THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

AUTHORITARIANISM AND PREJUDICE IN NEAR-EASTERN STUDENTS ATTENDING AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

LUTFY N. DIAB

Norman, Oklahoma

1956

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/188

AUTHORITARIANISM AND PREJUDICE IN NEAR-EASTERN STUDENTS ATTENDING AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

APPROVED BY

Carl R. Ardroyd

Alfred F. Glixman

Irene Mackintosh

A. Weilman

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer wishes to express his indebtedness to Dr. Carl R. Oldroyd under whose direction and guidance this research was done. Special thanks go to Dr. Alfred F. Glixman for his valuable suggestions on the statistical treatment of the data, to Dr. Irene Mackintosh for her helpful suggestions and criticisms on the organization of the material in this study, and to Dr. Arthur W. Heilman for his valuable comments in regard to the content and organization of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF TABLES		v
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM	1
II.	PROCEDURE	19
III.	RESULTS	23
IV.	DISCUSSION	31
V.	SUMMARY	45
REFERENCES		48
Appendix		
I.	Combined F and TFI Scales	50
II.	Bogardus Social Distance Scale	54
III.	Thurstone Scale	56
IV.	Background Questionnaire	58

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Pearsonian Correlations for F Scale with TFI, Bogardus, and Thurstone Scales	24
2.	Pearsonian Correlations for Christian and Moslem Subjects on the F Scale with Social Distance toward Each of the Four Minority Groups in the Bogardus Scale	25
3.	Mean Social Distances for Christians, Moslems, and "Others" toward Each of the Four Minority Groups in the Bogardus Scale	26
4.	Summary of Analysis of Variance of Social Distance Scores	27
5.	*t* Tests of Differences in Mean Social Distance Scores Assigned by Subjects (N = 74) to Each of the Four Minority Groups in the Bogardus Scale	28
6.	Percent of Subjects Checking Each Item on the Thurstone Scale	30

AUTHORITARIANISM AND PREJUDICE IN NEAR-EASTERN STUDENTS ATTENDING AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the relationship of authoritarianism to traditional family ideology and to prejudice (social distance) towards various minority groups in a relatively non-Western sample. Many approaches have been promulgated for the explanation of prejudice in intergroup relations. This study will be concerned with two of these approaches to prejudice, namely, "authoritarianism" and "reference group theory," which will be discussed separately in the following sections.

Various writers and researchers have described authoritarianism in great detail and have demonstrated that there is a close correlation between a number of interrelated personality traits, which have been labelled authoritarianism, and overt prejudice. However, it must be stressed at the outset that authoritarianism is only one explanation of prejudice, and, as pointed by Adorno et al., "the cause

of irrational hostility is in the last instance to be found in social frustration and injustice" (2, p. vii).

One of the early writers on authoritarianism was Fromm (6) who explained it as one mechanism of escape resulting from the insecurity of the isolated individual. He defines authoritarianism as being "the tendency to give up the independence of one's own individual self and to fuse one's self with somebody or something outside of oneself in order to acquire the strength which the individual self is lacking" (6, p. 141). In addition, Fromm says that authoritarianism can also appear and operate internally under the name of conscience or superego. He points out that "the feature common to all authoritarian thinking is the conviction that life is determined by forces outside of man's own self, his interest, his wishes. The only possible happiness lies in the submission to these forces" (6, p. 171). Also, Fromm remarks that "the sadist needs the person over whom he rules, he needs him very badly, since his own feeling of strength is rooted in the fact that he is the master over someone" (6, p. 145). Thus, the major purpose of sadism is to control others, and this comes from a weakness within the individual aroused by feelings of powerlessness and insignificance. This feeling of insignificance, resulting from a perceived weakness of the self, leads to a giving up of the "real" self for the "social" self in order to draw strength and also to the incorporation and control of others as

evidenced in the case of sadism--all this being done in order to avoid the feelings of aloneness and unbelongingness. For, according to Fromm, the need to avoid aloneness is considered to be the main essence of life. The other needs that are considered to be primary determinants of the character structure of the individual are the biological needs and the needs for the social-economic system. Fromm maintains that as a result of feelings of powerlessness, insignificance, and aloneness the individual takes an irrational approach to resolve his doubts and insecurities by giving up his "real" self and becoming the self that people and society expect him to be, i.e., he directs his capacities and potentialities so that they do not ordinarily come in conflict with convention and custom and then, when they do, there results a giving up of these capacities. In such a case, the individual self is felt as lacking in power and strength, and therefore the individual develops an admiration and fascination for power or authority. For such an individual, there are only two kinds of people: the weak and the strong. The strong arouse in the authoritarian individual admiration, respect, and submission, while the weak arouse contempt and domination. To the authoritarian, fate is something to which one must submit. A final characterization of the authoritarian personality is that the individual lacks potent offensive in that he will not

initiate change on his own, especially if this change is directed towards an established authority, unless such an authority is getting weaker and there is available a new authority to which he can cling.

The authoritarian character was also discussed and described by Maslow (12). Since Maslow's thinking about the authoritarian character agrees on many points with that of Fromm, his theory will be presented only briefly. Maslow conceives of the authoritarian person as a psychologically insecure individual who pictures the world around him as a sort of jungle in which human beings are primarily selfish, evil, or stupid. Human beings are regarded as being either superior (and therefore to be feared, resented, and admired) or inferior to the authoritarian person (and therefore to be scorned, humiliated, and dominated). This tendency to classify people into two groups, superior and inferior, is over-generalized to the extent that a "superior" person is considered as superior in everything and an "inferior" person inferior in everything. Also, the authoritarian person tends to have a strong drive for power, defined characteristically in terms of power over people. Hatred for a scapegoat is an important characteristic, but the choice of the scapegoat is not. Consciously or unconsciously, the authoritarian tends to identify kindness and sympathy with weakness (inferiority) and to identify cruelty and

selfishness with strength (superiority). Other human beings are looked upon only as tools and objects to be exploited for the authoritarian's own ends. Regarding the sadistic-masochistic tendency of the authoritarian person, Maslow states that

> every authoritarian character is both sadistic and masochistic. Which tendency will appear depends largely (but not entirely) on the situation. If he is in dominance status, he will tend to be cruel; if he is in subordinate status, he will tend to be masochistic. But because of these tendencies in himself, he will understand, and deep down within himself will agree with the cruelty of the superior person, even if he himself is the object of the cruelty (12, p. 408).

Other tendencies of the authoritarian character, according to Maslow, include the tendency to think of males as the stronger of the two sexes, the antagonism to education, particularly for the inferior ones, the avoidance of responsibility for one's own fate, the submission or the giving up to some stronger protector, and finally the achievement of a pseudo-security through compulsive-obsessive mechanisms.

Schaffner (21) has described the development of authoritarianism in the German culture. Tracing authoritarianism back to family situations and thinking of it as a product of inter-personal relationships (especially parent-child relationships) within the family, Schaffner talks of the German family life as revolving around the figure of the father. The father is

> omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent, as far as this

> is possible for a human being. He is the source of all the authority, all the security, and all the wisdom that his children expect to receive. Every other member of the family has lower status and lesser rights than his (21, p. 15).

The German word that expresses the attitude of the child towards the father means, literally, "honor-fear" and implies a far more awesome attitude toward the father than mere simple respect. The position of the mother is secondary to that of the father. The German mother, completely dependent on her husband, subjugates herself to his undisputed authority. Consequently, the ties between the mother and her children are weakened, and this leads to an increase in the dependence of both upon the central father-figure. Such a state of affairs creates in the mother a tendency to compete with the father for the affection, gratitude, and devotion of the children. Discussing the consequences of this situation, Schaffner states that

> the father's status within the home is partially threatened by his wife's hold upon the children, and it intensifies his insistence upon their respect for him. He must minimize the importance or wisdom of women and insist upon his wife's subordination to himself in order to maintain his position of superiority (21, p. 36).

In accordance with the accepted cultural pattern, the mother identifies herself with her husband's point of view. She remains subordinate to him, while the child is left to find his own "natural" place which is subordination to both parents. This process of indoctrination of the child which

contributes to authoritarianism is summarized by Schaffner:

> the authoritarian pattern demands passivity in the child. In so far as a child fails to learn this fundamental quality, he is unprepared for the society in which he is going to live. He may then become either an active rebel against authority, or merely a passive opponent. In either case, this deviant is unhappy in the usual German home, even when he is supported by one of the parents; he is also maladjusted outside the home, until he finds a group of other deviants. The pattern of passivity or aggression toward the system, which determines his behavior as an adult in German society, is formed during his childhood by his reaction to parental authority at home (21, pp. 51-52).

Mead (13) in her discussion of the development of the American character indicates a similar viewpoint regarding this authoritarian syndrome and its operation in this country. She says that "Americans are what they are because they have been reared in America by parents with certain ways of behaving" (13, pp. 120-121). She points out that these ways have changed lately towards an unwillingness to admit one's own mistakes and to blame them onto other people, other groups. She states that "for a generation, the most crucial area in American character formation, parenthood of children under twenty, has been manned by people who were willing to crawl out of their responsibilities by blaming somebody else" (13, p. 121). Mead remarks that the moral order of the world hinges on the parents as the interpreters. The parents assume the function of teaching goodness and morality to children. But Mead asks, what is to happen to

this order when the child finds out that, after all, his parents are neither all good nor all wise? In Mead's own words:

> The dynamics of American effort today depend on this relationship between moral parents and gradually disillusioned children who have, however, learned the lesson that goodness greater than their own lies somewhere within someone's reach. It is not a perfect mechanism. The moment of disillusionment when youth finds its parents wanting adds a bitterness which is probably not compatible with completely enthusiastic pursuit of a better world (13, p. 136).

Authoritarianism was also studied by many other researchers (18, 5, 19) who give further support to the concepts on authoritarianism presented in previous writings. Sanford (18) examined the relationship between authoritarianism and orientation to, or attitudes towards, various kinds of leaders and leadership situations. He contrasted the attitudes of high and low authoritarian individuals toward leaders and found that the highly authoritarian individual was characterized by the same attributes given him in the previous studies. The high scorer on authoritarianism, to put it in Sanford's words,

> admires conventional power figures, responds favorably to prestigeful figures but sometimes strongly rejects authority . . . seems more concerned with . . . /his/ own intimate relations with leaders than with the leader's relation to the job or to other people . . . and flavors . . . comments about leaders with moralistic overtones (18, pp. 26-27).

On the other hand, the low scorer tended either to take authority or to leave it with equanimity and to be concerned

with the leader's social function. Furthermore, the low scorer was neither disturbed by weak leaders nor occupied with moralistic attributes about them.

Authoritarianism, as defined by Adorno et al., consists of a number of variables underlying implicit pre-fascist tendencies (2). "Much that psychologically oriented writers have already said about anti-Semitism and about fascism suggests that the deeper psychological sources of these ideologies are very similar" (2, p. 57). In reporting on some personality correlates of anti-Semitism, Frenkel-Brunswik and Sanford have concluded that the most outstanding feature of the anti-Semitic person "seems to be a restricted, narrow personality with a strict conventional superego, to which there is complete surrender" (5, p. 285). In order for such a person to achieve harmony with the parents and with society as a whole, basic impulses have to be kept repressed and can find only devious expressions.

> Thus, anti-Semitism, and generally anti-out-groupism, may have an important function in keeping the personality integrated. Without these channels or outlets (if they should not be provided by society) it may be much more difficult, in some cases impossible, to keep the mental balance. Hence, the rigid and compulsive adherence to prejudices (5, p. 286).

The authors point out that such a type of anti-Semitism might be thought of as "puritanical anti-Semitism" in contrast to the Nazi type of anti-Semitism. However, they also add that the two types of anti-Semitism have much in

common, "primarily they share the authoritarian character, the aggressive undertone, the emphasis on fate, and the externalized superego" (5, p. 286). Sarnoff (19), studying the relationship of certain personality factors to anti-Semitism in a minority group, demonstrated that there were differences between those that were high and those that were low in anti-Semitism. The "highs" had more negative attitudes toward their parents and toward themselves and were less prone to retaliate actively against aggressors than those who were low in anti-Semitism.

Authoritarianism was studied at length by Adorno et al. (2). Here, as in the previous descriptions of the authoritarian character, we have psychoanalytic concepts explained theoretically. However, in addition, a successful attempt was made by the authors to measure and quantify authoritarianism. For such a purpose, an instrument known as the F(ascism) scale was devised to measure personality traits underlying authoritarianism. The variables that make up the F scale may be listed and defined briefly as follows:

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" (2, p. 228).

All of these variables which make up the basic content of the F scale "were thought of as going together to form a single syndrome, a more or less enduring structure in the person that renders him receptive to antidemocratic propaganda" (2, p. 228). The F scale measures prejudice or ethnocentrism without appearing to have this aim and without mentioning the name of any minority group. The F scale was devised to supplement its predecessor, the E scale, a direct measure of ethnocentrism. In this sense, ethnocentrism is considered to be a manifestation of authoritarianism. According to Adorno et al.,

> ethnocentrism is based on a pervasive and rigid ingroup-outgroup distinction; it involves stereotyped negative imagery and hostile attitudes regarding outgroups, stereotyped positive imagery and submissive attitudes regarding ingroups, and a hierarchical, authoritarian view of group interaction in which ingroups are rightly dominant, outgroups subordinate (2, p. 150).

Authoritarian subjects are defined as those who score high on the F scale. Their attitudes toward authority are

clean-cut and definite, they are susceptible to dictatorship, and they are much concerned with conventional rules of society. Frenkel-Brunswik and Sanford point out that it is not the middle-class values *per se* but rather the rigidity with which they are adhered to that is an important factor in anti-Semitism; consequently, "trends which are taboo according to the class standards become repressed, and hence, no longer susceptible to modification or control" (5, p. 289). Such a situation, according to these authors, is most likely to exist where

> parents are too concerned and too insistent with respect to their positive aims for the child and too threatening and coercive with respect to the "bad" things. The child is thus taught to view behavior in terms of black and white, "good" and "evil"; and the "evil" is made to appear so terrible that he cannot think of it as something in himself which needs to be modified or controlled, but as something that exists in other "bad" people and needs to be stamped out completely (5, p. 289).

This rigidity of adhering to middle-class values, which is inherent in the ethnocentric person's solution to social problems, "is not an isolated phenomenon but is rather an aspect of a general rigidity factor which will manifest itself in solving any problem, social or non-social in nature" (17, p. 276).

From the preceding discussion, it is apparent that authoritarianism is related to a particular type of interpersonal relationship within the family and, in a later stage, to the person's ethnocentrism. For example, Adorno

et al. found authoritarianism, as measured by the F scale, to be related to ethnocentrism, as measured by the E scale. They state that "the correlation of .75 between the E and the F scale means that scores on the former may be predicted with fair accuracy from scores on the latter" (2, p. 279). Also, in a study reported by Adelson (1) on minority group authoritarianism, it was further demonstrated that authoritarianism underlies the same variety of attitudes as in the majority groups studied by Adorno et al. and that it also shows its effects among minority groups in the American culture. Adelson states that

> the particular attitudes involved in Jewish authoritarian ideology are genotypically similar to non-Jewish authoritarian attitudes, in the sense that both can be understood with reference to such features of personality organization as authoritarian aggression and submission, the need for dichotomous and invidious distinctions, and so on (1, pp. 484-485).

In a recent study reported by Levinson and Huffman (8), authoritarianism, as measured by the F scale, was found to be related to autocratic family ideology. These authors devised a scale called the Traditional Family Ideology (TFI) Scale, and they found that the democratic-autocratic continuum of family ideology was related to the equalitarian-authoritarian continuum of personality. Also, the authors constructed an abbreviated 12-item TFI scale (8, p. 268), with a test-retest reliability of .93, which correlated significantly with authoritarianism and ethnocentrism in a

manner very much like the initial TFI scale.

These studies reported above centered around the investigation of variables underlying authoritarianism in Western cultures, particularly the U.S.A., and the relationship between this authoritarian syndrome, on the one hand, and family ideology and ethnocentrism (or prejudice), on the other. However, in order for authoritarianism to gain a wider range of applicability as a theory accounting for human behavior (particularly prejudice), it must likewise work for groups in non-Western cultures. Therefore, the main phase of the present research will be concerned with the study of authoritarianism in a relatively non-Western population by investigating the relation of the authoritarian personality to family ideology and to prejudice toward minority groups.

Prejudice has been studied by other psychologists with an orientation different from that involved in the studies previously discussed. Representative of these studies (14, 22, 23) is Sherif's work on intergroup relations and "reference group theory" (23). Prejudice is looked upon as a group norm regulating the relation of the in-group to the out-group. According to Sherif,

> reference groups, which are the groups to which the individual relates himself as a part or aspires to relate himself, serve functionally as major anchorings. In fact, reference groups might just as well be called

> anchoring groups. The individual's directive attitudes, viz., ego-attitudes, which define and regulate his behavior to other persons, other groups, and to an important extent even to himself, are formed in relation to the values and norms of his reference groups. They constitute an important basis of his self-identity, of his sense of belongingness, of the core of his social ties (23, p. 167).

When individuals cease to conform to group situations merely in response to external pressures from the group, i.e., when individuals have internalized group standards or norms, the group becomes a reference group for the individual. According to reference group theory, the norms regulating behavior toward out-groups are primarily determined by the nature of relations between the groups in question. Consequently, in-group democracy, for example, does not necessarily imply democratic dealings with out-groups and their respective members. On the other hand, compelling features of intergroup relations may affect the structure, as well as the norms, of the in-group. Prejudice, or negative intergroup attitudes, does not arise in relation to just any group but in relation to groups whose interests are in conflict with those of the in-group. Such an approach to prejudice is in contrast to the authoritarian personality viewpoint, as previously presented by Maslow and others, in the sense that the latter theory does not consider the choice of the scapegoat group as an important characteristic of the authoritarian personality structure. However, the reference

group theory states that out-groups are held at certain social distances from the in-group depending upon the nature of the functional relations between the in-group and these various out-groups. In other words, the social distances at which various out-groups are held will depend upon whether there is conflict in the interests of the groups in question and, if so, whether the conflict is with major or relatively minor motivations of the in-group. Therefore, the present study will also attempt to test the relative workability of these two theoretical approaches to prejudice in an Arab Near Eastern sample.

Prejudice, according to this reference group theory approach, is not the result of any one single individual's frustrations in his life history. Individual frustrations may be very important in affecting the intensity of an individual's prejudice, but they must be looked upon as a group norm in order to be considered as possible contributive factors to the intensity of personal prejudice. Here, frustration is not a factor in intergroup hostility unless it is seen collectively by the group members as affecting in-group goals and aspirations, with personal frustration having little to do with prejudice (16, 23). From a study of Hindu refugees in India, Ram and Murphy (16) state that

> Hindu refugees who suffered directly at Muslim hands (through loss of property or even through loss of

> family members) seem to harbor no more hostility to Muslims than those who made good their escape without suffering any such personal misfortune (16, p. 14).

This study will also investigate the role of personal adversity, experienced at the hands of certain out-groups, in affecting prejudice toward these out-groups.

Finally, the role of authoritarianism in a case of extreme prejudice toward an out-group will be investigated in this research. It was pointed out by Helfant (7) that when social pressures regarding an attitude are strong, the effect of personality factors is overruled (7, p. 19). Also, Adorno *et al.* state that the individual's contemporary situation could contribute to his expressed politico-economic ideology (2, p. 265). Thus, it may be possible to demonstrate here that authoritarianism will not show its effect in a case of extreme hostility between groups.

The following hypotheses are investigated in the present study:

1. Authoritarianism is significantly related to traditional family ideology.

2. Authoritarianism is significantly related to prejudice toward specific minority out-groups.

3. Personal adversity at the hands of an out-group does not affect the degree of an individual's prejudice toward that out-group.

4. Authoritarianism does not show a significant relationship to prejudice where there is extreme hostility between groups.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE

The sample used in this study consists of 76 foreign Arab students in Oklahoma and Texas, ranging in age from 19 years and 6 months to 29 years, with a mean age of 23 years and 4 months. Of this sample, 23 are Christians, 47 are Moslems, the rest indicated no religious preference or else belonged to a religious sect known as Druze. About 95 percent of this sample consists of undergraduates, all enrolled in various fields of engineering. All subjects are male and single, representing mostly middle and upper-middle classes in their own countries. The majority of the subjects, about 95 percent, come from Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria. Residence in the United States ranges from 6 months to 5 years.

A scale composed of the abbreviated form of the TFI scale (8, p. 268) and items from the F scale (2, pp. 255-257) was administered to all subjects. Correlations from these two subscales will be used to check hypothesis 1, that authoritarianism is related to traditional family ideology. The items from the two subscales were mixed together randomly and administered in the form shown in Appendix I. Item 22

in the F scale, which read "It is best to use some prewar authorities in Germany to keep order and prevent chaos" (2, p. 256), was excluded due to its inapplicability to the present sample. Also, the statement "this country" in items originally numbered 23 and 35 (2, pp. 256 & 257) was changed to read "our countries," as shown in items 14 and 26 (Appendix I). Since item 11 in the TFI scale (8, p. 268), which appears as item 25 in Appendix I, is a duplication of item 27 in the F scale (2, p. 255), it was not duplicated in our F scale. Our final scale had 39 items, including all 12 items from the abbreviated TFI scale, and 27 items from the F scale. Responses on all items were scored on the basis of a 7-point range, with a +3 answer scored as 7, a -3 answer scored as 1, and 4 as the score given for no response. Although the F scale items were mixed in with the TFI items for presentation to the subjects, they were scored separately.

Following the administration of this scale, a revised Bogardus social distance scale (Appendix II) composed of nine statements applying to four non-Arab minority groups in the Near East (Armenians, Kurds, Jews, and Circassians) was administered to all subjects. Social distances toward these minority groups are to be correlated with scores on the F scale in order to test hypothesis 2, that authoritarianism is related to prejudice towards specific out-groups. Some minor changes from the original scale were introduced

in the wording of items 2, 3, and 9 in the Bogardus scale. These changes were from "kin" to "relative," "personal chum in my club" to "personal and close friend," and from "exterminate" to "kill," respectively. Along with this scale was included a question concerning any personal losses that the individual might have suffered at the hands of any of these groups. This question was included to provide information for testing hypothesis 3, that personal adversity at the hands of an out-group has little to do with prejudice towards that group.

Also, the subjects were administered a 20-item Thurstone-type attitude scale (Appendix III) for the assessment of their attitudes toward one specific out-group, namely, Zionists. This is a group towards which there are extreme feelings of hostility on the part of Arabs. Such a group was picked in order to check hypothesis 4, that extreme hostility masks the effects of authoritarianism. Finally, the subjects were asked to fill out a questionnaire (Appendix IV) regarding their general background in an attempt to obtain additional relevant information.

Both the revised Bogardus social distance scale and the Thurstone-type attitude scale were taken from a study reported by Sartain and Bell (20). In this study, 250 college students served as judges and rated 100 statements of the "generalized" variety reflecting opinions toward national or racial groups (without naming any particular group) on a

scale of I to XI, with I representing least favorableness and XI greatest favorableness. For each item the median category of placement and the quartile deviation were calculated. Since the statements were all rated by the same judges, the selection of items that best fitted the sample in this study was justified. Also, regarding the effect of strong negative attitudes on the placement of items in the Thurstone scale, it was pointed out recently in an article by Prothro (15) that Arab students who rated items pertaining to Jews (a specific out-group towards which there exists considerable hostility) did not place the items any nearer the favorable end of the scale than did those who rated the same items with no group specified. Furthermore, it was found in this same study that "the Arab subjects who sorted the same items as had American subjects gave them quite similar scale values" (15, p. 16). Thus, our use of the reported scale values for the revised Bogardus and the Thurstone scales (20) would seem to be justifiable.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The results of this study are mainly summarized in Tables 1 through 6 and are stated in more detail in the sections that follow.

The possible range on the F scale is from 1 to 7, and the range obtained for the sample in this study is from 3.02 to 6.00, with a mean score of 4.76. For the TFI scale, the possible range is also from 1 to 7, and the range obtained for this sample is from 2.25 to 6.33, with a mean score of 4.75. Thus, the two sample means of 4.76 and 4.75, for the F and the TFI scales respectively, indicate that the sample is somewhat above average in authoritarianism and autocratic family ideology.

Authoritarianism, as measured by the F scale, was found to be significantly related to traditional family ideology, as measured by the TFI scale. Table 1 shows a .62 correlation between authoritarianism and family ideology, which is significant beyond the 1% level. This confirms the first hypothesis that family ideology is related to, and is most likely a part of, a larger syndrome of authoritarian

Table 1

Pearsonian Correlations for F Scale with TFI, Bogardus, and Thurstone Scales

	N	r
TFI	76	.62**
Thurstone	75	.14
Bogardus: Total	74	.08
Armenians	74	-.04
Kurds	74	-.01
Jews	74	.23*
Circassians	74	.03

*Significant at the 5% level
**Significant at the 1% level

ideology.

However, concerning the expected relationship between authoritarianism and prejudice (or social distance) toward minority groups, as stated in the second hypothesis, only partial substantiation was obtained. As may be seen from Table 1, no significant relation was found between authoritarianism and social distance (Bogardus scale) toward the four minority groups taken together. However, when authoritarianism was correlated with social distance toward each of the four minority groups separately, it was found to be significantly related to prejudice toward Jews but not

to prejudice toward Armenians, Kurds, or Circassians.

Since the sample in this study consists of both Christians and Moslems, it was speculated that the religious factor could have contributed to the low correlations between authoritarianism and prejudice toward Armenians, Kurds, and Circassians. All the subjects presumably knew that Armenians are predominantly Christians, while Kurds and Circassians are predominantly Moslems. Accordingly, correlation coefficients were computed between authoritarianism and social distance scores toward each of the four minority groups, for both Christians and Moslems separately. Again, as may be seen from Table 2, authoritarianism did not correlate significantly with prejudice toward any of the four minority groups. However, there is a positive, though insignificant, correlation between authoritarianism and prejudice toward Jews in the case of both Christian and Moslem subjects.

Table 2

Pearsonian Correlations for Christian and Moslem Subjects on the F Scale with Social Distance toward Each of the Four Minority Groups in the Bogardus Scale

	N	Armenians	Kurds	Circassians	Jews
F (Christians)	22	-.12	.08	.05	.13
F (Moslems)	47	-.08	-.01	-.01	.20

These results indicate that authoritarianism and prejudice towards non-Jewish minority groups are not related. This contrasts sharply with the findings of previous investigators. There is, however, the possibility that our sample was reacting to these minority groups in terms of their own religious group membership more than in terms of authoritarianism. If this were true, there would be no significant correlation between F scale scores and social distance scores, but there might be significant differences between social distance scores assigned to the three non-Jewish minority groups. In particular, we might expect the Moslem subjects to assign more favorable scores to the Kurds and Circassians (both predominantly Moslem groups) than to Armenians (a Christian group), while the Christian subjects would assign more favorable scores to the Armenians. Table 3

Table 3

Mean Social Distances for Christians, Moslems, and "Others" toward Each of the Four Minority Groups in the Bogardus Scale

	N	Armenians	Kurds	Circassians	Jews
Christians	22	8.92	7.38	7.67	4.30
Moslems	47	7.93	8.23	8.16	3.40
"Others"[a]	5	10.31	9.22	7.55	5.53

[a]"Others" refers to those subjects who did not indicate any religious preference or else belonged to a religious sect known as Druze.

shows the mean social distances toward all four minority groups for Christian and Moslem subjects in the sample, as well as for those subjects ("Others") who indicated no religious preference or else belonged to a religious sect known as Druze. In order to test whether our subjects were reacting differently to the minority groups in accordance with their own religious group membership, an analysis of variance was computed. Table 4 shows that the different religious subject groups in our sample could be considered as a homogeneous population, since there were no significant differences in the way they reacted to these minority groups.

Table 4

Summary of Analysis of Variance of Social Distance Scores

	ss	df	S^2	F	P
Total	3596.58	295			
Gross individual differences	1166.71	73			
Subject group	24.84	2	12.42	0.77	NS
Net individual differences	1141.87	71	16.08		
Gross paired scored differences	2429.87	222			
Minority group	980.57	3	326.85	49.90	.001
Subject group x Minority group	53.16	6	8.86	1.35	NS
Net paired scored differences	1396.14	213	6.55		

In other words, the subjects' religion in our sample did not have any significant relation to the amount of social distance at which they held each of the four minority groups. Consequently, *t* tests were computed for the entire sample to test the significance of the difference between mean social distances assigned to each of the four minority groups. As may be seen from Table 5, the subjects' attitudes toward Jews were consistently and significantly less favorable than towards any of the other three minority groups. However, there were no significant differences found between the subjects' mean social distances for Armenians, Kurds, and Circassians. Thus, it appears that religious group membership in our sample has nothing to do with prejudice towards minority groups.

Table 5

t Tests of Differences in Mean Social Distance Scores Assigned by Subjects (N = 74) to Each of the Four Minority Groups in the Bogardus Scale

	Kurds	Circassians	Jews
Armenians	0.797	0.980	10.54**
Kurds		0.183	9.75**
Circassians			9.56**

**Significant at the 1% level

In order to test the third hypothesis, a Chi-square was computed to determine whether personal loss at the hands of any one of the four minority groups would result in more hostility toward the particular out-group. Of all four minority groups, the Jews are the one out-group at the hands of which 40 percent of the subjects in this sample had suffered personal losses. However, the obtained Chi-square of 2.25, evaluated at 1 df, shows that personal loss or frustration at the hands of an out-group does not necessarily increase hostility toward that out-group more than is evinced by other in-group members who did not suffer any losses.

The fourth and last hypothesis, which states that authoritarianism will not show its effect in a case of extreme hostility towards an out-group such as Zionists, was confirmed by a non-significant correlation of .14 (Table 1) between authoritarianism, as measured by the F scale, and attitude toward Zionists, as measured by the Thurstone scale. However, beyond such a result, there appear to be some inconsistencies in the answers to items on the Thurstone scale which seem to have some pertinent relations to our study. The percentage of subjects checking each of the items on the Thurstone scale is presented in Table 6, which will be discussed more thoroughly in later sections.

Table 6

Percent of Subjects Checking Each Item on the Thurstone Scale

Item Number	Percent of Subjects
1	61
2	49
3	79
4	64
5	61
6	48
7	34
8	41
9	48
10	12
11	12
12	10
13	10
14	13
15	16
16	16
17	12
18	2
19	1
20	1

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The hypothesis that authoritarianism is significantly related to traditional family ideology was confirmed in this study (Table 1). Such a result was reported earlier by Levinson and Huffman (8) who found a .73 correlation between authoritarianism and traditional family ideology. Our finding paralleled that of Levinson and Huffman and demonstrated for the first time the existence of such a correlation in a relatively non-Western sample. That authoritarianism has been found to relate significantly to traditional family ideology in a culture different from that of previously reported studies gives wider support to the theory that the individual's convictions concerning family situations are an expression of deep-lying trends in his personality.

After investigating the role of authoritarianism in various groups in the American culture, Adorno *et al.* pose the following question:

> If . . . failure in superego integration, inability to establish emotional relationships with others, and overcompensatory reactions to weakness and passivity are among the important sources of potentially fascist trends within the personality, should we not expect that a

> group of prison inmates would score particularly high on our scales? (2, p. 817).

In fact, Adorno et al. reported that the over-all group mean for prison inmates on the F scale was 4.73, "the highest mean obtained for any group studied" (2, p. 844). In comparing the over-all group mean for the sample in this study, 4.76, to that reported by Adorno et al. for prison inmates, it is clear that our subjects have a group mean that is even higher than Adorno's prison inmates. Whatever the meaning of this high F scale score in relation to potential criminality, it is clear that our subjects are extremely authoritarian as judged by the standards of the American culture, a fact which needs some consideration. Since there is no obvious reason to suspect criminal potentiality in our group of subjects, it might be well to look at some of the ways in which the cultural background of our subjects differs from that of the subjects in previous studies.

In a study reported by Christie and Garcia (3), authoritarianism was studied in two different cultural settings in the United States and was found to vary even within the same socio-economic classes. The authors state that "residence in a relatively authoritarian subculture leads to a significantly greater acceptance of authoritarian ideology" (3, p. 469). Thus, it might very well be that high authoritarianism in the present sample is a cultural manifestation of an "authoritarian" type of society. In a manner

similar to the German culture as described by Schaffner, the culture of the Arab Near East defines the roles and status of most of its members in accordance with their age, sex, position in the family, religion, family background, etc. Older people are to be always respected and revered for, as an Arabic proverb goes, "Older by a day, wiser by a year." The position and place of women is secondary to that of men and is conceived to be primarily in the home. The economic dependence of the wife on her husband contributes greatly to her subordination to the latter's wishes and demands. Such a situation applies also in the case of children who are usually dependent on the father for support up to their adulthood. In other words, the Arab family may best be described as a patriarchal type of family. The eldest child in the family, especially if he happens to be a boy, holds a privileged position next to that of the parents. The father, from now on, is not called by his first nor by his last name by people who know him. Now that he has a son, John, he is called the "father of John," and the mother is referred to as the "mother of John." The eldest son, and only the eldest son, has the privilege to name his first-born son by the first name of his father. However, besides this importance given to the eldest son in various family matters, he is also burdened with many responsibilities toward his parents and his siblings. He could represent the family in the absence of his father, and he must keep up the good name of

the family. As for his siblings, he is quite often held responsible for wrongs committed by them. The parents feel that he should set a good example for the other siblings to follow and, once in a while, one could hear the parents uttering an Arabic proverb which says "The crooked furrow is from the bigger bull." Religion is an important factor in intimate inter-personal relations. For example, it plays a determining role in a man's choice of wife. More than that, election to parliament, especially in the republic of Lebanon, is proportional to the size of the different religious group memberships in various districts of the country.

Such factors in the Arab Near Eastern culture, which is full of various social taboos and predetermined roles, could have contributed greatly to the high authoritarianism found in the present sample. Furthermore, the same factors may equally well have contributed to high autocratic family ideology. For example, items 6, 9, 13, and 19 in the TFI scale (Appendix I) are all concerned with attitude toward women and their role in family and society. The role is fixed by cultural norms which make it mandatory and virtuous for a wife to obey her husband and be subordinate to him. Pre-marital sexual relations are very much frowned upon, and a woman's virginity before her marriage is an essential and all-important requirement. It would seem clear that the Arab culture, from which our subjects were drawn, is likely

to produce strong authoritarian ideology. The norms used in the United States, then, would not apply to Arabs. Likewise, the relationship of other variables to authoritarianism can be extrapolated into an Arab culture only with a great deal of caution. It is noteworthy that even among this very authoritarian group there is still a significant relation between authoritarianism and traditional family ideology. This should lend support to previous studies which have demonstrated a relationship between autocratic family ideology and authoritarianism at more moderate levels.

In accordance with the second hypothesis of this study, it was expected that authoritarianism would relate significantly to prejudice toward minority groups, as measured by a revised Bogardus social distance scale (Appendix II). However, because of the extremely authoritarian ideology of our group of subjects, we must be alert for a breakdown of the relationship detected by other investigators at more moderate levels. Prejudice is used here in the following sense: "The negative characteristic of attitudes of prejudice is revealed in the social distance at which the members of a prejudiced group hold another group and its members" (23, p. 78). Adorno et al. have reported a correlation of .75 between authoritarianism and ethnocentrism, the latter being measured by an E(thnocentrism) scale concerning attitudes toward Jews, Negroes, and other minorities and towards patriotism (2, p. 142). Such an E scale could

not be used with the present sample simply because it was constructed to apply in a culture with certain specific minority groups and with certain roles that are quite different from those which exist in the Arab Near East. As a result, a Bogardus-type social distance scale was used. As was stated previously, the expected relationship between authoritarianism and prejudice toward minority groups was not found in this study. Authoritarianism was found to be significantly related only to prejudice toward Jews but showed no significant relationship to prejudice toward Armènians, Kurds, and Circassians (Table 1). Furthermore, no significant relation was found between authoritarianism and prejudice toward all four minority groups taken together. Such a finding is at variance with results reported by Adorno et al. and other researchers in the field (2, 5, 8, 9, 11, 19). The problem here is that authoritarianism was found to be related to prejudice toward Jews but not to prejudice toward Armenians, Kurds, or Circassians. Thus, difference in religion within the sample was suspected as a factor in causing the low correlations, and so the sample was divided into a Christian and a Moslem sub-group. However, there still was no significant relation obtained between authoritarianism and prejudice toward any of these three minority groups for either the Christian or the Moslem subjects. The fact that the relationship became insignificant for prejudice towards Jews when the subject group was split into Christians and

Moslems is probably a statistical artifact resulting from a reduction in the size of the sample.

As was mentioned earlier, Armenians are predominantly Christians while Kurds and Circassians are predominantly Moslems. Thus, it could have been that the subjects in this sample were reacting to these groups mainly in terms of religion and in accordance with the subject's own religious affiliation. However, an analysis of variance (Table 4) showed that the subjects in this sample reacted homogeneously to all four minority groups regardless of which religion they belonged to. In other words, the subjects' religion, whether Christians or Moslems, did not affect their social distances toward these minority groups. About twenty years ago the greatest social distance toward out-groups in the Arab Near East was found to exist in relation to the religious groupings (4). However, the new spirit of nationalism among the Arabs has possibly rendered "Arabism" into a more potent reference group for most Arabs. About one-third of our sample indicated spontaneously that they are for Arab unity and that they will join any political party which will help accomplish this purpose. It is most likely that if the subjects were asked to express their opinions regarding Arab unity, the majority of them would have supported this notion wholeheartedly regardless to which religion they belonged. In short, "Arabism" may be considered as a reference group for this sample and, as a result, the prejudice

held by these subjects toward various out-groups could probably be explained better by the kind of functional relations that exist between them and the out-groups in question on the basis of "Arabism" rather than on a religious basis.

Out of the preceding discussion concerning the second hypothesis of this study, one point comes into the foreground. It seems that the choice of a scapegoat is more important than made to appear by Maslow and others in their discussion of authoritarianism. Maslow has stated in his discussion of the authoritarian character, and in accordance with earlier and later writings on authoritarianism, that hatred for a scapegoat is an important characteristic of the authoritarian but that the choice of the scapegoat has no general significance. Evidently, such a characterization did not reveal itself in this study. Though the degree of authoritarianism was quite high for the sample as a whole, the subjects maintained a more or less favorable attitude toward Armenians, Kurds, and Circassians, while their attitudes toward Jews were found to be significantly less favorable (Table 5). Relevant here is one question posed by Zawadski (24) as to "Why, sometimes, a certain minority group is selected to pick on where there are several to choose from?" (24, p. 132). Why did the subjects in this sample, regardless of whether they were Christians or Moslems, react to Jews, but not to the other three minority groups, in a quite unfavorable fashion? To account for such a result, answers could be

sought from both authoritarianism and reference group theory.

One answer comes from the differing functional relations existing between Arabs and the various minority groups. Ever since the Balfour Declaration in 1917, which promised the Jews a national home in Palestine, the Arabs have been crying "Down with the Balfour Declaration." Hostility between the two groups mounted over the years till it culminated in the Arab-Israeli war in 1948. Even now, eight years after the establishment of the state of Israel, the two groups are still technically at war with each other, and every now and then sporadic acts of aggression are committed along the borders. On the other hand, the relations between Arabs and Armenians, Kurds, and Circassians have been friendly throughout the years, or at least not antagonistic. Consequently, our results on social distance could be explained in terms of the functional relations between Arabs and these different minority groups.

There is, however, another possible explanation. One of the characteristics of the authoritarian personality is a strong tendency to dichotomize values. Thus, we might expect such an individual to have difficulty in spreading several minority groups along a continuum. He would be much more likely to divide the groups into two categories, one towards one end of the continuum and the other towards the other end. If our Arab subjects are authoritarian in this way, then, we might expect them to pick that group towards

which they have the greatest hostility (Jews) and put them at one end of the scale and then lump all other groups into a "non-Jewish" group and place them towards the other end of the scale. We might hypothesize that if only non-Jewish minority groups had been listed in the scale, more distinct separation of those groups might appear.

Our third hypothesis that personal adversity or suffering contributes little to the individual's attitude toward the out-group was confirmed. This result is in accordance with what Ram and Murphy found in their study of Indian refugees in India. A question may be raised concerning the importance of individual frustrations in intergroup hostility. It might best be said that for Arabs, regardless of whether they suffered at the hands of the Jews or not and regardless of whether they are Christian or Moslem Arabs, the Jews form a specific out-group toward which there are negative feelings in accordance with the relations between the two groups.

Such negative feelings exist more intensely when they are directed toward an even more specific out-group, Zionists, regardless of the individual's authoritarianism score. This is evident from the substantiation of the fourth hypothesis of this study. Here, the correlation which existed between authoritarianism and prejudice toward Jews becomes insignificant when authoritarianism is correlated with attitude toward Zionists. Concerning the effect of social pressures on a person's attitude, Helfant said that

"when social pressures with regard to an attitude are strong, the effect of personality factors is overruled" (7, p. 19). The social pressures in this context may be looked upon as the group norms regulating the attitude of in-group members towards the out-group. The "range of tolerable behavior" toward Zionists is so narrow that little is allowed for deviation from what is prescribed by in-group norms and interests. Consequently, authoritarianism does not relate significantly to attitude toward Zionists and its effect, if any, is overruled by social factors which have great weight in the determination of intergroup relations.

Finally, in addition to the confirmation of the fourth hypothesis of this study, it might be worthwhile to analyze the subjects' responses to individual items on the Thurstone scale. Table 6 shows the percentage of subjects who checked (agreed with) each of the items of the Thurstone scale (Appendix III). The items checked by more than 60 percent of the subjects are 1, 3, 4, and 5. These items deal respectively with the extermination of all Zionists, the exclusion of all Zionists from one's country, prohibiting Zionists from owning property, and finally prohibiting them from voting. As may be easily deduced, the last three items are considered by Arabs as contributive factors to the existence of the new state of Israel. "Voting" in this context was most probably interpreted with reference to Jewish-Zionist votes in this country which pressured the United

States government into supporting the Partition Resolution of Palestine in the United Nations. In contrast to 61 percent of the subjects who checked item 1 on the Thurstone scale, only 10 percent checked item 9 for Jews on the Bogardus scale which says "I would kill all members of this group." The discrepancy would seem to indicate that, on the whole, the subjects in this sample differentiated between Jews and Zionists and did not consider the two interchangeable. Again, in contrast to a mean social distance of 3.85 toward Jews, the sample had a less favorable mean social distance of 2.83 toward Zionists. However, it should be pointed out here that these two mean social distances were computed from different scales. The former is a mean of the scale values for statements assigned by all subjects to Jews on the Bogardus scale. While, on the other hand, the latter is a mean of the median scale values for statements checked by the subjects for Zionists on the Thurstone scale. However, in their original form (20) these two scales were equated. Nevertheless, the over-all differentiation between Zionists and Jews raises doubts even more forcefully about the role of authoritarianism in the determination of prejudice and points to the importance of social factors. It might be said here, along with Lindzey (10), that "displacement accompanied by the frustration-aggression process may be an important factor in the development of prejudice in individual cases. However, as a general explanation of

prejudice it appears to have serious limitations" (10, p. 309).

Among the subjects who indicated that they would like to exterminate all Zionists, 34 percent did not check item 2 which requires their participation in mob violence against Zionists. The reason for such an inconsistency was expressed by some of the subjects who remarked that mob violence is not fitting for an educated person, or else that they did not believe in it! The percentage of subjects checking items 6, 7, 8, and 9, as well as item 2, dropped to below 50 percent, especially in the case of item 7. All these items, with the exception of item 2 which was already discussed, deal with "discrimination" and, as such, are probably unacceptable to almost half of the sample. Item 7 which would exclude Zionists from first-class hotels seems especially objectionable because, in the words of some of the subjects, "it means treating them like Americans do to Negroes in this country!"

Of items 10 through 20, the highest percentage was for items 15 and 16 which were checked by 16 percent of the sample. Even though this percentage is low and may not have any particular importance, yet it might be a result of cultural factors in the case of item 16 which says "I would invite a Zionist to my home for luncheon or dinner." Arabic literature is full of stories on Arab hospitality, even to enemies, and this might have some relation to the result

obtained on this item. The present writer could not explain the relatively large number of subjects checking item 15 which says "I would permit my child to play with Zionist children."

In summary, it might be stated that authoritarianism was found wanting as a theory for the general explanation of prejudice. Situational and functional factors have to be taken into consideration whenever prejudice between groups is concerned. Our results on social distance could have been predicted on the basis of the kind of functional relations between Arabs and the various minority groups studied. This raises doubt concerning authoritarianism as a theory capable of encompassing all the facts on social distance or prejudice.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the relationship of authoritarianism to traditional family ideology and to prejudice (social distance) toward minority groups in a relatively non-Western sample. Also, the role of authoritarianism in intense negative intergroup relations as well as the function of personal adversity in prejudice toward out-groups were investigated in this research.

The sample used in this study consisted of 76 male foreign Arab students in Oklahoma and Texas, the majority of whom are engineering undergraduates, representing middle and upper-middle classes in their own countries. Twenty-three subjects in this sample were Christians and 47 were Moslems.

All subjects were administered a slightly modified form of the F scale, as a measure of authoritarianism, and the TFI scale, as a measure of traditional family ideology. A revised Bogardus social distance scale composed of nine statements and applying to four minority groups in the Arab World (Armenians, Kurds, Jews and Circassians) was administered as an index of prejudice or social distance. Also,

the subjects were asked to indicate if they had suffered any personal losses at the hands of any of these four minority groups. To measure attitude toward one specific out-group, Zionists, a 20-item Thurstone scale was used. Finally, the subjects were asked to fill out a questionnaire supplying information about their background.

The results confirmed the first hypothesis that authoritarianism was significantly related to traditional family ideology. However, concerning the second hypothesis of this study, authoritarianism was found to be significantly related only to prejudice toward Jews, but did not show significant relationship to prejudice toward Armenians, Kurds, or Circassians. Since Armenians are known to be predominantly Moslems, correlations were computed between authoritarianism and prejudice toward these minority groups for Christians and Moslems separately. However, the results still did not show any significant correlations. An analysis of variance showed that the subjects in this sample, regardless of their religious group membership were reacting consistently in an unfavorable manner toward Jews while maintaining a favorable social distance toward all of the other three minority groups. Explanations here were made in terms of the nature of functional relations between Arabs and these groups, as well as in terms of the authoritarian's general tendency to dichotomize values.

The third hypothesis of this study was verified

since it was found that personal loss at the hands of an out-group does not necessarily increase hostility toward that out-group more than is revealed by other in-group members who did not suffer any such losses. Finally, in accordance with the fourth hypothesis, authoritarianism did not relate significantly to attitude toward an extreme out-group, Zionists. Again, explanations here were made in terms of the kind of relations that exist between the two groups. The effect of personality factors was thought to be reduced here in the face of strong social pressures and conformity to in-group norms which define a negative attitude toward Zionists regardless of differences in authoritarianism among the subjects.

REFERENCES

1. Adelson, J. A study of minority group authoritarianism. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1953, 48, 477-485.

2. Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, Else, Levinson, D. J., and Sanford, R. N. The authoritarian personality. N. Y.: Harper & Brothers, 1950.

3. Christie, R., and Garcia, J. Subcultural variation in authoritarian personality. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1951, 46, 457-469.

4. Dodd, S. C. A social distance test in the Near East. Amer. J. Sociol., 1935, 41, 194-204.

5. Frenkel-Brunswik, Else, and Sanford, R. N. Some personality correlates of anti-Semitism. J. Psychol., 1945, 20, 271-291.

6. Fromm, E. Escape from freedom. N. Y.: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1941.

7. Helfant, K. Parents' attitudes vs. adolescent hostility in the determination of adolescents' sociopolitical attitudes. Psychol. Monogr., 1952, 66, Whole No. 13.

8. Levinson, D. J., and Huffman, P. E. Traditional family ideology and its relation to personality. J. Pers., 1955, 23, 251-273.

9. Levinson, D. J., and Sanford, R. N. A scale for the measurement of anti-Semitism. J. Psychol., 1944, 17, 339-370.

10. Lindzey, G. An experimental examination of the scapegoat theory of prejudice. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1950, 45, 296-309.

11. Lyle, W. H., and Levitt, E. E. Punitiveness, authoritarianism, and parental discipline of grade school children. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1955, 51, 42-46.

12. Maslow, A. H. The authoritarian character structure. J. soc. Psychol., 1943, 18, 401-411.

13. Mead, M. And keep your powder dry. N.Y.: William Morrow & Co., 1943.

14. Newcomb, T. M. Social psychology. N.Y.: Dryden, 1950.

15. Prothro, E. T. The effect of strong negative attitudes on the placement of items in a Thurstone scale. J. soc. Psychol., 1955, 41, 11-17.

16. Ram, P., and Murphy, G. Recent investigations of Hindu-Muslim relations in India. Hum. Organiz., 1952, 11, 13-16.

17. Rokeach, M. Generalized mental rigidity as a factor in ethnocentrism. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1948, 43, 259-278.

18. Sanford, F. H. Authoritarianism and leadership. Philadelphia: Stephenson-Brothers, 1950.

19. Sarnoff, I. Identification with the aggressor: some personality correlates of anti-Semitism among Jews. J. Pers., 1951-52, 20, 199-218.

20. Sartain, A. Q., and Bell, H. V. An evaluation of the Bogardus scale of social distance by the method of equal appearing intervals. J. soc. Psychol., 1949, 29, 85-91.

21. Schaffner, B. Father land. N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1948.

22. Sherif, M., and Cantril, H. The psychology of ego-involvements. N.Y.: Wiley, 1947.

23. Sherif, M., and Sherif, C. W. Groups in harmony and tension. N.Y.: Harper & Brothers, 1953.

24. Zawadski, B. Limitations of the scapegoat theory of prejudice. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1948, 43, 127-141.

APPENDIX I

Combined F and TFI Scales

We are trying to find out what the student thinks and feels about a number of important social questions and family situations. The best answer to each statement below is <u>your personal opinion</u>. We have tried to cover many different points of view. You may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about still others. Whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many other people feel the same way you do.

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

+1: I agree a little	-1: I disagree a little
+2: I agree pretty much	-2: I disagree pretty much
+3: I agree very much	-3: I disagree very much

___ 1. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.

___ 2. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.

___ 3. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.

___ 4. The facts on crime and sexual immorality show that we will have to crack down harder on young people if we are going to save our moral standards.

___ 5. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.

___ 6. It is somehow unnatural to place women in positions of authority over men.

___ 7. 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.

___ 8. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.

___ 9. Some equality in marriage is a good thing, but by and large the husband ought to have the main say-so in family matters.

___10. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places.

___11. 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.

___12. An insult to our honor should always be punished.

___13. A man should not be expected to have respect for a woman if they have sexual relations before they are married.

___14. What our countries need most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.

___15. The most important qualities of a real man are determination and driving ambition.

___16. Sex crimes, such as rapes and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.

___17. If children are told much about sex, they are likely to go too far in experimenting with it.

___18. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.

___19. Women who want to remove the word <u>obey</u> from the marriage service don't understand what it means to be a wife.

___20. Some day it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.

___21. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.

___22. A woman whose children are at all messy or rowdy has failed in her duties as a mother.

___23. Wars and social troubles may someday be ended by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world.

___24. Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked, and feebleminded people.

___25. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

___26. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in our countries, even in places where people might least expect it.

___27. The family is a sacred institution, divinely ordained.

___28. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.

___29. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.

___30. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

___31. If a child is unusual in any way, his parents should get him to be more like other children.

___32. The business man and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.

___33. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.

___34. A child should never be allowed to talk back to his parents, or else he will lose respect for them.

___35. Familiarity breeds contempt.

___36. Nobody ever learned anything really important except through suffering.

___37. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.

___38. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.

___39. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.

APPENDIX II

Bogardus Social Distance Scale

I. We are trying to find out how the Arab student in the U.S.A. feels toward a number of different cultural-racial groups. These groups are as follows:

____ A. Armenians

____ B. Kurds

____ C. Jews

____ D. Circassians

For each of the above four groups, choose one of the following statements which <u>best</u> expresses your feeling by writing the <u>number</u> of the statement you chose in the blank provided to the left of the corresponding group:

<u>P50</u>	<u>Q</u>		
10.95	.23	1.	I would accept a member of this group as my wife.
10.56	.66	2.	I would accept a member of this group as close relative by marriage.
9.91	.72	3.	I would accept a member of this group as a personal and close friend.
8.79	.76	4.	I would accept a member of this group as one of my business friends.
6.97	.78	5.	I would accept a member of this group as a house servant.
4.25	.74	6.	I would grant citizenship only to members of this group who adopt our customs and mores.

3.25	.84	7.	I would eliminate members of this group from my neighborhood by zoning laws.
1.29	.42	8.	I would exclude all members of this group from my country.
1.01	.26	9.	I would kill all members of this group.

II. Have you suffered any financial or other personal losses (loss of property or lives) at the hands of any of the above four groups? _____ If yes, please explain below as fully as you wish the losses you suffered and the group (or groups) responsible for these losses (Use back page if necessary).

APPENDIX III

Thurstone Scale

The following is a number of statements concerning Zionists. Please put a circle around the number in front of each statement that you agree with or that comes closest to your own opinion:

P50	Q		
1.01	.26	1.	I would exterminate all Zionists.
1.19	.40	2.	I would participate in mob violence against Zionists.
1.29	.42	3.	I would exclude all Zionists from my country.
2.10	.80	4.	I would prohibit Zionists from owning property.
2.15	.84	5.	I would prohibit Zionists from voting.
2.50	.86	6.	I would prohibit Zionists from attending our universities and colleges.
3.33	.91	7.	I would exclude Zionists from first-class hotels.
3.40	.88	8.	I would confine the residence of Zionists to certain districts or sections.
3.75	.96	9.	I would prohibit a Zionist from becoming a member of my athletic or country club.
7.13	.82	10.	I would rent property from a Zionist.
7.26	.98	11.	I would accept a Zionist as one of my speaking acquaintances.

7.62	.80	12.	I would allow Zionists to assist me as salespeople.
8.02	.96	13.	I would accept a Zionist as a partner in an outdoor sport.
8.40	.86	14.	I would accept Zionists to my street as neighbors.
9.12	.92	15.	I would permit my child to play with Zionist children.
9.41	.78	16.	I would invite a Zionist to my home for luncheon or dinner.
10.09	.76	17.	I would accept a Zionist as a roommate.
10.52	.65	18.	I would accept a Zionist as an intimate friend.
10.56	.66	19.	I would accept a Zionist as close kin by marriage.
10.95	.28	20.	I would accept a Zionist as my wife.

APPENDIX IV

Background Questionnaire

This is a brief questionnaire regarding your socio-cultural background. This individual information is necessary in order to evaluate the group as a whole. Your identity is not needed for this study, and so don't write your name down.

1. Birth date_____ Religion_____

   Class in college_____ Major_____

   Married or single_____ Father's occupation_____

   City and state of birth_____

2. What is your father's religion?_____;

   mother's religion?_____

3. Are both of your parents Arabs?_____;

   if not, what are they?_____

4. Is your family looked upon as belonging to low, lower-middle, middle, upper-middle, or upper class families?

   _____

5. What is your nationality?_____

6. Did your family live in Palestine shortly before 1948?__

   _____

7. Do you belong to any political party?_____; if yes, which one and what is its purpose?_____

   _____

In case you don't belong to any party now, which one would you like to join in the future and why?_____

_____

_____

8. How long have you been in the U.S.A. (years and months)?

_____

9. Are you going back to your home country after you finish your studies in the U.S.A.?_____

10. If you have any additional remarks to make on any of the above questions, please do so in the space below (Use back page if necessary).

_____