taken to be valid accounts of their childhood experiences. Since actual checks into the past were not made in these studies, and since distortion was a possibility, the validity of these reports seemed questionable.

One of the largest methodological complaints directed at this study centered around the interpretation of material. Adorno et al. (1950) seemed to rely quite heavily upon psychodynamic explanations to deal with the material. The critics felt that personality variables were not adequate to explain the prejudiced subject's behavior. Hood and Sherif commented on this issue:

Views which explain prejudice primarily through personality factors permit the individual to make of the world what he will through wish fulfillment, fantasy, and autism. While the deviate individual may succeed in ignoring reality to some extent, structuring and restructuring of perceptions by the great bulk of people are somewhat held in check by actual conditions such as, for example, group sanctions, which set certain compelling limits. The point is that intergroup relations of consequence today are not primarily matters of deviate behavior (Hood and Sherif, 1955, p. 82).

Subsequent studies on authoritarianism. It was a hypothesis of Adorno et al, (1950) that the authoritarian person has more anxiety and repressed thoughts than the non-authoritarian. Singer and Feshbach (1959) gave 147 college students a questionnaire consisting of the California F scale, the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale, and the Child-Waterhouse Reactions to Frustration Scale. This last scale gives indices of extrapunitive, intrapunitive, and constructive responses to frustration. Singer and Feshbach concluded:

A significant but low positive correlation was obtained between the F scale and the Taylor scale, the correlation being primarily accounted for by the association between high scores on the F scale and high scores on the Taylor scale. An analysis of the data in which the possible effects of "acquiescence set" were eliminated still yielded a significant,

positive relationship. In addition both the Taylor and F scales correlated positively with measures of both intrapunitive and extrapunitive tendencies and correlated negatively with the index of constructive reactions to frustration. The data further indicate that although highly anxious and highly authoritarian Ss deviate from the norm on the Taylor scale, they perceive themselves as being similar to the average person in the manner in which they react to frustration. On the other hand, low anxious and low authoritarian Ss perceive themselves as being more constructive, less intrapunitive, and less extrapunitive than the average person (Singer and Feshbach, 1950, p. 408).

Kogan (1955) measured repression in a sample of Ss; he based his study on the assumption in Adorno's study that authoritarians use repression to keep feelings of ambivalence towards the authority figure and their own feelings of weakness and dependency from self awareness. He found in this study that the ability to identify highly emotional stimulus words was inversely related to authoritarianism.

One particular study emerged to validate the finding that high scorers had a split between sex and affect. High scorers were found to view women as either "bad" or "good" in very traditionally dichotomous thinking. To test this split, Rothstein (1960) did a study aimed at investigating authoritarians' views of sexuality and kindness in women. He was also attempting to verify the finding of Adorno et al. (1950) that high scorers were overly concerned with sexuality, which, those authors suggested, showed a tendency to project unacceptable sexual impulses onto others. His hypotheses were:

1. Authoritarians should tend to overemphasize the sexual aspects of a woman's behavior, even though she is also shown to be affectionate and kindly as well.

2. Authoritarians should show dichotomous sex attitudes as evidenced by their "splitting" of sexuality and affection. Further, their impressions of the personality of a woman who is both sexual and kindly should tend to be organized in a nonintegrated manner (Rothstein, 1960, pp. 329-330).

He employed a group of college men. High scorers on authoritarian measures made up half of the group and low scorers on authoritarian measures made up the other half. A silent movie was shown to the Ss which involved two specific scenes. A young and attractive girl was the star in both scenes. In one scene the girl portrayed a sexually appealing woman. In the other scene the girl's role characterized her as being kind and understanding. One subgroup viewed the sexual scene first, and the other saw the kindly one first. Following the movie, the Ss gave accounts of the personality of the girl who was the star in both scenes. The Ss also filled out a questionnaire involving their heterosexual behavior. Rothstein concluded: "The high authoritarian group perceived the star as significantly more sexual than kindly and also reported splitting of sexuality and affection in heterosexual behavior to a significantly greater degree than was reported by low authoritarians" (Rothstein, 1960, p. 334). The author further stated that his findings substantiated "one of the underlying hypotheses of The Authoritarian Personality in that high authoritarians were found to over-react to sexuality in women" (Rothstein, 1960, p. 334).

A number of authors have tried, experimentally, to get at the authoritarian's view of the environment around him.

Adorno et al. (1950) commented on the high authoritarian viewing the world as a jungle where manipulation was an essential tool. Some authors have felt these views are just projections of the person's own feelings onto the outside world. Deutsch (1960) says: "His behavior toward the other is congruent with what he expects from the other, and also, what he expects from the other is congruent with his behavior toward the other" (Deutsch, 1960, p. 139, emphasis in original). In his experiment, Deutsch (1960) had his subjects involved in an interpersonal game where there were two basic positions. In the first, the Ss had to pick between being suspicious or trusting of another S, and in the second position they had to pick between being trustworthy or untrustworthy toward another S. There seemed to be an inclination for Ss who were trusting to be trustworthy and for Ss who were suspicious to be untrustworthy. He concluded that there was a correlation between game behavior and scores on the F scale. Deutsch (1960) found that those who scored low on the F scale were more likely to be trusting and trustworthy; high scorers on the F scale (authoritarians) were suspicious and untrustworthy.

DeSoto, Kueth, and Wunderlich did a study where high and low authoritarians viewed pictures of people they didn't know. Eventually they were asked to rate these pictures on various personality traits and also rate themselves using the same traits. They concluded that the authoritarian subjects



generally regarded the photographs of others as more threatening than non authoritarians did. They stated that the authoritarian subjects had an "indiscriminate condemnation and fearfulness of the strangers, with complementary insistence that they themselves are virtuous and able" (DeSoto, et al., 1960, p. 154).

Kates has done a study involving authoritarianism and the formation of first impressions. The case materials of two stimulus persons were given to Ss for evaluation. One stimulus person was low in authoritarianism and one was high. After reviewing the clinical material, the Ss did the Jones graphic rating scales and the F scale. Kates concluded:

Our results indicated that the high-authoritarian Ss evaluated the stimulus persons as manifesting significantly more authoritarianism, power, leadership, social sensitivity, positive traits, and personal attractiveness than did the low-authoritarian Ss. The stimulus persons were not distinguished on the basis of their authoritarianism; but the high-authoritarian stimulus person was perceived as possessing more power, leadership, positive traits, social sensitivity, and personal attractiveness than the low-authoritarian stimulus person. The estimates made by both high- and low-authoritarian Ss did not accurately reflect the distribution of authoritarianism in a population of fellow male students (Kates, 1959, pp. 285-286).

Kenny and Ginsberg (1958) examined the assumption of Adorno et al. (1950) that intolerance of ambiguity is a characteristic of the authoritarian character. The authors tested the validity of suggested measures of intolerance of ambiguity and the relationship between these measures and authoritarianism. The initial procedure tested the concept that there was a positive relationship between different

tests which were supposed to measure intolerance of ambiguity. The second method examined the concept that the different tests were positively related to authoritarianism. Kenny and Ginsberg concluded:

Seventy-six female Ss were given a battery of tests purporting to measure intolerance of ambiguity and authoritarian-submission. Only seven of the 66 correlations among measures of intolerance of ambiguity were significant at the .05 level, two of these having a relationship opposite to those predicted. In the main, these measures did not correlate significantly with a scale of authoritarian-submission (Kenny and Ginsberg, 1958, p. 304).

In a study a year later, Kenny and Ginsberg examined four subsequent hypotheses which were related to the repressed hostility component of the authoritarian personality.

These predict: (a) an inverse relationship between expression of aggression and authoritarian submission; (b) an inverse relationship between expression of aggression and intolerance of ambiguity; (c) a positive relationship between aggression expressed against non-conforming individuals and authoritarian submission; and (d) a positive relationship between aggression expressed against non-conforming individuals and intolerance of ambiguity (Kenny and Ginsberg, 1958, p. 121).

The only hypothesis which was supported by this study was the third one. Thus they did find that authoritarianism was related to aggression against nonconformists, but they could not find support for the rest of the hypotheses.

Frenkel-Brunswik has done some work in this area of intolerance of ambiguity. She collected most of her data at the Institute of Child Welfare at the University of California. The study dealt mainly with "rigid adherence vs. disinclination to ethnic prejudice in children, and the

motivational and cognitive correlates of these social attitudes" (Frenkel-Brunswik, 1949, p. 114). The children were visited and interviewed, and many were given perceptual tests. She visited the children in order to check some of the assumptions and impressions of Adorno et al. (1950) which they gathered from retrospective reports from the Ss.

The author discovered that some of the children were able to acknowledge negative and positive aspects of their parents and were able to experience love and hate feelings for the same figure. Other children viewed their parents as either all good or all bad. The author hypothesized that the latter group had repressed the negative aspects of their feelings. This hypothesis was formulated on the basis of the nature of verbal descriptions of parents and the contradictory responses obtained on Thematic Apperception Tests. These children described their parents in exaggerated and stereotypical ways, avoiding references to real feelings about them as real people. Consequently, the responses were lacking in variation and seemed to center around the concrete physical aspects of the parents. However, on such measures as the Thematic Apperception Tests, some rather contradictory feelings emerged from the children. The parents were often seen as threatening, punitive figures. Frenkel-Brunswik stated:

Synopsis of a variety of data suggests that the attempt to master aggression toward parental figures who are experienced as too threatening and powerful are

among the important determinants of the tendency rigidly to avoid ambiguity of any sort. The requested submission and obedience to parental authority is only one of the many external, rigid, and superficial rules which such a child learns. Dominance-submission, cleanliness-dirtiness, badness-goodness, virtue-vice, masculinity-femininity are some of the other dichotomies customarily upheld in the homes of such children. The absoluteness of each of these differences is considered natural and eternal, excluding any possibility of individuals trespassing from the one side to the other (Frenkel-Brunswik, 1949, p. 117).

The author delved into the perceptual area in relationship to this concept of intolerance of ambiguity. The study did not concentrate on the well-examined area of the figure ground reversals or the other Gestalt problems of perceptual ambiguity. This paper concentrated on the personality aspect of the problem. A number of experiments conducted were aimed at testing perceptual rigidity in the children. She described an experiment as follows:

First the picture of a dog was shown, followed by a number of pictures representing transitional stages leading finally to the picture of a cat. At every stage the subjects were asked to identify the object on the given card. In spite of the fact that the cards were not too well drawn for the purpose, distinct trends became evident. The prejudiced group tended to hold on longer to the first object and to respond more slowly to the changing stimuli. There was greater reluctance to give up the original object about which one had felt relatively certain and a tendency not to see what did not harmonize with the first set as well as a shying away from transitional solutions (Frenkel-Brunswik, 1949, p. 128).

The author felt that there was definitely a connection between the general denial of emotional ambivalences and the rigid perceptual responses exhibited in the experiments. She concluded: "There is some indication of a prevalence of premature reduction of ambiguous cognitive patterns to certainty

in the prejudiced subjects, as revealed by a clinging to the familiar" (Frenkel-Brunswik, 1949, p. 140).

Rokeach (1948) also studied the problem of rigidity. The major hypothesis he was testing was that rigidity found in the prejudiced person's solution of problems of a social nature is not a separate characteristic. He felt that there was a general rigidity which would be revealed in any sort of problem, social or other. Another hypothesis was that an ethnocentric person's thinking is more concrete than abstract; a non-ethnocentric person's thinking is more abstract in nature.

The author tested the hypothesis involved by utilizing a Gestalt psychological thinking problem which consisted of the manipulation of three jars. First a mental set was created by giving the subjects a number of problems which required a solution through a complex method. Then the subjects were given more problems which could be solved either by using the original set or by employing a better, more direct method. An indication of rigidity was obtained from the number of cases where the established set was retained; thereby the subjects exhibited an inability to restructure the area and to find the direct solution. The conclusions demonstrated that the children who scored very high on ethnic prejudice dealt with the new problems in a rigid way; the subjects who were lower on the prejudice variable solved the problems in a less rigid fashion. Rokeach (1948) obtained

an indication of concreteness of thinking through the use of scratch paper; the subjects used the paper to help with the solutions to the problems and they indicated their answers in arithmetic form or in sentence form. He concluded that more concrete thinking was displayed by the group that was higher in ethnocentrism.

Brown (1953) attempted to replicate the Rokeach (1948) study but was unsuccessful in his attempt. As a result, he proceeded to carefully examine the experimental design in the Rokeach (1948) experiment. He indicated that possibly some anxiety around achievement had to be aroused before the authoritarian subjects would demonstrate rigidity on the arithmetic problems.

To test this hypothesis, college students were asked to serve as Ss. "Three measures were used: the California F scale (as a measure of authoritarianism), the Einstellung arithmetic problems (as a measure of rigidity), and McClelland's projective measure of need for achievement (to provide an index of achievement anxiety)" (Brown, 1953, p. 475). Two different environments were created for this experiment. One was an ego-involving environment which the experimenter tried to create by dressing conservatively, maintaining a distant manner, and instructing the Ss to not review their tests before the time was indicated to do so. To produce a relaxed environment, the experimenter was casual in manner and indicated that he was a psychology major who

was doing a class project which he was not interested in doing.

In the ego-involved sample, there was a higher correlation between the Einstellung arithmetic problem and the F scores than in the relaxed sample. Anxiety around achievement (as demonstrated by moderate achievement scores) was connected to rigidity and authoritarianism in the ego-involving group. Moderate achievement scores on McClelland's projective measure were connected to high F scores but not to the behavior on the arithmetic problems. He concluded that "the rigidity which is associated with authoritarianism is a kind of defensive behavior which is perceived as warding off personal failure" (Brown, 1953, p. 475).

Some findings in the area of politics and economics. MacKinnon and Centers did a study involving urban stratification. The study was conducted in the Los Angeles, California, area. It was directed toward the connecting of the anti-democratic character to different indices of social stratification. The authors stated:

Though for the entire sample authoritarianism appears to increase with age except for a decrease between the twenties and thirties, the manual workers remain at a practically even level of authoritarianism throughout life, whereas the non-manual decrease in authoritarianism from the twenties to the thirties and thereafter increase to a point somewhat higher than that of the twenties, being clearly more equalitarian than the manual group during the thirties and forties. Greater past and present socioeconomic barriers among the manual workers and somewhat similar problems of adolescence and old age for both strata may explain these age relationships in authoritarianism (MacKinnon and Centers, 1956, p. 620).

The authors concluded that "authoritarianism is related inversely to education, occupation, and other stratification variables" (MacKinnon and Centers, 1956, p. 610). They also found that as the strength of class identification went up, authoritarianism increased also. There was a larger percentage of authoritarians in the working class.

Lipset did an article regarding the lower class and authoritarianism. He stated, "A variety of evidence from many countries suggests that low status and low education predispose individuals to favor extremist, intolerant, and transvaluational forms of political and religious behavior" (Lipset, 1959, p. 482). He made a distinction first between economic and non-economic liberalism. Non-economic liberalism meant backing such things as internationalist, liberal immigration legislation and civil rights for racial minorities. Lower classes were less liberal on these issues than the middle class. Economic liberalism involved welfare state issues and such issues as rearrangement of power, status, and income among the classes. The poor were definitely more liberal on these kinds of issues.

The author delved into the religion of the different classes and commented on the fact that the lower classes preferred a different kind of religious orientation. Lipset stated: "Many observers have called attention to a connection between low social status and fundamentalist or chiliastic religion. The liberal Protestant churches, on the



other hand, almost invariably have been predominantly middle-class in membership" (Lipset, 1959, p. 487). Jehovah's Witnesses was an example cited as an indication of the lower class's preference for authoritarian religions. The teachings of this fast-growing sect are embodied in a hierarchical framework and espouse a type of hell fire and salvation doctrine.

The author explored some studies involving foreign countries. He indicated that the patterns of authoritarians were similar in spite of geographic differences. The author cited as a reference a study done by Sven Rydenflet directed at the roots of Swedish communism. He referred to this as follows:

In his excellent study of the sources of Swedish communism, Sven Rydenfelt demonstrates the competitive relationship between religious and political extremism. He analyzed the differences between two northern counties of Sweden, Vasterbotten and Norrbotten, in an attempt to explain the relatively low Communist vote in the former (two per cent) and the much larger vote in the latter county (21 per cent), although both have comparable social and economic conditions. The Liberal Party, which in Sweden gives much more support than any other to religious extremism, was very strong in Vasterbotten (30 per cent) and correspondingly weak in Norrbotten (nine per cent). Rydenfelt concludes that a general predisposition toward radicalism existed on both counties, containing some of the poorest, most socially isolated, and rootless groups in Sweden, but that the expression of radicalism differed, taking a religious form in one county, and a Communist in the other (Lipset, 1959, p. 488).

Lipset described briefly the possible elements in the social environment of lower class people which could contribute to the formation of authoritarian patterns: "Low

education, low participation in political organizations or in voluntary organizations of any type, little reading, isolated occupations, economic insecurity, and authoritarian family patterns" (Lipset, 1959, p. 489). It appeared that lower class individuals voted less, read less, and on the whole were less concerned with political matters. He supported these views with the material from Stouffer's work concerning civil liberties. Lipset stated:

A study of the determinants of economic and non-economic liberalism reports that on every occupational level the persons poorly informed on public questions are more likely to be both more radical on economic issues and less liberal on non-economic issues. Non-voters and those less interested in political matters are much more intolerant and xenophobic than those who vote and have political interests (Lipset, 1959, p. 490).

He felt that the material indicated the fact that it takes a secure ego and a certain degree of sophistication to incorporate democratic norms. The individuals who lacked security and sophistication were more inclined to desire a simplified and demonological orientation to politics. There were a number of finer distinctions made in this article. For example, Lipset indicated:

In Germany, the United States, Great Britain, and Japan, individuals who support the democratic left party are more likely to support civil liberties and democratic values than people within each occupational stratum who back the conservative parties. That is, workers who back the democratic left are more likely to have tolerant or non-authoritarian attitudes than workers who support the conservative parties. Similarly, middle-class Social Democrats are more prone to support civil liberties than middle-class conservatives (Lipset, 1959, p. 500).

MacKinnon and Centers (1956), Lentz (1950), Smith (1955), and Smith and Rosen (1958) have all reported a strong

correlation between authoritarianism and views referred to as worldminded or internationalist. Smith and Rosen stated:

Using a new scale designed to measure the value orientation of "worldmindedness" apart from topical knowledge about or interest in international relations, Smith (1955) found attitude and personality differences between the two extreme groups that closely resembled the high and low F syndromes reported by Adorno et al. (1950) (Smith and Rosen, 1958, p. 170).

Smith and Rosen in their study have investigated this hypothesized relationship between authoritarianism and nationalism. After administering the Worldmindedness (W) scale and the F scale to 193 college students, they concluded:

The results indicate that the worldmindedness dimension is closely (and inversely) related to the dimension of authoritarianism and it is parsimonious to consider them as slightly different aspects of the same basic personality structure. It seems clear that the W Scale as well as other measures of internationalism-nationalism does not tap a personality dimension different from that originally investigated in the California Study (Smith and Rosen, 1958, p. 180).

Some studies involving personality variables connected to authoritarianism. The studies aimed at researching the link between personality adjustment and authoritarianism have centered around the development of scales for measuring prejudice on a personality level. The most successful scale grew out of Gough's work with the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. In 1951, Gough found a connection between the A-S (anti-Semitic) scale taken from the California study and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Gough (1951) worked with a sample of mid-western high school seniors. He performed an item analysis of their responses to the MMPI

using the Levinson-Sanford anti-Semitism scale as the criterion. From this analysis the author developed a Pr or "prejudice" scale which consisted of 32 items. Later, Gough (1951) obtained a 30 item scale from Sanford, who was involved in the California study on authoritarianism; he called this scale the "E-F" scale. It was supposed to ascertain the degree of authoritarianism or ethnocentrism in a subject.

Altus and Tefejian did a study to answer the following questions:

(a) What are the MMPI correlates of the E-F scale, published by Gough? (b) Would Gough's Pr scale still show an appreciable correlation when the population was changed from high school seniors to a college population and when the criterion was changed from the anti-Semitic scale to what Gough calls the E-F scale? (Altus and Tafejian, 1953, p. 145).

Altus and Tafejian (1953) first administered the MMPI, the Pr scale, and the E-F scale to 150 college students. After the 150 response sheets involving the MMPI were separated into two groups, two different item analyses of the items on the MMPI were made; high and low scores on the E-F scale were the criterion. An examination of the analyses of the MMPI indicated that there seemed to be a significant connection between the MMPI responses and quartile extremes of responses on the E-F scale.

Then, utilizing another group of college students, the authors found that the 40 items produced a linear correlation of .62 when matched with the E-F scale. "Gough's Pr scale, validated originally against an anti-Semitism scale, gave

r's of .30 and .37 for the two groups, when correlated with the E-F scale" (Altus and Tafejian, 1953, pp. 148-149). The authors concluded:

1. The high scorer on the E-F scale seems to be characterized by religious orthodoxy, unpleasant sexual attitudes, certain obsessive-compulsive traits, some paranoid trends, certain anti-social tendencies. Self-deprecatory attitudes were also apparent.
2. The cross validating r of .62 between the 40 items and the E-F scale would appear to imply a fair amount of validity for the MMPI items, at least for students at the college level (Altus and Tafejian, 1953, p. 149).

In a later study, Jensen gave the MMPI and the F scale to 114 seniors in high school and 712 freshmen in college; the tests were given to the same individuals twice, a year apart. The author summarized:

1. The distribution of Pr scores in the college sample was more skewed and constricted, with a piling up of low scores, than the distribution of scores in the high school group used in the derivation of the Pr scale.
2. The reliability of Pr (.81) compares favorably with that of other MMPI scales.
3. There was a significant decrease in mean Pr as students advance in college.
4. There were significant differences in mean Pr among students majoring in different fields.
5. Pr correlated significantly with the California F scale.
6. Pr was positively correlated with the Hs, D, Pd, Pt, Sc, and Ma scales, and negatively correlated with K and Hy (Jensen, 1957, p. 311).

Jensen concluded: "These findings and those of several related studies are discussed as a means of psychologically

characterizing the authoritarian personality. It was concluded that certain psychological factors are present in the authoritarian syndrome" (Jensen, 1957, p. 311).

Wells, Weinert, and Rubel (1956) have done some work in the area of conformity and authoritarianism. The authors believed that individuals who were influenced by the pressure to conform would probably display a higher degree of authoritarianism than those who were not influenced. In order to test this hypothesis, students viewed a picture of a car accident where one automobile had gone through an intersection against a stop light and had hit another car. Without any conformity pressure, 62 individuals viewed the picture and were questioned as to which operator was in the wrong. Out of this group, two individuals felt that driver B was at fault; driver B was operating the car which had been struck by driver A who had gone through the intersection. Then a second group of 62 subjects were shown the scene except that they were subjected to conformity pressure to find driver B at fault. Forty-one individuals found driver A at fault and 21 found driver B at fault. The author stated: "A comparison of the F scale scores of those who yielded to conformity pressure and those who did not showed that the yielders were significantly more authoritarian than the non-yielders" (Wells, Weinert, and Rubel, 1956, p. 135).

Christie and Garcia wanted to investigate the sample involved in the Adorno et al. (1950) study. They felt that:

Inasmuch as the findings of the California Public Opinion Study were based primarily upon data collected from residents of California, the results may be of limited generality. In California a wide range of attitudes toward minority groups are overtly expressed so that individuals in such a population are exposed to a variety of ideologies regarding minority groups (Christie and Garcia, 1951, p. 457).

The authors believed that another subculture besides the one located in California would produce different results on the prejudice scales. The scales as they viewed them were interpreted by the individual in terms of his own needs as they operated in a given cultural structure. Therefore to test this hypothesis, Christie and Garcia administered the California Public Opinion Scale to students in a beginning psychology class at the University of California and at a private college situated in a southern city (Southwest City). They concluded:

1. The Southwest City sample showed significantly higher acceptance of items on both the E (Ethnocentrism) and F (Authoritarianism) scales indicating greater prejudice toward minority groups and greater acceptance of authoritarian ideology.
2. It was found that the correlation between the F scale and the E scale was slightly higher in the Southwest City sample.
3. Members of the Southwest City sample were aligned along the F scale and every second person chosen. A z score was computed for each individual on the F scale in both samples, and members of the California group were matched for z score on the F scale and equivalent socioeconomic background.
4. An item analysis of the F scale showed that 18 of the 30 items were accepted to a significantly greater extent (.05 level of confidence) by the Southwest City students.

5. A cluster analysis of responses on the F scale indicated that three clusters were similar in both groups. The remaining four California clusters were not duplicated in the five remaining Southwest City clusters, but the latter seemed more extreme manifestations of the California clusters.
6. Background material on the two subcultures was given which indicated that the Southwest City students had been subjected to life in an environment characterized by a narrower range of expressed ideology which was fairly conservative in nature.
7. Exposure to this relative paucity of ideological stimulation is believed largely responsible for the higher scores manifested on the F scale by the Southwest City students, and it is doubted whether early child-rearing practices per se could be invoked as the relevant variable (Christie and Garcia, 1951, p. 469).

Rokeach's Dogmatism. Rokeach (1960) felt that there were some real flaws and inadequate interpretations made by Adorno et al. (1950) in their dealings with the concept of authoritarianism. He believed that the F scale ascertained the degree of right wing authoritarianism as opposed to measuring authoritarianism as a general concept. He stated that an instrument used to measure authoritarianism in general must not have ideological contents; he stated this because it was assumed that authoritarianism was present in individuals of many political views who may have been Jungians or Catholics or Deists. Consequently, he concluded that authoritarianism should be conceptualized as a method of thought instead of as a group of beliefs. Rokeach (1960) used the term dogmatism to refer to a cognitive approach which he saw as representing



general authoritarianism. He defined dogmatism in the following ways:

(a) A relatively closed cognitive organization of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, (b) organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute authority which, in turn, (c) provides a framework for patterns of intolerance and qualified tolerance toward others (Rokeach, 1954, p. 195).

A cognitive system of thought is viewed as closed to the degree that there is

(a) isolation of parts within the belief system and between belief and disbelief systems, (b) a discrepancy in the degree of differentiation between belief and disbelief systems, (c) dedifferentiation within the disbelief system, (d) a high degree of interdependence between central and peripheral beliefs, (e) a low degree of interdependence among peripheral beliefs, and (f) a narrowing of the time perspective (Rokeach, 1954, p. 195).

Rokeach built an elaborate conceptual system around these concepts and definitions. He stated that reality could be depicted in an individual through different kinds of beliefs. Some of these beliefs were taken as valid and others were taken as invalid. From this summation, he concluded that all cognitive structures could be divided into two distinct parts: a belief and a disbelief structure. The belief-disbelief structure could be viewed as changing with regard to its organization and content. The entire organization of a belief-disbelief system could be viewed as differing along a continuum extending from open to closed.

This continuum, in turn, may be conceived as a joint function of: (a) The degree of interdependence among the parts within the belief system, within the disbelief systems. . . . (b) The degree of interdependence between central and peripheral regions of the belief-disbelief

system. . . . (c) The organization of the belief-disbelief system along the time perspective dimension (Rokeach, 1954, p. 195).

Rokeach (1960) developed a set of postulates pertaining to the cognitive structure he conceptualized. He felt that in a closed belief-disbelief structure a condition of considerable isolation existed between the different areas of the belief system and among belief and disbelief systems. The disbelief structure was made up of a group of disbelief subsystems; every subsystem was situated "along a gradient of similarity to the belief system, the most similar disbelief subsystems being represented as regions most adjacent to the belief system" (Rokeach, 1954, p. 196). He stated that if the person had a large amount of dogmatism in his attitudes he would probably view his belief system as being extremely alien to his disbelief system. This dogmatic individual would also see ideological views directed to connections among belief and disbelief systems as erroneous. An individual with a large amount of dogmatism in his thinking would deny occurrences which disagreed with his belief system.

With regard to differentiation, Rokeach (1960) stated that with a more extensive dogmatic framework there would be more differentiation within the belief system and less differentiation within the disbelief system. With greater distance from the belief system, different disbelief subsystems would appear to become considerably more differentiated with regard to each other. In view of this differentiation process

Rokeach concluded: "The greater the dogmatism the greater the discrepancy between degree of knowledge of facts, events, ideas, and interpretations stemming from the belief system and any one of the disbelief subsystems" (Rokeach, 1954, p. 198). The author further concluded:

The greater the dogmatism the more will two or more disbelief subsystems represented as positions relatively far away from the belief system along the disbelief gradient be perceived as "the same" (e.g. that communism and socialism are the same, that the Democrats and Republicans are both run by Wall Street, etc.) (Rokeach, 1954, pp. 198-199).

As stated previously, Rokeach conceptualized central and peripheral parts in his belief system. He devoted some time in his writing to describing the relationship between these two divisions. He stated:

We have assumed further that, to the extent we are dealing with closed systems, the central part corresponds to beliefs in and about absolute authority and the peripheral part to beliefs and disbeliefs perceived to emanate from such authority. Thus, the more closed the system the greater the assumed degree of communication between central and peripheral beliefs and, at the same time, the less the assumed degree of communication among the various peripheral beliefs (Rokeach, 1954, p. 199).

Therefore, the particular peripheral beliefs and disbeliefs were constructed in a closed pattern because the individual saw them as having originated with positive and negative authority, not because of their inherent logical ties.

Rokeach (1954) commented that it was well known that dogmatic feelings on different concepts were resistant to modification by reasonable or objective proof.

Rokeach observed that dogmatism was governed by principles other than logic and objectivity. He commented: "The

greater the dogmatism the more will there be a change in a given peripheral belief (e.g., about birth control) if it is preceded by a perceived corresponding change by the authority (e.g., the Catholic Church)" (Rokeach, 1954, p. 199). Rokeach made another statement concerning assimilation in connection with the association between the central and peripheral areas: "The greater the dogmatism the greater the assimilation of facts or events at variance with either the belief or disbelief system by altering or reinterpreting them such that they will no longer be perceived as contradictory" (Rokeach, 1954, p. 199).

Rokeach assumed that the central area was critical in deciding what parts of reality would be present in the peripheral area and what parts would be omitted. He postulated the following: "The greater the dogmatism the more the avoidance of contact with stimuli--people, events, books, etc.--which threaten the validity of the belief system or which proselyte for competing disbelief systems" (Rokeach, 1954, pp. 199-200). With regard to the concept involving time perspective, Rokeach formulated some postulates. His first one in this area dealt with individuals' attitudes toward the present:

The greater the dogmatism the more will the present be perceived as relatively unimportant in its own right--as but a passageway to some future utopia. Furthermore, with an increase in dogmatism there will be a concomitant increase in the perception of the present as unjust and as full of human suffering (Rokeach, 1954, p. 200).

The author felt that this view of the present being less significant than a possible idealistic future could lead to the idea that an extreme reorganization of the present was required. He postulated, therefore, the following: "The greater the dogmatism the greater the condonement of force" (Rokeach, 1954, p. 200). Rokeach further postulated another part of the time perspective with regard to an individual's comprehension of the future:

With an increase in dogmatism there will be the following variations: an increasing confidence in the accuracy of one's understanding of the future, a generally greater readiness to make predictions, and a decreasing confidence in the predictions of the future made by those adhering to disbelief systems (Rokeach, 1954, p. 200).

In 1960, Rokeach had formulated a scale called the D Scale which was constructed to test this conceptual system as previously outlined. "Our procedure in constructing the Dogmatism Scale was essentially deductive. We scrutinized the various defining characteristics of open and closed systems. We then tried to construct statements designed to tap these characteristics" (Rokeach, 1960, p. 72). He used college students as subjects to validate his scale. The Midwest, New York, and England were the areas involved. Reliabilities obtained ranged from .80 to .90. The method used to validate the scale was the Method of Known Groups. In one of the validating studies, professors picked high and low dogmatic students to participate in the research. As predicted, the students picked for the high dogmatic sample scored higher than the others.

Rokeach (1960) contrasted different religious and political groups from universities in the Midwest, New York, and England. He concluded:

The results on the whole show that authoritarian left-of-center groups (Communists and religious non-believers) and authoritarian right-of-center groups (Catholics) score relatively high on the Dogmatism and Opinionation Scales. However, only the authoritarian groups to the right of center score high on the California F and Ethnocentrism Scales (Rokeach, 1960, p. 129).

Studies done on the F Scale and D Scale. It now seems apparent after much research that the construction of the F Scale was faulty. Evidently Adorno et al. (1950) knew that it is usually a wise idea when dealing with attitude scales to put both positive and negative statements. As it happened, the authors decided to construct each of the items as authoritarian assertions instead of using both the positive and negative statements.

Cronbach (1946) wrote about the concept of response sets in paper and pencil examinations. For instance, an individual could continually exhibit a tendency to agree with assertions in spite of the substance involved. If each of the statements in a scale asserted in a similar direction, an elevated score could be as much an indication of this type of acquiescence response set as of consent with the specific substance of the assertions.

Cohn (1956) stated that the F Scale was partially an instrument measuring acquiescent trend. He correlated a form of the F Scale with a sample of items of the Minnesota

Multiphasic Personality Test, and obtained a correlation of .41. Cohn stated:

The assumption underlying the F (predisposition to fascism) scale is that positive responses to the content of the scale items indicate some aspect of authoritarianism. For example, agreement with the statement, "Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn," presumably indicates authoritarian submission (Cohn, 1956, p. 129).

With this approach in mind, the author felt that the scale was tainted by a response set to respond positively due to the fact that the F Scale was made up of 30 statements that were fairly ambiguous and each statement was phrased in such a way as to elicit a positive response from an authoritarian subject. In order to test for this response set, Cohn (1956) employed a form [REDACTED] stated:

A measure [REDACTED] to answer positively was constructed [REDACTED] the Minnesota Multiphasic inventory [REDACTED] of 566 relatively ambiguous items. However, [REDACTED] scoring in terms of the conventional measure [REDACTED] number of "true" responses was calculated [REDACTED] pp. 129-130).

This measure of response set obtained from the item analysis of the MMPI was called the Plus scale. Cohn's .41 correlation between the F Scale and Plus scale was significant at the 1 per cent level. The author concluded:

On the basis of these data, it is concluded that the hypothesis that the F scale is related to a measure of response set to answer positively has been supported. Therefore, it is necessary to interpret scores on the F scale with caution until the extent to which the F scale is contaminated by the response set to answer positively is determined, or until some understanding of the meaning of the response set to answer positively is available (Cohn, 1956, pp. 132-133).

Multiphasic Personality Test, and obtained a correlation of .41. Cohn stated:

The assumption underlying the F (predisposition to fascism) scale is that positive responses to the content of the scale items indicate some aspect of authoritarianism. For example, agreement with the statement, "Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn," presumably indicates authoritarian submission (Cohn, 1956, p. 129).

With this approach in mind, the author felt that the scale was tainted by a response set to respond positively due to the fact that the F Scale was made up of 30 statements that were fairly ambiguous and each statement was phrased in such a way as to elicit a positive response from an authoritarian subject. In order to test for this response set, Cohn (1956) employed a form of the MMPI. He stated:

A measure of response set to answer positively was constructed by item analyzing the Minnesota Multiphasic inventory which is composed of 566 relatively ambiguous items. However, instead of scoring in terms of the conventional method the total number of "true" responses was calculated (Cohn, 1956, pp. 129-130).

This measure of response set obtained from the item analysis of the MMPI was called the Plus scale. Cohn's .41 correlation between the F Scale and Plus scale was significant at the 1 per cent level. The author concluded:

On the basis of these data, it is concluded that the hypothesis that the F scale is related to a measure of response set to answer positively has been supported. Therefore, it is necessary to interpret scores on the F scale with caution until the extent to which the F scale is contaminated by the response set to answer positively is determined, or until some understanding of the meaning of the response set to answer positively is available (Cohn, 1956, pp. 132-133).



The presence of acquiescent response set (ARS) in the F scale and D scale has been demonstrated by other authors also. Rokeach pointed to the possibility of the ARS in the D Scale when he stated: "It may be assumed that whatever objections have been raised with respect to response set in the F Scale may also be raised with respect to the present scales" (Rokeach, 1960, p. 405).

Lichtenstein, Quinn, and Hover (1961) explored this possibility. They obtained a correlation of .7 when they correlated the F and D scales. After removing the effects of ARS in the two scales, the .7 correlation went down to .57. They stated that both the D and F scales seemed to be affected by ARS.

Bass (1955) was the first investigator to work with a reversed form of the F Scale. He constructed an opposite statement for each of 29 items in the scale and developed a reversed form. He gave the reversed form and the F Scale to the same individuals. The logic behind this was that if the F Scale was measuring only authoritarianism then the agreement with it should be closely linked with disagreement with the reversed version; the correlation then between the scales should be near -1.00. However, the author found that the correlation was only -.20. Consequently, it appeared that the extent of authoritarianism shown on the F Scale was not generally matched by the extent of authoritarianism shown on the reversed scale.

Christie, Havel, and Seidenberg (1958) stated that although ARS was certainly one constituent part of the responses on the F Scale, its significance had been stressed entirely too much. They felt that the reversals were often not adequate and consequently could bias the results. The authors stated: "It was argued that the attempts at reversals were often characterized by items that were not psychologically opposed to the original items" (Christie et al., 1958, p. 159). Christie gave a number of rules for the completion of suitable reversals of the F scale items. An item analysis revealed that the greatest portion of Christie's reversed items differentiated positively between subjects who were high and low on the F scale. "An examination of the response patterns on the most discriminating items indicated that a minority of the respondents showed response set and that they were among the individuals who showed slight agreement with the F scale items" (Christie et al., 1958, p. 159). They concluded that the results did not uphold the association of acquiescence with authoritarianism.

Berkowitz and Wolkon (1964) believed that the trouble with the F Scale and its reversal might not be a result of the items themselves; they stated that the procedure might be causing the problems. Consequently, they constructed a new method, known as the forced choice method. In this method, every item on the F Scale was matched with its negatively stated counterpart. The subject was told to pick one

statement of the matched unit and indicate the degree to which he agreed with it in comparison to the other item. The findings of this scale could be contrasted with the research on the F scale, since the response categories used by the authors were comparable to the items on the F scale.

Berkowitz and Wolkon constructed a number of forced choice (FC) forms utilizing items that were previously accessible as the negative part of the item unit. The most successful form of their FC constructions was one that employed the F Scale items coupled with the reversals that Christie et al. (1958) prepared. For two samples, a correlation of .74 and .84 was obtained when the F and FC scales were correlated. The authors discovered that the FC form predicted adequately from the F Scale and the F Scale reversal form. Thus it was indicated that the FC format was generally insensitive to the response tendency of disagreement evoked by the reversed items. The authors stated that the FC format had eliminated the ARS which was distorting responses from the F Scale since every response entailed agreement, agreement with either an F+ (original) item or an F- (reversed) item. To summarize, this FC format derived from the reversals constructed by Christie et al. (1958) seemed to be the most adequate acquiescent-free scale available.

Peabody (1961) constructed reversals for the D scale utilizing the same criteria that Christie et al. (1958) employed for the construction of the F reversals which

Berkowitz and Wolkon (1964) also employed in their FCF scale.

Berger (1967) in his Master's thesis constructed a forced choice form of the D scale by uniting Rokeach's D scale with the reversed items that Peabody (1961) constructed in the same fashion as Berkowitz constructed the FCF scale. After a number of correlations were run he concluded:

These results supported the following specific hypotheses made in the present experiment that: (1) the correlation between the F and FCF would approximate the size of the correlation found previously by Berkowitz and Wolkon (1964), that is,  $r=.74$  and  $.84$ ; and (2) the D and FCD scales would be positively correlated (Berger, 1967, p. 52).

Berger also was interested in demonstrating that there was a common trait of repression in Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale (D scale), Adorno et al.'s California F Scale (F scale), and Berne's Repression-Sensitization Scale (RS scale). The author ran correlations in order to determine the degree of relationship between these scales. He concluded:

The results indicated that both the FCF and the FCD were not only reliable scales (based on the Hoyt (1941) method of calculating the reliability coefficient), but also valid. Furthermore, it was found that the RS scale was not significantly related to either the F or FCF scales, but that significant positive correlations existed between the RS scale and both the D and FCD scales (Berger, 1967, p. 64).

Berger (1967) attempted to explain this difference by pointing to the numerous items which have strong personal affect connotations.

A sensitizer would be expected to see himself as agreeing with these statements due to the negative emotional connotation each one has; but a repressor would

find agreement with such statements far too threatening, and he would repress any "approach" or agreement he felt and would report the "safer" or "better" response--that is, disagreement (Berger, 1967, p. 60).

He therefore concluded that the sensitizer would be inclined to get a higher score on the D scale than the represser. He also stated that the F scale lacked these kinds of items that had a direct personal effect and possibly this explained the insignificant correlation which the F scale had with the RS scale.

These new forms of the D and F scale are still in the experimental stages of development due to the small number of validation studies that have been conducted involving them.

It seems clear from the research done in this area since 1950 that Adorno et al. (1950) were identifying through the F scale a particular cluster of personality traits. In spite of the criticisms directed at their techniques and methodology, there seemed to be a general consensus that some personality traits tended to appear together in an individual. Almost every area of this research that Adorno et al. (1950) conducted has been examined and criticized. Due to the fact that conclusions in this study were based often upon recall of childhood experience without any factual examination of the actual childhood, some doubts as to the findings have been raised.

Christie and Jahoda (1954) and Rokeach (1960) have both stated that the F scale was sensitive to right wing authoritarianism and insensitive to left wing groups. Rokeach

(1960) then proceeded to develop the D scale partially in an effort to overcome this weakness he found to exist in the F scale, but primarily because he too felt that a specific personality cluster previously referred to as authoritarianism needed to be accurately measured. Christie and Jahoda (1954) criticized Adorno for the following: "A positive correlation between authoritarianism and political conservatism is claimed, although the contents of the two scales which produce the correlation are clearly overlapping and therefore inflate the value" (Christie and Jahoda, 1954, p. 119). Further research aimed at linking political conservatism with authoritarianism has been very inadequate since very few scales are available for measuring political conservatism.

One of the few available scales for measuring political conservatism was constructed by McClosky (1958). McClosky took a rather traditional approach to the concept of conservatism in the construction of his scale. He stated:

In the face of these diverse opinions, we cannot hope that the definition employed in our research, and the measure or "scale" that we constructed from this definition, will satisfy everyone. We have made an earnest effort, however, to extract from the tradition of self-styled conservative thought, and especially from the writings of Edmund Burke, a set of principles representing that tradition as fairly as possible. We have concentrated upon these attitudes and values that continually recur among acknowledged conservative thinkers and that appear to comprise the invariant elements of the conservative outlook (McClosky, 1958, p. 30).

With this philosophy as a background, the author constructed 43 statements of this type of conservative philosophy. After a refining process, the 43 statements were reduced to 9.

This 9 item scale comprises the test; the subject gives an agree or disagree response to the items involved. The author reported a reliability of .83.

Christie and Jahoda (1954) also raised the objection that the sample used in the 1950 Adorno et al. study was inadequate because it was based upon an urban middle class population. Singer and Feshback (1950), Kogan (1955), Rothstein (1960), and Deutsch (1960) have all done studies to identify the different traits outlined by Adorno et al. (1950) using varied populations and methodologies. The outcomes have been fruitful in that they validated many of Adorno's hypotheses. However, the samples employed in these studies were gathered from a college population, a fairly homogeneous population in many respects. Consequently, research seems to be needed which uses varied populations to measure the generalization of the "nature and degree of organization of sentiments and the relationship to personality traits found in this sample" (Christie and Jahoda, 1954, p. 69).

Both Adorno et al. (1950) and Rokeach (1960) attempted to link religion and authoritarianism. Neither of the two authors did much actual testing in this area. Adorno et al. (1950) stated that the connection between religion and prejudice did not play a significant part in their research, as quoted earlier in this study. In the interviews, Adorno et al. (1950) asked some questions about religion. They

discovered that: "High scorers, more often than low scorers, seem to make use of religious ideas in order to gain some immediate practical advantage or to aid in the manipulation of other people" (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 733). However, the authors did not delve too deeply into this area with their subjects. In fact, they didn't make any comparative studies with religious groups or sects outside the sample. Rokeach (1960) went briefly into this issue and concluded that the religious groups score higher on the whole than the non-believers on the scales involving authoritarianism. However, he stated that the left-of-center groups (Communists and religious nonbelievers) and the religious groups who were right of center all scored high on the D scale. Also, the .7 correlation that Lichtenstein et al. (1960) found between F and D scales indicated that the two scales might be measuring the same thing.

Nevertheless, both Rokeach (1960) and Adorno et al. (1950) failed to test deeply into this area of religion. Using college individuals for subjects left something to be desired if conclusions were to be generalized to different populations. It would appear that interpretations could broaden from the psychodynamic interpretations that Adorno et al. (1950) were criticized for to some sociological interpretations. Hood and Sherif (1955) have suggested that the psychodynamic interpretations are emphasized to the exclusion of some sociological explanations, as quoted earlier



in this study. However, few experimenters have broadened their samples to include specific sociological groups such as political leaders or ministers or college professors. It would appear that by testing such specific groups the particular group sanctions would be operating to such a great extent that the results would be influenced considerably.

## CHAPTER II

### PROBLEM

The general purpose of this study was to compare two specific samples of the clergy who differed on the issue of prayer in the public schools in regard to the degree of authoritarianism in the two samples. A secondary purpose was to determine the relationship between authoritarianism and dogmatism, and to obtain a measure of political conservatism within the samples.

As indicated previously, Adorno et al. (1950) pointed out that religion was becoming less significant to the society. However, he stated that some of the formalized properties of religion, such as the dichotomy of good and evil, and the placement of emphasis on individual effort, remained important.

This idea of religion becoming less significant in our culture is an idea which has been much discussed in the literature today. Secularization is the name often given to the process of religious change within our culture. Harvey Cox (1965) dealt with this changing role of religion in our urban society. He stated: "We have defined secularization as the liberation of man from religious and metaphysical tutelage, the turning of his attention away from other world and toward this one" (Cox, 1965, p. 17).

Cox (1965) spoke about urbanization and secularization. He felt that scientific and technological movements

that emerged along with, and in connection with, the destruction of religious views about the world, formed the basis for the urbanization developments. He stated: "The rise of urban civilization and the collapse of traditional religion are the two main hallmarks of our era and are closely related movements" (Cox, 1965, p. 1).

The author felt that the cosmopolitan nature of our modern world exposed the relativity of many traditions that man thought were unquestionable. Religion and religious explanations represented the core of much traditional thinking. Cox maintained that:

The forces of secularization have no serious interest in persecuting religion. Secularization simply bypasses and undercuts religion and goes on to other things. It has relativized religious world-views and thus rendered them innocuous. Religion has been privatized. It has been accepted as the peculiar prerogative and point of view of a particular person or group (Cox, 1965, p. 2).

From both the theoretical and the experimental data on the authoritarian character it appeared that the formal properties of religion that Adorno et al. (1950) touched upon were very similar to the characteristics of the authoritarian personality type. The fearful submission to authority figures, rigidity of thinking, strict antithesis of good and evil, and intolerance of others' views were all characteristics found in this authoritarian personality structure and in the doctrines of some religions. Adorno et al. (1950) and Rokeach (1960) did some preliminary correlating between authoritarianism and religiousness and asserted that high authoritarians

made more use of religious ideas than low scorers. However, they did not examine the attitudes of the religious leaders. It seems clear that an examination of the clergy might give further information on the actual attitudes of the religious leaders in today's secularized society.

It further follows from the line of thinking presented above that the secularization process might have influenced the attitudes of the clergy. Even though authoritarianism might have been an integral part of the basis of religious thinking, and, in fact, the orientation of the individuals involved in religion, the larger group, the society, might have influenced and modified this framework.

Adorno et al. (1950) have been severely criticized for their omission of sociological interpretations of their results. They relied almost entirely on psychological interpretations without taking group influences and cultural influences into consideration. Sociological influences from their particular sub-culture (the clergy in this case) as well as influences from this emerging secularized society might affect the attitudes of the ministers. One would expect that with these cultural influences plus the individual's psychological environment, there would be varying degrees of authoritarianism in the ministers themselves. There seems to have been a tendency to generalize Rokeach's and Adorno's findings concerning religion in their samples to larger populations without adequate validation.

In 1966, a group of 63 ministers from a southwestern city signed a petition to have prayer taken out of the public schools. The thinking displayed by these ministers seems to be representative of the secularized movement that Cox (1965) spoke about in his book. These men felt that religion was a private thing and that the constitutional rights of the public were being violated. Their eyes were focused upon a larger population than the sub-group to which they belonged. These ministers indicated in their petition that they were not against religious training, but for it. Their objection was that such training should take place in the home and at the chosen place of worship. Also, they felt that the religious observances in the public schools were a violation of the First Amendment of the Constitution. They cited the Supreme Court rulings which stated that religious observances, specifically reading of the holy scriptures and prayer, in the public schools were prohibited under the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment.

These men were criticized greatly by many people including members of their particular congregations. At least one quarter of them were obliged to leave their parish because of this petition. The groups that opposed this centered most of their arguments around traditional thinking, thinking which is being modified by the secularization process. One minister stated in a letter to a local newspaper concerning the petition signers that: "They would have our

boys and girls grow up spiritual morons as to the great heritage left us by our famous forefathers, in order that they might propagate the Utopian Myth of the One World Church."

It appears that these men who signed this petition were men who seemed willing to risk being rejected by their religious subgroup in order to voice their feelings. The act seems to show some degree of assertion and possible flexibility. They were operating with many values co-existing within their thinking; they took themselves, their religious subgroup, the congregation, and the larger culture into account and acted with commitment by publically taking an unacceptable stand; they did not acquiesce to the authority of the churches which, in the majority of cases, found the stand unacceptable. In essence, one would expect that the men who signed this petition would be low scorers on the authoritarian measures.

The specific purposes of this study are to test the following hypotheses:

1. The men who signed the petition to take prayer out of the public schools score lower on authoritarianism (the FCF scale) than a matched sample of ministers who opposed this petition.

2. The ministers who signed the petition to take prayer out of the public school score lower on dogmatism (the FCF scale) than the ministers who opposed this petition.

3. A positive relationship obtains between the scores on the FCF scale and those on the FCD scale.

4. The ministers who signed the petition to take prayer out of the public schools score lower on conservatism (McClosky's Conservatism Scale) than the ministers who opposed this petition.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD

#### Subjects

Subjects for this study were ministers from a southwestern city. An informant provided the list of names of the sixty-three ministers who signed the petition to have prayer removed from the public schools in this city. A reported 25 per cent of the list had been obliged, due to their action, to leave their parishes in this city. The experimenter took the list and began randomly calling the men who were reported to still be available. The first twenty-three who were called were willing to participate by making an appointment with the experimenter. Each of these ministers was asked to give the name of a minister of his faith who he knew had spoken against this petition. One minister opposing the petition did not return his scales, so it was necessary to eliminate him and his match from the sample. Another pair of ministers was eliminated from the study because they were the only representatives of their faith. The total group of subjects in this experiment was forty-two. The sample consisted of four Catholics, six Christians, fourteen Episcopalians, ten Methodists, and eight Presbyterians.



### Materials

Four instruments were used in this present study: Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum's (1957) Semantic Differential (SD), McClosky's (1958) Conservatism Scale, Berkowitz's (1964) Forced Choice F Scale (FCF scale), and Berger's (1967) Forced Choice D Scale (FCD scale).

The Semantic Differential (See Appendix A) used in this study only had one concept. After the one concept, "PRAYER IN SCHOOL," fifteen bipolar adjectives were selected from Osgood et al.'s (1957) list (osgood et al., 1957, p. 43). Under the potency dimension, five scales were selected which had high loadings on this particular dimension of meaning. They were: strong-weak, brave-cowardly, healthy-sick, rich-poor, large-small. Five scales that were highly loaded on the evaluative dimension were selected: good-bad, clean-dirty, kind-cruel, nice-awful, valuable-worthless. Five more from the activity dimension were included: bright-dark, high-low, fast-slow, sharp-dull, active-passive. This made a total of fifteen scales or adjective pairs. The SE was used to confirm the sample selection and indicate that the men would react to the tests in a manner which was reflective of their public opinion concerning the issue.

The Conservatism Scale (See Appendix B) constructed by McClosky (1958) has been mentioned earlier in this dissertation. It consisted of nine items which required agree and disagree responses.

The FCF scale (see Appendix C) contained 25 pairs of items. As in the study by Berkowitz and Wolkon (1964), every pair contained one of the original F Scale items and the reversal of that item that Christie et al. (1958) employed. Berkowitz and Wolkon (1964) utilized the items which were in the original F Scale and also the reversals used by Bass (1955) and Christie et al. (1958). Because Christie did not construct adequate reversals for three of the original F scale items, and Bass did not construct an adequate reversal for one of the original F Scale items, the FCF Scale utilized by Berkowitz and used in this present study contained twenty-five of the original items; the four inadequate reversals were not included. To allow for an item by item connection between the F and FCF scales, the items excluding the four mentioned were arranged in the FCF Scale in the same order as in the original F Scale. Berkowitz and Wolkon (1964) randomly placed F+ items before their reversals in half of the items, and following them in the other half, because of the chance that order could have some effect. This study used the same order as Berger (1967) employed in his study. He stated:

A table of random numbers (Walker and Lev, 1953) was used to assign the "reversal first" pairs. This in the FCF scale, items 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, and 22, had the original F scale item preceding its reversal, while in the other 12 items the reversal of each pair was presented first . . . (Berger, 1967, p. 24).

The FCF Scale contained 40 sets of items (see Appendix D). In accordance with the form of the FCF Scale, Berger

(1967) constructed sets of items containing one of the original D Scale items and its reversal as constructed by Peabody (1961). The order of the items in the D Scale was reproduced in the FCD Scale. Berger (1967) used the same random assignment process to obtain the reversal order. He concluded:

In each item pair of the FCD scale, the reversal preceded the original in items 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 21, 22, 24, 27, 28, 29, 32, 36, 37, 39, and 40. In the other 20 items the original preceded the reversal . . . (Berger, 1967, p. 24).

In this research, a biographical data sheet was employed (see Appendix E) so that identification of the individuals participating would be possible for matching purposes. This form was placed at the end of the booklet containing the different scales.

### Procedure

The experimenter started randomly calling ministers whose names appeared on the petition. The experimenter stated:

My name is Bonnie Drucker and I am a student at the University of Oklahoma. I am doing some research involving the past issue of prayer in the schools; I am interested in measuring attitudes of the clergy. Would you be willing to participate, and if so, when is it convenient for me to come by and speak to you?

If the ministers were interested, the experimenter made an appointment to speak with them. The major purpose of this interview was to obtain from each minister the name of a minister of the same faith who he knew had opposed the petition, and who was in favor of prayer in the public schools.

The experimenter scheduled these appointments in the church office of the minister. School clothes, flat shoes, and little make-up were all part of the attire of the experimenter. At these appointments, after the ministers were asked for the name of a suitable match, they were asked also if they would be willing to give about an hour of their time to fill out some attitude scales at a later date. The ministers were instructed that they would be called for an appointment in a few weeks.

At this time a letter was drafted and sent to the 23 ministers who were given as matches by the petition signers. The letter was a repetition of what had been stated on the phone to the initial group of signers. At the end of the letter, the ministers were informed that they would be called within a few days to see if they would be willing to participate in the study. When the ministers were contacted, they were first asked if they were willing to participate. If they were, they were notified that the questions that would be asked of them would take about an hour of their time. At this same time of calling the matches to make appointments, calling in random order was initiated upon the entire sample of 46 men. Appointments were scheduled over a period of three weeks.

The experimenter came to the scheduled testing sessions held in the minister's church offices wearing similar attire as worn to the first meetings. The ministers were informed that the material collected in the interview would

be anonymous. Each subject received a booklet of the test materials which consisted of directions for the semantic differential, the semantic differential, the Conservatism scale, a direction sheet for the Forced Choice scales, the FCF scale, the FCD scale, and, finally, the biographical data sheet. They were instructed to start at the beginning and work through the scales without jumping ahead. Three of the subjects were matched to petition signers requested to mail the test to the experimenter. One of the three failed to return his questionnaire, and was dropped from the sample. This necessitated dropping his match as well.

The McClosky (1958) scale was scored as McClosky suggested in terms of the number of agree responses that the subject gave.

Berger (1967) devised a method for scoring the FCF and FCD scales so that the scores on these scales would be comparable to the scores on the F and D scales. He stated:

To each of the subjects' ratings a constant of  $\pm 4$  was added: if, in the item pair, the original preceded the reversal, then a constant of +4 was added (taking into consideration not only the numerical value, but also the sign), but if the reversal preceded the original, then a constant of -4 was added (again considering both numerical value and sign). After each score was thus converted, the absolute sum of all the subject's choices was computed. Thus, this method converted scoring on any one item to a 1 to 7 point scale making the FCF and FCD comparable with the F and D scales respectively (Berger, 1967, p. 29).

A high score on the F scale indicated authoritarianism, and a high score on the D scale indicated dogmatism. A low score on the F scale indicated non-authoritarianism, and a low score on the D scale indicated non-dogmatism.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

Before proceeding with the analysis of the material concerning the predictions, it might be helpful to review briefly the methods used in scoring the different tests involved.

#### Scoring Methods

The semantic differential (SD) test. The scoring was done with the use of the key mentioned by Kerlinger (1967). There were 15 scales and one concept involved in this test; a one through seven system of scoring was utilized. To avoid a set from developing in the response patterns of the subjects, the experimenter randomly reversed the order of eight of the scales so that there was not a list of similar adjectives. "Reversals are used to counteract response bias tendencies. A subject cannot go down the list and check all scales at the same point" (Kerlinger, 1967, p. 571).

The McClosky Scale. The total number of the agree responses was obtained for each subject. A mean was obtained for each group in the sample. The mean for the petition signers was .47 out of a possible 9; the mean for the non-signers was 1.66.

The FCF Scale. The scoring procedure used for this test was the one developed by Berger (1967) which was discussed previously. It simply involved the addition of a

constant of a +4 to the score on the item pairs where the original preceded the reversal, and the addition of a constant of a -4 when the reversal preceded the original. After the scores were converted, the absolute sum of all of the responses was computed.

The FCD Scale. The scoring for this scale was identical to the process used on the FCF scale. The score conversion process was followed by the computation of the absolute sums.

### Analysis of Data

Semantic differential data. Six different tests were run with the data from the semantic differential concept on the two groups (See Appendix F). The first three tests run were 2 (group) X 7 (mean scale positions) chi squares. One test was run for each of the three dimensions of evaluation, potency, and activity. Table 1 gives the results of the three chi squares run for the two groups.

Table 1

Chi Squares for the Semantic Differential  
for the Two Groups

Dimensions	Chi Square	<u>df</u>	<u>P</u>
Activity	21.66	6	.01
Potency	26.32	6	.01
Evaluative	30.52	6	.01

$\chi^2$  .01 at 6 df = 16.81

The next three tests were independent group tests which were employed to show the direction of differences. Table 2 gives the results of the three tests for the two groups. An F test for homogeneity of variances was used on each t to determine what the df would be.

Table 2  
t tests for the Semantic Differential for the  
Two Groups

Dimensions	Group Means		Difference Tests		
	Signers	Non-Signers	t	<u>df</u>	<u>P</u>
Activity	5.0	2.98	8.62	40	.01
Potency	5.28	2.79	6.92	40	.01
Evaluation	5.0	2.44	7.76	20	.01

t .01 at 40 df = 2.740

t .01 at 20 df = 2.845

The results in Table 1 and Table 2 show that the sample selections have been validated. The two samples responded to the measurements in a way which was consistent with their public stands on the issues

Demographic data. The biographical data sheet placed at the end of the test booklets revealed information regarding the regional background of the ministers in the two samples. It was found that two-thirds of the men in the petition-signing group were from either the northern, eastern or western states, and that two-thirds of the non-signing group were from the southern states.



The occupational level of the fathers of the two groups of ministers was also revealed in the biographical data sheet. It was found that 60 per cent of the men of the petition-signing group came from families where their fathers were white-collar workers. Seventy-five per cent of the men in the non-signing group came from families where their fathers were laborers.

### Analysis of Data in Regard to Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. It was predicted that the men who signed the petition to take prayer out of the public schools would score lower on the FCF scale than the ministers who opposed this petition. A t test was performed on the data (see Appendix G), the summary of which is presented in Table 3.

Table 3

t test of FCF Scale Scores for the Two Groups

Groups	Mean Scores	df
Petition Signing Group	54.76	40
Non-Signing Group	83.95	40
t = 7.21		F = 1.49
<u>P</u> .01 2.704		<u>P</u> .05 2.12

The results show that the prediction--that the subjects who signed the petition to remove prayer from the public schools would score lower on authoritarianism (the

FCF scale) than the other group--was supported by the findings.

After a differential item analysis was completed, the experimenter found that the following F Scale items were responded to strongly in a non-authoritarian manner (a strong disagreement with the F Scale item) by five or more men in the petition-signing group. The areas these items are said to measure according to Adorno et al. (1950) are enclosed in parentheses following the item numbers: 2, 5, 6, 8, (Authoritarian Submission) 10, 11, 12, 13, (Authoritarian Aggression) 14, (Anti-intracception), 15, 16, 17, 18, (Superstition and Stereotypy) 19, 20, (Power and "Toughness") 21, 22, (Destructiveness and Cynicism) 23, and 25 (Projectivity). There is no group of items answered by these men in a strongly authoritarian manner by five or more men.

It was found that the non-signing group responded strongly to the following F Scale items by five or more men in a non-authoritarian manner. Again the areas tested are in parentheses after the items: 2, 8, (Authoritarian Submission) 10, 11, 12, (Authoritarian Aggression) 14 (Anti-intracception) 15, 16, 17, 18, (Superstition and Stereotypy) 19, (power and "Toughness") 21, 22, (Destructiveness and Cynicism) and 23 (Projectivity). This same group of men responded strongly in an authoritarian manner by five or more men to the following items on this scale. The areas tested follow the item numbers: 1, (Conventionalism and Authoritarian Submission)

3, (Conventionalism and Authoritarian Aggression) and 7 (Power and "Toughness" and Authoritarian Submission). The positive responses to these items indicated the authoritarian areas the non-signing group most strongly supported.

Hypothesis 2. This prediction stated that the ministers who signed the petition to take prayer out of the public schools would score lower on the FCD scale than the ministers who opposed the petition (see Appendix H). A t test was performed on this data and the conclusions are presented below in Table 4. An F test indicated that  $df/2$  should be used in evaluating t.

Table 4

t test of FCD Scale Scores for the Two Groups

Groups	Mean Scores	<u>df</u>
Petition Signing Group	122.05	20
Non-Signing Group	139.62	20
t = 3.20		F = 2.61
<u>P</u> = .01 2.85		<u>P</u> .05 2.12

The results show that the prediction--that the subjects who signed the petition to remove prayer from the public schools would score lower on dogmatism (the FCD scale) than the other group--was supported by the findings.

A similar differential item analysis was performed on the FCD scale items as on the FCF scale items. It was found

that the following D scale items were responded to strongly in a non-dogmatic manner (strong disagreement with the D scale item) by five or more ministers in the petition-signing group. The areas these items were said to measure, according to Rokeach (1960), are enclosed in parentheses following the item numbers: 1, 3, (Isolation) 5, 6, 9, (Content of primitive beliefs) 18, 19, 22, 23, 27, (Authoritarianism) 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, (Intolerance) 34, and 36 (Beliefs controlled by authority). This same group of men responded strongly in groups of five or more to the following items in a dogmatic manner (agreement with the D scale items). The area tested is enclosed in parentheses after the items: 21 and 21 (Authoritarianism Belief in the Cause).

It was found that the non-signing group responded strongly in groups of five or more men to the following D scale items in a non-dogmatic manner. The areas tested are listed after the item numbers: 1, 3, (Isolation) 5, 6, 7, 8, (Content of primitive beliefs) 18, 19, 22, 25, 27, (Authoritarianism) 30, 32, 33, (Intolerance) 34, 36, (Beliefs controlled by authority) 37, and 40 (Attitude toward past, present and future). This same group of ministers responded strongly in groups of five or more to the following items in a dogmatic manner. The tested areas follow the item numbers: 4, (Amount of knowledge possessed) 5, (Beliefs regarding loneliness, isolation and helplessness) 10, (Feeling of urgency about the future) 20, 21, (Authoritarianism) and 38

(Attitude toward the future). The positive responses to these items indicated the areas the non-signing group of men most supported on the FCD scale.

Hypothesis 3. It was predicted that a positive relationship would be found between the scores on the FCF scale and those on the FCD scale. A correlation was calculated which included the entire sample of 42 ministers. The correlation coefficient was found to be .41, with a df of 40. Using the t test methods as outlined in Guilford (1956), the results showed that the correlation was significantly different from zero,  $p < .01$ .

Analyzing the items in the F and D scales revealed that the following items were the most-agreed-with responses answered in a non-authoritarian manner on the FCF scale. The areas these items measured, according to Adorno et al. (1950) are listed following the items: 10, (Authoritarian Aggression), 15, (Superstition and Stereotypy) 10, (Power and "Toughness") 22, (Destructiveness and Cynicism) and 25 (Projectivity). The item answered in an authoritarian manner was item 1 (Conventionalism).

On the FCD scale, the items which were answered most often in a non-authoritarian manner were the following. Again, the areas measured are included in parentheses following the item: 1, 3, (Isolation) 15, (Concern with power) 18, 19, (Authoritarianism) 30 (Intolerance). The items answered in a dogmatic manner are the following: 4 (Amount of knowledge possessed), and 10 (Urgency about the future).

Hypothesis 4. This prediction indicated that the ministers who signed the petition to take prayer out of the public schools would score lower on the Conservatism Scale than the ministers who opposed this petition (see Appendix I). A t test was run on the data and Table 5 gives the results. An F test for variance was used once again to establish the appropriate df.

Table 5

t test for the Conservatism Scale for the Two Groups

Groups	Mean Scores	<u>df</u>
Petition Signing Group	.47	20
Non-Signing Group	1.66	20
t = 3.22		
F = 3.39		
P .01		
2.845	P .01	2.94

The results indicated that the prediction--that the ministers who opposed the clergy who signed the petition would have a higher score on the Conservatism scale--was supported.

The items the non-signing group most agreed with on the McClosky (1958) Conservatism Scale were numbers 2 (twelve agree responses), 3 (five agree responses), 4 (five agree responses), and 5 (five agree responses). Item number 2 was the item most of the men agreed with, and it dealt with the belief that political authority comes from some higher power. Item number 3 dealt with sticking by what you have rather than

trying something new you don't really know about. Item number 4 dealt with wisdom coming with age, and item number 5 dealt with the preference of the practical man anytime to the man of ideas. The petition-signing group had scattered agreements with no more than two agree responses to any item.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION

The purpose of this present study was to compare two samples of ministers who differed on the issue of prayer in the schools with regard to a measure of authoritarianism, dogmatism, and conservatism.

It was clear that the two samples differed in regard to their views on the issue of prayer in the schools. The semantic differential tests indicated that subjects in the petition signing group differed significantly from the non-signing group. The chi-square tests and the t tests all showed that the groups were different on each of the three dimensions of evaluation, potency, and activity. The petition signers judged "PRAYER IN SCHOOL" as being low on the evaluation, potency, and activity dimensions. The non-signing group judged the issue to be high on the evaluation, potency and activity dimensions.

McClosky's conservatism scale did differentiate significantly between the two groups of men. A  $t = 3.22$  was obtained which is significant beyond the .01 level. Although there was a significant difference between the two groups on this scale, the scale itself seemed inadequate as a measure of conservatism. McClosky had an interpretation system for this scale which could not be applied to the data of this study. "Subjects scoring 7-9 on the conservatism scale were



thrown into the uppermost or Extreme Conservative Quartile; those with scores of 5-6 were labeled Moderate Conservatives; with scores of 3-4, Moderate Liberals; and the lowest quartile, with scores of 0-2, were called Liberals" (McClosky, 1958, p. 34).

In this study the mean scores for the petition-signing group on this scale was 0.47 and the mean score for the non-signing group was 1.66. Although this was a significant difference, both of the mean scores are, according to McClosky, considered to be liberal scores. Evidently, the questions were too obvious to be effective in measuring conservative attitudes for the sample. The high authoritarianism and high dogmatism evidenced in the non-signing group would seem to go along with conservative attitudes in general as both Adorno et al. (1950) and Rokeach (1960) have mentioned. According to the instrument used to measure conservatism, however, this was not the case. Nevertheless there was a significant difference between the two groups on this issue even if it was in the liberal area of McClosky's scoring system.

Examining the backgrounds of these two groups, there is a definite difference in their regional background. The petition-signing group came primarily from the northern states such as Ohio, Pennsylvania, Nebraska, New Jersey, and California. The non-signing group was mainly from southern states such as Mississippi, Alabama, Texas, and Oklahoma. These findings support the study Christie and Garcia (1950)

did with a California sample and a sample from a southwestern city. Not only did the southwestern city group score higher on the F scale than the California group, but their backgrounds indicated that there was a conservatism prevailing.

There are some differences in these two samples on the occupational level of their fathers. The petition-signing group came primarily from families where the fathers were accountants, school administrators, attorneys, and ministers, whereas the non-signing group came from families where the fathers were primarily laborers such as farmers and construction workers and maintenance men. Lipset (1950) found that the lower the occupational level, the higher the authoritarianism. The lower classes were also found to be less non-economically liberal than the middle and upper classes; in essence, they were more conservative than the upper classes. The results of this study confirm this finding.

Adorno et al. (1950) did find a pseudoconservative ideology among the high scorers. These authors stated that the psychological structure of the pseudoconservative was conventionality and authoritarian submission on the ego plane, with violent tendencies, anarchic feelings and chaotic destructiveness in the unconscious area. They felt that the genuine conservative would be those people who had temporarily been able to identify with authoritarian patterns without much carry over of their emotional conflicts and without strong ambivalences. The group who scored higher on the conservatism

scale also had higher authoritarian scores in this study. Accompanied by their higher ratings on the two scales, the non-signers behaved in a way which was consistent with comments on the pseudoconservative's actions from Adorno et al. (1950). They speak of their " . . . 'fanatical' eagerness to defend God and Country . . . " (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 683). The group of non-signers centered most of their arguments around the traditional thinking indicative of the right-strata thinking which Adorno et al. (1950) mentioned. The quote cited earlier in this paper about their complaints indicated that they felt the petition signers were against a great heritage and against spiritual emphasis and, more specifically, against their own ethnic group of Christians. It is exactly this thinking that is the focal point of the ethnocentric thinking of authoritarian personality types. These men were attacking the other ministers for abandoning their own kind.

It is apparent from the data on the t test on the FCF scale that the petition-signing group was less authoritarian than the non-signing group. The t test score of 7.21 was significant beyond the .01 level. It is clear from this that the group who opposed prayer in the school was less authoritarian than the group who was for keeping it in the school.

The experimenter felt that some of the traits as outlined by Adorno et al. (1950) as being representative of authoritarianism were to be observed in this group that did

not sign the petition. Rigid and compulsive behavior were primary in these observed patterns.

This non-signing group showed extreme tension signs throughout the testing sessions, which were displayed in various ways. Every subject attempted to question the experimenter on the reasons for different questions. They then usually proceeded to ruminate about the questions by making comments as to the different ways they would answer the question, whether as a theologian or a layman. Obsessive behavior was evident in most of the testing sessions. Sometimes the experimenter had to repeat the directions several times or explain in detail some part of the directions.

The ministers of this group seemed quite rigid in their questioning of the correct directions and in their questioning of the individual questions. Rokeach (1948) associated rigidity with ethnocentric thinking. He found that concrete thinking was more prevalent among the more prejudiced subjects. In a group of problem tasks he found the prejudiced subjects were unable to restructure the set in order to solve new problems with new ways. The non-signing group displayed a similar rigidity. The directions for the semantic differential were different from the directions for the conservatism scale and also different from the directions for the FCD and FCF scales. This seemed to cause confusion for these subjects, and they would make open verbal comments about the transition from one set of instructions to another.

They seemed to be unable to adjust rapidly to the new set and change their behavior accordingly.

The experimenter also noticed that this non-signing group of subjects was unable to tolerate ambivalent feelings without much discomfort. Frenkel-Brunswik (1949) did some work in the area of inability to tolerate ambivalent feelings. The author felt that some subjects were unable to acknowledge ambivalent feelings; these same subjects were found to be ethnocentric in their thinking. The experimenter found that the non-signing group seemed to get frustrated with their ambivalent feelings. An indication of this frustration occurred when many of them would comment that they felt both disagree and agree responses to the same questions on the conservatism scale; they wished to put both responses since neither response, according to them, would be entirely correct.

The non-signing group treated the experimenter in a very conventional way as would be expected from their high authoritarian scores. The undertone of most of the meetings was that the subject acted out the role of the fatherly, moralistic minister who was assisting a student in the name of the pursuit of knowledge. The experimenter had the impression that the subjects were participating because they believed that good men of God were supposed to show interest in education and truth and were supposed to help in any way they could. However, such comments as "I really don't think this material is efficient material for getting at minister's

views" seemed to reveal their ambivalent feelings. They showed some discomfort at the questions and some irritation at their nature and content. Other comments would emerge such as "I really think you ought to ask about our views about God, the church, etc." They seemed to want to keep the questioning on grounds where they had thought the responses over very thoroughly. The experimenter many times received a spontaneous lecture from the subjects on his hard-life history and how he had arrived at the house of the Lord. They also would mention how interested they were in education and progress and other conventionally acceptable pursuits.

The petition signers behaved in a very different manner. They did not have an air of condescension or authority about them. The directions were seldom questioned or obsessed over. The experimenter was not questioned as to her motives or possible findings of the study, or her educational level as was often the case with the other group. The men in this group seldom seemed to be at all disturbed by the questions on the different scales. The communication between the experimenter and this group of subjects during the testing sessions was minimal. These men read the directions, took the scales, and said they enjoyed participating and that was the end of most of the communication. The experimenter was surprised at the casual atmospheres that prevailed during the testing sessions. There was no feeling

of an authority figure exuding from this group. They could have been a group of bankers or teachers or any other educated group of men.

The results indicated that the petition-signing group was less dogmatic than the non-signing group. The t test on the FCD scale revealed a 3.20, which was significant beyond the .01 level. It would appear that the group who did not sign the petition viewed the removal of prayer from the school as being against their religious conscience. This group's rigid adherence to their religious doctrines even when such doctrines appeared to be unconstitutional is understandable in terms of their closed cognitive belief systems. Rokeach states:

The greater the dogmatism the more will the disbelief subsystem most similar to the belief system (factional or "renegade" subsystems) be perceived as threatening the validity of the belief system and hence the greater the tendency to exert effort designed to reject this subsystem and the adherents thereof (Rokeach, 1954, p. 198).

The actions of the non-signing group directed against the signers of the petition illustrated Rokeach's statement. The men who signed the petition were within a similar subsystem to the non-signing group, as they were all members of the clergy. The signers of the petition were viewed by these non-signers as being in a "renegade" subsystem in their views toward prayer in the school. They were vehemently attacked as being against Christian teaching. The attackers were unable to view the legitimacy of another system because it threatened their main theological central belief system. It

would appear that this particular conflict caused great turmoil within the belief systems of these men. Here men of their own belief systems were going against the basic teachings of the church--that of propagating religion. Not only were they going against the authority of the church, but they were being placed in a very conflicting situation as to which authority or belief system was superior. The whole struggle over coexisting belief systems was involved in this prayer issue. The petition-signing group was compromising with what appeared to be the members of the disbelief subsystems, non-Christians or people opposed to its propagation within the church. The petition signers were facing the fact that although the removal of the prayer from the school was against their major belief system, it was in accordance with another belief system, the United States Constitution. They had to come to some compromise between these two belief systems. It appears that the non-signers solved the conflict of the opposing opinions of the two belief systems by ignoring the validity of one of their own belief systems. They all are citizens of the same country and presumably believe in the Constitution which governs it.

The correlation between the FCD and the FCF scales was significant beyond the .01 level. A correlation of .41 was obtained from this calculation. It was apparent that the two scales were measuring a similar thing. This finding goes along with Lichtenstein and Quinn (1961) who found a .57



correlation between the F and D scales. It also agrees with the findings of Peabody (1961) who obtained a correlation of .61 between the F and the D scales. However, the FCD and the FCF scales have not been correlated before. Berger (1967) constructed the FCD scale and did some correlations with the Repression-Sensitization scale (RS) and the D scale in his study. The FCD and FCF scale were not correlated in his study. The obtained correlation goes along with the high correlations obtained between the F and D scale as well as the validating correlations obtained between the F and FCF scale and the D scale and FCD scale. There is a possibility that the obtained correlation was due to an inflation of the correlation by having no middle sample.

Adorno et al. (1950) found that religion and authoritarianism were often found together. The rigid tenants of Christianity such as the antithesis of good and evil as well as the ingroup loyalty and subservient feelings all lent themselves well to authoritarian structures. Rokeach, as previously mentioned, found that on his scales religious groups scored higher on the average than non-believers. It would seem from these conclusions that both groups of men being so closely affiliated with religious thinking would score higher on the D and F scales. However, this study shows that this is not accurate.

Although both of these groups of men were from theological settings, they differed significantly on all of the

measures in this study. It seems clear that some other variables were involved which might account for the differences. It is apparent that the fact that they all are ministers is not enough similarity to make their thinking similar. Perhaps some further testing into the individual background would provide information which would indicate the development of their particular value systems and actions. Perhaps, even with a background analysis, some questions would still be unanswered as to the values of these men.

The experimenter feels that the process of secularization, which Cox (1965) described, revealed a possible explanation for the actions of the petition signers. Secularization, as mentioned previously, is the process of turning away from religion to this world, with all of its problems. Within this process, religion becomes a private matter and the changing urban culture becomes the center of man's attention, replacing religion which once was the center. These signers seemed to be turning their attention with their concern over constitutionality to this world. The other group seemed to be caught up in the theological value system, along with all of the traditional, rigid, conservative thinking that often accompanied religion. This group of non-signers does follow along with Adorno's and Rokeach's findings of authoritarianism being associated with religious affiliation.

In evaluating this research and in comparing it with other studies, several variables emerge which warrant further

study. The results of this study suggest that theological affiliations can have very different values. One group scored high on the FCD scale, the FCF scale, and the conservatism scale. Additional research is necessary to determine the roots of these differences. As Hood and Sherif (1955) suggested, more than a psychodynamic interpretation is necessary to explain authoritarianism. It appears that just a sociological examination in terms of professions is not sufficient to explain the differences. Perhaps a more extensive examination of sociological, psychological, and cultural variables would give more conclusive answers to the questions concerning the development of the authoritarian structure.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY

In May, 1966, a group of ministers in a southwestern city signed a petition to have prayer removed from the public schools. A number of other ministers spoke openly against this group. The purpose of this study was to test the two groups of ministers--the petition signers, and the ones who opposed them--for authoritarianism (a forced choice version of Adorno's F scale), dogmatism (a forced choice version of Rokeach's D scale), and conservatism (McClosky's Conservatism scale). A further purpose was to test for a correlation between the FCF and FCD scales.

The subjects consisted of twenty-one petition signers of various religions, and twenty-one opposing non-signers of the same faith. The tests were administered individually in a booklet which consisted of a semantic differential to validate the minister's point of view on prayer in the school, the Conservatism scale, the FCF scale, the FCD scale, and a short biographical data sheet used to match the faiths of the opposing ministers, and to obtain demographic data.

Analysis of the data indicated that the ministers who signed the petition to have prayer removed from the public schools scored lower on authoritarianism, dogmatism, and conservatism than the ministers who opposed this action. A significant correlation was also found between the FCF and FCD scales.

The results of this study indicate that ministers of different faiths who were willing to make a public stand for a personal belief in spite of criticisms from members of their own faiths, tended to be more liberal, less authoritarian, and less dogmatic than their opposites. Possible reasons for these results were discussed, and suggestions for future research were offered.

## REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, Else, Levinson, D. J., and Sanford, R. N. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- Altus, W. D. and Tafejian, T. T. MMPI Correlates of the California E-F scale. Journal of Social Psychology, 1953, 38, 145-149.
- Bass, B. M. Authoritarianism or acquiescence? Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 616-623.
- Berger, V. F. Effects of repression and acquiescence response set on scales of authoritarianism and dogmatism. Unpublished Masters Thesis, The University of Oklahoma Library, 1967.
- Berkowitz, N. H. and Wolkon, G. H. A forced choice form of the F scale--free of acquiescent response set. Sociometry, 1964, 27 (1), 54-65.
- Brown, R. W. A determinant of the relationship between rigidity and authoritarianism. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1953, 48 (4), 469-476.
- Christie, R. and Garcia, J. Subcultural variation in authoritarian personality. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1951, 46, 457-469.
- Christie, R., Havel, Joan, and Seidenberg, B. Is the F scale reversible? Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 143-159.
- Christie, R. and Johoda, Marie. (Ed.) Studies in the scope and method of "the authoritarian personality." Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1954.
- Cohn, T. S. The relation of the F scale to a response set to answer positively. Journal of Social Psychology, 1956, 44, 129-133.
- Cox, H. The secular city. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1965.
- Cronbach, L. J. Response sets and test validity. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1946, 6, 475-494.
- DeSoto, C., Kueth, J. L., and Wunderlich, R. Social perception and self-perception of high and low authoritarians. Journal of Social Psychology, 1960, 52, 149-155.

- Deutsch, M. Trust, trustworthiness, and the F scale. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61 (1), 138-140.
- Frenkel-Brunswik, Else. Intolerance of ambiguity as an emotional and perceptual personality variable. Journal of Personality, 1949, 18, 108-143.
- Fromm, E. Escape from freedom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1941.
- Fromm, E. Man for himself. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1947.
- Gough, H. G. Studies of social intolerance. Journal of Social Psychology, 1951, 33, 237-269.
- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Hood, W. R. and Sherif, M. An appraisal of personality-oriented approaches to prejudice. Sociology and Social Research, 1955, 40 (2), 79-85.
- Jensen, A. R. Authoritarian attitudes and personality maladjustment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 1957, 54, 303-311.
- Kates, S. L. First-impression formation and authoritarianism. Human Relations, 1959, 12, 277-286.
- Kenny, D. T. and Ginsberg, Rose. Authoritarian submission attitudes, intolerance of ambiguity, and aggression. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 1958, 12 (2), 121-126. (a)
- Kenny, D. T. and Ginsberg, Rose. The specificity of intolerance of ambiguity measures. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 300-304. (b)
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Kogan, N. Authoritarianism and repression. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 53 (1), 34-37.
- Lentz, T. F. The attitudes of world citizenship. Journal of Social Psychology, 1950, 32, 207-214.
- Lichtenstein, E., Quinn, R. P., and Hover, G. L. Dogmatism and acquiescent response set. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63 (3), 636-638.

- Lipset, S. M. Democracy and working-class authoritarianism. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 482-501.
- McClosky, H. Conservatism and personality. American Political Science Review, 1958, 52, 27-45.
- MacKinnon, W. J., and Centers, R. Authoritarianism and urban stratification. American Journal of Sociology, 1956, 61, 610-620.
- Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., and Tannenbaum, P. H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Illinois: The University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Peabody, D. Attitude Content and agreement set in scales of authoritarianism, dogmatism, anti-Semitism, and economic conservatism. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63 (1), 1-11.
- Rokeach, M. Generalized mental rigidity as a factor in ethnocentrism. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1948, 53, 259-278.
- Rokeach, M. The nature and meaning of dogmatism. Psychological Review, 1954, 61 (3), 194-204.
- Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960.
- Rothstein, R. Authoritarianism and men's reactions to sexuality and affection in women. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61 (3), 329-334.
- Singer, R. D., Feshbach, S. Some relationships between manifest anxiety, authoritarian tendencies, and modes of reaction to frustration. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 404-408.
- Smith, H. P. Do intercultural experiences affect attitudes? Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 469-477.
- Smith, H. P., and Rosen, Ellen W. Some psychological correlates of worldmindedness and authoritarianism. Journal of Personality, 1958, 26, 170-183.
- Wells, W. D., Weinert, G., and Rubel, Marilyn. Conformity pressure and authoritarian personality. Journal of Psychology, 1956, 42, 133-136.



## APPENDIX A

### THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

If you feel that the concept at the top of the page is VERY CLOSELY RELATED to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

If you feel that the concept is QUITE CLOSELY RELATED to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check as follows:

If the concept seems ONLY SLIGHTLY RELATED to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the thing you're judging.

FAIR:       :       :       : X       :       :       : UNFAIR

(1) Place your check marks in the middle of the spaces, not on the boundaries.

99

- (2) Be sure to check the scale for every concept,  
DO NOT OMIT ANY.
- (3) Never put more than one check mark on a single scale. Sometimes you may feel as though you've had the same item before on the test. MAKE EACH ITEM A SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT JUDGEMENT. Work at fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items, that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we want your true impressions.

Thank you.

## PRAYER IN SCHOOL

FAST	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	SLOW
HEALTHY	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	SICK
VALUABLE	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	WORTHLESS
CRUEL	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	KIND
SHARP	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	DULL
DIRTY	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	CLEAN
PASSIVE	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	ACTIVE
GOOD	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	BAD
DARK	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	BRIGHT
WEAK	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	STRONG
COWARDLY	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	BRAVE
NICE	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	AWFUL
POOR	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	RICH
LARGE	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	SMALL
LOW	: ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ :	HIGH

APPENDIX B

THE CONSERVATISM SCALE

If you agree with the statement, circle A. If you disagree, circle the D.

1. If you start trying to change things very much, you usually make them worse. A D
2. No matter how we like to talk about it, political authority really comes not from us, but from some higher power. A D
3. It's better to stick by what you have than to be trying new things you don't really know about. A D
4. A man doesn't really get to have much wisdom until he's well along in years. A D
5. I prefer the practical man anytime to the men of ideas. A D
6. If something grows up over a long time, there will always be much wisdom in it. A D
7. I'd want to know that something would really work before I'd be willing to take a chance on it. A D
8. All groups can live in harmony in this country, without changing the system in any way. A D
9. We must respect the work of our forefathers and not think that we know better than they did. A D

## APPENDIX C

### THE FCF SCALE

### ATTITUDE INVENTORY

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.

+3: I agree a great deal more with A than B.

+2: I agree somewhat more with A than B.

+1: I agree slightly more with A than B.

-1: I agree slightly more with B than A.

-2: I agree somewhat more with B than A.

-3: I agree a great deal more with B than A.

For example, if the item reads:

A. Practice makes perfect.

— B. There are some things that cannot be achieved perfectly, regardless of the effort.

If you agree a great deal more with statement A than with statement B, mark your answer with +3.

However, if you agree somewhat more with statement B than with statement A, mark your answer with -2.



- +3: I agree a great deal more with A than B.
- +2: I agree somewhat more with A than B.
- +1: I agree slightly more with A than B.
- 1: I agree slightly more with B than A.
- 2: I agree somewhat more with B than A.
- 3: I agree a great deal more with B than A.

- \_\_\_ 1. A. One of the most important things children should learn is when to disobey authorities.  
B. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
- \_\_\_ 2. A. People should be willing to overlook failures in the manners and unpleasant personal habits in other people.  
B. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.
- \_\_\_ 3. A. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.  
B. It would be a good thing if people spent more time thinking and talking about ideas just for the fun of it.
- \_\_\_ 4. A. The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.  
B. The artist and professor are probably more important to society than the businessman or manufacturer.
- \_\_\_ 5. A. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.  
B. The findings of science may some day show that many of our most cherished beliefs are wrong.
- \_\_\_ 6. A. If it weren't for the rebellious ideas of youth, there would be less progress in the world.  
B. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
- \_\_\_ 7. A. It is more important for this country to have a just legal and political system than a series of trustworthy leaders, however courageous, tireless, and devoted they might be.  
B. 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.

- +3: I agree a great deal more with A than B.
- +2: I agree somewhat more with A than B.
- +1: I agree slightly more with A than B.
- 1: I agree slightly more with B than A.
- 2: I agree somewhat more with B than A.
- 3: I agree a great deal more with B than A.

- \_\_\_ 8. A. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.  
B. It's only natural for people to sometimes have thoughts about hurting a close friend or relative.
- \_\_\_ 9. A. In the long run it is better for our country if young people are allowed a great deal of personal freedom and are not strictly disciplined.  
B. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
- \_\_\_ 10. A. An insult to our honor should always be punished.  
B. Insults to our honor are always important enough to both.
- \_\_\_ 11. A. Sex crimes, such as pedophilia and attacks on children, are signs of mental illness; such people belong in hospitals, not in prison.  
B. Sex crimes, such as pedophilia and attacks on children, deserve more than imprisonment; such criminals ought to be severely whipped, or worse.
- \_\_\_ 12. A. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.  
B. Most honest people admit to themselves that they have sometimes hated their parents.
- \_\_\_ 13. A. It's nobody's business if someone is a homosexual as long as he doesn't harm other people.  
B. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.
- \_\_\_ 14. A. 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.  
B. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best to face it and try to think it through, even if it is so upsetting that it keeps him from concentrating on other things.

- +3: I agree a great deal more with A than B.
- +2: I agree somewhat more with A than B.
- +1: I agree slightly more with A than B.
- 1: I agree slightly more with B than A.
- 2: I agree somewhat more with B than A.
- 3: I agree a great deal more with B than A.

- \_\_\_ 8. A. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.  
B. It's only natural for people to sometimes have thoughts about hurting a close friend or relative.
- \_\_\_ 9. A. In the long run it is better for our country if young people are allowed a great deal of personal freedom and are not strictly disciplined.  
B. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
- \_\_\_ 10. A. An insult to our honor should always be punished.  
B. Insults to our honor are not always important enough to bother about.
- \_\_\_ 11. A. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, are signs of mental illness; such people belong in hospitals rather than in prison.  
B. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.
- \_\_\_ 12. A. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.  
B. Most honest people admit to themselves that they have sometimes hated their parents.
- \_\_\_ 13. A. It's nobody's business if someone is a homosexual as long as he doesn't harm other people.  
B. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.
- \_\_\_ 14. A. 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.  
B. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best to face it and try to think it through, even if it is so upsetting that it keeps him from concentrating on other things.

- +3: I agree a great deal more with A than B.
- +2: I agree somewhat more with A than B.
- +1: I agree slightly more with A than B.
- 1: I agree slightly more with B than A.
- 2: I agree somewhat more with B than A.
- 3: I agree a great deal more with B than A.

- \_\_\_ 15. A. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.  
B. It's all right for people to raise questions about even the most sacred matters.
- \_\_\_ 16. A. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places.  
B. An urge to jump from high places is probably the result of unhappy personal experiences rather than something inborn.
- \_\_\_ 17. A. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.  
B. It doesn't make much sense to divide people into groups like the weak and the strong; too many people are strong in some ways and weak in others.
- \_\_\_ 18. A. Some day it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.  
B. It is highly unlikely that astrology will ever be able to explain anything.
- \_\_\_ 19. A. There are many difficulties a person cannot overcome no matter how much will power he has.  
B. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.
- \_\_\_ 20. A. Many people have too great a fear of plots hatched in secret by politicians.  
B. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.
- \_\_\_ 21. A. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.  
B. Human nature doesn't make war inevitable; men may some day establish a peaceful world.
- \_\_\_ 22. A. Familiarity breeds contempt.  
B. You may dislike a person very much, but the chances are that if you get to know him well you'll have more respect for him.

- +3: I agree a great deal more with A than B.
- +2: I agree somewhat more with A than B.
- +1: I agree slightly more with A than B.
- 1: I agree slightly more with B than A.
- 2: I agree somewhat more with B than A.
- 3: I agree a great deal more with B than A.

- \_\_\_ 23. A. Even though people of all sorts mix together nowadays, you don't have to worry very much about catching an infection or disease.  
B. 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.
- \_\_\_ 24. A. There are times when it is necessary to probe into even the most personal and private matters.  
B. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
- \_\_\_ 25. A. In spite of what you read about the wild sex life of people in important places, the real story is about the same in any group of people.  
B. 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.

## APPENDIX D

### THE FCD SCALE

- +3: I agree a great deal more with A than B.
- +2: I agree somewhat more with A than B.
- +1: I agree slightly more with A than B.
- 1: I agree slightly more with B than A.
- 2: I agree somewhat more with B than A.
- 3: I agree a great deal more with B than A.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. A. There may be crucial differences between the United States and Russia, but there are also many important features they have in common.

B. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. A. To really believe in democracy means that the less intelligent will have an equal share in the government.

B. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. A. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.

B. To believe seriously in freedom of speech means that freedom of even those political groups we disagree with cannot be restricted.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. A. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.

B. It is natural for a person to be nearly as well acquainted with ideas he opposes as with ideas he believes in.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. A. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.

B. Man on his own has many resources within himself, and is neither helpless nor miserable.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. A. The world is fundamentally more a place full of friendly people than a lonesome place.

B. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. A. Most people generally care about others.

B. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. A. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.

B. If I have personal problems I'd rather try to work them out by myself than find someone who would tell me how to solve them.

- +3: I agree a great deal more with A than B.
- +2: I agree somewhat more with A than B.
- +1: I agree slightly more with A than B.
- 1: I agree slightly more with B than A.
- 2: I agree somewhat more with B than A.
- 3: I agree a great deal more with B than A.

- \_\_\_ 9. A. There's no need to be afraid of the future.  
B. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.
- \_\_\_ 10. A. What I really hope to accomplish is limited enough so that I don't feel rushed about it.  
B. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.
- \_\_\_ 11. A. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.  
B. I'm able to stop even if I get wound up in a heated discussion.
- \_\_\_ 12. A. I do not find it necessary to repeat myself several times in a discussion to make sure I'm being understood.  
B. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.
- \_\_\_ 13. A. 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.  
B. I generally listen to what others are saying in a heated discussion rather than becoming absorbed in what I am going to say.
- \_\_\_ 14. A. It is better to be alive and not at all a hero, than to be a dead hero.  
B. It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.
- \_\_\_ 15. A. While like most people I would like to make some small accomplishment in life, I have no secret ambition to become a great man; if I had I would certainly admit it to myself.  
B. 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.
- \_\_\_ 16. A. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.  
B. There are things in life that matter at least as much as for a person to want to do something important.



- +3: I agree a great deal more with A than B.
- +2: I agree somewhat more with A than B.
- +1: I agree slightly more with A than B.
- 1: I agree slightly more with B than A.
- 2: I agree somewhat more with B than A.
- 3: I agree a great deal more with B than A.

- \_\_\_ 17. A. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.  
B. While most people would probably want to do something of great benefit to the world if given a chance, I wouldn't care if it were done by someone else rather than myself.
- \_\_\_ 18. A. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.  
B. There have been many really great thinkers in the history of mankind who have had different ideas.
- \_\_\_ 19. A. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.  
B. I do not hate anyone because he stands for things different from me.
- \_\_\_ 20. A. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.  
B. Whether a man has really lived or not is not determined by whether or not he believes in some great cause.
- \_\_\_ 21. A. Whether or not a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause, life can be meaningful.  
B. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.
- \_\_\_ 22. A. Many of the different philosophies in this world are partly true, probably none of them is entirely correct.  
B. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.
- \_\_\_ 23. A. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.  
B. A person who gets enthusiastic about many causes is as likely to be a person of integrity as one who gets enthusiastic about a single cause.

- +3: I agree a great deal more with A than B.
- +2: I agree somewhat more with A than B.
- +1: I agree slightly more with A than B.
- 1: I agree slightly more with B than A.
- 2: I agree somewhat more with B than A.
- 3: I agree a great deal more with B than A.

- \_\_\_ 24. A. In order to achieve anything we often have to compromise with our political opponents; this isn't likely to lead to the betrayal of our own side.  
B. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.
- \_\_\_ 25. A. 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.  
B. We should be willing to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do as regards differences of opinion and religion.
- \_\_\_ 26. A. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.  
B. It is not necessarily selfish for a person to consider primarily his own happiness.
- \_\_\_ 27. A. If a person feels that those who believe in the same thing he does are going wrong he should say so, publicly if necessary.  
B. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.
- \_\_\_ 28. A. Nowadays one should try to come to terms with different ideas of people or groups in our own camp, rather than being on guard against them as we might with ideas from the opposing camp.  
B. 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.
- \_\_\_ 29. A. The best chance for a group to exist in the long run is to tolerate as much difference of opinion as there may be among its members.  
B. A group which tolerates too much differences of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.

- +3: I agree a great deal more with A than B.
- +2: I agree somewhat more with A than B.
- +1: I agree slightly more with A than B.
- 1: I agree slightly more with B than A.
- 2: I agree somewhat more with B than A
- 3: I agree a great deal more with B than A.

- \_\_\_ 30. A. There are two kinds of people in this world:  
those who are for the truth and those who  
are against the truth.  
B. It doesn't make sense to divide people into two  
distinct kinds, like those for the truth and  
those against the truth since almost everyone  
tries to be for the truth as he sees it.
- \_\_\_ 31. A. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly  
refuses to admit he's wrong.  
B. I'm not likely to feel intense anger when a  
person refuses to admit he's wrong, even if  
he seems stubborn.
- \_\_\_ 32. A. One should be tolerant of a person who thinks  
primarily of his own happiness, not consider  
him to be beneath contempt.  
B. A person who thinks primarily of his own happi-  
ness is beneath contempt.
- \_\_\_ 33. A. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays  
aren't worth the paper they are printed on.  
B. It's a good thing that many different ideas get  
printed nowadays since there may be something  
of value in many of them and this is the only  
way we can find out.
- \_\_\_ 34. A. 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.  
B. In trying to know what's going on in our complex  
world there are matters where we cannot avoid  
relying on leaders or experts, but there are  
many issues that we should try to decide our-  
selves on their own merits.
- \_\_\_ 35. A. 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.  
B. Before hearing the opinions of those one respects,  
one should try to have an opinion of one's  
own about what's going on.

- +3: I agree a great deal more with A than B.
- +2: I agree somewhat more with A than B.
- +1: I agree slightly more with A than B.
- 1: I agree slightly more with B than A.
- 2: I agree somewhat more with B than A.
- 3: I agree a great deal more with B than A.

- \_\_\_ 36. A. In the long run rather than have only friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as ones own, it is better to include some friends and associates with different tastes and beliefs.  
B. 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.
- \_\_\_ 37. A. It's important to live life in the present; one can never be sure what the future may bring.  
B. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.
- \_\_\_ 38. A. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."  
B. Since a man cannot know how it will turn out, he should not risk everything in a single gamble if he wants to accomplish his mission in life.
- \_\_\_ 39. A. People with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems tend to understand what's going on as much as I do.  
B. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.
- \_\_\_ 40. A. Most people know what's good for them as well as anyone else does.  
B. Most people just don't know what's good for them.

APPENDIX E

THE BIOGRAPHICAL DATA SHEET

Please complete the following:

1. Year completed studies for the ministry \_\_\_\_\_.
2. Religion \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Father's occupation \_\_\_\_\_.
4. Native state \_\_\_\_\_.

APPENDIX F

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL DATA

Table 6  
Mean Scores for Petition-Signing Ministers  
N=21

<u>S</u>	Activity	Potency	Evaluation
1	4	4.4	5.2
2	3	3.0	3.0
3	4.6	4.4	4.6
4	6	6.8	5.6
5	5	5.2	4.8
6	4.4	5.6	4.6
7	6	6.8	5.8
8	5.6	5.0	5.0
9	4.8	5.6	5.0
10	4.2	4.6	5.0
11	5.8	4.6	4.6
12	6	7.0	6.2
13	4.6	5.0	5.0
14	4.6	4.8	3.6
15	6.2	6.6	5.4
16	4.6	4.6	5.0
17	4.6	4.2	4.0
18	4.2	4.2	5.0
19	5.8	6.4	6.4
20	6.6	6.4	5.8
21	4.4	5.6	5.4



Table 7

Mean Scores for Non-Signing Ministers  
N=21

<u>S</u>	Activity	Potency	Evaluation
1	4.8	4.0	3.6
2	6	5.8	6.0
3	2.4	2.2	1.4
4	3.2	2.4	2.6
5	1.4	1.0	1.2
6	3.8	2.8	1.8
7	3	2.4	1.6
8	4.4	4.2	2.4
9	2	3.6	1.8
10	1.2	1.2	1.4
11	3	3.4	2.6
12	3.8	3.2	3.4
13	4.2	3.8	3.6
14	1.8	1.8	2.0
15	1	1.0	1.0
16	3.2	3.0	3.4
17	4.2	4.2	4.2
18	2.4	3.0	2.0
19	1.4	1.2	1.0
20	2.2	2.2	1.2
21	3.2	2.2	3.0

APPENDIX G

FCF SCALE DATA

Table 8

FCF Scale Scores for the Two Groups  
N=42

<u>S</u>	Petition-Signing	Non-Signing
1	41	82
2	66	95
3	59	64
4	62	99
5	44	93
6	52	93
7	64	61
8	46	71
9	43	90
10	62	85
11	41	66
12	38	75
13	73	85
14	69	79
15	54	92
16	55	63
17	49	94
18	38	87
19	52	118
20	76	97
21	66	74

## APPENDIX H

### FCD SCALE DATA

Table 9

FCD Scale Scores for the Two Groups  
N=42

<u>S</u>	Petition-Signing	Non-Signing
1	104	132
2	124	124
3	119	155
4	133	131
5	111	158
6	148	151
7	111	134
8	115	157
9	117	140
10	109	136
11	119	94
12	147	116
13	137	146
14	112	128
15	114	123
16	107	165
17	121	176
18	116	99
19	146	168
20	128	148
21	125	151

APPENDIX I

CONSERVATISM SCALE DATA

Table 10

Conservatism Scale Scores for the Two Groups  
N=42

<u>S</u>	Petition-Signing	Non-Signing
1	1	1
2	1	2
3	1	2
4	1	1
5	0	0
6	0	3
7	2	1
8	1	1
9	0	6
10	0	1
11	0	2
12	3	0
13	0	2
14	0	2
15	0	2
16	0	0
17	0	0
18	0	4
19	0	2
20	0	3
21	0	0