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PREFACE

This volume, as was the case with its two predecessors, is intended as a basic empirical reference work in the social sciences. We expect it to be of use to three different audiences:

1) Researchers actively involved in social research, especially those carrying out survey work in psychology, sociology, and political science.

2) Students taking course work in research methods who may be interested in gaining familiarity with the tools of social scientists.

3) Non-researchers in relevant content areas, such as social commentators, political analysts, and journalists.

The aim of these volumes has been to include a complete list of relevant empirical instruments for a number of important attitude areas, the actual items in these scales along with scoring instructions, and a comprehensive assessment of their strengths and weaknesses. Also, the hope has been that the form of presentation of this work would help the reader to make his own judgments about the state-of-the-art in social research. The advanced scholar might well conclude that we have been only partially successful in achieving these goals. Yet, the important thing is that these goals be made concrete, and emphasized and, as a result, serve as guidelines for the improvement of future attitude research.

The bulk of this work was supported by grant MH 10809-02 from the United States Public Health Service. However, had it not been for the generous extra support from the Inter-university Consortium for Political Research, and especially Professor Warren Miller, these volumes would not have been completed. The Survey Research Center kindly agreed to underwrite the cost of their publication.
We also wish to express our appreciation to Dr. Jeanne Knutson of the Stanford University Institute of Political Studies, who provided us with invaluable leads to attitude scales we had overlooked. We are especially indebted to Eileen Marchak, Virginia Nye, and Karin Klue for their patient typing and retyping of unreadable manuscripts. We are also grateful to Robert Krull, Barbara Surovell, Douglas Truax, William Haney, Christine Linder, and Betsy Carroll for their contributions and editing skills.

Finally, we would like to thank the authors of the scales included in this monograph. All of those located so far have kindly given permission to reprint their scale items, and many have offered useful supplementary information and references.

August 1969

John P. Robinson

Phillip R. Shaver
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CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

Background

The inspiration for these handbooks came from the pioneer efforts of Professor Robert Lane, a political scientist at Yale University. Professor Lane was disturbed, as many social scientists still are today, at the proliferation of empirical instruments in fields related to his area of interest. In the summer of 1958, he attempted to pull together those scales that would be of value to researchers in the field of political behavior, whose interests range from personality characteristics (e.g., neuroticism, authoritarianism) to occupational background (e.g., job satisfaction or status) to political attitudes (e.g., internationalism, conservatism). While Professor Lane was able initially to interest the National Institutes of Health to continue this research, previous commitments on his time prevented him from pursuing it further. Subsequently, the availability of personnel at the Survey Research Center ensured that this valuable work would be continued under the general supervision of Professor Philip Converse.

There exist, of course, many cogent reasons for such an undertaking. Empirical instruments are likely to appear under surprising book titles, in any one of 15 social science journals (and may appear in 20 others), in seldom circulated dissertations, or from commercial publishers, as well as in the long undisturbed piles of manuscripts in the offices of social scientists. Surely this grapevine of information is inefficient for the interested researcher. One must stay in the same area of interest on a continuing basis for several years (and not enough social scientists can)
to become aware of the empirical literature and instruments available. Often, the interdisciplinary investigator is interested in the relation of some variable, which he has heard of only casually, to his favorite area of interest. His job of combing the literature to pick a proper instrument consumes needlessly long hours that often end only in a frustrating decision to forego measuring this or that characteristic. Worse still, he may resort to devising his own measure rapidly and adding to the already burdensome number of inadequately conceived instruments. In our search through the literature we found an unfortunate amount of replication of previous discoveries as well as an unawareness of related (and often better) research done in the same area.

Our searching procedure took us back through the earliest issues of Psychological Abstracts as well as the printed history through 1966 of the most likely periodical sources of psychological instruments (Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Journal of Social Psychology, and the Journal of Applied Psychology) and sociological or political measures (Sociometry, American Sociological Review, Public Opinion Quarterly, and the American Political Science Review). Doctoral dissertations were combed by examining back issues of Dissertation Abstracts and we are grateful to University Microfilms of Ann Arbor for providing us with pertinent dissertations. Still, not all universities belong to this service; Harvard notably is not a member. Dissertation Abstracts is also relatively recent. Contact with the large variety of empirical research being done at the University of Michigan opened new leads and widened our search, as did conversations with researchers we were able to contact at the 1965 and 1966 annual meetings of the American Sociological Association and the American Psychological Association. These meetings also served to bring
a number of other empirical instruments to our attention. Finally, Dr. Jeanne Knutson of Stanford University reviewed a preliminary list of scales that we had assembled and directed us to a number of instruments that had eluded our search.

Our focus in the project has been in compiling attitude scales (that is, series of items that are homogeneous in content) which are useful in a survey research rather than a laboratory setting. We have not attempted the gigantic and perhaps hopeless task of compiling single attitude items, which often tap important variables for purposes of analysis, but for which a complete compilation is well beyond the scope of our project. We have made three major (and occasional minor) exceptions to this rule: questions that have been used in the Survey Research Center election studies (see Chapter 13 of our main volume, Measures of Political Attitudes), single questions of job satisfaction (in Measures of Occupational Attitudes), and measures of life satisfaction and happiness (Chapter 2 of this volume).

There is one very substantial body of attitude literature that we have largely chosen to ignore—that centered around the application of Osgood's Semantic Differential. An exhaustive bibliography of research applications of this technique, in all attitude areas, is given in Snider and Osgood (1968).

Although we attempted to be as thorough as possible in our searching procedure, we can make no claim that this volume contains every scale pertaining to our chapter headings. We feel confident however that we have brought attention to the vast majority of higher-quality instruments available.
Contents of This Volume

A brief outline of the contents of the 10 chapters of this handbook may prove helpful to the reader. The remainder of this introductory chapter lays out in brief detail the contents of each chapter and concludes with a review of some important research areas that we unfortunately could not cover in this volume.

In Chapter 2, John Robinson reviews survey evidence on the correlates of (single questions about) life satisfaction and happiness in the general public. He finds a number of constant relationships holding in this attitude area—percentages of the population reporting themselves as dissatisfied, the high stability of such reports among individuals, and the consistent correlations obtained with background variables (particularly marital status and income). Especially important is the consistency with which persons expressing satisfaction with their way of life also manifest attitudes related to other topics covered in this volume, namely high self-esteem, low alienation, and high trust of people. Finally, he stresses the

1In the introductory chapters of the companion volumes we have outlined the major criteria for scale construction which we have used in evaluating the 93 scales reviewed in this volume. These evaluative criteria fall into three groups:

1) Item construction criteria (sampling of relevant content, wording of items, and performing item analyses)
2) Response set criteria (controlling the spurious effects of acquiescence and social desirability on responses to items)
3) Psychometric criteria (representative sampling, presentation of proper normative data, test-retest reliability, item homogeneity, discrimination of known groups, cross-validation, and further statistical procedures).

We have tentatively planned a short introductory text on attitude measurement (through McGraw-Hill publishers) which should make clear the rationale on which our instrument evaluation is based.

The reader should also note that because of limited resources, we were unable to achieve complete standardization of scale descriptions across the different scale reviewers for the various chapters in this volume. We hope the reader can be tolerant of such inconsistencies.
need for more attention to how such questions relate to the behavior of suicide and to how the black and other low income sectors of the public respond to them.

Phillip Shaver surveys a large number of measures related to self-esteem and the self-concept in Chapter 3. Included in this list are instruments constructed by representatives of different areas within psychology, each of which appears to use a different name and theoretical rationale for the same (or nearly the same) construct. For example, in clinical psychology the favored term is apparently "ego-strength," in social psychology one finds "self-consistency" and "self-esteem," in political science, "personal efficacy." Shaver finds an alarming lack of consistent findings in this research area and a continuing proliferation of poorly validated scales. By offering a wide sample of this diversity, he hopes to encourage comparative evaluation of measures in this area.

Fourteen measures relating to the often abused term "alienation" are reviewed in Chapter 4. One of the main problems with the most widely-used instruments in this area is their failure to provide for any control over agreement response set. Nevertheless the general correlates of alienation (or alternatively anomia) seem well-established--low social status, minority race, and general lack of social participation. While a number of sociologists have suggested that specific components of alienation (e.g., powerlessness, isolation) need to be distinguished, there is little empirical evidence to support the fruitfulness of such a division. In one of the most thorough investigations of attitude states in the literature, McClosky and Schaar find their Anomy Scale to be significantly related to an awesome number of psychological variables--life satisfaction, low self-esteem, inflexibility, pessimism, misanthropy, acquiescence, extreme political beliefs, and aggression. These findings tie in with the pattern
of inter-correlations noted in Chapter 2, and further suggest a common syndrome potentially encompassing many of the constructs in this volume.

The vast literature on authoritarian and dogmatic personality characteristics is represented by 27 scales in Chapter 5, including the major instruments from the well-known California Study, scales related to Rokeach's conception of closed-mindedness, Eysenck's T scale for measuring "toughmindedness," and several measures of components of the authoritarian syndrome, such as "intolerance of ambiguity." In the introductory portion of Chapter 5, Shaver indicates the major theoretical issues on which research in this area has focused and discusses the complex relationship (still a matter of considerable controversy) between acquiescence response bias and "true" authoritarianism as factors contributing to high scores on measures of authoritarianism and dogmatism.

In Chapter 6, we review four promising instruments that are political in nature (e.g., nationalism, social responsibility), but which came to our attention too late for inclusion in *Measures of Political Attitudes.*

Chapter 7 is devoted to measures of values, to which many psychologists refer as something like "meta-attitudes," i.e., constructs that are more over-arching and pervasive than attitudes. In other words, an individual's attitudes across many areas (e.g., nationalism, conformity) can be explained as emerging from one common value (e.g., loyalty). Teresa Levitin examines a total of 12 scales of values in this chapter, including two (by Bales and Couch and by Scott) that provide exhaustive multidimensional analyses of this domain of psychological orientations.

The scales in Chapter 8 may be seen as tapping one basic value, that of favorableness toward people in general. Considering the range of
behaviors and attitudes that have been found to relate successfully to
the five scales in this chapter, it is surprising that one does not find
more application of them in the social science literature. Of particular
interest in this chapter is Christie's intriguing scale developed success­
fully from the writings of the 14th century writer, Machiavelli.

Religious values are among the topics reviewed in Chapter 9 by
Shaver. Here again we find an attitude area where some promising multi­
dimensional spadework has been undertaken, especially in the case of the
research of Glock and Stark.

Finally in Chapter 10, we examine three sets of scales that are
mainly of methodological interest--primarily for the measurement of the
response set of social desirability. The social desirability scale of
Crowne and Marlowe is particularly noteworthy for its rigorous tests of
validity (although there is some question about the scale's internal con­
sistency and use as a control for social desirability).

What Could Not Be Included

There exist a number of other attitude areas that properly belong
in a monograph with a title such as ours, but could not be included be­
cause of time and financial constraints. Areas that immediately come to
mind are achievement (and other motives such as power and affiliation), aspir­
ation, conformity (although scales of inner- vs. other-directedness are in­
cluded in our occupational volume), marital and family attitudes, and
personality characteristics. We are encouraged to hear that comprehen­
sive reviews of the variables in the latter two areas are already in prepa­
ration--attitudes toward marriage and family by Murray Straus of the Uni­
versity of New Hampshire, and personality measures (with main emphasis on
variables with mental health implications) by Sidney Cobb, Jack French, and Ki-Taek Chun of the Mental Health in Industry Program at the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Our original plans called for rough guides (in the form of a list of variables measured) to the more noteworthy personality measures that are available, especially the omnibus copyrighted scales such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the California Personality Inventory, and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. We have found this task not only to be beyond our capabilities, but perhaps not worth the effort until more multidimensional research is directed toward reducing the tremendous list of personality variables and constructs to some manageable number, which are comparable across the various personality batteries.

Some encouraging results along this line are already in evidence. Wiggins (1968) concludes that factorial studies of temperament structure have clearly established extroversion and anxiety as the most pervasive dimensions in this domain. Among recent factorial studies that similarly promise a parsimonious category system of personality dimensions are:

1) Norman's (1967) cross-validated factors of extroversion (or surgency), agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability that have emerged from well-designed and replicated studies of items from the major personality inventories.

2) Comrey's (1964) factorially pure dimensions of compulsion, hostility, neuroticism, and shyness (which seem to parallel respectively Norman's dimension of conscientiousness, and the reverse end of his agreeableness, emotional stability, and extroversion dimensions).

Note that both sets of dimensions include counterparts of extroversion and anxiety, "the big two" of Wiggins (to which he also sees parallels in the ubiquitous semantic differential factors of activity-potency and
evaluation). A counterpart to the extroversion factor likewise appears in the inclusion dimension of Schutz's (1958) Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientations or FIRO (the other two factors in this most interesting FIRO system being control and affection).

It is our hope that by making available a wide range of attitude scales from the growing social science literature this monograph can contribute to the reduction of the vast number of construct names and measures to their most basic dimensions. It should then be quite feasible to develop standardized instruments to measure these dimensions as accurately and efficiently as possible.

Although we could not hope to provide an absolutely exhaustive coverage of attitude scales in these volumes, it would not be at all difficult to incorporate important omissions in later volumes or revisions. Furthermore, our efforts may provoke a larger scale undertaking (perhaps on an annual review basis) to provide the field with a truly definitive dictionary of attitude measures.
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CHAPTER 2 - LIFE SATISFACTION AND HAPPINESS

The types of questionnaire responses examined in this chapter focus primarily on feelings of contentment with one's style of life. Our main attention is devoted to overall assessments of such global feelings as how satisfied or happy respondents in social surveys claim they are. While the use of such global measures obscures known complexities in these assessments, we shall see that they do produce predictable findings with uncommon regularity.

Data on life satisfaction serve important functions in various fields of inquiry. The sociologist may consider replies of unhappiness as one component of alienation from the social system, and indeed we do find that measures of the two constructs intercorrelate to a moderate degree. The clinical psychologist may view them as an indicator of an individual's "social adjustment," or use them to chart swings in the moods and emotions of individuals over a period of time (for some interesting developments along this line, see Maisel, 1969). The political scientist might use such data to find ways in which the political system can maximize satisfaction in a society. Finally, the practical politician should be aware of the sources of discontent in society to instigate programs of adjustment before such discontent reaches crisis proportions. Presumably, all of the efforts in the "war on poverty" in this country have been motivated by the assumption that the life of poverty is one that needs correction to assure a better life for poor people. Unfortunately, no data have been collected during the last few crucial years to see whether poor people whose incomes have increased with the advent of the war on poverty have indeed attained higher levels of personal satisfaction or happiness with their lives.

For the most part this review will attempt to duplicate as little as possible of the material covered in Wilson's (1967) comprehensive survey of the literature. Rather it will be mainly concerned much more deeply with documenting the variations in the statistical distributions of these global assessments. For purposes of simplicity, we shall ignore data obtained from countries other than the United States.¹

The review is divided into five sections: 1) description of the studies in which global assessments of satisfaction have been obtained,

¹Wessman (1956) has found levels of reported unhappiness to be slightly higher in the United States than in England or Holland, but lower than in Canada or, especially, France. Cantril (1965) found ratings on self-anchoring scales to be higher in the United States than in any of the other countries included in his study.
2) stability and reliability of these global assessments, 3) variations in reported satisfaction according to background factors (e.g., sex, marital status, socioeconomic status), 4) relation between reported satisfaction and other attitudes, and 5) relation between satisfaction and behavior.

**Social Surveys into Life Satisfaction**

Wilson (1967) includes studies of reported happiness that extend back into the 1930's. Since few surveys conducted prior to the 1950's employed sophisticated sampling methods, their value is too limited to report here. Wilson does describe a nationwide study by Wessman (1956) in which 46% of the population was characterized as "very" happy, 45% as "fairly" happy, 7% "not very" happy, and 1% "not at all" happy.

Probably the first extensive survey into happiness with a nationwide probability sample was that of Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960). The authors asked a single three-alternative question (see Table 1) on happiness as part of an interview schedule that lasted well over an hour, dealing in depth with reported psychological adjustment and problems with work, family, and social relations. The sample consisted of a national cross-section of 2,460 respondents chosen by probability methods to represent the entire adult (over 21 years of age) population of the United States. The study was conducted in the spring of 1957.

Bradburn and Caplovitz (1965) employed the Gurin et al. happiness question in a study of four towns in Illinois with between three and ten thousand population. Two of the towns were classified as economically depressed, the other two as relatively well-off economically. Approximately one hundred interviews were taken with a cross-section of men between the ages of 25 and 49 in each community. These were supplemented with short questionnaires distributed to other adult members of the same household, bringing the total number of responses up to over 2,000. Interviews were conducted in the spring of 1962, with a special reinterview with 547 respondents being completed in the fall of 1962 to gauge the effects of the Cuban missile crisis on reported happiness. (It had practically no discernible effect.)

A single question on satisfaction with life\(^2\) was included in the 1965 nationwide study of Americans' use of time by Converse and Robinson (in press). The intent of the question was to relate life satisfaction to the ways in which different individuals allocated their time. One particular expectation was that lower satisfaction would be reported by individuals spending the most time viewing television. The sample consisted of 1,244 adults living in homes where at least one member of the household held a regular job in a non-farm occupation and was under age 65. The survey was

---

\(^2\)In the first survey, the alternative "not at all" satisfied was used. Less than 1% of the sample chose this alternative and so it is merged with the "not very satisfied" alternatives in Table 1. The alternative was not used at all in the 1968 survey.
Table 1: Basic Satisfaction Items and Distribution of Responses in Sample Populations

**Happiness:** Taking all things together, how would you say things are these days—would you say you're very happy, pretty happy or not too happy these days?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Pretty</th>
<th>Not Too</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958 (Gurin et al.)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962 (Bradburn and Caplovitz)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Life Satisfaction:** In general, how satisfying do you find the way you're spending your life these days? Would you call it completely satisfying, pretty satisfying, or not very satisfying?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Completely</th>
<th>Pretty</th>
<th>Not Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965 (Converse and Robinson)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 (Survey Research Center)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Self Anchoring Scale:** All of us want certain things out of life. When you think about what really matters in your own life, what are your wishes and hopes for the future? In other words, if you imagine your future in the best possible light, what would your life look like then, if you are to be happy? Take your time in answering; such things aren't easy to put into words.

Now taking the other side of the picture, what are your fears and worries about the future? In other words, if you imagine your future in the worst possible light, what would your life look like then? Again take your time in answering.

Here is a picture of a ladder. Suppose we say that at the top of the ladder (pointing to Value 10) represents the best possible life for you and the bottom (pointing to Value 0) represents the worst possible life for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ladder Value</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High (7, 8, 9, 10)  Middle (4, 5, 6)  Low (0, 1, 2, 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High (7, 8, 9, 10)</th>
<th>Middle (4, 5, 6)</th>
<th>Low (0, 1, 2, 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= 100%
restricted to people living in or near cities of 50,000 population or more—which eliminated individuals in "rural" areas containing about one-third of the United States population. Respondents were interviewed in late fall, 1965 and early spring, 1966.

The question was repeated in the 1968 Survey Research Center post-election study of political behavior. This sample of 1,315 respondents provided full representation of the entire population and was, moreover, supplemented with a special sample of Negro citizens to allow more detailed analyses of this important segment of the population. Table 1 shows that the distribution of replies remained amazingly constant over the three-year time period between 1965 and 1968.

The final measure included in this section is the standard self-anchoring scale devised by Cantril (1965) and employed by him in a thirteen-nation study, in which nearly 20,000 people were interviewed. In the United States survey, 1,549 people were interviewed in the summer of 1959 using a modified probability sample. The self-anchoring device employs an eleven-point ladder, the lowest end (point 0) referring to the respondent's own description of the "worst possible life" and the highest end (point 10) to his description of the "best possible life."

Measurement difficulties arise in trying to compare the self-anchoring scale data with the other measures in Table 1. Cantril gives descriptions of his data in terms of average scores along this eleven-point scale (the average score for the entire sample being 6.6). The arithmetic midpoint of 5 does provide a logical division between the satisfied and dissatisfied, and some 13% of the Cantril sample chose response options below this value. This percentage ends up being very close to those giving the responses "not too happy" or "not very satisfied" to the two previous questions in Table 1.

\[\text{This value is lower than the 7.6 value obtained with a scale that Cantril (1965, p. 265) employed to more directly inquire into people's present satisfaction.}\]

"Some people seem to be quite happy and satisfied with their lives, while others seem quite unhappy and dissatisfied. Now, look at the ladder again. Suppose that a person who is entirely satisfied with his life would be at the top of the ladder, and a person who is extremely dissatisfied with his life would be at the bottom of the ladder.

Where would you put yourself on the ladder at the present stage of your life in terms of how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with your own personal life?"

Unfortunately, Cantril does not present the rich body of correlates for this question that are available for the question in Table 1. While the correlation between replies to this question and that of Table 1 is only .36, the pattern of relations with background variables (especially race and socioeconomic status) is quite similar. The pattern of relation to questions on the components of satisfaction—such as self-respect and religion (for the complete list, see Appendix A)—is also similar, although the correlations are lower for the question in Table 1 (as can be seen in Appendix A).
Cantril's technique both controls for and obscures variations due to individual differences in aspiration levels. However, open-ended material dealing with choice of standards for "best" and "worst" possible life conditions provides rich ancillary information on the types of factors that people consider responsible for satisfaction or dissatisfaction. In Table 2, we have summarized those factors in Cantril's study that were prominently mentioned in this regard.

It can be seen that almost two-thirds of Cantril's sample mentioned economic factors in describing their best possible life, with just under half mentioning good health or family contentment. In terms of the worst possible life, however, poor health was mentioned more often than undesirable economic circumstances, with unhappy occurrences to family an even less important consideration in this connection. Only a quarter of the population noted family concerns in connection with the worst possible life, the same proportion as mentioned the international situation in this regard. Thus one's family is far more likely to be thought of as a source of hopes rather than fears, the international situation having the opposite function.

In the left side of Table 2, we have taken the liberty of comparing these replies to those obtained by Gurin et al. in response to open-ended questions on sources of happiness and unhappiness. Percentages are lower in these tables because less probing was employed by SRC interviewers with these questions than in the Cantril study. Again, however, the finding emerged that the family is more often a source of happiness and occurrences in the larger community a source of unhappiness. In the Gurin study, however, economic factors were relatively more prevalent as sources of unhappiness than of happiness.

This last difference, probably resulting from the serious incompatibilities that exist in the connotations of the two sets of questions,  

---

4 About 90% of these responses refer to fear of war.
5 Cantril did uncover one major source of perceived discontent that does not appear in Table 1 when he asked about "things...you feel may be keeping you from having a more satisfying life than you are having now?" Over 40% chose "lack of training and education" from a list of eight factors. No other factor was chosen by more than 20% of the sample. Furthermore, over half of the sample listed education as an item that "you really feel would make a big difference in your own happiness." The only item to exceed this one was income. Of course, many respondents value education only to the extent that it will assure them a larger income or a more prestigious job (Chase, 1962).
6 One interesting figure is the 11% in Cantril's study who give "status quo" replies to the questions. This may be compared to the 8% in the Gurin et al. study who have replies coded as "independence or absence of burdens or restraints." In both studies, no respondents mentioned such factors in a negative context.
Table 2: Types of factors mentioned as leading to personal satisfaction and dissatisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors in Cantril (1965)</th>
<th>Factors in Gurin et al. (1960)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td>Economic and material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>Respondent's health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong></td>
<td>Family's health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal values</strong></td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status quo</strong></td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job or work situation</strong></td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International situation</strong></td>
<td>Community/world problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social values</strong></td>
<td>Other interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political</strong></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nothing mentioned</strong></td>
<td>Nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Questions asked in the Cantril study are given in Table 1.

**Questions asked in Gurin et al. were:** For sources of happiness, "What are some of the things that you feel pretty happy about these days?" For unhappiness, "Everybody has things about their life they are not completely happy about. What are some of the things that you're not too happy about these days?"

**Totals add up to more than 100% because of multiple responses.**
makes precise comparisons untenable. Nevertheless, it can be seen that in both studies over three times as many people can think of no negative factors as can think of no positive factors.

Reliability of Satisfaction Measures

One of the most impressive features of the questions in Table 1 is the stable test-retest reliabilities they exhibit. It could well be expected that measures of satisfaction would comprise the example par excellence of a measure subject to the ups and downs of daily life. In a small random sample of 90 residents in Jackson, Michigan, however, Converse and Robinson (in press) found a correlation (Kendall's tau) of .59 between reported satisfaction at one time and satisfaction reported in an interview four to six months earlier. The happiness question was added to this follow-up survey and it correlated .46 with the satisfaction question (and .43 with the satisfaction reply in the first interview). Bradburn and Caplovitz reported a test-retest table with the happiness question recorded over an eight month period which, when reduced to a value of Kendall's tau, equals .43; less than 2% of respondents chose the opposite extremes (i.e., "not too happy" at time 1 and "very happy" at time 2 or the reverse) across the time interval. Wilson (1960) reports two studies with test-retest correlations, one with a value .70 (a one-month interval) and the other a value of .67 (a two-year interval).

We shall comment on the internal consistency aspect of reliability (correlations with such variables as depression, adjustment, alienation, and self-esteem) in a later section.

Correlates of Reported Satisfaction

In this section we shall review briefly and document quantitatively the extent to which differences in satisfaction are related to standard background factors. The factors are considered under the following headings: sex and marital status, age, socioeconomic status, status incongruence, race, and other background factors.

Sex and Marital Status. Only insignificant differences in satisfaction are reported between men and women. Some interesting differences have emerged, however, when sex is examined by what seems to be the most powerful single predictor of satisfaction—marital status. Differences in contentment, outlined in Table 3, give little support to the stereotypes of the frustrated spinster and the carefree bachelor. The Bradburn and Caplovitz study in fact shows markedly higher unhappiness among single men than single women.

All studies indicate married people to be significantly happier than unmarried people. Among the unmarried (where small sample sizes could
Table 3: Differences in reported satisfaction by marital status and sex, and by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Not Too Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurin et al. (1966)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradburn and Caplovitz (1965)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Not Very Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converse and Robinson (in press)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson (1969)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
account for considerably more instability than appears in Table 3), the widowed and divorced generally emerge as the least satisfied, with single people (excepting single males in the Bradburn and Caplovitz study) significantly more satisfied than either the divorced or widowed. If it is "better to have loved and lost," it seems better to have done so before entering the state of matrimony. One final note of interest is that all of these results were also found in Wessman’s (1956) national survey.

Age. Differences by age generally show decreased satisfaction for older people, as can be seen in Table 4. The differences are larger and more monotonic for the happiness question than for the satisfaction item or the self-anchoring scale. Methodological procedures may account for the reversals in the Converse-Robinson and Cantril studies: the lack of many unemployed, elderly, and retired people (who were largely excluded) in the Converse-Robinson study and the reduced aspirations (which form the top of the "ladder") of elderly people in the Cantril study. Moreover, in the latest Survey Research Center study, it can be seen that differences by age largely disappear when unmarried people are excluded. In other words, the consistent finding of increase of unhappiness with age may well hinge upon the higher incidence of divorce and death of marital partners for this group.

The present author has also had the opportunity to ask the standard satisfaction and happiness questions of several samples of students at various high schools and colleges in Michigan over a two-year period. No possibility for probability sampling has presented itself, but these students consistently evidence higher levels of personal dissatisfaction than the adult samples we have been examining. Upwards of 25% of the high school students and students in the social sciences at the University of Michigan chose the alternatives "not very satisfied" or "not too happy" in response to the questions. The rate of choice was more nearly normal (11%) for a small sample of students at Adrian college, which indicates that the University of Michigan results should not be generalized to all college students. Nevertheless, the higher personal discontent among students compared to other individuals under age 30 in cross-section samples (Table 3) may indicate that the student role is not a particularly satisfying one.

Social Status. Persons of higher social status invariably report higher levels of satisfaction than persons of lower status. Inkeles (1960) noted the finding in a number of different countries and Cantril (1965) subsequently found it to be true in each of the countries for which he had socioeconomic data available. The same has constantly been found in the area of job satisfaction (Robinson, 1969) and, although the assumption

7 Gurin et al. found that 17% of respondents whose parents were divorced or separated rated themselves as currently unhappy vs. 11% of those from intact homes.

8 The rate is also relatively low (5%) for 18 individuals classifying themselves as students in the 1968 election study. All of these students were over 21 and most were probably graduate students.
Table 4: Differences in satisfaction by age

Gurin et al. (1960)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>21-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Not Too Happy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bradburn and Caplovitz (1965)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Under 30</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Not Too Happy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Converse and Robinson (in press)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Under 30</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Not Very Satisfied</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Research Center (1968)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>21-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Not Very Satisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Married only)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cantril (1965)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Under 29</th>
<th>30-49</th>
<th>Over 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Low Personal Present Ratings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that grades are a criterion of social status in the college community may
be open to question, the author has found that college students with high
grades report higher levels of personal satisfaction.

We shall defer detailing the exact differences in satisfaction by
status until the next section which deals with the interaction of the two
main indicators of status: income and education. With few exceptions
satisfaction has been associated monotonically with increasing levels on
these two variables. However, interesting patterns of response have
occurred when the two variables are examined simultaneously and these
have interesting theoretical implications, as we shall see.

**Status Incongruence.** The literature on the effects of status
incongruence—referring to the inequities of individuals as to their posi­
tion on separate dimensions of status (especially for education and income)—
generally has yet to show clear and consistent results necessary to justify
the attention this phenomenon has received (Kasl, 1969; Jackson and Curtis,
1968). One of the puzzling aspects of much of this research, especially
as it affects psychological states such as happiness or frustration, has
been the failure of researchers to separate "desirable" incongruence
(e.g., income level higher than expectations based on educational level)
from "undesirable" incongruence (e.g., income level lower than correspond­
ing educational level). We devote attention to this aspect in Table 5,
with our interest directed toward the likelihood of very high satisfaction
for "overachievers" (low education but high income) and very low satis­
faction for "underachievers" (high education but low income).

The interaction of education and income in the four studies in Table
5 produces mixed results regarding the significance of incongruence.
Stronger support for the unusually low unhappiness associated with de­
sirable incongruence appears most notably in the Bradburn and Caplovitz
data (i.e., the low 3% figure for persons with grade school education
earning the relatively high income of over $7,000 per year). It also
holds true in the latest Survey Research Center data, but significantly
only for those with extremely high incomes (i.e., for those with less than
a high school education earning over $15,000 per year, of whom not one
reported himself as not very satisfied). It fails to hold in either the
Converse-Robinson study or for the Gurin et al. data (although the range
of income and education categories for this study is too restricted to
fully test the incongruence hypothesis).

---

9 Since the Cantril study does not include such a breakdown, the reader may
find the univariate differences of interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Low personal rating (0, 1, 2, 3)</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Differences in satisfaction by education and income

Gurin et al. (1960) -- % Not Too Happy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade School</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Some College or more</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $5,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $5,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bradburn and Caplovitz (1965) -- % Not Too Happy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade School</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Some College or more</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $3,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000-6,999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,000 and over</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Converse and Robinson (in press) -- % Not Very Satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade School</th>
<th>Some High School</th>
<th>High School Grad</th>
<th>Some College or More</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $4,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000-5,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000-9,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 or more</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Research Center (1968) -- % Not Very Satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Than High School Grad</th>
<th>High School Grad</th>
<th>Some College or More</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $6,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000-9,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-14,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under $4,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Than High School Grad</th>
<th>High School Grad</th>
<th>Some College or More</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $4,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000-7,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,000 and over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support for the negative consequences of undesirable incongruence is not strong in Table 5. In fact in three of the five sets of data, the opposite effect holds true--the college-educated low income group turns out to be even less dissatisfied than other low income individuals. The Converse-Robinson study does show the predicted effect of undesirable incongruence. The effect also appears in the latest Survey Research Center study if one lowers the income range to under $4,000 annual income, as we have done at the bottom of Table 5. The results show that the effects of incongruence are extremely sensitive to the income boundaries that the analyst decides to employ.

In these analyses, the small sample sizes and the inconsistent results preclude definitive conclusions about the effects of status incongruence. Moreover, no matter how important or interesting incongruence is theoretically in predicting discontent, in terms of explaining variance in discontent among all members of American society, incongruence certainly cannot be considered as important a factor as the singular effects of either marital status, income, or education.

Race. With Negroes comprising only a tenth of our population, sample sizes again pose a major limitation in the data of Table 6. Nevertheless, only one study in which race has been included as a variable shows less discontent among Negroes than whites: the 1965-66 Converse-Robinson study. This reversal again may be attributable to the sampling restrictions on individuals who were unemployed or who resided in rural areas in the 1965-66 study. In the 1968 data, Negro-white differences are considerably reduced if one looks only at married respondents. Households in which such unmarried persons were unemployed would have been excluded in the 1965-66 study. Outside of this study, however, roughly twice as high a proportion of Negroes as whites report themselves as not too happy or not very satisfied.

Differences in satisfaction by race are examined in Table 6 as a function of income and region of the country, since these are important factors that come to mind in connection with the relation between race and satisfaction and that have not been examined previously in the literature. It can be seen in Table 6 that regional differences are generally insignificant, but that the effects of income are strong in both regions for whites.

---

10 As noted earlier, the 1968 data do have the advantage of including a special supplementary sample of Negroes which essentially doubles the size of the Negro sample in Table 6.

11 Cantril (1965) found some of the largest differences in ratings on his self-anchoring scale were due to race, Negroes scoring an average of 1.4 ladder steps below whites; moreover, this difference was maintained when the question was repeated with a national sample in 1963. Cantril, however, does not examine differences in the Negro population either by income or region so that his data cannot be included in the Table 6 format.
Table 6: Differences in Satisfaction by Race as a Function of Region and Income (Sample sizes for Negroes in parentheses)

Gurin et al. data -- % Not Too Happy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Negroses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>non-South</td>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>non-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $2,000</td>
<td>21 (71)</td>
<td>40* (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000-3,999</td>
<td>36 (22)</td>
<td>19 (43)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000-5,999</td>
<td>0* (5)</td>
<td>27 (26)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000 and over</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>33* (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>= 23%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Converse and Robinson (in press) -- % Not Very Satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Negroses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>non-South</td>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>non-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $4,000</td>
<td>11 (19)</td>
<td>17 (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000-5,999</td>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>8 (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000 and over</td>
<td>13 (16)</td>
<td>5 (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>= 10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Research Center (1968) -- % Not Very Satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Negroses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>non-South</td>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>non-South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $4,000</td>
<td>16 (74)</td>
<td>27 (34)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000-7,999</td>
<td>10 (31)</td>
<td>29 (24)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,000 and over</td>
<td>6 (17)</td>
<td>12 (33)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>= 18%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sample size under 10.
Reexamination of the Gurin et al. data, however, fails to uncover a monotonic relation between income and satisfaction for Negroes—in either the South or the non-South. Actually, the large differences in income levels between these regions may be partially to blame. If we used revised categories so that income distribution is more equitable within each region, we have for the Negro population:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>non-South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $1,000</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000-2,999</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 and over</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000-4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This arrangement indicates no relation between income and satisfaction for Negroes outside the South and not much relation in the South (except for the handful of Negroes who had earned over $3,000).

These results differ somewhat from those found in the Survey Research Center studies using the life satisfaction question. The Converse-Robinson data if anything show the opposite effect: little relation with income in the South and the expected decreased satisfaction with lower income outside the South. The most recent Survey Research Center data, on the other hand, tend to show the expected decreases with lower income in both the South and non-South. Of particular interest is the shift towards higher dissatisfaction in the non-South, particularly among middle income Negroes.

One would be sorely tempted to speculate on the findings from any one of these studies seen separately, but when they are arranged comparatively as in Table 6, the inconsistencies seriously dampen any enthusiasm about the validity of such speculations. It would be truly fascinating to find that increased income does not result in greater happiness for Negroes in the non-South (as in the Gurin et al. data) or that the patterns of relation between income and satisfaction are reversed in the South and the non-South (as in the Converse-Robinson data) or that Negroes in the South are more satisfied than those in the non-South at all income levels. However, the lack of any clear thread of meaning in the trends of relations across the time period preclude any fruitful speculation about intriguing historical changes in Negro attitudes about their lot in life.

What is obviously needed are questions about happiness and satisfaction to be asked of a large sample of Negro respondents so that adequate benchmark data can be established. The question should then be repeated with similar samples on a regular basis, or even incorporated into panel studies. With such data, we would be on surer ground in learning about

---

12 If such samples are taken, special care needs to be exercised to control for the effects of one factor that has not been measured in connection with questions of personal contentment—the race of the person doing the interviewing. Previous studies have shown interviewer's race to influence the replies of Negroes generally, and questions of this nature would seem to be highly subject to such influence.
important questions such as whether Negroes migrating from the South will find life more rewarding than those who stay behind. Unfortunately the ambiguities from past studies in Table 6 render answers to such questions totally inconclusive.

Other Factors. A further prime predictor of unhappiness appears to be employment status. Bradburn and Caplovitz (1965) found high rates of unhappiness among the unemployed (31%) and retired (27%). In a more recent study (Noll and Bradburn, 1968) these rates were again abnormally high—39% for the unemployed and 30% for the retired. In the recent Survey Research Center data, 37% of the unemployed rated themselves as "not very satisfied."

Differences by religious affiliation have not generally proved to be very significant. Catholics reported slightly more unhappiness in the Gurin et al. data, but report less dissatisfaction in the most recent Survey Research Center study. In this latter study, people of the Jewish faith report somewhat higher dissatisfaction (17% say they're not very satisfied), but Cantril found that Jews rated themselves somewhat higher on his self-anchoring scale. Again the small proportion of Jews in the population may well be responsible for these inconsistencies.

Gurin et al. located higher rates of unhappiness (18%) in metropolitan areas, and slightly lower than average unhappiness in the suburbs compared to residents of small cities and rural areas. The same pattern of results held true in the 1968 Survey Research Center data, even when controlled for the factors of income and race. Finally Cantril found a slightly higher preponderance of low self-anchoring scale ratings for urban dwellers (8%) than residents of rural areas (5%).

Relation with Other Attitudes

One of the more interesting features of measures of satisfaction and happiness is the wide range of other psychological attitudes with which they correlate. Yet for many of these attitudes one is not sure whether these correlations should not actually be higher than those which are obtained. This is especially true for variables tapping general psychological adjustment, which include measures of concepts like depression, self-esteem, and alienation. It can easily be expected that expressed happiness would be a prime indicator of a person's general adjustment and that one would be alarmed at low rather than high correlations between the two sets of variables.

In this study, the unhappiness rate was twice as high for wives of the unemployed vs. wives of the employed. This phenomenon held true in the 1968 SRC data with 28% of wives of the unemployed reporting dissatisfaction vs. 6% of wives of the employed.
Perhaps the most impressive evidence of the essential congruity of satisfaction and self-esteem is provided in the Survey Research Center data for 1965-66 and 1968. The correlation of the satisfaction item with each of the items in the Survey Research Center personal efficacy scale is given at the top of Table 7. The average inter-item correlation of .23 for the 1968 data and .18 for the Converse-Robinson study is relatively high considering that average inter-item correlation for each of the personal efficacy items themselves is .30. Furthermore, these results held true when controlled for sex and education.

More direct measures of self-esteem were included in Bachman et al.'s (1967) national study of 2,500 tenth-grade boys. Unfortunately, the life satisfaction questions employed did not include the one in Table 1, but the correlation between the three-item life satisfaction scale and a ten-item self-esteem scale was .53 for the entire sample. Some of the inter-item correlations for selected items from these scales are noted at the bottom of Table 7. It can be seen that again items measuring happiness and satisfaction correlate almost as well with self-esteem items as the self-esteem items do with each other. (A complete list of the actual items in the satisfaction and self-esteem scales, along with the distribution of replies of the sample of boys to these items, are outlined in Appendix B to this chapter; items from other scales which correlate with the satisfaction scale are also included in Appendix B.)

Further evidence for the close interconnection of self-esteem and satisfaction is provided at many points in Wilson's (1967) review. Wilson notes, for example, studies which have demonstrated drops in self-esteem accompanying periods of unhappiness and depression and studies which report correlations in the .40's between unhappiness and discrepancies between real self and ideal self (see Chapter 3) and between need for achievement and actual achievement.

Wilson concludes that the most impressive single finding in research on happiness is the correlation of happiness and successful involvement with people. Subsequent corroboration of this conclusion is evidenced by correlations of .50 and .40 between the negative end of the satisfaction scale of Bachman et al. and their measures (reproduced in Appendix B) of lack of social support and personal anomie respectively. Again the anomie scale items correlate almost as highly with satisfaction items as they do with each other.

Also in line with Wilson's conclusion are the positive, but not high (average being .15), inter-item correlations with items measuring trust.

---

14 The present author has found correlations in the .30's and .40's between satisfaction measures and efficacy in samples of undergraduates at the University of Michigan and correlations in the .20's and .30's between satisfaction and more direct measures of self-esteem.

15 We are grateful to Dr. Bachman for making these correlational data available to us before they are formally published.
Table 7: Correlations between satisfaction and items tapping self-esteem (Survey Research Center data, 1965-66 and 1968)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation with Satisfaction</th>
<th>1965-66</th>
<th>1968</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Have you usually felt pretty sure your life would work out the way you want it to*, or have there been times when you haven't been sure about it?</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When you do make plans ahead, do you usually get to carry out things the way you expected*, or do things usually come up to make you change your plans?</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you think it is better to plan your life a good way ahead*, or would you say life is too much a matter of luck to plan very far?</td>
<td>Not Asked</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Some people feel they can run their lives pretty much the way they want to*; others feel the problems of life are sometimes too big for them. Which one are you most like?</td>
<td>Not Asked</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates response reflecting personal competence

Bachman et al., 1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Satisfaction</th>
<th>Life Satis.</th>
<th>Happiness</th>
<th>Not Proud</th>
<th>Nothing Right</th>
<th>Do Job Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am very satisfied with life</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I find a good deal of happiness in life</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel I do not have much to be proud of</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel I can't do anything right</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When I do a job I do it well</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in people in the 1968 election study. Possibly the conclusion may also be extended to encompass the repeated finding that satisfaction is strongly related to reported marital and job satisfaction.

Among some of the research findings employing other psychological variables that have been or could be related to reported satisfaction and happiness are:

--a .41 correlation with social adjustment and -.44 with anxiety (Wilson, 1960)

--a correlation of -.19 with worry and -.20 with a psychosomatic symptom score (Gurin et al., 1960)

--a -.41 correlation with anomie and the implication that life satisfaction is only one of numerous psychological variables (e.g., guilt, bewilderment, misanthropy) that are encompassed by the same syndrome (McClosky and Schaar, 1965)

--correlations of .53 with depression, .59 with sadness, .42 with irritability, .41 with anxiety, and .34 with resentment noted in the Bachman et al. data

--the fact that the social correlates of reported satisfaction (especially marital status and income) lead to the largest differences in Srole's et al. (1962) estimate of psychological impairment.

With all these positive correlations, one might rightly inquire as to what it is that we really are measuring (or not measuring) with satisfaction and happiness questions. More specifically the problem of psychological response sets is one factor that immediately springs to mind, especially the response set of social desirability. Yet items from Crowne and Marlowe's (Chapter 10) social approval scale fail to correlate consistently (average .06) with any of the satisfaction items, or for that matter with the items from the myriad of scales that we have found to correlate with satisfaction in the Bachman et al. study.

Finally, we should mention the attempt of Bradburn and Caplovitz to isolate the various component feelings related to happiness and unhappiness. The authors constructed twelve items describing pleasurable and unpleasurable ways people feel and asked each respondent to indicate how often he had felt that way during the past week. Five items describing positive feelings and four items describing negative feelings were formed.

---

16 The reader should not interpret the preceding discussion to mean that there are no instances in the literature which show opposite patterns. Wilson (1967) notes several instances of correlates of this type that have failed to stand the test of replication. However, the present author is encouraged by the fact that he has found that these patterns of correlation hold up consistently in data he has collected for classroom use from students at the University of Michigan. Simmons (1966) reports much the same pattern of results, adding a new variable--attitude uncertainty--to the list of basic correlates of dissatisfaction.
into separate indices (three of the original negative feeling items failed
to correlate substantially with the other negative items and were dropped
from further analysis). They found that a statistically insignificant
positive correlation existed between the two indices, contrary to expecta­
tions that there would be a strong negative correlation. This can be seen
at the inter-item level in Appendix C, where we have reproduced the items
and the inter-item correlation matrix.

This implies that individuals with strong positive feelings are just
as likely to have strong negative feelings as they are to have no negative
feelings. In other words, a person can have strong negative feelings and
yet describe himself as very happy, because he has strong compensatory
sources of positive feelings. The advantages of considering the two
indices separately (a procedure we have recommended on page 19 of Robinson
et al., 1968) can be seen in Table 8. Only 12% of those having high

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Feeling</th>
<th>Positive Feelings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Too Happy</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Feelings</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

positive feelings to compensate for high negative feelings describe them­
selves as not too happy--in comparison to 40% of those with high negative
feelings but few sources of positive feelings. Similarly among those with
low negative feelings, only 1% of those with high positive feelings described
themselves as not too happy vs. 13% of those with low positive feelings.
In the same way that Gurin et al. found better-educated people describing
more positive and more negative aspects of their self-concept, Bradburn and
Caplovitz find further evidence of this heightened self-awareness. They show
individuals who had been to college to be far more likely than those
with grade school education to give responses that combined high positive
feelings and high negative feelings.

Wilson has suggested that the reason Bradburn and Caplovitz find no
relation between positive and negative items was their failure to construct
items that were polar opposites. For example, he points out that whereas
"pleasure over accomplishments" is included as a positive feeling, "disap­
pointment over failure" is a logical counterpart that should have been
included as a negative feeling. He claims that his own research has shown
that such polar opposites do correlate negatively as expected. He further
notes that the Bradburn-Caplovitz negative items refer to negative emotional feelings of a general nature, while the positive items refer to success and energy.

It may also be argued that the regular increases in unhappiness across rows and columns in the Table 8 data do not argue well for the need to separate positive and negative feelings. The real value of separating dimensions is provided when they produce complex interaction patterns (as in the Table 5 status incongruence data). Nevertheless, the practice of separating the two dimensions does become fruitful when we find the systematic differences by educational level noted by Bradburn and Caplovitz.

Relation of Life Satisfaction to Behavior

Neither Gurin et al. (1960) nor Cantril (1965) devote attention to the relation between professed contentment and any actual behavior. Although Wilson (1960) implies at many points that satisfaction is associated with increased social interaction, he reports on only one study (Fellows, 1956) that examines actual behavior. Fellows did find that people who spent more time in leisure time activities expressed more happiness.

Bradburn and Caplovitz also found that among males aged 25-49 (the only segment of the population for which they had data available), higher scores on their positive feelings index (Appendix C) were attained by people active in a wide variety of activities. Although the differences were in many cases neither startling nor monotonic with the amount of activity, increased participation in the following activities (in the previous month or shorter periods) was associated with higher positive feelings: contact with relatives, get-togethers with friends, telephone contact with friends, meeting new people, organizational membership, taking a trip in a car, eating out in a restaurant, participating in sports, and attending sports events.\(^{17}\) Moreover, these differences generally held up when controlled for socioeconomic status. When seven of these items were formed into a participation index, 44% of the high scorers on this index scored highly on the positive feelings index vs. 23% of those scoring low in participation. Controls for status reduced this gap to about 16% (instead of 21%). Unfortunately, the authors related the Table 1 happiness question only to the activity of organizational membership, and it seemed to make a difference only for those of low status. Presumably, the direct correlation between happiness and other activities produced similarly unexciting results.

As noted earlier, the inclusion of the life satisfaction question in the Converse-Robinson study was intended to permit observation of whether a certain patterning of activities was associated with more satisfaction.

\(^{17}\)Higher positive feelings were not reported by those taking longest trips in the previous week, those participating in religious services, or those viewing most television.
than other patterns. The correlations between satisfaction and participation in 18 types of activities are presented in Table 9, separately for men and women. It can be seen that the relation between participation in activities and satisfaction is much more pronounced for women than men. As was the case with the Bradburn and Caplovitz data, none of the correlations is outstanding. However, 12 of the 18 coefficients are significant and in the expected direction for women\(^{18}\) (although only 3 of 18 are for men). The two activities which did correlate for both men and women were activities that did not work well for Bradburn and Caplovitz: attendance at organizational functions and church attendance.\(^{19}\) This correlation with frequency of church attendance was replicated in the 1968 election study, and held true separately for Protestants, Catholics, and Jews.

With such an unpromising pattern of correlations across studies (although the weight of the evidence does point to greater satisfaction among the more active), it may be well to conclude on a more consistent note concerning the relation between expression of satisfaction and behavior. Specifically, if one is looking for the ultimate behavioral manifestation of unhappiness, it would be the act of suicide. Fortunately, statistics on suicide have been collected for well over a hundred years (e.g., Maris, 1969). Moreover, most of the variables which we have seen relate to unhappiness—the unmarried state, the student role, low economic status, and low education—turn out to be prime associates of suicide. Furthermore, for some variables the differences in suicide rates for these groups are of roughly the same magnitude as those observed for unhappiness; e.g., three-to-one ratios for the widowed or divorced to those who are married.

Again all is not perfect; the higher suicide rates for males and whites are not reflected in their expressed unhappiness. However, it is known that attempted suicides are higher for women, which Maris feels might completely offset the large disparity in male-female completed suicide rates. Moreover, Maris speculates that the peculiar life circumstances of Negroes in America leads them to direct their aggression to external targets.

Therefore, the relation between unhappiness and suicide may prove to be one of the most dramatic examples of the basic congruity of attitudes and behavior. This is not to say that there is a one-to-one correspondence between unhappiness and suicide. Rather, in the spirit of Campbell's (1963) application of the Guttman scale model to the relation of attitudes and behavior, dissatisfaction with life is a necessary but not a sufficient

---

\(^{18}\) All but three of these correlations for men and women hold when controlled for education and income.

\(^{19}\) The expectation that the less satisfied would spend more time watching television also held true for women but not for men. On an average day, women who said they were "not very satisfied" watched 136 minutes of television vs. 105 minutes for those saying they were completely satisfied or pretty satisfied. The figure for all groups of men was about 135 minutes per day.
We're also interested in things people do in their spare time, when they aren't working.

I have a list of free-time activities, and I would like to have you tell me about how often you have been doing these things during the past year (HAND CARD). For example, "Going to the movies." Would you say that you've generally been going to the movies once a week or more, every two or three weeks, half-dozen to a dozen times all year, one to five times a year, or not at all this year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Correlation with Life Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men (N = 490)</td>
<td>Women (N = 640)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Going to the movies</td>
<td>- .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Going to club meetings, activities</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PTA, union, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Going to church (or religious activities)</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Going to classes or lectures</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Going to watch sports events</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Fishing, hunting, camping, hiking</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Boating, swimming, picnics, pleasure-drives</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Playing active sports (bowling, softball, etc.)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Going to nightclubs, bars, etc.</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Going to concerts, plays, etc.</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Going to fairs, museums, exhibits, etc.</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Gardening and working around yard</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Making and fixing things around house</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Shopping, except for groceries</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Helping relatives, neighbors, friends</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Visits with relatives, neighbors, friends</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Playing cards, other indoor games</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Working on hobbies, painting or music</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
condition for suicide. That is, only unhappy people commit suicide, but not all unhappy people commit suicide. In terms of a two-by-two table, there are no people falling in the upper right hand cell:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Suicide</th>
<th>Suicide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One main implication of this model is that fewer people will commit suicide than express dissatisfaction, which is borne out by the statistical discrepancy between the roughly 10% of the population who express dissatisfaction compared to the .01 to .04% who commit suicide in any one year.

Such speculation is now based solely on the striking parallels between the demographic correlates of the two behaviors. Although the sample sizes for a panel study to directly test the hypothesis would be prohibitive for a cross-national study, it would seem to be a most fruitful area for more intensive study.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this review we have found a number of constant relationships when respondents in social surveys are asked to report on their general satisfaction with life. First of all, it was found that there has been relatively little change in the percentage of the population expressing discontent--Gurin et al. found 11% of a nationwide sample saying they were "not too happy" in 1958; Converse and Robinson found 11% professing their life to be not very satisfying in 1965, and when the Survey Research Center asked the question three years later 10% chose this alternative. The overall figure for the Bradburn and Caplovitz study was 17%, but dropped to 13% if the economically depressed communities were excluded. Cantril found the same 13% figure falling on the negative side of his self-anchoring scale. As is the case with job satisfaction (Robinson, 1969), the vast majority of the population seem content with the way they are spending their lives.

A second constancy was that people who express satisfaction at one time period are quite likely to express satisfaction if interviewed some months later. Expressions of satisfaction then are much more stable at the individual level than one might at first imagine.
A third constancy centered around the relations with standard demographic variables. Widowed and divorced people consistently show the highest rates of dissatisfaction and unhappiness. Unemployed people and other extremely low income individuals also show very high rates of dissatisfaction with life. The present author has also noted a persistent trend of students to rate themselves as not very satisfied. Older people and Negroes express more dissatisfaction, but the latest available data indicate that these differences are considerably reduced or disappear when controlled for marital status.

While almost all studies show a consistent trend for satisfaction to increase with both income and education, some irregularities do appear when the two variables are examined simultaneously. Specifically, highly educated individuals in extremely low paying jobs express higher life dissatisfaction than other individuals in low paying jobs. On the other hand, individuals in high paying jobs but with relatively little education have been found to profess more satisfaction than other individuals at comparable salary levels. Such interesting patterns have not appeared in every study that has been conducted and, furthermore, explain relatively little variance in life satisfaction across the whole population. Differences by sex, religious affiliation, size of city, and region of the country are even less significant.

The pattern of correlations with other psychological attitudes is another area where consistent results have been located. Particularly significant is the finding that persons of high self-esteem or personal competence express more satisfaction with life. Satisfaction has also been found to be greater among people who are better socially adjusted, who demonstrate more trust in people, who feel less alienated, and who suffer less from anxiety, worry, and psychosomatic symptoms. Even stronger attitudinal correlates of satisfaction, as might be implied from the findings mentioned above, are marital and job satisfaction.

Finally, we found that a number of studies point to greater satisfaction among people who are actively involved in a number of leisure-time activities, such as membership in organizations and church attendance. Again, not all studies show that participation in the same activities leads to greater satisfaction nor that differences between those at different levels of activity are particularly large.

Suicide is one behavior with which dissatisfaction with life would most likely be correlated. Although no studies of suicide have included attitudinal questions administered some time beforehand, there are striking similarities in the pattern of correlation that the two behaviors have with background variables (e.g., marital status, age).

The above summary has glossed over many inconsistencies and unreplicated findings that do exist in this literature. What would be particularly useful at this stage of research would be some attempt to collect all of the above types of information (personal attitudes, behavior patterns, and background variables) on the same individuals in a panel design study. We may then come to more fully understand the ways in which satisfaction changes in representative populations. With such information,
perhaps we could begin to address ourselves to the more important problem of methods of decreasing the ranks of the dissatisfied in this country.

If such studies do become feasible in the near future, they should attempt to go beyond the single questions to which we have devoted most attention here and delve into sources and components of satisfaction. Such a strategy proved fruitful in the Bradburn and Caplovitz study, as well as in the studies by Gurin et al., Cantril, and Converse-Robinson. For this purpose, researchers might well find detailed instruments developed in research on non-representative populations to be of considerable benefit. The scales of Green (1965), Clyde (1963), Weisman and Ricks (1966), and Wilson (1960) are some of the most recent efforts that would deserve consideration in this connection.

There are two further methodological side-issues to which future research in this area should address itself. One, the effects of interviewer characteristics on these responses (especially racial differentials), we have already mentioned in an earlier footnote. The second was also brought up in previous discussion--the effects of the response set of social desirability. While the available research evidence from Bachman et al. generally indicates that measures of social desirability show relatively little relation to measures of life satisfaction, their specific relation to the measures of Table 1 has yet to be investigated. No matter how strong such correlations turn out to be, the effects of this response set need to be assessed and controlled before measures of life satisfaction can achieve maximum applicability.
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APPENDIX A

Questions on components of satisfaction (Cantril 1965)

Now I am going to ask you some questions which you can easily answer by looking at the ladder I showed you before.

After I ask you each question, just point to the place on the ladder you think is appropriate for you now. Don't be hesitant or embarrassed in putting yourself near the top or near the bottom of the ladder if that is the way you happen to feel. Just give your first reaction without thinking too much about it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Correlation with Personal Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Table 1.

*See footnote 3.
APPENDIX B

Measures used in the Bachman et al. (1967) study and the distribution of responses to these questions by a cross-section of 2,500 tenth-grade boys. Reproduced from Arscott (1968).

(R - reversed item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Almost always true</th>
<th>Often true</th>
<th>Sometimes true</th>
<th>Seldom true</th>
<th>Never true</th>
<th>Missing data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A28</td>
<td>I generally feel in good spirits</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1=100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A51</td>
<td>I am very satisfied with life</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A65</td>
<td>I find a good deal of happiness in life</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction with Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Almost always true</th>
<th>Often true</th>
<th>Sometimes true</th>
<th>Seldom true</th>
<th>Never true</th>
<th>Missing data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2=100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>I feel that I have a number of good qualities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>I am able to do things as well as most other people</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24</td>
<td>I feel I do not have much to be proud of (R)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A29</td>
<td>I take a positive attitude toward myself</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A39</td>
<td>Sometimes I think I am no good at all (R)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-esteem (Rosenberg)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Almost always true</th>
<th>Often true</th>
<th>Sometimes true</th>
<th>Seldom true</th>
<th>Never true</th>
<th>Missing data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>I am a useful guy to have around</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>I feel that I can't do anything right (R)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A48</td>
<td>When I do a job, I do it well</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A63</td>
<td>I feel that my life is not very useful (R)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B (cont.)

LACK OF SOCIAL SUPPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A73</td>
<td>I feel that nobody wants me</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A82</td>
<td>I feel lonesome</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A90</td>
<td>These days my parents really help out; they don't let me down (R)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A101</td>
<td>I feel loved (R)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOMIE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>No one cares what happens, when you get right down to it</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31</td>
<td>The life of the average man is getting worse, not better</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A36</td>
<td>People don't really care what happens to the next fellow</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A41</td>
<td>I get the feeling that life is not very useful</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A45</td>
<td>These days I get the feeling that I'm just not a part of things</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A53</td>
<td>These days I don't know who I can depend on</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A98</td>
<td>It is hardly fair to bring a child into the world the way things look now</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A107</td>
<td>I feel no one really cares much about what happens to me</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B (cont.)

#### DEPRESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Almost always true</th>
<th>Often true</th>
<th>Sometimes true</th>
<th>Seldom true</th>
<th>Never true</th>
<th>Missing data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A70</td>
<td>I feel the future looks bright (R)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A88</td>
<td>Things seem hopeless</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A89</td>
<td>I feel bored</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A93</td>
<td>I feel down in the dumps</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A96</td>
<td>I feel depressed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A111</td>
<td>I am bothered by noise</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SADNESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Almost always true</th>
<th>Often true</th>
<th>Sometimes true</th>
<th>Seldom true</th>
<th>Never true</th>
<th>Missing data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A20</td>
<td>I feel like smiling (R)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A35</td>
<td>I feel happy (R)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A110</td>
<td>I feel sad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### RESENTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Almost always true</th>
<th>Often true</th>
<th>Sometimes true</th>
<th>Seldom true</th>
<th>Never true</th>
<th>Missing data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A56</td>
<td>Although I don't show it, I am very jealous</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A72</td>
<td>I am likely to hold a grudge</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A75</td>
<td>When I look back on what's happened to me, I feel cheated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A76</td>
<td>I don't seem to get what is coming to me</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A78</td>
<td>I feel I get a raw deal out of life</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A83</td>
<td>If I let people see the way I really feel, they would think I was hard to get along with</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A85</td>
<td>Other people always seem to get the breaks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Product-Moment Correlations of Items on Feelings Scale
(Males, age 25-49 only)

Bradburn and Caplovitz, 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items from Feelings Check-List</th>
<th>Proud</th>
<th>Excited</th>
<th>Top of World</th>
<th>Uneasy</th>
<th>Restless</th>
<th>Bored</th>
<th>Lonely</th>
<th>Depressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive cluster</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleased about having accomplished something</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud because someone complimented you on something you had done</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particularly excited or interested in something</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On top of the world</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative cluster</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaguely uneasy about something without knowing why</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So restless you couldn't sit long in a chair</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bored</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very lonely or remote from other people</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed or very unhappy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rejected negative items**

Angry at something that usually wouldn't bother you
That you had more things to do than you could get done
That you couldn't do something because you just couldn't get going
CHAPTER 3 - MEASUREMENT OF SELF-ESTEEM AND RELATED CONSTRUCTS

Self-esteem as a hypothetical construct has been important in personality theories, such as those of Rogers, Murphy, Horney, and Adler, where survival and maintenance of the human psychological self is seen as analogous to physical survival in other animal species; in studies of attitude change (e.g., Janis, 1954) where low self-esteem is often associated with persuasibility; and in a wide variety of social psychological experiments and field studies (see Wylie's reviews, 1961, 1968; and the recent volume edited by Gordon and Gergen, 1968). Low self-esteem has been related, by scholars as well as popular writers, to political behavior, social disturbances, and various other forms of personal and group dissatisfaction (e.g., McClosky and Schaar, 1965)--the usual claim being that people with low self-esteem are also likely to be alienated, unhappy about their lives, and to feel incapable of controlling their futures. Thus, under a variety of labels--internal control, personal efficacy, ego-strength--self-esteem has been linked with other attitudes or psychological syndromes discussed in this book; for example, alienation, authoritarianism, and life satisfaction.

Yet after many years of conceptual prominence and utilization in research, the self-esteem variable has been difficult to operationalize well. Scales purporting to measure self-esteem or some related concept, such as "adjustment" or "competence," continue to proliferate with apparently little willingness on the part of researchers to face the measurement problems inherent in their work. (There are now perhaps two-hundred such scales in the literature--most used only once.)
This continues to be the situation despite Ruth Wylie's excellent critical review of the "self-concept" literature published in 1961. Personal contact with some of the researchers whose work was criticized at that time, and familiarity with later publications in this area, suggest to us that Wylie succeeded in discouraging some people enough to turn them toward other topics while failing to spark significant methodological advances. The reasons for this result remain a mystery, for the significance of self-esteem as a theoretical construct is still evident. Perhaps the answer lies primarily in the difficulty necessarily encountered in measuring phenomenal variables with instruments whose validity has yet to be firmly established.

In an attempt to facilitate further work on measures of self-esteem, we will state briefly the major methodological problems discussed in detail by Wylie and then review the several approaches to measurement that have been employed in research during the last 20 years. Following this, several scales will be presented, a few to represent each methodological approach.

Definition

Self-esteem, as we have understood the term in choosing scales to be included here, has been defined recently by Coopersmith (1967) as follows:

By self-esteem we refer to the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself: it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval, and indicates the extent to which the individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy. In short, self-esteem is a personal judgment of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds toward himself. It is a subjective experience which the individual conveys to others by verbal report and other overt expressive behavior. (pp. 4-5)
Several features of this definition have methodological implications. First, level of self-esteem is considered to be a relatively enduring characteristic of a person. Although there undoubtedly are transitory fluctuations depending, for example, on momentary successes or failures, receipt of commendation or experience of embarrassment, an individual's general level of self-regard is thought to be fairly stable. Second, self-esteem results from evaluations of the self as an "object," yet in some of its aspects this object is only available for scrutiny by the subject. This presents an unusually difficult problem regarding the validity of measurement instruments. And aside from the matter of scale validation, the problems of individual differences in defensiveness and response-biasing are raised. Third, self-esteem is based on attitudes toward the self, which suggests that a wide variety of attitude measurement techniques may be utilized. And, since attitudes—predispositions to respond favorably or unfavorably to an object or event—may be either conscious or unconscious, these measurement techniques need not be limited to conscious self-reports. That is, projective measures may also be used.

These and several related issues will now be discussed in sufficient detail to alert the reader to important characteristics of the scales to be presented.

Dimensions

A person's self-concept may be thought of as multi-dimensional (Miller, 1963; French, 1969; Sherwood, 1962, 1965). According to this approach, an individual positions himself on a large number of cognitive

\footnote{Indeed, Coopersmith has demonstrated this stability in preadolescent children over a period of three years, r = .70 (1967, p. 10).}
dimensions, such as height, weight, honesty, physical attractiveness, and intelligence. Each of these may have an associated evaluative scale according to which he judges his worth on that dimension. Total or global self-esteem would then be some weighted average of all these dimensional evaluations, where the weights are determined by importance or salience of each dimension in the person's overall self-concept or self-identity. For example, if a person's athletic ability is an important issue for him, his self-evaluation on this dimension will greatly affect his overall self-esteem.

This theoretical scheme immediately suggests problems for the researcher. Each respondent may have an idiosyncratic set of dimensions and weights. If a global self-esteem measure fails to include the most important dimensions for all respondents, or weights all the dimensions equally when they have different subjective salience, then the measure will have limited construct validity. Moreover, some of the dimensions of a person's self-identity may well be unconscious and thus inaccessible to simple conscious self-description.

These problems are difficult to overcome, but at the very least they argue for careful selection of dimensions (items) and some exploration of differential weighting techniques. Measurement of "unconscious evaluations" is a more difficult matter for survey research but will be considered briefly later on.

Actual-Ideal Discrepancy Scores

A common approach to the measurement of self-esteem or self-acceptance (not necessarily equivalent constructs) involves obtaining a difference between a respondent's "actual" or "present" self and his
"ideal" or "aspired" self. There are several problems associated with this procedure. According to Swinehart:

The major weakness in this approach is the frequent failure to establish a baseline for comparisons in measuring the discrepancy; absolute size of the discrepancy is usually taken as a measure of self-esteem, without regard to the subject's satisfaction with his "actual" self-evaluation or the acceptability of a given discrepancy as the subject perceives it (e.g., Calvin and Holtzman, 1953; Hanlon, Hofstaetter, and O'Connor, 1954; Lepine and Chodoroff, 1955). The term "self-acceptance" does not necessarily imply high self-esteem, despite the fact that it is so used in many studies employing a discrepancy measure. Self-acceptance may be based on a realistic recognition of some falling short of an ideal (Taylor and Combs, 1952; Cohen, 1954; Steiner, 1957); if this holds true generally, extremely low actual-ideal discrepancies on rating scales or check lists are likely to reflect defensiveness rather than high self-esteem. Other kinds of instruments used to assess self-acceptance (e.g., Bills, 1954; Owake, 1954) face the same problem.

A good measure based on actual-ideal discrepancies should include some assessment of the importance of each self-evaluative dimension for the subject, the "actual" and "ideal" positions on each of these dimensions and the acceptability of each position to the subject, the acceptability of discrepancies of various sizes on each dimension, and the subject's estimation of his ability to reduce the size of unacceptable discrepancies. If the subjective probability of reducing a disturbing discrepancy is very high, the existence of the discrepancy may have no effect on a person's self-evaluation, but many authors seem to equate any large actual-ideal discrepancy with low self-esteem. (1961, pp. 2-3)

The use of discrepancy scores should be preceded by exploration of the component scores, usually "self" and "ideal-self." Wylie (1961) found in her review of several such instruments that most of the variation between individuals and over time for a single individual was due to the "self" component and not to the "ideal-self" component. This may reflect substantial agreement on a cultural ideal for the traits assessed.

Finally, there is a related controversy (Sherwood, 1962) over the use of the term "ideal." Perhaps "aspired self" would be more appropriate—something like "what you (the respondent) are realistically trying to achieve." This might reveal more about the importance of discrepancies,
although their importance still needs to be determined empirically, and perhaps would yield greater individual differences since it appears, on the surface at least, to be less directly related to cultural stereotypes of the "ideal." More work needs to be done on this matter.

Validity

If it is argued that the self-concept is a strictly phenomenological variable, as does Wylie, then observer ratings of subjects' behavior are irrelevant to the validity of scores on a self-evaluation scale. However, to the extent that a respondent is evaluating himself in a way similar to the evaluations others make of him (e.g., "I am a good speller"), then it makes sense to check his description with that of observers. (Coopersmith's research provides an example of this procedure.) Even where this approach is reasonable, however, it is rarely sufficient to establish the validity of a scale designed to measure self-regard, as opposed to self-description, because regard depends in part on an individual's idiosyncratic standards and on his unique access to some characteristics of himself (e.g., honesty). This leaves one with the need to establish "construct validity" (Cronbach and Meehl, 1955; Campbell and Fiske, 1959).

The process of establishing the construct validity of a self-concept measure contains four steps; as outlined by Wylie, these are as follows:

a) We may make observational, including mathematical, analyses of the measuring process to determine what variables other than the construct in question might be influencing our results.

b) We may ascertain that there are intercorrelations among measures presumed to index the same construct.
c) It is pertinent to make internal item analyses and factor analyses of an instrument to determine how many basic processes must be postulated to account for response variance on the instrument as a whole.

d) Cronbach and Meehl (1955) have suggested that, in the absence of suitable external validating criteria, we may examine results obtained from studies in which responses on the instrument in question are related to other stimulus and response variables. Positive findings from such a study offer support simultaneously to the construct validity of the instrument and to the theory behind the study. In general, such investigations would involve (a) successful prediction of group differences, and (b) studies of predicted changes over occasions (especially after controlled experimental intervention). We must bear in mind, however, that such findings offer ambiguous support at best, since the ratio of unknown to known variables does not preclude alternate interpretations. We are not, therefore, warranted in by-passing validity procedures of the types (a) - (c) above. The appearance of face validity coupled with studies of type (d) will never suffice to establish the construct validity of a newly devised instrument (Wylie, 1961, pp. 25-26).

Unfortunately, most measures of self-esteem used in past research have had little more than face-validation, and the vast majority have been used in only one study. Responses to these scales have been, or could have been, confounded with acquiescence response biases, tendencies to endorse socially desirable statements (see Crowne and Stephens, 1961; Pervin and Lilly, 1967; Edwards, 1955, 1957) due to lack of subject anonymity, failure to include all relevant components of the self, hostility toward the experimenter, the restricted nature of the measuring instrument, and scoring and statistical analysis procedures (especially, as mentioned above, the use of compound indexes whose components have not been separately studied). All of these sources of confusion have been discussed by Wylie in some detail. The list could be extended to include type of instructions, demographic distinctions (age, sex, level of education, race, SES), self-awareness and insight (presumably related to IQ and education), and defensiveness. The latter is just beginning to be studied carefully at the Institute for Social Research by French and his colleagues (French, 1969).
Reliability

For many of the scales used in published research no information about reliability is provided, and it is usually fair to assume that none is available. When reliability coefficients are mentioned, they are primarily of the interjudge or split-half, rather than the test-retest, kind. This is a particularly serious problem in studies where a change in self-esteem over time is predicted—for example, following an experimentally induced failure or after a period of counseling. Especially when an investigator's hypotheses are not supported consistently, it is difficult to tell whether his predictions were unconfirmed or his scale was unreliable.

Equivalence of Measures

Attitude measurement has been attempted with a variety of techniques—from Q-sorts to true-false tests to semantic differentials. Any of these methods is potentially useful in assessing a person's self-regard. However, each has its own advantages and limitations which should be considered by a researcher about to design a study. Each of the standard techniques is discussed briefly below and examples of scales developed to measure self-esteem are given for each one. Then, as in previous chapters, these scales are presented individually with relevant information concerning their development and use. It should be noted that this list is far from exhaustive, being compiled with three main criteria in mind: 1) that each have known reliability and validity, 2) that all major techniques be illustrated, and 3) that several different theoretical positions be represented. In some cases it was impossible to meet all three criteria.
Arranging the scales by method tends to obscure theoretical distinctions. Although these are discussed briefly as each scale is presented, the reader is encouraged to consult original sources to clarify the origins and history of the instruments. The book by Gordon and Cergen (1968) would also be helpful for this purpose.

**Q-Sorts**

In this procedure a variety of statements (items) printed on cards are sorted into piles lying along a specified continuum, such as "like me--unlike me." Generally the number of cards to be placed in each pile is also specified so that a quasi-normal distribution results. Numbers can be assigned to each item according to its placement, and the results of one sort can be correlated with results from another person under the same instructions, or from the same person under different instructions, or at different times.

Using this method, an individual can describe himself, his ideal-self (the person he would like to be), "the average man," his mother, and so on. In most studies the score of interest is the discrepancy between self and ideal-self for an individual, which is taken to be an index of self-dissatisfaction or maladjustment. But it is also possible to define the "healthy" individual on the basis of clinical judgments and to compare an individual's self-description with this "ideal."

There is still disagreement about the effect of forcing a quasi-normal distribution. Block (1956) and Livson and Nichols (1956) have argued in favor of forced distributions, while Jones (1956) has reported that his subjects showed significant individual differences in distribution form, a possibly important characteristic that is ignored when a single form is required of all subjects.
There are other problems with Q-sorting. One is that absolute differences between self and ideal scores sometimes obscure important directional differences. Another is that mere correlations between self and ideal do not reveal important individual differences in patterning (i.e., two persons with the same self-ideal correlation coefficient may have very different self-descriptions). Still another is that the procedure is time-consuming. This presents not only problems of administration time and subject fatigue, but also questions concerning memory. For example, is it reasonable to infer self-dissatisfaction from a discrepancy between self and ideal sorts when the subject cannot remember during the second sort exactly what he said in the first? Finally, we note again that using a discrepancy index whose components are not well studied can present problems of interpretation. Most of the variance in self-ideal discrepancy scores is due to the self component; the ideal component appears to be less variable across individuals and more stable over time (as expected on the assumption that individual ideals are derived in large part from widely known cultural ideals).

In spite of these problems, the Q-sort procedure has been used with considerable success in a number of studies. Most of its drawbacks can be eliminated by careful scale construction and pretesting. (For extensive evaluation of the Q-sort method, see Block, 1961.) The following instruments based on the Q method will be described in detail in this chapter:

1. Adjective Q-Set for Non-Professional Sorters (Block 1961)
2. Butler-Haigh Q-Sort (1954)

The Adjective Q-Set was developed by Block in a series of studies exploring the Q method. It was chosen for the present chapter because it
offers a promising format for survey use, employing easily understood adjectives which are "sorted" by a numbering technique rather than by physical sorting, and is based on a forced-rectangular rather than forced-normal distribution. The Butler-Haigh instrument has been used in a number of counseling studies, as a measure of client improvement. It is based on the personality theory and client-centered therapy technique of Carl Rogers (Rogers and Dymond, 1954). Taken together, these two instruments represent the Q method of self-description fairly well.

**Semantic Differential Scales**

The semantic differential technique developed by Osgood and his coworkers (Osgood and Suci, 1955; Osgood *et al.*, 1957) was designed to measure the meaning of an object or event to a person, rather than his attitude toward it. However, Osgood and Suci (1955) have discovered three general factors of meaning that are measured by the semantic differential—labelled "evaluative," "potency," and "activity." If one conceives of an attitude as a kind of evaluation and, more specifically, as an attitude toward oneself as a self-evaluation, then the semantic differential scales loading high on the evaluative factor may be used to measure attitudes toward the self. At least fifteen of these scales have been identified: good-bad, beautiful-ugly, sweet-sour, clean-dirty, tasty-distasteful, valuable-worthless, kind-cruel, pleasant-unpleasant, bitter-sweet, happy-sad, sacred-profane, nice-awful, fragrant-foul, honest-dishonest, and fair-unfair. For special groups, related continua may be substituted or used in addition. Schwartz and Tangri (1965), for example, used a bipolar "square-cool" dimension in a study involving the self-esteem of Negro sixth-graders in central Detroit.
The procedure requires a person to rate an object, e.g., the self, on a number of seven-point bipolar scales, such as the following:

Beautiful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Ugly

By placing a check in one of the seven spaces, the respondent indicates both the direction and intensity of his feelings about himself on this dimension. The spaces are usually numbered 1 to 7 and scores are assigned accordingly. These scores may be summed across several bipolar scales. Also, discrepancy scores derived from the ratings of two objects (e.g., self and ideal-self) may be calculated and summed, similar to the procedure followed in Q sorting. Of course, all of the usual problems encountered in dimension selection and weighting, and in the employment of discrepancy scores, must be faced by a researcher using this method.

Two examples of Osgood-type semantic differential self-evaluation instruments will be discussed in detail in this chapter, along with a methodologically similar measure developed by Sherwood:

3. Self-Concept Semantic Differential (Schwartz and Tangri 1965)
4. Self-Description Semantic Differential (Pervin and Lilly 1967)
5. Inventory of the Self Concept (Sherwood 1962)

The Schwartz-Tangri measure shows how the semantic differential technique can be applied in studies of children (sixth-graders, in this instance). Pervin and Lilly's instrument was used in a methodological study, which showed that one source of small self-ideal discrepancies may be "need for social approval"—thus questioning the usual interpretation that these indicate truly high self-esteem. Sherwood's Inventory, while not strictly a semantic differential, is quite similar in method, and his theory and research findings make the Inventory interesting enough for
inclusion here. In addition, the two latter measures demonstrate how dimensions can be weighted according to subjective importance.

**Likert-Type Scales**

Many of the instruments designed to measure self-esteem, or other aspects of the self concept, use five or seven point Likert-type scales (Likert, 1932). The respondent is presented with a self-descriptive statement and is asked to rate its applicability to him, usually along the dimension "never ... most of the time" or "very unlike me ... very much like me." Integral values are assigned to each scale point and total scores are usually obtained by simple summation. Statements can be worded positively or negatively to avoid acquiescence.

There are several problems with this method. The summation of items may not be justified if some items are considerably more salient to the individual than others. A related point can be made considering the neutral point on each scale:

The "undecided" category is often considered as a zero or neutral point of an item, and, by analogy, the zero point of a scale might be taken as the attitude score corresponding to the score that would be obtained if the individual checked "undecided" for every item in the scale. However, this interpretation is ambiguous, since such a score could be achieved by checking the undecided category for all items, by checking "strongly agree" for half of the items and "strongly disagree" for the other half, or through some similar combination of agree-disagree responses. (Shaw and Wright, 1967, p. 24).

As with other scaling problems, these difficulties can be considerably reduced through careful item-analysis and pretesting--procedures which have been by-passed in much of the research on self-esteem.

The following instruments containing Likert items have been selected for detailed treatment:
6. Index of Adjustment and Values (Bills, Vance, and McLean 1951)
7. Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg 1965)
8. Personal Competence Scale (Campbell et al., 1960)
9. Body-Cathexis Scale (Secord and Jourard 1953)
10. Low Self-Esteem Scale (Hunt, Singer, and Cobb 1967)
11. Self-Acceptance Scale (Berger 1952)

The Bills Index has been fairly widely used on a variety of populations, and the author has carefully kept records of the results.² It is a good scale for studies involving self-ideal discrepancy as a variable. Rosenberg's measure is useful for survey research because it is quite short, suitable for high school students, and is a veteran as well of several large-scale surveys of adults. The Personal Competence measure has also been successfully used in a number of election-year surveys conducted by the Survey Research Center. In these surveys competence was found to be related both to political attitudes and to involvement in the political process.

The Body-Cathexis Scale was chosen for inclusion because it measures important attitudes that are often ignored in self-esteem research--namely, feelings about the attractiveness of one's own body (for further discussion of the place of "body image" in personality dynamics, see Fisher and Cleveland, 1958). The Low Self-Esteem Scale, as its title implies, taps feelings about the self which border on depression. Finally, Berger's scale was included because it stems from the theoretical notion of self-acceptance (rather than esteem) and was shown to correlate positively with "acceptance

²These can be obtained by writing to Dr. R.E. Bills, College of Education, University of Alabama.
of others," thus suggesting possible connections between self-regard and lack of prejudice.

**Check Lists**

There are several instruments which present the respondent with a series of statements or adjectives each of which he is to check if they apply to him (or to his ideal self, etc.). This is similar to the Likert method, but it does not allow for distinctions of degree on each item; the person indicates only acceptance or rejection of each item. Generally a total score is derived by summing the checks, so the problems of item salience and restricted domain mentioned earlier also arise with this method. There are many such check lists in existence; the following illustrate the range available:

12. Adjective Check List (Gough and Heilbrun 1965)
13. Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith 1967)
14. Ego-Strength Scale (Barron 1953)
15. Interpersonal Check List (Leary 1957)

The Adjective Check List (ACL) is a well-known general personality assessment device, not specifically a self-esteem measure, which can be easily and quickly (10-15 minutes) administered. Barron's measure of ego-strength and Leary's Check List are also fairly general in content although, unlike the ACL, they are based on fairly specific theoretical systems. All three of these measures were devised primarily for clinical use, but can obviously be employed in a variety of other research areas as well.

The Coopersmith Inventory is included for at least two reasons:
1) it has been used in extensive research and found to have considerable validity; 2) it was designed to assess self-esteem in grade-school aged children, a population of interest to many researchers.
These four measures represent several variations of the basic check list format: the ACL and the Interpersonal Check List require only checks next to self-descriptive adjectives and phrases; the Inventory involves dichotomous "like me--unlike me" responses; and the Ego-Strength Scale is made up of true-false items.

**Projective and Open-ended Measures**

Because self-evaluations may not be completely accessible to consciousness, projective testing techniques have been developed in an attempt to infer "unconscious attitudes" and psychological needs related to self-esteem. The respondent is relatively free to respond in whatever way he chooses, and objective coding categories must be developed to classify the wide range of responses that result. Of course this is the major drawback of projective methods for survey studies. It is difficult to agree on appropriate coding categories, and even when one or two instrument designers can do so, it takes considerable time and effort to teach someone else to use the coding scheme reliably. Also, it is not easy to decide how free responses should be quantified. Finally because the responses are supposed to indicate unconscious feelings the problem of establishing validity is even more difficult than with phenomenal measures. Nevertheless, feelings about the self which are not accessible to introspection and direct verbal report, yet are significant determinants of behavior, are theoretically important, and it is worthwhile to develop methods to assess them.

Because projective measures are rarely included in surveys, they will not be presented in this volume. However, the interested reader may want to consider the following: the Incomplete Sentences Blank (Rotter and Willerman, 1947; Rotter et al., 1949), the W-A-Y Technique (Bugental
and Zelen, 1950), a method for assessing attitudes toward one's own name (Diller, 1954).

The use of projective measures in large-scale survey research has been discussed at length in a monograph by Veroff et al. (1960). Several uses of the TAT and Rorschach in self-concept research can be found in Wylie (1961).

We have included one measure that might fall under the "projective" rubric only because it is open-ended and relatively nondirective, although its authors would not claim that it assesses "unconscious" attitudes. This is the Kuhn and McPartland Twenty-Statements Test, which consists merely of twenty blanks following the question, "Who am I?" It is interesting not only for its method, but also for the findings it has generated within the context of the sociological school called "symbolic interactionism," most notably that people tend to list first all their social statuses and roles (e.g., student, father, Catholic) before listing privately held beliefs and feelings, such as loneliness or ambition:

16. Twenty-Statements (Who am I?) Test (Kuhn and McPartland 1954)

**Forced-Choice Measures**

The scales included in this section were chosen as much for their theoretical significance as for their method. Both instruments use a forced-choice procedure, according to which the respondent must decide to endorse either of two alternatives—one representing one end of a dimension, the other representing the opposite end. The dimension being used here was named "internal versus external control of reinforcement" (Rotter, 1966), because in developing his Social Learning Theory (Rotter, 1954; 1955; 1960) Rotter found that perceived contingency was an important variable in
the acquisition and maintenance of many behaviors. He also found that some people develop "generalized expectancies" that the world will be controllable or subject to their influence; while others come to believe their fates are determined mostly by chance or external powers.

Several scales have been designed to measure "generalized expectancy of internal (or external) control;" e.g., Crandall et al. (1965), Battle and Rotter (1963), and Morrison (1966). However, only two will be discussed in the present chapter: the original by Rotter (1966) and an augmented version of it designed to tap dimensions of racial ideology among Negroes in the United States. It is important to note that research involving this scale indicates that the internal-external control measure is definitely not unidimensional in some circumstances:

17. Scales to Measure Internal-External Control (Rotter 1966)
18. Multidimensional I-E Scale (with emphasis on race ideology) (Patricia Gurin et al. 1969)

A Measure of Self-Consistency

The notions of "personal integration" and "identity formation," common in the literature on personality and development psychology, imply that a normal person strives to attain, and maintain, a coherently organized and fairly stable set of attitudes toward himself. In social psychology this is just a special case, though perhaps the most important, of a general tendency to avoid attitudinal inconsistency or "cognitive dissonance" (Festinger, 1957; Zajonc, 1968).

The final instrument to be considered in this chapter is a recently developed measure of self-consistency that appears to be quite promising. It remains to be seen how it relates to scores on other self-concept measures. Some of the relevant theoretical notions, useful for researchers
interested in these relations, can be found in Gergen's (1968) paper, "Personal Consistency and the Presentation of the Self." Preliminary research findings obtained with the Self-Consistency Measure are outlined below in the section describing its use:

19. Measure of Self-Consistency (Gergen and Morse 1967)

Conclusion

So far our discussion has been organized by assessment method rather than theoretical approach, because the state of theoretical development in this area does not allow for concise presentation of alternative theories and associated research. Nevertheless, it is possible to compare the measures described in the following pages according to certain criteria, and hopefully this will aid the reader in choosing a scale appropriate to his needs.

The most general and atheoretical measures, useful for overall self-description and possibly for the development of special purpose subscales, are the ACL and Block's Adjective Q-Set. These both require only that the respondent be familiar with common self-descriptive adjectives. The ACL takes less time to administer, but the Q-Set measures degree of self-descriptiveness while the ACL does not. Several indices have been developed for the ACL (e.g., "self-confidence") and these can be scored on the basis of a single administration. Unless further work were done with the Block Q-Set, it would have to be administered twice, once for "self" and once for "ideal self" descriptions.

Also quite general are the semantic-differential scales. Any one of the three discussed in this chapter can easily be adapted to a researcher's particular needs by the addition of appropriate bipolar adjective
scales. For further information about application of the semantic differential technique see the recent book by Snider and Osgood (1968).

Three instruments cover the broad clinical and social conceptions of self-description and self-esteem: the Butler-Haigh Q-Sort, Bills' Index of Adjustment and Values, and Leary's Interpersonal Check List. All of these are customarily scored for self-ideal discrepancies. Of the three, the Bills Index is probably the easiest to use, but readers interested in the theories associated with the other two would probably prefer them for testing theoretically derived hypotheses.

Three of the scales are based on general social psychological conceptions of self-esteem: those devised by Rosenberg, Coopersmith, and Hunt et al. Of these measures, Coopersmith's is appropriate for school children, Rosenberg's measure covers the widest range of self-esteem feelings and does so efficiently, while the Hunt et al. scale was devised especially to tap the low end of the self-esteem continuum.

The constructs labelled internal-control, ego-strength, and personal competence seem to have much in common. They all tap a sense of personal effectiveness in anticipating and controlling one's self, one's future, and one's physical and social environments. Just how closely the contents of the corresponding scales overlap is an area that needs further exploration.

The remaining scales are all designed for special purposes. The Body-Cathexis Scale assesses satisfaction or dissatisfaction with physical characteristics of the self--an important consideration for predicting to social behavior (e.g., dating). The Berger scale measures self-acceptance, and has usually been administered with other items regarding "tolerance" or "acceptance of others." (These items are included in the list presented
later in this chapter.) The Twenty-Statements Test indicates the importance of social roles in shaping a person's identity, and elicits the names of the most important roles for each individual. Finally, the Measure of Self-Consistency taps sources of conflict within a person's self-conception.

The large number of self-concept measures in existence obviously cannot be covered in a volume such as this. Nevertheless, the 19 scales chosen for inclusion represent the range of available methods and theoretical viewpoints fairly well. Careful reading of the following pages will suggest many fruitful avenues for research which, if followed, could surely reduce the present confusion in the self-concept literature and perhaps yield better measures of the most important components of self-esteem.
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This Q-set was designed to yield a comprehensive description of personality using only commonly known adjectives. It can be administered with "self" descriptive instructions in order to obtain an index of self acceptance.

The scale consists of 70 items which a respondent arranges into seven categories, with 10 items in each category. Each item is an adjective or adjective phrase that should be familiar to a person with a high school education. Unlike the usual Q-sort procedure of sorting cards into piles so as to approximate a normal distribution, Block's Q-set can easily be administered in questionnaire form with the respondent placing a 7 in front of the ten adjectives "most like" him, a 1 in front of the ten "least like" or "most unlike" him, and so on. The resulting distribution is rectangular.

If two "sorts" are obtained describing, say, self and aspired self, a correlation coefficient between them can be calculated by the following method:

\[ r = 1 - \frac{\text{Sum of the squared discrepancies}}{560} \]

A squared discrepancy is the squared difference between self score and aspired self score for a given adjective.

The book in which the scale is reproduced (Block, 1961) contains no information about reliability, validity, or sample on which the scale was devised and tested, because this book is primarily about the Q-sort method in general and about a highly sophisticated Q-set for professional raters in particular. However, two references are made to published studies in which an earlier version of the scale was used (Block and Thomas, 1955; Chang and Block, 1960). We will briefly review relevant data from these studies which bear upon the scale presented here.

The sample for the Block and Thomas (1955) study included 56 student volunteers enrolled in psychology classes at San Francisco State College. They were "relatively homogeneous with respect to age, intelligence, and socioeconomic status."

These students completed two "sorts," with approximately one week intervening. The first was self-descriptive; the second described the respondents as they "ideally would like to be." Correlations between the two ranged from -.30 to .84 with a median of .64.

In Chang and Block (1960) 20 self-identified homosexual males and 20 control males, roughly matched by age, education, and socioeconomic status, describing themselves, their ideal selves and their mothers and fathers using a set of 79 adjectives, most of which
are included in the Adjective Q-Set presented here. As predicted, homosexuals were more likely to identify with their mothers than were the control males. Identification was measured by the correlation between ideal self and mother and father descriptions obtained from the respondents. No difference in self-acceptance between homosexuals and controls was found, and no scores were given in the article.

Reliability
No information given.

Validity
In the Block and Thomas study the following two hypotheses were supported: (a) degree of self-satisfaction, indicated by self-ideal correlation, is curvilinearly related to adjustment (measured by MMPI scales); (b) degree of self-satisfaction is ordinally related to the conceptual dimension of ego control (measured by an MMPI-based scale). To the extent that these hypotheses are theoretically sound, there is some suggestion here that the self-ideal correlation indicates self acceptance.

Location

Administration
Subjects typically complete their first "sorting" in less than thirty minutes; subsequent "sorts" require about twenty minutes.

One possible set of instructions is given below with the scale items.

Results and Comments
This Q-set is interesting because it shows how the procedure of sorting can be adapted for survey use. Before it gains wide acceptance, however, more information relevant to its validity is needed, and test-retest reliability should be explored. Also, it would probably be worthwhile to construct shorter versions for some purposes.

Like the Butler-Haigh Q-Sort, the Adjective Q-Set is subject to the criticisms leveled by Wylie against composite scores such as the self-ideal discrepancy. The same self-acceptance correlation coefficient can be obtained by people with very different responses. Nevertheless, careful scrutiny of such differences, exemplified in Block and Thomas (1955), is possible by comparison of discriminating items.
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AN ADJECTIVE Q-SET FOR USE BY NON-PROFESSIONAL SORTERS
SPECIFIED 7-POINT DISTRIBUTION (N=70)
10 ADJECTIVES IN EACH CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. absent-minded</th>
<th>24. frank</th>
<th>48. self-indulgent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. affected</td>
<td>25. friendly</td>
<td>49. selfish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ambitious</td>
<td>26. guileful</td>
<td>50. self-pitying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. assertive, dominant</td>
<td>27. helpless</td>
<td>51. sense of humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. bossy</td>
<td>28. hostile</td>
<td>52. sentimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. calm</td>
<td>29. idealistic</td>
<td>53. shrewd, clever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. cautious</td>
<td>30. imaginative</td>
<td>54. sincere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. competitive</td>
<td>31. Impulsive</td>
<td>55. sophisticated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. confident</td>
<td>32. Intelligent</td>
<td>56. stubborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. considerate</td>
<td>33. versatile</td>
<td>57. suspicious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. cooperative</td>
<td>34. introspective</td>
<td>58. sympathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. cruel, mean</td>
<td>35. jealous</td>
<td>59. timid, submissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. defensive</td>
<td>36. lazy</td>
<td>60. touchy, irritable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. dependent</td>
<td>37. likable</td>
<td>61. tactless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. disorderly</td>
<td>38. perservering</td>
<td>62. unconventional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. dissatisfied</td>
<td>39. personally charming</td>
<td>63. undecided, confused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. dramatic</td>
<td>40. reasonable</td>
<td>64. unhappy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. dull</td>
<td>41. rebellious</td>
<td>65. uninterested, indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. easily embarrassed</td>
<td>42. resentful</td>
<td>66. unworthy, inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. easily hurt</td>
<td>43. reserved, dignified</td>
<td>67. warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. energetic</td>
<td>44. restless</td>
<td>68. withdrawn, introverted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. fair-minded, objective</td>
<td>45. sarcastic</td>
<td>69. worried and anxious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. feminine</td>
<td>46. poised</td>
<td>70. wise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INSTRUCTIONS:

You have been asked to describe yourself as you honestly see yourself. You are to use the adjectives listed on this page. Please read the instructions through several times since it is important that the procedure be followed in all its detail.

Look through the list of adjectives and notice that a good many of them are descriptive of you, to a greater or lesser degree. Others of the adjectives are quite undescriptive of you and are even the opposite of the way you see yourself. Your task is to indicate the various DEGREES with which each adjective describes you.

As a first step, look through the list and then pick out the TEN adjectives or phrases you feel are most characteristic or descriptive of you. Put the number 7 in front of these words. Now, look through the list again and pick out the TEN words which you feel are quite characteristic of you (excluding from consideration those words you have already given the number 7 to). Write the number 6 in front of these words. Now of those words that remain,
pick out the TEN adjectives that you feel are fairly descriptive of you and place the number 5 in front of them.

Now work from the opposite end toward the middle. Of those words not yet numbered, pick out the TEN adjectives that are most uncharacteristic of you and give them the number 1. Pick out the TEN adjectives that you feel are quite uncharacteristic of you and give them the number 2. Now choose the TEN adjectives fairly uncharacteristic of you and give them the number 3.

As a check, count the words that still have no numbers. If the total is TEN then you have followed the procedure properly. If the total is different, then a mistake has been made somewhere and you had better check to see if you have ten words numbered 7, ten 6's, ten 5's, ten 3's, ten 2's, ten 1's.

When you have checked to see if you are correct, place the number 4 in front of the ten words remaining without numbers and your task is finished.

A few warning words. You may have difficulty in placing the required number of adjectives into each of the categories. For example, where ten words are required for a category, you may find that you have too many or too few. In either event, finish with the required number of words, either by eliminating those that can most sensibly be moved out or by moving in those words that are most relevant. You may feel that some of your word placements are forced. Your task is admittedly an awkward one but try and work through it anyway.

There is a research method in our madness.

In closing we should like to emphasize again that the worth of this research is completely dependent upon how well and conscientiously the various people participating in it carry through their tasks. Numbering the adjectives as described above is perhaps tedious. When honestly done, the results can be quite self-revealing. By the method of coding being used, no one can know just how you honestly evaluate yourself. We would request therefore that if for some reason you feel that you cannot or prefer not to carry through with this task in a meaningful and honest manner, mail in the material with a simple note to this effect. As you can readily see, any analysis of adjectives which have been jokingly numbered or very cautiously responded to would prove to be worthless.
BUTLER - HAIGH Q-SORT (Butler and Haigh 1954)

Variable

This instrument was designed for use in an evaluation of client-centered counseling techniques (Rogers and Dymond, 1954). It purports to measure "self-concept" and "ideal self-concept" as these are conceived by Rogers.

Description

Subjects were required to sort 100 item-cards into nine piles twice--once to describe themselves and a second time to describe their "ideal person." The distribution of items in the nine piles was forced to approximate normal. Subjects were given the following instructions:

1. **Self-sort** - Sort these cards to describe yourself as you see yourself today, from those that are least like you to those that are most like you.

2. **Ideal-sort** - Now sort these cards to describe your ideal person--the person you would most like within yourself to be.

Sample

Subjects were applicants for counseling at the University of Chicago Counseling Center, ranging in age from 21 to 40 years (mean=27 years); 18 were male, 11 female; 16 were students at the University of Chicago and 13 were from the surrounding community.

Reliability

The authors do not discuss the reliability of their items or of self and ideal scores. However, Wylie (1961) has analyzed their published results and come to the following conclusions:

1. Using the self-ideal correlation as a measure of self-esteem yields significant differences between individuals, indicating that the self-ideal r discriminates between people.

2. A test-retest rho of .78 for 16 of the subjects who were used as a control group was computed by Wylie. This was based on self-ideal r's scored 60 days apart. Further analysis suggested that the self score was less stable over this period than the ideal score.

Validity

Butler and Haigh present little evidence regarding the construct validity of their Q-sort measures, but their study offers some contention that self-ideal r is a valid index of self-esteem. Wylie suggests, however, that most of the validity is due to the self component and that little, if anything, is gained by including the ideal component.

Location

Butler, J.M. and Haigh, G.V., Changes in the relation between self-concepts and ideal concepts consequent upon client-centered counseling. In C. Rogers and Rosalind Dymond (eds.), Psychotherapy and
Administration

This measure is self-administered and requires an estimated 45 minutes for each sort. 100 cards, each displaying one self-referent statement (e.g. "I am likeable") are required. For the self sort, the items are placed in nine piles according to the dimension "like me" to "unlike me." For the ideal sort, the dimension is "like ideal" to "unlike ideal."

Results and Comments

The self-ideal r (which mainly reflects self score) increased after counseling, but did not increase in control group or in the treatment group during a pretherapy waiting period.

One problem should be noted with regard to the items as they are stated below. If "like me" is interpreted by a subject as "I am often like this" or "I often do this," then some ambiguity may result from item-phrases which introduce a further degree of frequency--e.g. "I often feel humiliated." It is suggested that such frequency terms should be rewritten to avoid this ambiguity.

References


The following items were reprinted in Rogers and Dymond (1954); the remaining 26 items did not discriminate satisfactorily and are not reported in their article.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative: Contribute to score if fall on &quot;unlike me&quot; side (0-3)</th>
<th>Positive: Contribute to score if fall on &quot;like me&quot; side (5-8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I put on a false front.</td>
<td>I make strong demands on myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel humiliated.</td>
<td>I often kick myself for the things I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I doubt my sexual powers.</td>
<td>I have a warm emotional relationship with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a feeling of hopelessness.</td>
<td>I am responsible for my troubles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have few values and standards of my own.</td>
<td>I am a responsible person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to control my aggression.</td>
<td>I can accept most social values and standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to give up trying to cope with the world.</td>
<td>Self-control is no problem with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to be on my guard with people who are somewhat more friendly than I had expected.</td>
<td>I usually like people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually feel driven.</td>
<td>I can usually live comfortably with the people around me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel helpless.</td>
<td>My hardest battles are with myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My decisions are not my own.</td>
<td>I am optimistic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a hostile person.</td>
<td>I am liked by most people who know me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am disorganized.</td>
<td>I am sexually attractive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel apathetic.</td>
<td>I can usually make up my mind and stick to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't trust my emotions.</td>
<td>I am contented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's pretty tough to be me.</td>
<td>I am poised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am impulsive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative: Contribute to score if fall on &quot;unlike me&quot; side (0-3)</td>
<td>Positive: Contribute to score if fall on &quot;unlike me&quot; side (5-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the feeling that I am just not facing things.</td>
<td>I am a rational person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try not to think about my problems.</td>
<td>I am tolerant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am shy.</td>
<td>I have an attractive personality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am no one. Nothing seems to be me.</td>
<td>I am ambitious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I despise myself.</td>
<td>I have initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I shrink from facing a crisis or difficulty.</td>
<td>I take a positive attitude toward myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just don't respect myself.</td>
<td>I am assertive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid of a full-fledged disagreement with a person.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can't seem to make up my mind one way or the other.</td>
<td>I am likeable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confused.</td>
<td>My personality is attractive to the opposite sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a failure.</td>
<td>I am relaxed and nothing really bothers me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid of sex.</td>
<td>I am a hard worker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a horror of failing in anything I want to accomplish.</td>
<td>I feel emotionally mature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really am disturbed.</td>
<td>I am intelligent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All you have to do is just insist with me, and I give in.</td>
<td>I am self-reliant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel insecure within myself.</td>
<td>I am different from others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to protect myself with excuses, with rationalizing.</td>
<td>I understand myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel hopeless.</td>
<td>I am a good mixer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am unreliable.</td>
<td>I feel adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am worthless.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I dislike my own sexuality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SELF-CONCEPT SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL (Schwartz and Tangri 1965)

Variable

This scale measures favorableness of the self-concept on several evaluative semantic differential scales. It was designed for use in a study of 6th graders.

Description

Ten seven-point scales of the Osgood type (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957) were chosen which either loaded high on the evaluative factor (Osgood and Suci, 1955) or appeared a priori to be suitable for self-evaluation. The adjectives used had to be familiar to sixth grade boys.

Scores could range from 1 to 7 on each bipolar scale and thus from 10 to 70 on the total scale.

The authors administered this instrument in a study of potential delinquents.

Sample

Respondents were 101 Negro sixth graders (typically 12 years old) in an inner-city, all Negro Detroit public school.

Reliability

No information given.

Validity

The boys' teacher and the principal and assistant principal of the school rated each boy in response to the following question: "Which boys will (will never) have police or court contacts?"

Boys rated "good" had a mean self-evaluation score of 23.48; for "bad" boys the mean was 27.29. The difference between these means was statistically significant (t=2.12; p<.05).

Location


Administration

The authors report that the boys had little trouble in filling out the questionnaire measure. Instructions were given orally in class, and examples were written on the blackboard using the concepts "apple" and "my shirt." Although the time taken was not reported, it probably was between five and ten minutes.

Results and Comments

In the study referred to here it was also found that "good" boys' self-concepts correlated highly with what they believe their teachers think of them (using the same bipolar scales to describe what "My teacher thinks I am"). "Bad" boys' self-concepts were correlated with what "My mother thinks I am." This demonstrates how the semantic differential technique can easily be applied in making comparisons.
The Self-Concept Semantic Differential appears to be especially useful when a short, easy-to-understand measure is called for. It would benefit from further analysis of reliability and validity; because of the ease with which it is administered, this should not be difficult to provide.
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## SELF-CONCEPT SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

**I AM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfish (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Good: I am good
- Useful: I am useful
- Superior: I am superior
- Smart: I am smart
- Square (7): I am square
- Tough: I am tough
- Selfish (7): I am selfish
- Friendly: I am friendly
- Kind: I am kind
- Important: I am important

**Opposites:**
- Bad: I am bad
- Useless: I am useless
- Inferior: I am inferior
- Stupid: I am stupid
- Cool (1): I am cool
- Soft: I am soft
- Unselfish (1): I am unselfish
- Unfriendly: I am unfriendly
- Cruel: I am cruel
- Unimportant: I am unimportant
SELF-CONCEPT SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL (Pervin and Lilly 1967)

Variable

The authors were primarily concerned with the relationship between social desirability (measured by the Marlowe-Crowne Scale, consisting of 33 true-false items; see Crowne and Marlowe, 1960) and ratings of self and ideal-self on a semantic differential measure.

Description

One hundred respondents were administered a semantic differential with standard instructions (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957, p. 82). Two concepts, MY SELF and MY IDEAL SELF, were placed on separate pages, each to be rated on the following 13 scales: Evaluative (sociable-unsociable, good-bad, kind-cruel, unselfish-selfish, wise-foolish), Activity (active-passive, eager-indifferent, rash-cautious, excitable-calm), Potency (strong-weak, free-constrained, severe-lenient, hard-soft).

While rating each dimension, respondents indicated how certain they were of their ratings on a 4-point scale from "very uncertain" to "very certain." Following the two concept rating, on a separate page, the respondents judged the importance of each scale "as a personality trait" on a 4-point scale from "very unimportant" to "very important." Finally, they completed the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale.

Sample

The respondents were 50 male and 50 female undergraduates from an unnamed university. No further specification was given.

Reliability

No information given; presumably this was not studied.

Validity

Only face validity can be claimed for the instrument, although the findings reported are in line with the predictions, thus suggesting some construct validity.

Location


Administration

Thirty-nine ratings are required for each of the two concepts—13 for description, 13 for certainty, and 13 for importance. This would take about half an hour to complete.

Results and Comments

No actual scores are reported in this article, only correlations between social desirability scores and the various self measures. The methodological significance of the findings warrants quotation of the authors' summary:

This research tested two hypotheses: (1) High scores on the Marlowe-Crowne SDS will be related to a tendency to judge oneself positively and report few self-ideal self discrepancies on the semantic differential. (2) This relationship will hold
most for adjective scales loading on the evaluative factor, for scales rated as important and for scales on which Ss are uncertain of their ratings. High SD scores were found to be related significantly to high self judgments and low self-ideal discrepancies on scales high on the evaluative dimension, but not on scales high on the potency and activity dimensions. High SD scores were found to be most related to low self-ideal discrepancies and high importance ratings. The study indicated the need to consider the content on which the SD tendency manifests itself and the possible effects of defensiveness on self and ideal judgments.
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### SELF-CONCEPT SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

**A)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Very certain...Very uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsociable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unselfish</td>
<td></td>
<td>Selfish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eager</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rash</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cautious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free</td>
<td></td>
<td>Constrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lenient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Ideal Self</th>
<th>Very certain...Very uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsociable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cruel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unselfish</td>
<td></td>
<td>Selfish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eager</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rash</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cautious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C) How important would you rate each of these scales as a personality trait?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Very unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociable-Unsociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good-Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind-Cruel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unselfish-Selfish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise-Poorish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active-Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eager-Indifferent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rash-Cautious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitable-Calm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong-Weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-Constrained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe-Lenient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Soft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INVENTORY OF THE SELF-CONCEPT (Sherwood 1962)

Variable

This was one measure used by Sherwood (1962; 1965) in an attempt to develop the Self-Identity Theory proposed by Miller (1959; 1963) and elaborated by French (1969). It measures the discrepancy between actual and aspired self on several "identity dimensions," each of which is weighed according to its importance in determining the respondent's overall self-concept. The resulting score, according to the theory, is an approximate index of self-esteem or self-evaluation.

Description

Although Self-Identity Theory is quite general, Sherwood chose to test several of its derivations in the context of a sensitivity-training (T-group) laboratory. This setting was expected to yield changes in identity and self-esteem within a relatively short period (two weeks), which could then be correlated with pressure and information from a "referent public"-- the members of the respondent's T-group. Because of this particular research setting, the dimensions used are often group oriented and probably do not constitute anything like a random sample of identity dimensions. Nevertheless, the instrument could easily be adapted to include other dimensions, and the method involved is worth considering.

Twenty-six labelled bipolar dimensions were chosen and three more were left to be labelled by the respondent. Each had eleven spaces between poles where checks could be placed. Two marks were made on each scale, an X for "actual" or "present" self and an 0 for "aspired" self. The rationale for using aspired rather than "ideal" is given by Sherwood as follows:

...we assume that the ideal self attribute is usually at such a level of irreality as to have lesser behavioral consequences than that of the aspired self attribute, if the latter is perceived by the person as a goal toward which he is motivated, rather than an ideal standard. Therefore, we propose that the degree of self attribute evaluation may be better measured by the discrepancy between the self attribute and the aspired self attribute (1962, p. 42).

Importance ratings were obtained by having the respondent place the number of each dimension on a line indicating its significance for his total self evaluation, using an 11-point scale from "extremely important" to "extremely unimportant." Only six dimensions could be located at each scale point. (See instructions below.)

Sample

The subjects in Sherwood's experiment were 68 adults attending a 2-week session at the National Training Laboratories in Human Relations Training at Bethel, Maine. They were evenly divided between the sexes and had a median age of 40 years.

He also conducted a separate 2-week test-retest reliability study with 57 introductory psychology students at the University of Michigan. This was thought advisable because the T-group sample was
expected to show considerable change over a 2-week period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aspired self-identity</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-identity</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance (&quot;coreness&quot;)</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-evaluation, discrepancy</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expected, the student group showed higher test-retest reliability. The meaning of these results is enhanced by Sherwood's detailed analysis of the causes of change in the experimental (training) group.

Validity

Only face validity was claimed, but a large number of predictions derived from Self-Identity Theory were confirmed, thus suggesting that the measure has promising construct validity. Currently it is being used in several studies at the Institute for Social Research which should add to the information already available for its validity.

Location


A briefer presentation of the research findings can be found in: Sherwood, J.J. Self-identity and referent others, Sociometry, 1965, 28, 66-81.

Administration

The Inventory is self-administered and takes about half an hour to 45 minutes for completion. Of course, this would be considerably altered by changing or adding dimensions.

Results and Comments

Sherwood's findings lend support to the theory he presented and suggest the value of his measure. It should be noticed, however, that he was successful partly because he knew which dimensions of his respondents' self-concepts were likely to be salient in a particular experimental situation. The reader may have to alter these appropriately for different applications.

Although Sherwood's Inventory is not, strictly speaking, a semantic differential in the Osgood tradition, it is similar enough to be included in this section.

Researchers interested in self-actualization, or in the effects of group experiences on an individual's self-identity, will find
the other measures in Sherwood's dissertation worth investigation. Unfortunately there is not enough space to include them all here.
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INVENTORY OF THE SELF-CONCEPT

Instructions

The following characteristics have been found to be used by many persons in describing themselves. Probably not all persons use all of these characteristics to describe themselves. If you find that some of these characteristics are not a part of your present picture of yourself, please indicate that by checking the appropriate place.

Each characteristic is represented graphically by a scale.

1. Please indicate the location on the scale where you presently picture yourself by an: X

Please do not be concerned if you see yourself as being different in different situations (e.g., cooperative-competitive). You are to indicate how you picture yourself in general or most usually.

In addition to your present picture of yourself, we are also interested in the aspirations which people have for themselves. All persons have a desired picture of themselves toward which they see themselves to be realistically striving. This is not meant to be the person's ideal--rather, that picture of yourself which you actually aspire to attain in the future.

2. Please indicate the location on the scale where you aspire to picture yourself by an: O

Do not restrict yourself to a particular range on the scale, feel free to place your responses anywhere on the scale. The only requirement is that you be honest with yourself. Please do not be concerned with the way your answers would be judged by others, this is completely irrelevant here. Remember, you are describing yourself to yourself—not to other people.

Please feel free to make any comments you like on the margins.

The scale runs continuously from one labeled extreme to the other with the varying degrees being indicated by spaces (_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _).

Please mark both an X indicating your present picture of yourself and an O for your aspired picture of yourself. Place your marks in the middle of the spaces (_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _) not on the boundaries.

Sensitive to others

Inensitive to others
The remaining scales were defined by the following pairs of opposites:

Self-confident - Lack self-confidence
Critical of others - Tolerant of others
Skillful with others - Awkward with others
Reserved - Talkative
Value myself high - Value myself low
Participant - Non-participant
Authoritarian - Democratic
Competent - Incompetent
Non-aggressive - Aggressive
Honest - Dishonest
Active - Passive
Likeable - Not likeable
Competitive - Cooperative
Insightful about myself - Lack insight about myself
Follower - Leader
Timid - Bold
Moral - Immoral
Individualist - Conformist
Hostile - Affectionate
Tense - Relaxed
Unfair - Fair
Unintelligent - Intelligent
Liberal - Conservative
Friendly - Unfriendly
Independent - Dependent

The final portion of the questionnaire is concerned with how you evaluate your present picture of yourself.

Listed below are the same 26 characteristics which appeared earlier in this questionnaire. They are listed in no special order. At the end of this list there are 3 blank spaces in which you are to fill in 3 characteristics which are important to your picture of yourself and which were not included in those previously mentioned.

After you have filled in your own descriptions of yourself in the blank spaces provided, please carefully consider how important each of these 29 characteristics is in how you evaluate your present picture of yourself.

The criterion you are to use in determining the importance of each characteristic in evaluating yourself is:

If I were suddenly to see myself as being closer to the end of the scale which is less desirable to me -- how much would this one characteristic lower my total evaluation of my self.

In the spaces provided on the next page, indicate the relative importance of each characteristic to your evaluation of yourself.
1. Sensitive to others - Insensitive to others  
2. Self-confident - Lack self-confidence  
3. Critical of others - Tolerant of others  
4. Skillful with others - Awkward with others  
5. Reserved - Talkative  
6. Value myself high - Value myself low  
7. Participant - Non-participant  
8. Authoritarian - Democratic  
9. Competent - Incompetent  
10. Non-aggressive - Aggressive  
11. Honest - Dishonest  
12. Active - Passive  
13. Likeable - Not likeable  
14. Competitive - Cooperative  
15. Insightful about myself - Lack insight about myself  
(Insert your own three characteristics of yourself here)  
16. Follower - Leader  
17. Timid - Bold  
18. Moral - Immoral  
19. Individualistic - Conformist  
20. Hostile - Affectionate  
21. Tense - relaxed  
22. Unfair - fair  
23. Unintelligent - intelligent  
24. Liberal - Conservative  
25. Friendly - Unfriendly  
26. Independent - Dependent  
27.  
28.  
29.  

Using the above numbers, indicate the importance of each of these characteristics to your total evaluation of your present picture of yourself. Place each item number on one of the lines below. Only one number may be placed on a line ( ), for example, 8 22 29. Not more than 6 items can be placed in any one category (e.g., not more than 6 items can be considered to be: "8 - Quite important." ) Be sure that all 29 item numbers are used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NUMBER</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE FOR TOTAL SELF EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10- Extremely important to my total self evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9- Very important to my total self evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8- Quite important to my total self evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7- Moderately important to my total self evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6- Somewhat important to my total self evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5- No strong feelings either way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4- Somewhat unimportant to my total self evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3- Moderately unimportant to my total self evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2- Quite unimportant to my total self evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1- Very unimportant to my total self evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0- Extremely unimportant to my total self evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, on this scale you are to rate your overall level of self-evaluation or self-esteem, that is, how high or low you presently evaluate your total picture of yourself. (Use an X)

High          Low
INDEX OF ADJUSTMENT AND VALUES (Bills, Vance, and McLean 1951)

Variable

The IAV is based on a conceptual scheme termed "phenomenological psychology" by Bills, Vance, and McLean (1951). According to this conception, "maladjustment may be defined as any discrepancy between the concept of self and the concept of the ideal self." The term value, as used by the authors, refers to a trait which the individual considers desirable. Self-attitudes are evaluations made by the individual of his own traits, interests (means of achieving values), or self. These evaluations are based on the individual's values.

Description

A sample of 124 words was taken from Allport's list of 17,953 traits (Allport and Odbert, 1936). An attempt was made to choose "items which occur frequently in client-centered interviews and which seem to present clear examples of self-concept definitions." On the basis of a three-week test-retest study involving 44 college students, unreliable items were thrown out. The resulting scale contains 49 words.

Respondents use each of the words in the following sentence: "I am a (an) _____ person," and indicate on a five-point scale how much of the time this statement describes them. The scale points from one to five are "seldom," "occasionally," "about half the time," "a good deal of the time," and "most of the time." The numerical responses are recorded in the first of three blank columns following the list of 49 words.

In the second column of blanks, respondents indicate how they evaluate their position on each trait. Ratings are again based on a five-point scale:

1) I very much dislike being as I am in this respect
2) I dislike being as I am in this respect
3) I neither dislike being as I am in this respect nor like being as I am in this respect
4) I like being as I am in this respect
5) I very much like being as I am in this respect

Summing down Column II, then, yields a measure of self-acceptance.

In the third column of blanks, respondents complete another sentence with each word -- "I would like to be a (an) _____ person" -- and indicate how often this is true, using the same scale as for the first column. Columns I and III, then, measure self-concept and ideal self-concept.

Respondents are instructed to complete the three ratings for each word before going on to the next. Therefore, it appears that careful comparisons between self and ideal ratings are encouraged.
Several different groups of college students have been tested. Results from some non-student groups are reported in the Bills manuscript mentioned below.

The 49-item IAV as administered to 237 students at the University of Kentucky. The odd-even split-half reliability of the self-acceptance scale (Column II) was .91 (p<.001). For the discrepancy scores (difference between Columns I and III ignoring sign) this figure was .88 (p<.001). After six weeks 175 students were retested, yielding a test-retest reliability coefficient of .83 for self-acceptance and .87 for discrepancy scores (in both cases, p<.001). For these 175 students, self-acceptance and discrepancy scores from the first test were correlated and a coefficient of -.77 was obtained (p<.001). This indicates that the expected relationship exists between self-ideal incongruence and self-acceptance as measured within the IAV.

In the 1951 report, several investigations relevant to validity were reported. Here these can only be briefly mentioned.

1) Twenty female college students were given the IAV and then a Rorschach examination. Several comparisons between Rorschach indexes of adjustment and self-acceptance scores were made and a remarkable correspondence was obtained in each case.
2) Three classes in mental hygiene received the IAV at the beginning and end of the semester course (total N=38). By chance alone, two students were expected to show changes in self-acceptance greater than 1.97 times the standard error of measurement. In fact, 14 students showed such a change (toward greater acceptance). 3) In a study involving 142 college students the IAV was administered one week before a questionnaire about sources of personal unhappiness -- these sources being scored as either threats from self or threats from others. "Acceptance of self scores below the population mean were significantly related to threat from self and acceptance of self scores above the population mean were significantly related to threat from others."

Since 1951 a number of other studies have contributed evidence for the validity of the IAV. These are discussed, as are norms for various groups, in an unpublished and undated manuscript available from Robert E. Bills, College of Education, University of Alabama.


The Index is self-administered and requires about an hour for slower respondents to finish.
Results and Comments

This is one of the better self-evaluation instruments. It is easy to understand and has been successfully administered to thousands of high school and college students, as well as to various non-student groups. Much information about correlates, reliability, and validity has been carefully collected and organized by Bills. Unfortunately, this material has not been published, but it is available on request.

Of course, the use of discrepancy scores is subject to caution, as indicated by Wylie (1961). But the addition of a self-acceptance measure makes it possible to explore further the meaning of these discrepancy scores.

As noted above, requiring the respondent to evaluate self and ideal-self at one time may impose consistency, or some other bias, more than two separate ratings would (as in the O sort procedure). This problem remains to be explored.
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SELF INSTRUCTIONS FOR IAV

There is a need for each of us to know more about ourselves, but we seldom do have an opportunity to look at ourselves as we are or as we would like to be. On the following page is a list of terms that to a certain degree describe people. Take each term separately and apply it to yourself by completing the following sentence:

I AM A (AN) ___________ PERSON.

The first word in the list is academic. So you would substitute this term in the above sentence. It would read--I am an academic person.

Then decide HOW MUCH OF THE TIME this statement is like you, i.e., is typical or characteristic of you as an individual, and rate yourself on a scale from one to five according to the following key:

1. Seldom, is this like me.
2. Occasionally, this is like me.
3. About half the time, this is like me.
4. A good deal of the time, this is like me.
5. Most of the time, this is like me.

Select the number beside the phrase that tells how much of the time the statement is like you and insert in Column I on the next page.

EXAMPLE: Beside the term ACADEMIC, number two is inserted to indicate that--occasionally, I am an academic person.

Now go to Column II. Use one of the statements given below to tell HOW YOU FEEL about yourself as described in Column I.

1. I very much dislike being as I am in this respect.
2. I dislike being as I am in this respect.
3. I neither dislike being as I am nor dislike being as I am in this respect.
4. I like being as I am in this respect.
5. I like very much being as I am in this respect.

You will select the number beside the statement that tells how you feel about the way you are and insert the number in Column II.

EXAMPLE: In Column II beside the term ACADEMIC, number one is inserted to indicate that I dislike very much being as I am in respect to the term, academic. Note that being as I am refers to the way you describe yourself in Column I.

Finally, go to Column III; using the same term, complete the following sentence:

I WOULD LIKE TO BE A (AN) ___________ PERSON.

Then decide HOW MUCH OF THE TIME you would like this trait to be a characteristic of you and rate yourself on the following five point scale.
1. Seldom, would I like this to be me.
2. Occasionally, I would like this to be me.
3. About half the time, I would like this to be me.
4. A good deal of the time, I would like this to be me.
5. Most of the time, I would like this to be me.

You will select the number beside the phrase that tells how much of the time you would like to be this kind of a person and insert the number in Column III.

EXAMPLE: In Column III beside the term ACADEMIC, number five is inserted to indicate that most of the time, I would like to be this kind of person.

Start with the word ACCEPTABLE and fill in Column I, II, III before going on to the next word. There is no time limit. Be honest with yourself so that your description will be a true measure of how you look at yourself.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. academic</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. acceptable</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. accurate</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. alert</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ambitious</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. annoying</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. busy</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. calm</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. charming</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. clever</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. competent</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. confident</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. considerate</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. cruel</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. democratic</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. dependable</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. economical</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. efficient</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. fearful</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. friendly</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. fashionable</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. helpful</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. intellectual</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. kind</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. logical</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. meddlesome</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. merry</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. mature</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. nervous</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. normal</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. optimistic</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. poised</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. purposeful</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. reasonable</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. reckless</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. responsible</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. sarcastic</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. sincere</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. stable</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. studious</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. successful</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. stubborn</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. tactful</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. teachable</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. useful</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. worthy</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. broad-minded</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. businesslike</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. competitive</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. fault-finding</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SELF-ESTEEM SCALE (Rosenberg 1965)

Variable
This scale was designed to measure attitudes toward the self along a favorable-to-unfavorable dimension and was constructed for use in a large scale survey of high school students.

Description
The author designed the Self-Esteem Scale with several criteria in mind. One was his conception of self-esteem.

When we speak of high self-esteem...we shall simply mean that the individual respects himself, considers himself worthy, he does not necessarily consider himself better than others, but he definitely does not consider himself worse, he does not feel that he is the ultimate in perfection but, on the contrary, recognizes his limitations and expects to grow and improve.

Another criterion was ease of administration. Since the scale had to be completed along with several other scales in one class period, it was held to ten items. The other criterion, unidimensionality (Guttman) and validity are discussed below.

The ten items are of the Likert type, allowing one of four responses: strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. In Rosenberg's study, positively and negatively worded items were presented alternately in order to reduce the danger of response set. The ten items, through the use of "contrived" items (Stouffer et al., 1953), were scored to yield a seven point scale. (See the description accompanying the items below).

Sample
The sample consisted of 5,024 high school juniors and seniors from 10 randomly selected public high schools in New York State. (For some of the validation work the sample was 50 young adult normal volunteers at the clinical center of the National Institute of Health).

Reliability/Homogeneity
Using the Guttman procedure, the reproducibility of this scale was 92 percent and its scalability was 72 percent for Rosenberg's sample of 5,024 students. He also mentions in a footnote (p. 30) that a study by Earle Silber and Jean S. Tippett showed a test-retest reliability of .85 for a group of college students retested after two weeks.

Validity
Several attempts were made to assure validity. (1) fifty young adult "normal volunteers" employed by the National Institute of Mental Health filled out the Self-Esteem Scale and were independently rated by ward nurses on Leary Scales (Leary, 1957, also, see this chapter, p.135). A significant association was obtained between self-esteem scores and depression (as judged
by the nurses). The depression items were "often gloomy" and "frequently disappointed." (2) In the larger survey (N=5,024), a significant correlation appeared between self-esteem and depressive affect (measured by another self-administered scale). (3) A significant correlation was obtained between self-esteem and a number of psychosomatic symptoms. (4) There was significant association between self-esteem and choice as a class leader in a sociometric study involving 272 high school seniors. The first three relationships were negative, the last was positive. Related findings are reported throughout Rosenberg's book.

It is worth noting that the nurses judged high self-esteem scorers as somewhat more likely than low scorers to be "able to criticize self," thus supporting the definition presented above which includes recognized limitations. This also suggests that the nurses were not simply rating self-criticism as a sign of depression.


This scale appears to have been carefully constructed, and its use by Rosenberg indicates that it can make theoretically meaningful discriminations between groups of adolescents. It remains to be seen whether it can also be employed successfully in studies of adults, although the items are quite general and seem appropriate for adults as well as high school students.* Research having to do with self-esteem or competence in particular areas, e.g., intellectual or athletic, would require more specific items. Studies involving the ideal self-concept probably would not be possible with this instrument either, because the items are not appropriate for describing an "ideal." However, where a short and general index of self-esteem is required, this scale is recommended.


*Preliminary analysis of Rosenberg's items included in adult surveys by the Survey Research Center suggests that they are quite all right for this purpose.
SELF-ESTEEM SCALE

Scale Stem I was contrived from the combined responses to the three questions listed below. If a respondent answered 2 out of 3 or 3 out of 3 positively he received a positive score for Scale Stem I. If he answered 1 out of 3 or 0 out of 3 positively, he received a negative score for Scale Stem I.

I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least an equal plane with others.

1 ___________ Strongly agree
2 ___________ Agree
*3 ___________ Disagree
*4 ___________ Strongly disagree

I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

1 ___________ Strongly agree
2 ___________ Agree
*3 ___________ Disagree
*4 ___________ Strongly disagree

All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

*1 ___________ Strongly agree
*2 ___________ Agree
3 ___________ Disagree
4 ___________ Strongly disagree

Scale Stem II was contrived from the combined responses to two self-esteem questions. 1 out of 2 or 2 out of 2 positive responses were considered positive for Scale Stem II.

I am able to do things as well as most other people.

1 ___________ Strongly agree
2 ___________ Agree
*3 ___________ Disagree
*4 ___________ Strongly disagree

I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

*1 ___________ Strongly agree
*2 ___________ Agree
3 ___________ Disagree
4 ___________ Strongly disagree
Scale Stem III

I take a positive attitude toward myself.

1 __________ Strongly agree
2 __________ Agree
*3 __________ Disagree
*4 __________ Strongly disagree

Scale Stem IV

On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

1 __________ Strongly agree
2 __________ Agree
*3 __________ Disagree
*4 __________ Strongly disagree

Scale Stem V

I wish I could have more respect for myself.

*1 __________ Strongly agree  
*2 __________ Agree  
3 __________ Disagree  
4 __________ Strongly disagree

Scale Stem VI was contrived from the combined responses to two self-esteem questions. 1 out of 2 or 2 out of 2 positive responses were considered positive.

I certainly feel useless at times.

*1 __________ Strongly agree  
*2 __________ Agree  
3 __________ Disagree  
4 __________ Strongly disagree

At times I think I am no good at all.

*1 __________ Strongly agree  
*2 __________ Agree  
3 __________ Disagree  
4 __________ Strongly disagree

* Positive responses indicate low self-esteem.
PERSONAL COMPETENCE (Campbell et al. 1960)

Variable
The notion of competence (or alternately, personal efficacy) is closely related theoretically to those of ego-strength (e.g., Barron, 1953) and internal control (Rotter, 1966), both of which are discussed in this chapter. The measure of personal efficacy described below has been used in several SRC studies, especially where there was an interest in links between political behavior and personality. Personal efficacy is a feeling of mastery over the self and the environment. "The person lacking such a sense of mastery may either be tense and anxious about the course of his personal life, or may be resigned in a fatalistic way to a succession of events with which he does not feel that he can cope adequately." (Campbell et al., 1960, p.517)

Description
Several versions of this scale have been used. In studying the 1956 election, eight Likert-type items were used. Items in forced-choice format were used in 1960 and 1964 (see below).

Scoring is accomplished simply by summing the Likert ratings across all items in the scale, or for the forced-choice version, scoring one point for each answer in the personally competent direction.

Reliability/ Homogeneity
Average inter-item correlation for the 1956 items was .16 (for items 1, 3, and 6 the average was about .36). For the three-item scale used in 1960 and 1964 the average was about .30 (see Robinson et al, 1968). No test-retest data are reported.

Validity
In the 1956 election study (Campbell et al., 1960), personal efficacy was related to education and to "sense of political effectiveness." The authors interpreted the complex pattern of relations to mean that education, among other things, contributes to the feelings of personal effectiveness, and that these feelings and further education contribute jointly to sense of political efficacy and political involvement. Consistent replications of this pattern in later election studies supports the construct validity of the Personal Efficacy Scale.

Location

Administration
Depending on how many items are used, this scale should take between 5 and 15 minutes to complete.

Results and Comments
In every election-year survey, personal efficacy has been related to political attitudes and behavior. Apparently this is one personality characteristic that has reliable implications for behavior. The authors' tentative explanation is quite interesting:
The efficiency of ego functioning bears directly on the way in which the individual can or must allocate his energies in dealing with the environment. Where such functioning is chaotic, more energy is drained off in the maintenance of the psychological economy and less remains to initiate and create beyond the immediate emotional necessities. Where the ego is strong, however, the individual can maintain a higher level of involvement in these secondary areas of behavior. (Campbell et al., 1960, pp. 518-519)

This hypothesis, and the relationship between the personal efficacy construct and related ones such as internal control, deserve further study.

Personal competence has been found to correlate positively and significantly with strong-mindedness, trust in people, and trust in government in Robinson et al. (1968). Response distributions for these items are also contained in this volume.

The items were originally developed as an extension of the political efficacy scale (see Robinson et al., 1968) by Douvan and Walker (1956). These authors were the first to find a carry-over from personal competence to competence in other areas. Further analysis revealed that people who scored low on competence consistently gave answers to projective questions (viz. TAT pictures) "which reflected a posture of an oppressive uncontrollable external reality." People scoring low in competence were no different from others in their view of the internal environment however.
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Personal Competence (Likert-type items used in 1956)

(* Reversed scoring)

*1. I would rather decide things when they come up than always try to plan ahead.
   Agree a lot       Agree a little       Disagree a little       Disagree a lot
2. I have always felt pretty sure my life would work out the way I wanted it to.
*3. I seem to be the kind of person that has more bad luck than good luck.
4. I never have any trouble making up my mind about important decisions.
5. I have always felt that I have more will power than most people have.
*6. There's not much use for me to plan ahead because there's usually something that makes me change my plans.
7. I nearly always feel pretty sure of myself even when people disagree with me.
*8. I have often had the feeling that it's no use to try to get anywhere in this life.
Personal Competence (Forced choice items used in 1960 and 1964)
(* indicates personal competence)

1. Have you usually felt pretty sure your life would work out the way
   you want it to, or have there been times when you haven't been very
   sure about it?
   *Pretty sure Sometimes not very sure

2. Do you feel that you are the kind of person who gets his share of
   bad luck, or do you feel that you have mostly good luck?
   *Mostly good luck Bad luck

3. When you make plans ahead do you usually get to carry out things the
   way you expected, or do things usually come up to make you change
   your plans?
   *Things work out as expected Have to change plans

Personal Competence (Forced choice items used only in 1960)

4. Are you the kind of person that plans his life ahead all the time or do
   you live more from day to day?
   *Plans ahead Live from day to day

5. Some people feel like other people push them around a good bit. Others
   feel that they run their lives pretty much the way they want to. How
   is it with you?
   *Run own life Get pushed around

6. Would you say you nearly always finish things once you start them or
   do you sometimes have to give up before they are finished?
   *Always finish Sometimes give up

7. If you had your choice, would you rather have a job where you gave the
   orders or a job where somebody else told you what to do?
   *Rather give orders Rather be told what to do
BODY-CATHEXIS SCALE (Secord and Jourard 1953)

Variable

One of the components of the self, when self is considered as an attitude object, is the physical body. The BC-SC Scale was designed to measure attitude toward one's body. The term body-cathexis means "the degree of feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the various parts or processes of the body." The scale also measures the more general self-cathexis (self-esteem).

Description

The scale is divided into two sections: the first a listing of 46 body parts and functions; the second, 55 self traits believed to represent a sampling of the various conceptual aspects of the self. Items in both sections are rated on the following 5-point scale:

1. Have strong feelings and wish change could somehow be made.
2. Don't like, but can put up with.
3. Have no particular feelings one way or the other.
5. Consider myself fortunate.

Secord and Jourard were interested in discovering the extent to which level of self-esteem was associated with level of satisfaction with one's body. They also wanted to know whether dissatisfaction with the body was a source of anxiety and insecurity. To explore these interests, one group of subjects was given the BC-SC Scale and the H Test, which measures anxiety related to parts and functions of the body (Secord, 1953); another group was given the BC-SC Scale and the Maslow Test of Psychological Security-Insecurity (Maslow, et. al., 1945). (For resulting distributions, see table below.) Each subscale score is derived by summing item ratings and dividing the sum by the number of items.

Sample

For the study including the H Test, subjects were 70 college males and 56 females. The second study involved 47 college men and women (breakdown by sex was not given). The authors reported that "no important differences between means of the various scores for the two sexes were obtained."

In order to reduce the effects of response biasing, subjects falling into the following categories were not included in computations: (a) a frequency = 32 in category 4; (b) a frequency=28 in category 5; and (c) a frequency=24 in category 5, when accompanied by less than 2 responses in categories 1 and 2 combined.

This resulted in a final sample comprising 45 males and 43 females.
Split-half reliability coefficients (corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula) were calculated; they are presented with means and standard deviations below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body-cathexis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-cathexis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These reliabilities are high, considering that the eliminated subjects would have raised the impression of consistency.

For males, the correlation between BC and SC scores was .58 (N=45, p<.01); for females it was .66 (N=43, p<.01). This suggests that body-cathexis and self-esteem co-vary to a moderate degree.

An "anxiety-indicator score," obtained by summing the ratings for each male on the 11 BC-Scale items most negatively cathexed by the group of males and dividing by 11, correlated -.37 with the H Test (N=45, p<.05). A similar score for females yielded r=-.40 (N=43, p<.01). This lends some support to the notion that negatively cathexed body features are causes of anxiety.

The Maslow test correlated -.37 with BC (N=46, p<.01) -.41 with the anxiety indicator score (N=46, p<.01) and -.52 with SC (N=46, p<.01). This indicates that low cathexis is associated to some degree with insecurity.


Both parts of the BC-SC Scale are self-administered. The combined scales should take less than an hour to complete. The instructions used by Secord and Jourard are given below with the items.

This scale, because it is an attempt to measure an important but neglected component of the self, deserves more attention. The reliability appears satisfactory, but further tests are needed, especially of the test-retest sort. The validation evidence is weak because of the lack of complete reliability of the Maslow and H Tests. Further work is needed with better criterion measures.
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INSTRUCTIONS AND ITEMS

On the following pages are listed a number of things characteristic of yourself or related to you. You are asked to indicate which things you are satisfied with exactly as they are, which things you worry about and would like to change if it were possible, and which things you have no feeling about one way or the other.

Consider each item listed below and encircle the number which best represents your feelings according to the following scale:

1. Have strong feelings and wish change could somehow be made.
2. Don't like, but can put up with.
3. Have no particular feelings one way or the other.
5. Consider myself fortunate.

Body-Cathexis Items Used in BC Scale

- hair
- facial complexion
- appetite
- hands
- distribution of hair over body
- nose
- fingers
- elimination
- wrists
- waist
- energy level
- back
- ears
- chin
- exercise
- ankles
- neck
- shape of head
- body build
- profile
- height
- age
- width of shoulders
- arms
- chest
- eyes
- digestion
- hips
- skin texture
- lips
- legs
- teeth
- forehead
- feet
- sleep
- voice
- health
- sex activities
- knees
- posture
- face
- weight
- sex (male or female)
- back view of head
- trunk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Cathexis Items Used in SC Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>first name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to express self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taste in clothes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sense of duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sophistication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life-goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>artistic talents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popularity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imagination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitivity to opinions of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>last name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impulses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handwriting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligence level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>athletic skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>love life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strength of conviction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skill with hands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOW SELF-ESTEEM (Hunt, Singer, and Cobb 1967)

Variable

This scale was originally developed to be part of an inventory to measure the various manifestations of depression (Hunt, Singer, and Cobb, 1967). A review of the literature (Singer, 1964) established that the central dimension in the syndrome of depression is lowered self-esteem. Other important manifestations of depression include helplessness, increased unmet dependency needs, withdrawal, retardation, and disturbed body rhythms.

Description

Items to measure the various components of depression were selected from those utilized in previous studies, with most of them coming from a study by Grinker et al. (1961). Many of the questions were converted into the form of five-point scales, since it was felt this was a necessary level of discrimination. The original wording was maintained whenever this was consistent with the goal of keeping the questions as simple and as short as possible.

A relatively arbitrary decision was made regarding the number and type of items to include in indices to measure each depression component. Index construction was guided by factor-analytic results in Grinker's study (Grinker et al., 1961) and by the face validity of the items. A self-rating inventory was devised to measure the components of the depression syndrome suggested by the literature review (Singer, 1964).

Most of the indices from the inventory have been incorporated into a card-sort measure (Hunt, Schupp, and Cobb, 1966) of sixteen affective dimensions. Variables measured by the card-sort include anxiety, anger-irritation, resentment, impulse to aggression, depression, and self-esteem.

A factor analysis (Lillibridge, 1968) of responses to the card-sort measure, revealed separate factors corresponding to most of affective dimensions. The present version of the low self-esteem scale, based on the results of the factor analysis, includes many of the items from the original inventory indices for self-esteem and retardation.

The eleven items are of the Likert type allowing one of five responses: very untrue, somewhat untrue, neither true nor untrue, somewhat true, very true. In the card-sort measure these items are randomly interspersed among 103 other items.

Sample

The depression inventory was developed and validated using psychiatric outpatient and normal samples. Employed municipal workers, firemen, and some volunteers from middle-class households comprised the normal sample. The psychiatric sample consisted of the patients seen at a university outpatient clinic over a two-week period. This latter sample included both long-
term treatment patients and medical referrals who were seen only for a single consultation. Patients reported by the psychi-iatrist to have severe disturbances in reality orientation were excluded. There were both men and women in these samples and their mean age was about 37 years.

The analysis of card-sort responses utilized a sample of male blue-collar workers between the ages of 35 and 59 who were married and had at least three years seniority.

Reliability The test-retest reliability for the depression inventory indices was determined, over an interval of three to four weeks, for the normal sample. The indices for low self-esteem and retardation showed reliability values of .72 and .66, respectively. The mean item intercorrelation for the eleven questions in the present version of the low self-esteem scale is .32 based on data from the blue-collar workers.

Validity Diagnostic summaries from clinical case records for the patient sample were coded for mention of depression by a trained staff member. It was found that the mean scores on the low self-esteem and retardation indices discriminate significantly between patients diagnosed as depressed, and the normal sample. These indices appear to possess significant concurrent validity.

In the current longitudinal study of blue-collar workers who lost their jobs due to a plant closing (Cobb, Brooks, Kasl, and Connelly, 1966), interviewer ratings of self-esteem are correlated with the card-sort self-esteem index. Preliminary analyses suggest that these correlations vary from a low of .10 to a high of .50, with the correlation tending to increase with time since the plant closing. Analysis of this data is continuing.


Administration Scale is self-administered and takes less than five minutes to complete.

Results and Comments Although this scale is still quite experimental, preliminary results indicate that it is a useful measure of low self-esteem, an important component of depression. It is interesting to note that items originally labeled "retardation"--involving mental alertness and quickness--correlate with more traditional self-esteem and depression indicants such as "I'm a failure." The reason for this relationship requires further explanation.

Crinker, R., Miller, J., Sabshin, M., Nunn, R. and Nunnally, J.  


Lillibridge, J.  Construction of revised affective states indices based on factor analysis of card sort items, unpublished manuscript. MHI Project 327, Analysis Memo No. 6, January 1968.

Singer, K.  A study of depression, unpublished manuscript. MHI Reprint No. 70, September, 1964.

(The last three documents were produced in the Mental Health in Industry program at the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.)
LOW SELF-ESTEEM

(* Agree response indicates low self-esteem)

1. I am a quick thinker.
2. When I do a job, I do it well.
3. I am usually alert.
4. When I make plans ahead, I usually get to carry out things the way I expected.
5. I am good at remembering things.
6. As a husband, I do a good job these days.
7. I feel the future looks bright.
8. I am a useful guy to have around.
9. I am inclined to feel that I'm a failure.
10. I sometimes feel that my life is not very useful.
11. I feel as though nothing I do is any good.
SELF-ACCEPTANCE SCALE (Berger 1952)

Variable
Self-acceptance was defined in accordance with an intensive study by Scheerer (1949). The self-accepting person is characterized by behavior guided by internalized values (rather than external pressure), "a faith in his capacity to cope with life," responsibility, objective acceptance of criticism, sense of self-worth, and an absence of shyness or self-consciousness.

Description
Berger prepared an initial scale containing 47 statements on self-acceptance to be used in conjunction with a scale measuring acceptance of others. These scales were administered to 200 students in first year sociology or psychology, ages 17 to 45. An item analysis was performed in which those respondents whose total scores were in the top 25 percent were compared on each item with those in the bottom 25 percent. The best items, in terms of relevance to the definition of self-acceptance and discriminative ability, were chosen for inclusion in the final scales. Thirty-six items were included in the self-acceptance scale.

Sample
The 36 item scale was administered to the following groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day-session college students</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>135.50</td>
<td>22.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening-session college students</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>142.63</td>
<td>13.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>128.45</td>
<td>23.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stutterers</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>141.36</td>
<td>27.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech problems at University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>116.43</td>
<td>11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult classes at Y.M.C.A.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>128.77</td>
<td>26.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability/Homogeneity
Matched-half reliabilities were computed for the groups listed above, and the Spearman-Brown formula was then used to estimate whole-test reliability. These estimates were all .894 or greater for the self-acceptance scale, except for one group for which it was .746.

Validity
Twenty subjects wrote essays about themselves which were then scored for self-acceptance by four judges (average intercorrelation on the Self-Acceptance Scale and essay ratings was .897). Berger also discusses several group differences which serve as evidence of the scale's validity.

Location

Administration
Each of the 36 items was matched with a Likert-type answer space on an IBM scoring sheet. The answers ran from "not at all true of myself" to "true of myself." Estimated completion time is about 20 minutes.
Results and Comments

Using this scale, Berger concluded that self-acceptance and acceptance of others are significantly related. He has also kindly provided us with a list of related studies using his scale, and these are listed among the references below.
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SELF-ACCEPTANCE SCALE

(The asterisked items measure self-acceptance; the others measure acceptance of others.)

This is a study of some of your attitudes. Of course, there is no right answer for any statement. The best answer is what you feel is true of yourself.

You are to respond to each question on the answer sheet according to the following scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Slightly true of myself</td>
<td>About half-way true of myself</td>
<td>Mostly true of myself</td>
<td>True of myself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remember, the best answer is the one which applies to you.

*1. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems. (High acceptance end of answer scale: 1)

*2. I don't question my worth as a person, even if I think others do. (5)

3. I can be comfortable with all varieties of people--from the highest to the lowest. (5)

4. I can become so absorbed in the work I'm doing that it doesn't bother me not to have any intimate friends. (1)

5. I don't approve of spending time and energy in doing things for other people. I believe in looking to my family and myself more and letting others shift for themselves. (1)

*6. When people say nice things about me, I find it difficult to believe they really mean it. I think maybe they're kidding me or just aren't being sincere. (1)

*7. If there is any criticism or anyone says anything about me, I just can't take it. (1)

*8. I don't say much at social affairs because I'm afraid that people will criticize me or laugh if I say the wrong thing. (1)

*9. I realize that I'm not living very effectively but I just don't believe I've got it in me to use my energies in better ways. (1)

10. I don't approve of doing favors for people. If you're too agreeable they'll take advantage of you. (1)

*11. I look on most of the feelings and impulses I have toward people as being quite natural and acceptable. (5)

*12. Something inside me just won't let me be satisfied with any job I've done--if it turns out well, I get a very smug feeling that this is beneath me, I shouldn't be satisfied with this, this isn't a fair test. (1)
13. I feel different from other people. I'd like to have the feeling of security that comes from knowing I'm not too different from others. (1)

14. I'm afraid for people that I like to find out what I'm really like, for fear they'd be disappointed in me. (1)

15. I am frequently bothered by feelings of inferiority. (1)

16. Because of other people, I haven't been able to achieve as much as I should have. (1)

17. I am quite shy and self-conscious in social situations. (1)

18. In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else. (1)

19. I usually ignore the feelings of others when I'm accomplishing some important end. (1)

20. I seem to have a real inner strength in handling things. I'm on a pretty solid foundation and it makes me pretty sure of myself. (5)

21. There's no sense in compromising. When people have values I don't like, I just don't care to have much to do with them. (1)

22. The person you marry may not be perfect, but I believe in trying to get him (or her) to change along desirable lines. (1)

23. I see no objection to stepping on other people's toes a little if it'll help get me what I want in life. (1)

24. I feel self-conscious when I'm with people who have a superior position to mine in business or at school. (1)

25. I try to get people to do what I want them to do, in one way or another. (1)

26. I often tell people what they should do when they're having trouble in making a decision. (1)

27. I enjoy myself most when I'm alone, away from other people. (1)

28. I think I'm neurotic or something. (1)

29. I feel neither above nor below the people I meet. (5)

30. Sometimes people misunderstand me when I try to keep them from making mistakes that could have an important effect on their lives. (1)

31. Very often I don't try to be friendly with people because I think they won't like me. (1)

32. There are very few times when I compliment people for their talents or jobs they've done. (1)
33. I enjoy doing little favors for people even if I don't know them well. (5)
*34. I feel that I'm a person of worth, on an equal plane with others. (5)
*35. I can't avoid feeling guilty about the way I feel toward certain people in my life. (1)
36. I prefer to be alone rather than have close friendships with any of the people around me. (1)
*37. I'm not afraid of meeting new people. I feel that I'm a worthwhile person and there's no reason why they should dislike me. (5)
*38. I sort of only half-believe in myself. (1)
39. I seldom worry about other people. I'm really pretty self-centered. (1)
*40. I'm very sensitive. People say things and I have a tendency to think they're criticizing me or insulting me in some way and later when I think of it, they may not have meant anything like that at all. (1)
*41. I think I have certain abilities and other people say so too, but I wonder if I'm not giving them an importance way beyond what they deserve. (1)
*42. I feel confident that I can do something about the problems that may arise in the future. (5)
43. I believe that people should get credit for their accomplishments, but I very seldom come across work that deserves praise. (1)
44. When someone asks for advice about some personal problem, I'm most likely to say, "It's up to you to decide," rather than tell him what he should do. (5)
*45. I guess I put on a show to impress people. I know I'm not the person I pretend to be. (1)
46. I feel that for the most part one has to fight his way through life. That means that people who stand in the way will be hurt. (1)
47. I can't help feeling superior (or inferior) to most of the people I know. (1)
*48. I do not worry or condemn myself if other people pass judgment against me. (5)
49. I don't hesitate to urge people to live by the same high set of values which I have for myself. (1)
50. I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong. (5)
*51. I don't feel very normal, but I want to feel normal. (1)
*52. When I'm in a group I usually don't say much for fear of saying the wrong thing. (1)
*53. I have a tendency to sidestep my problems. (1)
54. If people are weak and inefficient I'm inclined to take advantage of them. I believe you must be strong to achieve your goals. (1)

55. I'm easily irritated by people who argue with me. (1)

56. When I'm dealing with younger persons, I expect them to do what I tell them. (1)

57. I don't see much point to doing things for others unless they can do you some good later on. (1)

*58. Even when people do think well of me, I feel sort of guilty because I know I must be fooling them--that if I were really to be myself, they wouldn't think well of me. (1)

*59. I feel that I'm on the same level as other people and that helps to establish good relations with them. (5)

60. If someone I know is having difficulty in working things out for himself, I like to tell him what to do. (1)

*61. I feel that people are apt to react differently to me than they would normally react to other people. (1)

*62. I live too much by other peoples' standards. (1)

*63. When I have to address a group, I get self-conscious and have difficulty saying things well. (1)

*64. If I didn't always have such hard luck, I'd accomplish much more than I have. (1)
Variable

The Adjective Check List (ACL) can be used to measure self-conception or conceptions of others (e.g., the "typical college freshman"). Twenty-four indices have been developed which can be scored from one administration of the ACL: total adjectives checked, defensiveness, total favorable adjectives, total unfavorable, self-confidence, self-control, lability, personal adjustment, achievement, dominance, endurance, order, intraception, nurturance, affiliation, heterosexuality, exhibition, autonomy, aggression, change, succorance, abasement, deference, and counseling readiness.

Description

The 171 words from Cattell's factor-analytic studies (1943, 1946) were supplemented with adjectives thought to be relevant to the personality theories of Freud, Jung, Mead, Murray, and others, and a list totaling 279 words was thus obtained. Over several years of experimental use, the total was raised to 300.

The several separate indices were constructed primarily by studying correlational patterns with other personality measures and behavior. Additional indices could of course be obtained either by a priori clustering of adjectives or by further empirical research.

A full description of all indices is contained in the manual by Gough and Heilbrun (1965), available from Consulting Psychologists Press (577 College Avenue, Palo Alto, California 94306). As an example, consider "self-confidence." This index was devised by contrasting self-descriptions of men and women rated as higher and lower on poise, self-assurance, and so on. Items with consistent positive correlations are called "indicative" of self-confidence, items with negative correlations are listed as "contraindicative."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative</th>
<th>Contraindicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aggressive</td>
<td>affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrogant</td>
<td>anxious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assertive</td>
<td>cautious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear-thinking</td>
<td>commonplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td>fickle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conscientious</td>
<td>gentle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courageous</td>
<td>inhibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determined</td>
<td>lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominant</td>
<td>modest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energetic</td>
<td>patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enterprising</td>
<td>quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enthusiastic</td>
<td>reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forceful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high-strung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humorous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obliging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outspoken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicative (continued)
persistent
progressive
rational
resourceful
sharp-witted
shrewd
sociable
strong
talkative

Score is determined by subtracting number of contraindicative from indicative adjectives checked and then converting to a standard score according to sex and total number of adjectives checked. Similar methods are used to score the other 23 indices.

Sample
Four experimental groups were used to study test-retest reliability: 56 college males and 23 college females tested 10 weeks apart, 100 college males retested after 6 months, and 34 medical students retested after five and one-half years.

Reliability
For our sample scale, "self-confidence," test-retest coefficients were as follows for the samples just mentioned: .73, .64, .69, and .63. The authors note that reliabilities, although of this magnitude for most of their indices, are lower than for many other kinds of self-description instrument and may indicate that the ACL is subject to short-term fluctuations in mood, etc. The authors found that reliability coefficients were significantly related to certain checked adjectives, so test-retest stability is a characteristic of the respondent as well as the test.

Validity
Acquiescence is controlled for to a large extent by assigning standard scores after taking "total number checked" into account. Correlations between Edwards Social Desirability Scale and the various ACL indices were generally lower than for other self-description instruments (median was +.16) for "self-confidence," .06 (N = 400)--so SD appears not to be an important contaminant.

The ACL indices have indicated considerable construct validity in a wide variety of studies (reported in Gough and Heilbrun, 1965), including prediction of college dropout (Heilbrun, 1962), termination of counseling (Heilbrun, 1961), and architectural creativity (MacKinnon, 1963).

Location

Administration
The scale is self-administered and may be completed in 10 to 15 minutes, even by unsophisticated respondents.

Results and Comments
This is a widely used instrument--easy to administer and to understand, because it requires only a knowledge of adjectives most of which are from everyday language. It appears to be a fruitful way to collect a great deal of data in a short time.
Because the ACL is manufactured for sale, along with its scoring manuals, profile sheets, and associated devices, by Consulting Psychologists Press, we cannot reprint much of the relevant information (such as tables of standard scores) here. Hence, it would be advisable for a researcher desiring detailed information to obtain the ACL manual. Information and materials for machine scoring are also available.
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ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST

1. absent-minded
2. active
3. adaptable
4. adventurous
5. affected
6. affectionate
7. aggressive
8. alert
9. aloof
10. ambitious
11. anxious
12. apathetic
13. appreciative
14. argumentative
15. arrogant
16. artistic
17. assertive
18. attractive
19. autocratic
20. awkward
21. bitter
22. blustering
23. boastful
24. bossy
25. calm
26. capable
27. careless
28. cautious
29. changeable
30. charming
31. cheerful
32. civilized
33. clear-thinking
34. clever
35. coarse
36. cold
37. commonplace
38. complaining
39. complicated
40. conceited
41. confident
42. confused
43. conscientious
44. conservative
45. considerate
46. contented
47. conventional
48. cool
49. cooperative
50. courageous

51. cowardly
52. cruel
53. curious
54. cynical
55. daring
56. deceitful
57. defensive
58. deliberate
59. demanding
60. dependable
61. dependent
62. despondent
63. determined
64. dignified
65. discreet
66. disorderly
67. dissatisfied
68. distractible
69. distrustful
70. dominant
71. dreamy
72. dull
73. easy-going
74. effeminate
75. efficient
76. egotistical
77. emotional
78. energetic
79. enterprising
80. enthusiastic
81. evasive
82. excitable
83. fair-minded
84. fault-finding
85. fearful
86. feminine
87. fickle
88. flirtatious
89. foolish
90. forceful
91. foresighted
92. forgetful
93. forgiving
94. formal
95. frank
96. friendly
97. frivolous
98. fussy
99. generous
100. gentle

101. gloomy
102. good-looking
103. good-natured
104. greedy
105. handsomely
106. hard-headed
107. hard-hearted
108. hasty
109. headstrong
110. healthy
111. helpful
112. high-strung
113. honest
114. hostile
115. humorous
116. hurried
117. idealistic
118. imaginative
119. immature
120. impatient
121. impulsive
122. independent
123. indifferent
124. individualistic
125. industrious
126. infantile
127. informal
128. ingenious
129. inhibited
130. initiative
131. insightful
132. intelligent
133. interests-narrow
134. interests-wide
135. intolerant
136. inventive
137. irresponsible
138. irritable
139. jolly
140. kind
141. lazy
142. leisurely
143. logical
144. loud
145. loyal
146. mannerly
147. masculine
148. mature
149. meek
150. methodical

151. mild
152. mischievous
153. moderate
154. modest
155. moody
156. nagging
157. natural
158. nervous
159. noisy
160. obliging
161. obnoxious
162. opinionated
163. opportunistic
164. optimistic
165. organized
166. original
167. outgoing
168. outspoken
169. painstaking
170. patient
171. peaceable
172. peculiar
173. persevering
174. persistent
175. pessimistic
176. planful
177. pleasant
178. pleasure-seeking
179. poised
180. polished
181. practical
182. praising
183. precise
184. prejudiced
185. preoccupied
186. progressive
187. prudish
188. quarrelsome
189. queer
190. quick
191. quiet
192. quitting
193. rational
194. rattlebrained
195. realistic
196. reasonable
197. rebellious
198. reckless
199. reflective
200. relaxed
201. reliable  
202. resentful  
203. reserved  
204. resourceful  
205. responsible  
206. restless  
207. retiring  
208. rigid  
209. robust  
210. rude  
211. sarcastic  
212. self-centered  
213. self-confident  
214. self-controlled  
215. self-denying  
216. self-pitying  
217. self-punishing  
218. self-seeking  
219. selfish  
220. sensitive  
221. sentimental  
222. serious  
223. severe  
224. sexy  
225. shallow  
226. sharp-witted  
227. shiftless  
228. show-off  
229. shrewd  
230. shy  
231. silent  
232. simple  
233. sincere  
234. slipshod  
235. slow  
236. sly  
237. smug  
238. snobbish  
239. sociable  
240. soft-hearted  
241. sophisticated  
242. spendthrift  
243. spineless  
244. spontaneous  
245. spunky  
246. stable  
247. steady  
248. stern  
249. stingy  
250. stolid  
251. strong  
252. stubborn  
253. submissive  
254. suggestible  
255. sulky  
256. superstitious  
257. suspicious  
258. sympathetic  
259. tactful  
260. tactless  
261. talkative  
262. temperamental  
263. tense  
264. thankless  
265. thorough  
266. thoughtful  
267. thrifty  
268. timid  
269. tolerant  
270. touchy  
271. tough  
272. trusting  
273. unaffected  
274. unambitious  
275. unassuming  
276. unconventional  
277. undependable  
278. understanding  
279. unemotional  
280. unexcitable  
281. unfriendly  
282. uninhibited  
283. unintelligent  
284. unkind  
285. unrealistic  
286. unscrupulous  
287. unselfish  
288. unstable  
289. vindictive  
290. versatile  
291. warm  
292. wary  
293. weak  
294. whiny  
295. wholesome  
296. wise  
297. withdrawn  
298. witty  
299. worrying  
300. zany
### Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith 1967)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This scale for children ages 8 to 10 measures the evaluation which an individual &quot;makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself: (self-esteem) expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval, and indicates the extent to which the individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy.&quot;</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Description** | The Self-Esteem Inventory contains 58 items, most selected from an earlier scale developed by Rogers and Dymond (1954; see the introduction to this chapter). The remainder were written especially for this scale. The statements are worded especially for children ages 8 to 10 and are concerned with self-attitudes in these following areas: peers, parents, school, and personal interests. Coopersmith used the scale in an intensive study of fifth and sixth grade children to determine the antecedents and consequences of various levels of self-esteem. In the same study he employed behavioral measures, parental interviews, and a variety of other measures. |

| **Sample** | The scale has been administered to a group of 87 5th and 6th graders in Connecticut, 44 boys (mean 81.3, SD 12.2) and 43 girls (mean 83.3, SD 16.7), and to a larger, more diverse group of "children attending the public schools of central Connecticut." For these 1,748 children the mean for males was 70.1, SD 13.8; for females a mean of 72.2, SD 12.8. |

| **Reliability** | For a 5th grade subset of the first sample (N=30), the test-retest reliability after five weeks was .88. For a subset of the larger population (N=56) the test-retest reliability after a **three year interval** was .70. |

| **Validity** | The scale has shown considerable construct validity in a series of studies by Coopersmith, establishing theoretically consistent relationships with creativity, anxiety, parental treatment, level of aspiration, and other variables. |


| **Administration** | The scale of 58 items takes an estimated 20 minutes to complete. It is self-administered, requiring the subject to check either "like me" or "unlike me" in response to each of the 58 descriptive statements. |

| **Results and Comments** | Coopersmith's research with this instrument establishes several specific antecedents and behavioral consequents of high, medium, and low self-esteem in children. The Self-Esteem Inventory correlates with laboratory behavior and projective evidence. Interestingly, the |
results suggest that defensive biasing is generally of little importance in these studies. Coopersmith concludes that the appropriate family environment for producing high self-esteem can be characterized by "conditions of acceptance, clear definition of rules, and respect."

Reference
SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY

Please mark each statement in the following way:

If the statement describes how you usually feel, put a check (√) in the column "Like Me."

If the statement does not describe how you usually feel, put a check (✓) in the column "Unlike Me."

There are no right or wrong answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Like Me</th>
<th>Unlike Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I spend a lot of time daydreaming.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm pretty sure of myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often wish I were someone else.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm easy to like.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents and I have a lot of fun together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never worry about anything.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it very hard to talk in front of the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish I were younger.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are lots of things about myself I'd change if I could.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can make up my mind without too much trouble.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm a lot of fun to be with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get upset easily at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always do the right thing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm proud of my school work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone always has to tell me what to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It takes me a long time to get used to anything new.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm often sorry for the things I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm popular with kids my own age.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents usually consider my feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm never unhappy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm doing the best work that I can.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give in very easily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can usually take care of myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm pretty happy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather play with children younger than me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents expect too much of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like everyone I know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to be called on in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's pretty tough to be me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things are all mixed up in my life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids usually follow my ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one pays much attention to me at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never get scolded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not doing as well in school as I'd like to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can make up my mind and stick to it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really don't like being a boy (girl).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like Me</td>
<td>Unlike Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I have a low opinion of myself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I don't like to be with other people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>There are many times when I'd like to leave home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I'm never shy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I often feel upset in school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>I often feel ashamed of myself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I'm not as nice looking as most people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>If I have something to say, I usually say it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Kids pick on me very often.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>My parents understand me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>I always tell the truth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>My teacher makes me feel I'm not good enough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>I don't care what happens to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>I'm a failure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>I get upset easily when I'm scolded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Most people are better liked than I am.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>I usually feel as if my parents are pushing me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>I always know what to say to people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>I often get discouraged in school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Things usually don't bother me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>I can't be depended on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Coopersmith says in the body of his book that the scale contained 50 items and that scores ranged from 40 to 100 in one sample. However, in Appendix A where the scale is reproduced it appears with 58 items and no instructions for scoring.
EGO-STRENGTH SCALE (Barron 1953)

Variable

This scale was originally devised to predict the response of psychoneurotic patients to psychotherapy. However, further consideration of item content and correlates of the scale led Barron to believe it would be a good measure of the general aspects of effective functioning usually subsumed, in clinical psychology, under the term "ego-strength."

Description

The scale consists of 68 items to which the subject responds "true" or "false" indicating whether or not the statement applies to him. The original pool of 550 MMPI items was administered to 33 psychoneurotic patients prior to psychotherapy. After a period of 6 months, the 33 subjects were rated as having clearly improved or as being unimproved by two skilled judges who were acquainted with the course of therapy (their degree of agreement was reflected by an $r$ of .91). The final 68 items were chosen on the basis of significant correlations with the rated improvement of these patients.

The test is scored by assigning 1 point for every response indicating "ego-strength" (the "ego-strength" responses are indicated in the list of items below). Scores may range from 0 to 68 with a higher score indicating greater "ego-strength."

Sample

The respondents involved in the construction of this scale were 33 psychoneurotic patients at the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research at Berkeley (IPAR). After 6 months, 17 were judged to have improved and 16 were judged to be unimproved.

Reliability

For a different sample of 126 clinic patients, the odd-even reliability was .76. Test-retest reliability after three months for a sample of 30 patients was .72.

Validity

After an intensive 3-day psychological assessment at IPAR, staff members filled out adjective check lists for each of 40 graduate students who had taken the Ego-strength (E-S) Scale and other personality tests. The check lists for the 10 highest and 10 lowest on the E-S were compared. The following adjectives showed differences between "highs" and "lows" at the .05 level:

Adjectives checked more frequently about high-scoring subjects:
alert, adventurous, determined, independent, initiative, outspoken, persistent, reliable, resourceful, responsible.

Adjectives checked more frequently about low-scoring subjects:
affected, dependent, effeminate, mannerly, mild.

Staff members rated these same subjects on a number of psychological variables (inferred from behavior in an assessment setting). The E-S Scale correlated significantly with vitality (.38), drive (.41), submissiveness (-.40), effeminacy (-.34) and intraceptiveness (-.34). E-S also correlated .24 with self-confidence, .24 with poise and .25 with breadth of interest.
The author felt that in order for a measure of ego-strength to be in accordance with psychoanalytic theory, scores on it should be positively correlated with standardized measures of intelligence. For the original sample of 33, the E-S Scale correlated .44 with the Wechsler-Bellvue Test. It correlated .36 with the Primary Mental Abilities Test, and .47 with the Intellectual Efficiency Scale of the CPI for a sample of 160 Air Force officers. For the graduate student sample, the E-S correlated .39 with the Miller Analogies Test, and .52 with the Intellectual Efficiency Scale.

As anticipated, in the graduate student sample, E-S correlated -.33 with the Prejudice Scale of the MMPI, and -.46 with the California E Scale, while for the officer sample, it correlated -.42 with the Tolerance Scale of the CIP and -.23 with the E Scale.

Cross validation studies were conducted employing three clinical samples: 53 patients given psychotherapy because of delayed recovery from injury or physical disease, 52 patients given brief psychotherapy during the preceding five years at Langly Porter Clinic, and 46 patients currently receiving therapy at a general hospital. All subjects took the MMPI at the beginning of therapy and were rated on degree of improvement following therapy. For the first sample, the ratings correlated .42 with the E-S Scale. For the second sample an eta of .54 was obtained between improvement ratings and E-S score. For the third sample, the improvement ratings correlated .38 with E-S.

Location Barron, F. An ego-strength scale which predicts response to psychotherapy, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1953, 17, 327-333.

Administration Estimated administration time is 30 minutes.

Results and Comments This instrument is almost assuredly not unidimensional. Barron grouped the 68 items into eight clusters whose labels suggest the diversity underlying the single concept of "ego-strength": physical functioning and physiological stability, psychasthenia and seclusiveness, attitudes toward religion, moral posture, sense of reality, personal adequacy, phobias and infantile anxieties, and "miscellaneous." High and low ego-strength are characterized by the following patterning of these categories:

**High** (associated with improvement in psychotherapy): (a) good physical functioning; (b) spontaneity, ability to share emotional experiences; (c) conventional church membership, but nonfundamentalist and undogmatic in religious beliefs; (d) permissive morality; (3) good contact with reality; (f) feelings of personal adequacy and vitality; (g) physical courage and lack of fear.

**Low** (associated with lack of improvement in psychotherapy): (a) many and chronic physical ailments; (b) broodiness, inhibition, a strong need for emotional seclusion, worrisomeness; (c) intense religious experiences, belief in prayer, miracles, the Bible; (d) repressive and primitive morality; (3) dissociation and ego-alienation; (f) confusion, submissiveness, chronic fatigue; (g) phobias and infantile anxieties.
Several of these components seem to be similar to constructs measured by other scales in this chapter, such as personal efficacy and attitudes toward the body. Others seem to overlap with measures in other chapters, for example, attitude toward the Bible and authoritarian morality ("repressive" and "primitive").

This assortment of characteristics suggests again the possible inter-relation of several constructs mentioned in this book. Nevertheless, it is not at all clear that "ego-strength" will be the best theoretical concept to unite these apparently heterogeneous constructs, when and if such a union becomes possible. Comparative studies, using the various measures suggested and diverse populations, could prove worthwhile in working toward a coherent theory and a more efficient set of measuring instruments.

Note: Barron continually speaks in his article of 68 items, but he only lists 66. Thus we have assumed he meant to say 66 rather than 68.
EGO-STRENGTH SCALE

(Ego-strength responses are indicated in parentheses)

A. Physical functioning and physiological stability.

1. During the past few years I have been well most of the time. (T)
2. I am in just as good physical health as most of my friends. (T)
3. I have never had a fainting spell. (T)
4. I feel weak all over much of the time. (F)
5. My hands have not become clumsy or awkward. (T)
6. I have a cough most of the time. (F)
7. I have a good appetite. (T)
8. I have diarrhea once a month or more. (F)
9. At times I hear so well it bothers me. (F)
10. I seldom worry about my health. (T)

B. Psychasthenia and seclusiveness.

11. I feel unable to tell anyone all about myself. (F)
12. I feel sympathetic towards people who tend to hang on to their griefs and troubles. (F)
13. I brood a great deal. (F)
14. I frequently find myself worrying about something. (F)
15. I have met problems so full of possibilities that I have been unable to make up my mind about them. (F)
16. I get mad easily and then get over it soon. (T)
17. When I leave home, I do not worry about whether the door is locked and the windows closed. (T)
18. Sometimes some unimportant thought will run through my mind and bother me for days. (F)
19. Often I cross the street in order not to meet someone I see. (F)
20. I dream frequently about things that are best kept to myself. (F)

C. Attitudes toward religion.

21. I go to church almost every week. (T)
22. I pray several times every week. (F)
23. Christ performed miracles such as changing water into wine. (F)
24. Everything is turning out just like the prophets of the Bible said it would. (F)
25. I have had some very unusual religious experiences. (F)
26. I believe my sins are unpardonable. (F)

D. Moral posture.

27. I would certainly enjoy beating a crook at his own game. (T)
28. When I get bored, I like to stir up some excitement. (T)
29. I do many things which I regret afterwards (I regret things more or more often than others seem to). (F)
30. I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong. (T)
31. Some people are so bossy that I feel like doing the opposite of what they request, even though I know they are right. (T)
32. I like to flirt. (T)
33. I am attracted by members of the opposite sex. (T)
34. I never attend a sexy show if I can avoid it. (F)
35. I like to talk about sex. (T)
36. I do not like to see women smoke. (F)
37. Sometimes I enjoy hurting persons I love. (T)

E. Sense of reality.
38. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences. (F)
39. I have strange and peculiar thoughts. (F)
40. I have had blank spells in which my activities were interrupted and I did not know what was going on around me. (F)
41. When I am with people, I am bothered by hearing very queer things. (F)
42. At times I have fits of laughing and crying that I cannot control. (F)
43. I have had no difficulty in keeping my balance in walking. (T)
44. Parts of my body often have feelings like burning, tingling, crawling, or like "going to sleep." (F)
45. My skin seems to be unusually sensitive to touch. (F)

F. Personal adequacy, ability to cope.
46. My plans have frequently seemed so full of difficulties that I have had to give them up. (F)
47. I am easily downed in an argument. (F)
48. I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job. (F)
49. My way of doing things is apt to be misunderstood by others. (F)
50. I sometimes feel that I am about to go to pieces. (F)
51. I feel tired a good deal of the time. (F)
52. If I were an artist, I would like to draw flowers. (F)
53. If I were an artist, I would like to draw children. (F)
54. I like collecting flowers or growing house plants. (F)
55. I like to cook. (F)
56. When someone says silly or ignorant things about something I know, I try to set him right. (T)

G. Phobias, infantile anxieties.
57. I am not afraid of fire. (T)
58. I am made nervous by certain animals. (F)
59. Dirt frightens or disgusts me. (F)
60. I am afraid of finding myself in a closet or small closed place. (F)
61. I have often been frightened in the middle of the night. (F)

H. Miscellaneous.
62. I like science. (T)
63. I think Lincoln was greater than Washington. (T)
64. I very much like horseback riding. (F)
65. The man who had most to do with me when I was a child (such as my father, stepfather, etc.) was very strict with me. (T)
66. One or more members of my family is very nervous. (T)
INTERPERSONAL CHECK LIST (Leary 1957)

Variable

In Interpersonal Diagnosis of Personality, Leary presents the fruits of several years of labor by a group of psychiatrists and clinical psychologists who were attempting to build a model of personality focusing on modes of social interaction. This group included LaForge and Suczek (1955), who did most of the work on the instrument presented below. The resulting model is much too complex to be summarized adequately here. It is treated despite this problem because it offers great promise (perhaps the reader will be tempted to delve into the complexities further after receiving a slight exposure here).

Description

The theoretical scheme is based on one key assumption about the motivation of human behavior:

Personality is the multilevel pattern of interpersonal responses (overt, conscious, or private) expressed by the individual. Interpersonal behavior is aimed at reducing anxiety. All the social, emotional, interpersonal activities of an individual can be understood as attempts to avoid anxiety or to establish and maintain self-esteem (pp. 15-16).

The primary task for Leary and his co-workers was to find a systematic, objective way to classify interpersonal responses at several levels of personality. Five such levels were chosen: public communication, conscious description, private symbolization (dreams, fantasies, etc.), unexpressed unconscious (avoided responses), and values. The same set of categories, arranged in a circular diagram (see figure), were selected to classify responses at each level. The arrangement of categories is based on the intersection of two dimensions: dominance-submission (vertical axis in the figure) and hostility-affection horizontal axis). Each of the 16 response categories is claimed to be closest to the adjoining categories in kind, and furthest from its polar opposite. Each response has four degrees of intensity: "mild or necessary amount of the trait" (innermost ring of the figure), "moderate or appropriate amount of the trait" (second ring out from the center), "marked or inappropriate amount of the trait" (third ring), and "extreme amount of the trait" (fourth ring).

The Interpersonal Adjective Check List, to be described here, has been used to measure interpersonal responses at three levels: public communication (e.g., clinicians' ratings of what patients do and say in a group), conscious description (usual kind of self-rating), and value assessment (usual kind of ideal-self rating). Several other instruments were also used, but they will not be discussed here.

The Check List has been through several revisions, described by Leary in detail (1957, Appendix 2). The form presented here:

comprises 128 items—eight for each of the 16 interpersonal variables. An intensity dimension has been built into the
check list such that each of the 16 variables is represented by a 4-point scale. For each variable there is one intensity item which reflects "a mild or necessary amount...." Three items refer to intensity 2, "a moderate or appropriate amount...." Three words reflect intensity 3, "a marked or inappropriate amount...." And one word expresses intensity 4, an "extreme amount of the trait."

An attempt was made to develop a stimulus situation which would be a balanced representation, at various intensities, of each of the 16 hypothesized varieties of interpersonal behavior. In assigning scores to the test responses, the "unit" assumed to be invariant became, not the standard deviation computed for a certain sample under certain scaling assumptions, but an event from a defined set of events; the subject's selection or rejection of any word in the list. The advantage of such an approach is that direct numerical comparison of raw scores (number of words in a given category checked by a subject) is possible and meaningful as a set of communications from the patient, so that a model for statistical inference need involve no untestable scaling assumptions.

Sample
The check list has been administered to thousands of respondents, many of them clinic patients, but also including college students, dermatitis patients, and overweight women. The data presented below all came from clinic patients or from a sample of 200 overweight ("obese") women.

Reliability
A 2-week test-retest study was conducted with 77 of the 200 obese women. Reported by octant (of the circle figure): AP, .76; BC, .76; DE, .81; FG, .73; HI, .78; JK, .83; LM, .75; NO, .80. Coefficients for sixteenths (of the circle figure) were of similar magnitude, ranging from .64 (F) to .83 (D).

Validity
The circular arrangement of traits, recall, is based on a claim that adjacent traits are most similar. One would expect, therefore, that the relationships between two traits would be a monotonic decreasing function of their separation. Using data from three groups--clinic males, clinic females, and the obese women--this prediction was borne out without exception (whether octants or sixteenths were chosen as variables). Other predicted relationships are discussed throughout Leary's book.

Location


Administration
Leary reports no information regarding typical administration time, but a single self-description would probably take about 15 minutes.
The attractiveness of this scale lies primarily in the theory from which it was developed. The notion of corresponding measurement of various levels of the personality (or "self" from the point of view of the present chapter) is an important one rarely faced by self-concept researchers. Few people have attempted to measure conscious and unconscious self-esteem, for example, on comparable scales or dimensions.

Just how well Leary's method accomplishes this task is another matter, to be settled by future work. His book was a very tentative statement of theory and method, and has yet to receive sufficient response from other researchers.

The classification of interpersonal behaviors into 16 category variables is portrayed circularly as follows:
INTERPERSONAL CHECK LIST (FORM 4)
(Words arranged by octant and intensity)

Octant 1: AP
A: 1 Able to give orders
   2 Forceful
      Good leader
      Likes responsibility
   3 Bossy
      Dominating
      Manages others
   4 Dictatorial

Octant 2: BC
B: 1 Self-respecting
   2 Independent
      Self-confident
      Self-reliant and assertive
   3 Boastful
      Proud and self-satisfied
      Somewhat snobbish
   4 Egotistical and conceited

Octant 3: DE
D: 1 Can be strict if necessary
   2 Firm but just
      Hardboiled when necessary
      Stern but fair
   3 Impatient with others' mistakes
      Self-seeking
      Sarcastic
   4 Cruel and unkind

Octant 4: FG
F: 1 Can complain if necessary
   2 Often gloomy
      Resents being bossed
      Skeptical
   3 Bitter
      Complaining
      Resentful
   4 Rebels against everything

Octant 5: HI
H: 1 Able to criticize self
   2 Apologetic
      Easily embarrassed
      Lacks self-confidence
   3 Self-punishing
      Shy
      Timid
   4 Always ashamed of self

P: 1 Well thought of
   2 Makes a good impression
      Often admired
      Respected by others
   3 Always giving advice
      Acts important
      Tries to be too successful
   4 Expects everyone to admire him

C: 1 Able to take care of self
   2 Can be indifferent to others
      Businesslike
      Likes to compete with others
   3 Thinks only of himself
      Shrewd and calculating
      Selfish
   4 Cold and unfeeling

E: 1 Can be frank and honest
   2 Critical of others
      Irritable
      Straightforward and direct
   3 Outspoken
      Often unfriendly
      Frequently angry
   4 Hard-hearted

G: 1 Able to doubt others
   2 Frequently disappointed
      Hard to impress
      Touchy and easily hurt
   3 Jealous
      Slow to forgive a wrong
      Stubborn
   4 Distrusts everybody

I: 1 Can be obedient
   2 Usually gives in
      Easily led
      Modest
   3 Passive and unaggressive
      Meek
      Obey too willingly
   4 Spineless
Octant 6: JK
J: 1 Grateful
   2 Admires and imitates others
      Often helped by others
      Very respectful to authority
   3 Dependent
      Wants to be led
      Hardly ever talks back
   4 Clinging vine

Octant 7: LM
L: 1 Cooperative
   2 Eager to get along with others
      Always pleasant and agreeable
      Wants everyone to like him
   3 Too easily influenced by friends
      Will confide in anyone
      Wants everyone's love
   4 Agrees with everyone

Octant 8: NO
N: 1 Considerate
   2 Encouraging others
      Kind and reassuring
      Tender and soft-hearted
   3 Forgives anything
      Oversympathetic
      Too lenient with others
   4 Tries to comfort everyone

K: 1 Appreciative
   2 Very anxious to be approved of
      Accepts advice readily
      Trusting and eager to please
   3 Lets others make decisions
      Easily fooled
      Likes to be taken care of
   4 Will believe anyone

M: 1 Friendly
   2 Affectionate and understanding
      Sociable and neighborly
      Warm
   3 Fond of everyone
      Likes everybody
      Friendly all the time
   4 Loves everyone

O: 1 Helpful
   2 Big-hearted and unselfish
      Enjoys taking care of others
      Gives freely of self
   3 Generous to a fault
      Overprotective of others
      Too willing to give to others
   4 Spoils people with kindness
TWENTY STATEMENTS TEST (Kuhn and McPartland 1954)

Variable
The authors call this a "self-attitudes test" but it does not measure attitudes as these are usually conceived. It merely requires the respondent to answer the question "Who am I?" in up to twenty statements.

Description
The test is completely contained in the following set of instructions:

There are twenty numbered blanks on the page below. Please write twenty answers to the simple question "Who am I?" in the blanks. Just give twenty different answers to this question. Answer as if you were giving the answers to yourself, not to somebody else. Write the answers in the order that they occur to you. Don't worry about logic or "importance." Go along fairly fast, for time is limited.

Kuhn and McPartland gave this test to 288 undergraduate students at the State University of Iowa during class meetings of sociology and anthropology courses. Twelve minutes were allowed for completion of the test. In spite of the request for 20 statements, the range was from one to 20, with a median of 17.

Responses were classified as consensual (referring to groups and classes whose limits and conditions of membership are matters of common knowledge) or as subconsensual (referring to groups, classes, attributes, traits, etc. which require interpretation by the respondent to be precise or to place him relative to other people). Examples of the consensual variety are "student, girl, from Chicago, pre-med, daughter, oldest child, studying engineering"; that is, statements referring to consensually defined statuses and classes. Examples of the subconsensual category are "happy, bored, pretty good student, too heavy, good wife, interesting"; that is, statements without positional references, or with references to consensual classes obscured by ambiguous modifiers. (More precise working definitions of these categories are available in McPartland, 1953, p. 147.)

It was found that "respondents tended to exhaust all consensual references they would make before they made (if at all) any subconsensual ones." Seeing this, the authors decided simply to use as a score an individual's number of consensual responses. The resulting test satisfies the definition of a Guttman scale; reproducibility coefficients for each scale type are given in the article.

Sample
As mentioned, 288 undergraduates from S.U.I., who were taking sociology or anthropology courses in 1952, comprised the sample.

Reliability
The coefficient of reproducibility for the scale (based on an unspecified 151 cases from the 288) was .903. The test-retest reliability of the scale scores (for an unspecified period) was "approximately +.85."
Validity

No direct test of validity was made; and the authors seemed unable to think of one that would be appropriate, since they had not predicted any particular relationship between scores on the test and other variables. They did, however, test for differences in scores between different religious groups with a separate question, finding significant differences between the higher-scoring Catholics, "small sects," "Protestants," Congregationalists, Lutherans, "Christians," and Jews, on the one hand, and lower-scoring Methodists, Presbyterians, and "Nones" on the other. The former groups tended to yield more references to religious affiliation in the Twenty Statements Test, suggesting that for them religious group identification was more salient. (Nevertheless, the reason for grouping denominations in this way is not very convincing—for example, "nones" are obviously not likely to see religious membership as salient, and for this reason may have one less consensual category readily available during the 12 minute testing period.)

Location


Administration

As mentioned, 12 minutes were allowed in this study for respondents to work on the test. The authors do not make clear whether they think the range of completions obtained was due to the short administration time or to individual differences in available self-descriptive statements, regardless of time.

Results and Comments

This instrument is interesting because of its relevance to social psychological theories of self-identity that stress internalization of social roles. The finding that most adults exhaust salient social sub-identities before mentioning "subconsensual" traits is quite important. It remains for other workers, however, to establish meaningful relationships between simply derivable scores from this measure (such as number of consensual responses) and other variables.
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SCALE TO MEASURE INTERNAL VERSUS EXTERNAL CONTROL (Rotter 1966)

Variable
For several years Rotter, in developing a "social learning theory" (Rotter, 1954; 1955; 1960), has been concerned with the effects of perceived internal vs. external control of reinforcement.

"Acquisition and performance differ in situations perceived as determined by skill versus chance. Persons may also differ in generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement."

The instrument to be described here was designed to measure these "generalized expectancies." (Rotter, 1966, has discussed the similarity of this notion to alienation, competence, field dependence, and ego-strength.)

Description
The developmental history of the Internal-External Control (I-E) Scale is documented in Rotter's (1966) monograph. Following several revisions based on item-analyses, social desirability controls, and studies of discriminant validity, a 29-item, forced-choice questionnaire was produced. Six of these items are "fillers," the other 23 offer choices between internal and external belief statements.

The items are presented below along with their correlation to the total test score (minus that item). The total score is computed simply by summing the number of external beliefs endorsed.

Sample
The correlations presented with the items are based on 200 male and 200 female Ohio State University elementary psychology students. The I-E Scale has been administered to other groups, also; see Rotter (1966) and Lefcourt (1966) for details.

Reliability/ Homogeneity
For the student group just mentioned an internal consistency analysis (Kuder-Richardson) yielded \( r = .70 \) for males, and the same for females. For two subgroups of this population test-retest reliability coefficients were computed. After one month: males, \( r = .60 \) \((N = 30)\); females, \( r = .83 \) \((N = 30)\); combined, \( r = .72 \) \((N = 60)\). After two months: males, \( r = .49 \) \((N = 63)\); females, \( r = .61 \) \((N = 54)\); combined, \( r = .55 \) \((N = 117)\). Rotter suggests that part of the decrease after the two-month period is due to differences in administration (group vs. individual).

Validity
Correlations with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (1964) range from -.07 to -.35. Several factor analyses reported by Rotter support the assumption of unidimensionality of the I-E Scale, and numerous laboratory and survey studies give evidence for its construct validity (however, see Gurin, et al., 1969, and the following section of the present chapter for important qualifications).

Location
The I-E Scale is self-administered and can be completed in about 15 minutes.

This scale has been used in a number of interesting and important studies. It is relatively short and easy to comprehend. It would be helpful to have more evidence regarding its relation to other self-concept measures reported in this chapter, but little comparative work has been done so far. The conceptual similarities between "internal control," self-esteem, and personal efficacy appear to be great, but whether there is a corresponding similarity of measures remains to be seen.

The section of this chapter immediately following offers important additional information about conditions under which the I-E Scale appears to be multidimensional. It should be read before using the scale in research.

Several related scales, too numerous to be included here, have been developed for special populations and purposes. The reader may want to consult the original sources for information about these: see Crandall, et al. (1965), An Intellectual Responsibility Scale; Battle and Rotter (1963), Children's Picture Test of Internal Control; Morrison (1966), Children's Internal-External Control Scale.

Additional information about the reliability and validity of Rotter's scale may be found in Hersch and Scheibe (1967).

Battle, E. S. and Rotter, J. B. Children's feelings of personal control as related to social class and ethnic group, Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 482-490.


Rotter, J. B. Some implications of a social learning theory for the prediction of goal directed behavior from testing procedures, *Psychological Review*, 1960, 67, 301-316.
INTERNAL VS. EXTERNAL CONTROL

(Correlations are those of each item with total score, excluding that item.)

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
   b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them. Filler
2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
   b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make. .26
3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them. .18
4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
   b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries. .29
5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
   b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings. .18
6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
   b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities. .32
7. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
   b. People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others. .23
8. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
   b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like. Filler
9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
   b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action. .16
10. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
    b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless. .24
11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
    b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time. .30
12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
    b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it. .27
13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
    b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow. .27
14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
    b. There is some good in everybody. Filler
15. a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
    b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin. .29
16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
    b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it. .31
17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control. 
   b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.

18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
   b. There really is no such thing as "luck."

19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
   b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
   b. How many friends you have depends on how nice a person you are.

21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
   b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
   b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
   b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
   b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
   b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
   b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
   b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
   b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
   b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

Note: Score is the total number of underlined choices (i.e., external items endorsed).
Rotter (1966) offered evidence that his I-E Scale was unidimensional, and that it could predict to behavior in a variety of situations: risk-taking, occupational and educational goal-setting, and participation in social action, for example. These are all quite important behaviors for minority group members and people in the lower socioeconomic strata. Thus, it is not surprising to find that researchers working on these problems have become interested in the I-E Scale and have employed it in their studies.

In doing so, Gurin and her colleagues have found that "internal control" is not a unitary dimension in the attitude structure of Negro college students. In a recent paper (Gurin et al., 1969) the multidimensional nature of personal control for Negroes is spelled out, and a corresponding technique for measurement is presented.

The multidimensional approach is based on two key distinctions. The first, a distinction between self and other, highlights the fact that a person may feel he is in control of his own life, yet believe that people in general are not; or--as is more likely for a poor man or a victim of discrimination--he may feel that most people control their destinies, although he himself does not. A second distinction, important for studies of Negroes in American society, Gurins have labelled "individual vs. system blame." The issue here is whether a black person sees individual qualities of Negroes or social system factors as the key determinants of his fate.

Gurin et al. factor-analyzed a pool of items used in a recent study of Negro college students and obtained evidence for the distinctions just outlined. Included in the factor analysis were the 23 items of the Rotter I-E Scale, three items from the Institute for Social Research Personal Efficacy Scale, and a set of questions, in the same forced-choice format, written especially to tap beliefs about the operation of personal and external forces in the race situation in the United States.

The highlights of the analysis are as follows. The five items loading highest on Factor II are all phrased in the first person; thus, a person choosing the internal alternative on these items appears to believe in "personal control"--a concept much like Rotter's "internal control."

In contrast, only one of the items loading on Factor I explicitly uses the first person. Referring instead to people generally, these items seem to measure the respondent's ideology or general beliefs about the role of internal and external forces in determining success and failure in the culture at large....We have called this factor a measure of the respondent's control ideology.
The importance of this distinction is summarized in the following paragraph:

In the performance area we find that the two control measures...work in opposite ways. Students who are strongly internal in the personal sense have higher achievement test scores, achieve higher grades in college and perform better on an anagrams task which was included in the instruments administered in the study. In contrast, students who are strongly internal in the sense of believing that internal forces are the major determinants of success in the culture at large perform less well than the more externally-oriented students.

Factor III contains items referring to control or influence of racial discrimination, war, and world affairs; this was labelled "system modifiability." It will not be discussed further here because it does not bear directly on the distinctions under discussion.

Factor IV contained most of the race-related questions, probably only because of this general content similarity. These were subjected to a second factor analysis. Factor III of this second analysis is of special interest. Labelled "individual-system blame," it appears to represent the theoretical distinction proposed by Gurin et al. A similar pattern of results obtains for Factor I in the second analysis; it measures the extent to which the students felt that individual effort and mobility or group action represented the best way to overcome discrimination.

Sample

The sample on which the factor analysis was based contained 986 males and 1212 females, half of a random sample from 12 predominantly Negro colleges in the United States. (Other groups are also discussed in the paper.)

Reliability

The authors have test-retest data, but at the moment it has not been processed.

Validity

The paper by Gurin et al. is devoted almost entirely to reporting evidence for the validity of the two distinctions outlined above. This can only be summarized here:

1.) In the Coleman study of educational opportunity (Coleman and staff, 1966), "Negro students in college are equally, if not more, internal than white students in responding to statements which sound very much like our (Gurin's) measure of control ideology....In contrast, race differences do appear in questions which use a personal referent. Negro students are less internal than their white peers in answering questions about their own life experiences...."

2.) In the Gurin study: "Usually it is the sense of personal control, but not control ideology, that differentiates motivation and performance." Using several dependent measures this pattern was borne out. Conclusion: "Given that these opposing results from the two types of control measures cancel each other, the total Rotter score understandably bears no relationship to these performance indicators."
3.) Regarding the distinction between individual and system blame, Negroes who were "external" in the sense of blaming the system now appear more innovative and efficacious—in terms of choosing non-traditional (for Negroes) occupations and engaging in collective civil rights action. This is important, because self-blame in this case does not correspond at all to what Rotter intended by the term "internal control."

Location

Administration
These items can be self-administered in less than half an hour.

Results and Comments
Whereas Rotter conceived of the "internal" personality as confident, competent, innovative, and so on, the Gurin study shows that for Negroes living in the United States of the 1960s this is a faulty conception. For them, accepting blame for their relatively poor socioeconomic status would imply the opposite of competence and innovation.

The authors found no relationship in their 1964 sample, between scores on the personal-other and individual-system blame dimensions. However, they suggest that this may be changing today. Among their respondents, surveyed during a period of optimism about civil rights gains, there were relatively few "racial militants." However, the range of scores on this militancy dimension was sufficient to obtain a negative correlation between militancy and personal control. From this the authors conclude:

If the tide of events should increasingly force motivationally effective Negroes to feel they have to choose between individual and collective expressions of their effectiveness, the social implications are obviously of paramount concern. Such a polarization would also sharpen some of the questions we have raised about the usual assumption in the internal-external control literature that effective motivation always flows from internal orientations.
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MULTIDIMENSIONAL INTERNAL-EXTERNAL CONTROL SCALE

FACTOR I: CONTROL IDEOLOGY

1a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

2a. No matter how hard you try, some people just don't like you.
b. People who can't get others to like them, don't understand how to get along with others.

3a. In the case of the well prepared student, there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

4a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

5a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
b. Who gets to be boss depends on who has the skill and ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

6a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

7a. Without the right breaks, one cannot be an effective leader.
b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability; luck has little or nothing to do with it.

8a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

9a. Knowing the right people is important in deciding whether a person will get ahead.
b. People will get ahead in life if they have the goods and do a good job; knowing the right people has nothing to do with it.

10a. Leadership positions tend to go to capable people who deserve being chosen.
b. It's hard to know why some people get leadership positions and others don't; ability doesn't seem to be the important factor.

11a. People who don't do well in life often work hard, but the breaks just don't come their way.
b. Some people just don't use the breaks that come their way. If they don't do well, it's their own fault.
12a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
   b. There really is no such thing as "luck."

13a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
   b. There's no much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

FACTOR II: PERSONAL CONTROL

14a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
   b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

15a. What happens to me is my own doing.
   b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

16a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
   b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

17a. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
   b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

18a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
   b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck play an important role in my life.

FACTOR III: SYSTEM MODIFIABILITY

19a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand nor control.
   b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs, the people can control world events.

20a. Racial discrimination is here to stay.
   b. People may be prejudiced but it's possible for American society to completely rid itself of open discrimination.

21a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

22a. The racial situation in America may be very complex, but with enough money and effort, it is possible to get rid of racial discrimination.
   b. We'll never completely get rid of discrimination. It's part of human nature.
FACTOR IV: RACE IDEOLOGY

23a. It's lack of skill and abilities that keeps many Negroes from getting a job. It's not just because they're Negro. When a Negro is trained to do something, he is able to get a job.

b. Many qualified Negroes can't get a good job. White people with the same skills wouldn't have any trouble.

24a. The best way to handle problems of discrimination is for each individual Negro to make sure he gets the best training possible for what he wants to do.

b. Only if Negroes pull together in civil rights groups and activities can anything really be done about discrimination.

25a. The best way to overcome discrimination is through pressure and social action.

b. The best way to overcome discrimination is for each individual Negro to be even better trained and more qualified than the most qualified white person.

26a. Many Negroes who don't do well in life do have good training, but the opportunities just always go to whites.

b. Negroes may not have the same opportunities as whites, but many Negroes haven't prepared themselves enough to make use of the opportunities that come their way.

27a. Negroes would be better off and the cause of civil rights advanced if there were fewer demonstrations.

b. The only way Negroes will gain their civil rights is by constant protest and pressure.

28a. Depending on bi-racial committees is just a dodge. Talking and understanding without constant protest and pressure will never solve problems of discrimination.

b. Talking and understanding as opposed to protest and pressure is the best way to solve racial discrimination.

29a. Many Negroes have only themselves to blame for not doing better in life. If they tried harder, they'd do better.

b. When two qualified people, one Negro and one white, are considered for the same job, the Negro won't get the job no matter how hard he tries.

30a. Organized action is one approach to handling discrimination, but there are probably very few situations that couldn't be handled better by Negro leaders talking with white leaders.

b. Most discriminatory situations simply can't be handled without organized pressure and group action.

31a. The attempt to "fit in" and do what's proper hasn't paid off for Negroes. It doesn't matter how "proper" you are, you'll still meet serious discrimination if you're Negro.

b. The problem for many Negroes is that they aren't really acceptable by American standards. Any Negro who is educated and does what is considered proper will be accepted and get ahead.
32a. Discrimination affects all Negroes. The only way to handle it is for Negroes to organize together and demand rights for all Negroes.
   b. Discrimination may affect all Negroes but the best way to handle it is for each individual Negro to act like any other American—to work hard, get a good education, and mind his own business.

ITEMS NOT LOADING ON ANY FACTOR

33a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
   b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

34a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
   b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

35a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
   b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

36a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
   b. This world is run by the few people in power and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

37a. With enough effort, we can wipe out political corruption.
   b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

38a. The so-called "white backlash" shows once again that whites are so opposed to Negroes getting their rights that it's practically impossible to end discrimination in America.
   b. The so-called "white backlash" has been exaggerated. Certainly enough whites support the goals of the Negro cause for Americans to see considerable progress in wiping out discrimination.

39a. If a Negro only tries hard enough, he can get ahead despite opposition from whites.
   b. It's true that an individual Negro can get ahead by hard work, but every Negro will sometime face discrimination or opposition that can't be solved by individual effort alone.
FACTOR I: INDIVIDUAL-COLLECTIVE ACTION

1a. The best way to handle problems of discrimination is for each individual Negro to make sure he gets the best training possible for what he wants to do.
b. Only if Negroes pull together in civil rights groups and activities can anything really be done about discrimination.

2a. The best way to overcome discrimination is through pressure and social action.
b. The best way to overcome discrimination is for each individual Negro to be even better trained and more qualified than the most qualified white person.

FACTOR II: DISCRIMINATION MODIFIABILITY

3a. Racial discrimination is here to stay.
b. People may be prejudiced but it's possible for American society to completely rid itself of open discrimination.

4a. The so-called "white backlash" shows once again that whites are so opposed to Negroes getting their rights that it's practically impossible to end discrimination in America.
b. The so-called "white backlash" has been exaggerated. Certainly enough whites support the goals of the Negro cause for Americans to see considerable progress in wiping out discrimination.

5a. The racial situation in America may be very complex, but with enough money and effort, it is possible to get rid of racial discrimination.
b. We'll never completely get rid of discrimination. It's part of human nature.

FACTOR III: INDIVIDUAL-SYSTEM BLAME

6a. It's lack of skill and abilities that keeps many Negroes from getting a job. It's not just because they're Negro. When a Negro is trained to do something, he is able to get a job.
b. Many qualified Negroes can't get a good job. White people with the same skills wouldn't have any trouble.

7a. Many Negroes who don't do well in life do have good training, but the opportunities just always go to whites.
b. Negroes may not have the same opportunities as whites, but many Negroes haven't prepared themselves enough to make use of the opportunities that come their way.

8a. Many Negroes have only themselves to blame for not doing better in life. If they tried harder, they'd do better.
b. When two qualified people, one Negro and one white, are considered for the same job, the Negro won't get the job no matter how hard he tries.
9a. The attempt to "fit in" and do what's proper hasn't paid off for Negroes. It doesn't matter how "proper" you are, you'll still meet serious discrimination if you're Negro.

b. The problem for many Negroes is that they aren't really acceptable by American standards. Any Negro who is educated and does what is considered proper will be accepted and get ahead.

FACTOR IV: RACIAL MILITANCY

10a. Negroes would be better off and the cause of civil rights advanced if there were fewer demonstrations.

b. The only way Negroes will gain their civil rights is by constant protest and pressure.

11a. Depending on bi-racial committees is just a dodge. Talking and understanding without constant protest and pressure will never solve problems of discrimination.

b. Talking and understanding as opposed to protest and pressure is the best way to solve racial discrimination.

12a. Organized action is one approach to handling discrimination, but there are probably very few situations that couldn't be handled better by Negro leaders talking with white leaders.

b. Most discriminatory situations simply can't be handled without organized pressure and group action.

13a. Discrimination affects all Negroes. The only way to handle it is for Negroes to organize together and demand rights for all Negroes.

b. Discrimination may affect all Negroes but the best way to handle it is for each individual Negro to act like any other American—to work hard, get a good education, and mind his own business.
MEASURE OF SELF-CONSISTENCY (Gergen and Morse 1967)

Variable

In many theoretical formulations within clinical and social psychology emphasis is placed on the degree to which a person's views of self are consistent or integrated. The general notion of cognitive consistency, in fact, is one of the pillars of modern social psychology (Abelson et al., 1968). In spite of the importance of the concept, say Gergen and Morse, "attempts at measurement (e.g., McQuitty, 1941, 1950; Duncan, 1966) have been subject to important methodological deficiencies." With the measure reviewed here, they hope to overcome many of these.

Description

The authors have concisely stated their aims and procedures as follows:

In addition to standard criteria of scale construction, three considerations guided the initial development of the measure. First, it was important that the degree of self-consistency attributed to the person reflect his own subjective appraisal. Second, it was important to rule out forms of socially desirable responding. And finally, it was important that the measure be one that would not demand excessive time to administer.

A list of 34 self-descriptive adjectives was thus developed from a group of approximately 600 responses to the question, "Who am I?" This list was carefully selected to reflect a wide variety of psychologically relevant traits. Half the traits had been judged by a series of independent raters to be positive in character and half negative. The two groups of adjectives appear in the following table.

Test instructions require the respondent to:

1. Choose those five traits from each of the two lists (positive and negative) which describe him most accurately.
2. List the 10 chosen traits down the side and across the bottom of a 10 X 10 matrix.
3. Compare each trait with each of the others, and for each comparison indicate the degree of consistency on a four-point scale (a zero rating to be given when the two traits are "generally compatible" and "don't contradict each other, but go hand in hand" and a rating of three when the opposite is true, etc.).

The respondent's self-consistency score is derived from simply summing the ratings; a high score indicates a high degree of self-perceived inconsistency.

Sample

For 129 male and 80 female undergraduates the mean and standard deviation were 36.24 and 21.33, respectively.
Reliability

In an 8-week test-retest study involving 50 of these students a coefficient of .73 was obtained, indicating moderate reliability.

Validity

Response bias. The Marlowe-Crowne (1960) Social Desirability Scale was administered to 30 of the students and to a separate group (50 nurses). "In neither case did the correlation between self-consistency and SD begin to approach significance."

Construct validity. Support was obtained for several hypotheses derived from Mead's (1934) notion—central to social psychology—that "self-conception is largely the result of internalization of the views of significant others with whom one interacts." These hypotheses can only be summarized here:

1.) The greater the degree to which various significant others are judged to differ in their perceptions of an individual, the less consistent will be his view of self.
2.) The greater the range of significant others encountered by a person during his developmental years, the less consistent his view of self.
3.) The less the degree to which a person's views of self are anchored in the views of significant others, the less consistent his self-estimate.
4.) Initial support was also obtained for the central notion that inconsistency may be associated with various forms of maladaptation. High-inconsistency Ss were found to score lower on the psychological well-being scale of the CPI, and lower on the tolerance and good impression subscales of the same measure. In addition, for a subsample of females, those with higher inconsistency had fewer dates and engaged in fewer college activities. (All of these were statistically significant at the .05 level.)

Location


Administration

No time is given by the authors, but it would probably take less than half an hour to self-administer this measure.

Results and Comments

Initial findings indicate that this measure of self-consistency has considerable promise. The authors have further studies in progress to test the usefulness of the instrument in social psychological laboratory studies. The reader may want to look for those in the standard journals before using the measure for similar purposes. At the time of this writing none of these articles is available in published form.

One further analysis of the initial results should be noted:

The results indicated that the rated inconsistency of positive trait pairs was significantly lower than that perceived among negative traits. More interestingly, the rated inconsistency of positive-negative pairings was significantly greater than for negative-negative. These results raise an important question concerning
the importance of content as opposed to feeling-tone in the person's perception of self-consistency. The greatest contribution to inconsistency is produced when the person is confronted with both positive and negative self-aspects, regardless of the specific denotative meaning of these aspects.
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TRAITS FORMING THE SELF-CONSISTENCY MEASURE

List I (Positive)

Optimistic
Studious
Honest
Considerate
Reliable
Kind
Sincere
Friendly
Cautious
Independent
Practical
Happy
Sensitive
Tolerant
Idealistic
Adventurous
Intelligent

List II (Negative)

Impatient
Worrier
Self-conscious
Moody
Rebellious
Immature
Quick-tempered
Easily influenced
Lazy
Gullible
Envious
Often feel misunderstood
Disorganized
Guilt-ridden
Stubborn
Self-centered
Noisy
CHAPTER 4 - ALIENATION AND ANOMIA

The concept of alienation has become one of the most widely used and misused terms of our time. While the scales in this chapter afford us considerable insight into this phenomenon in society, we shall see that major methodological problems remain to limit their basic utility.

These scales come from the realms of both sociology and psychology, but mainly from sociology. In sociology the topic is often subsumed (from Durkheim) under the heading of "anomie," although the first thing a sociologist in the area will want to impress on his audience is that anomie refers to a property of a social system and hence cannot be directly measured by the attitudes of single individuals. Therefore one encounters the use of the related terms "anomia" and "anomy" in connection with attitude measurement in this area.

There are fourteen scales in this chapter that relate to such concepts:

1. Anonym Scale (McClosky and Schaar 1965)
2. Anomia Scale (Srole 1956)
3. Powerlessness (Neal and Seeman 1962)
4. Political Alienation (Olsen 1969)
5. Alienation via Rejection (Streuning and Richardson 1965)
6. Purpose-in-Life Test (Crumbaugh 1968)
7. Alienation Scale (Dean 1961)
8. Alienation (Middleton 1963)
9. Political Alienation (Horton and Thompson 1962)
10. Alienation (Nettler 1957)
11. Anomie Scale (Hyman, Wright and Hopkins 1960)
12. Helplessness (Gamson 1961)
13. Alienation (Davids 1955)
14. Alienation Within a Social System (Clark 1959)

Most of these scales, and especially the most widely-used two, suffer from a major fault that needs correction—the lack of control over agreement response set. None of the items in either the McClosky and Schaar or Srole scale is keyed in the negative direction. In one cross-section study Lenski and Leggett (1960) included the Srole item:
"It's hardly fair to bring children into the world, the way things look for the future."

Later in the same interview schedule, they asked respondents to agree or disagree with the statement:

"Children born today have a wonderful future to look forward to."

While a logician could argue that the two statements are not exact opposites of each other, a basic inconsistency in orientation does exist between the two statements. In point of fact, Lenski and Leggett found that more than two-thirds of their respondents who agreed with the first statement also agreed with the second. Blue-collar respondents and black respondents were most likely to exhibit this inconsistent response pattern and hence to seriously call into question the traditional finding that both groups express greatest alienation. Actually, however, one does find this result holding true for those who agree with the first statement and disagree with the second, although the differences are greatly reduced:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Blue</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Negro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collar</td>
<td>Collar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with first</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with first and disagree with second</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In other words, if the Lenski-Leggett data can be generalized, they suggest that one is more likely to risk overestimating the number of alienated individuals in a sample using the Srole scale than to risk making incorrect inferences about which variables are associated with alienation. Nevertheless more extended research needs to be done on the validity of such a generalization. In the meantime, researchers need to be especially cautious in estimating the size of the alienated segment of the population using these questions (this general caution probably applies to all attitude measures, but
this is one area where researchers often speculate incorrectly about the large number of alienated persons in society).

Of the fourteen scales in this chapter, that of McClosky and Schaar has produced the greatest variety of correlates. The McClosky-Schaar study provides some of the strongest arguments for the contention that there exists considerable overlap in the concepts developed in the separate chapters of the present volume. Specifically, McClosky and Schaar find their anomoly scale to relate to life satisfaction (Chapter 2), aspects of self-esteem (Chapter 3), extreme political beliefs (Chapter 6), aspects of authoritarianism (Chapter 5), trust in people (Chapter 8), and some methodological scales (Chapter 10). The scale, however, does not have impressive internal consistency and thus far has yet to undergo a full test of validity, in the sense of correlation with some observed behavior (although this is probably true of most scales in this chapter). The authors do note that the astonishing number of attitudinal variables that relate to this scale are not affected when controls for acquiescence, social status, or status frustration are controlled.

The Srole scale has undoubtedly been applied in the widest variety of separate research studies (over 25 such studies are noted in the sociological literature up to 1965 by Bonjean et al., 1967). The scale has consistently related as hypothesized to socio-political attitudes and background variables, such as social status (although note the arguments two paragraphs previously). The internal consistency and unidimensionality of the scale seem well established, although both of these facets may be spuriously affected by agreement response set. (In Bonjean et al., pp. 34-35, Srole is quoted as feeling that negative wordings of these items would be accepted by everyone; the reader might want to examine the negative items provided by Christie in
our scale review of Srole.) As was the case with the McClosky-Schaar scale, normative data from cross-section populations are available for the Srole scale.

The powerlessness scale of Neal and Seeman draws its items from the internal-external control scale of Rotter, which is reviewed in the previous chapter. The item content for the powerlessness scale deals with control over societal and economic problems rather than personal problems. The authors present data to support their argument that the scale taps an aspect of alienation not reflected in Srole's anomia scale, although the two are moderately correlated. The scale has been used in a variety of research studies and its internal consistency and validity seem well established. Items are in forced-choice format to prevent the operation of agreement response set. The reader may also be interested in the normlessness scales that have been developed in this same research program.

The Olsen political alienation scale makes an interesting distinction between feelings of incapability and feelings of discontent—the first referring to alienation imposed on the individual (measured by the Survey Research Center political efficacy scale), the second to an attitude reached by the individual. Empirical evidence for the need of such a distinction is not compelling, as the two scales both intercorrelate highly and show largely the same pattern of correlations with background variables (although there is some evidence for feelings of discontent to characterize the older middle class and, for incapability, those of lower social status). Both scales do predict to political participation. However, the internal consistency of the items is not high and they appear liable to agreement response set.

The Streuning-Richardson study, in addition to supporting the uni-dimensionality of the five-items in the Srole scale, provides eleven other items that appear to tap the same domain (unfortunately again none of these are worded in the negative direction). This study was mainly methodological
and hence haphazard sampling was employed and no evidence regarding validity is advanced. It was found that even though separate factors of alienation and authoritarianism were isolated by factor analysis, scores on the two factors did correlate .41.

Crumbaugh's purpose-in-life test, which appears to be an extension of a semantic differential type approach, was developed from clinical psychological experience. In fact, one validation of this test consists of its ability to separate successfully functioning individuals in society from individuals diagnosed as neurotic. While such differentiation is statistically significant, it is not as large as one might imagine such differences to be. More impressive are the correlations of test scores with ratings of ministers and psychiatrists. The test does correlate significantly with depression and anomia scales.

The alienation scale of Dean attempts to isolate three separate components of powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation. The three components do intercorrelate significantly, but the social isolation scale correlates lower with authoritarianism than the other two (which may make the effort at component separation worthwhile). The author has confirmed hypotheses about voting behavior in subsequent studies using the scale (although these effects do not hold when controlled for social status).

The Middleton scale is similar in that it is built largely upon Seeman's conceptual distinction between five types of alienation. The items (one for each type of alienation) have relatively high internal consistency but again are liable to agreement response set. No evidence for validity is available but the author has found dramatic differences between whites and Negroes with these items.

The Horton and Thompson measure separates two facets of alienation:
powerlessness and power consciousness. The second facet appears to predict whether citizens would vote at all, and if they did, the first facet then predicted a "no" vote on a referendum. No reliability data are presented for these very short scales.

The Nettler scale contains a number of both interesting and questionable features. Most interesting are the novel content areas (mass culture, family and religion, in addition to the usual area of politics) and the fact that the scale was validated by the use of a known group of "aliens." However, the specific items suffer from wording peculiarities, e.g., "Are you interested in having children? (Or would you be at the right age?);" and the quantitative evidence for the essential homogeneity of items is not compelling. The scale would seem to tap an upper-middle class alienation (an active disgust), rather than the usual content of previous scales (a sort of passive malaise) and may be useful for researchers interested in such a distinction.

Hyman et al.'s anomie scale also introduces some new item content into this attitude area. However, it has yet to be tested on any large-scale sample, and no data on its reliability or validity are available. The most successful of Gamson's "helplessness" items (in terms of predicting opposition to fluoridation) were drawn from the Survey Research Center political efficacy scale (reviewed in *Measures of Political Attitudes*).

The final two scales of Davids and of Clark seem applicable only to limited populations. The Davids' items have only been applied to a sample of 20 undergraduates at Harvard and one wonders if even this group found the items to be highly esoteric. It is interesting to see that the author's alienation scale was composed of measures of five initially separate intellectual dispositions (egocentricity, distrust, pessimism, anxiety, and resentment) which were later combined because of their high intercorrelations.
The scale scores for the 20 individuals were validated against how they were judged by clinical psychologists along these dimensions.

The Clark scale was developed for use with members of an agricultural cooperative, which somewhat delimits its applicability. The items appear to have adequate internal consistency, and impressive data bearing on the scale's validity are reported. The reader may want to refer to two similar "alienation from work" scales that are presented in our volume of occupational attitudes.

For a comprehensive effort at measurement of children's alienation and involvement in the school setting, Rhea et al. (1966) is recommended.
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ANOMY (McClosky and Schaar 1965)

Variable
Anomy is defined as normlessness. The traditional sociological model (e.g., Durkheim)—assuming that social conditions give rise to specified feelings (anomie) which in turn result in certain behaviors—is revised to give equal weight to psychological variables as a cause of anomie.

Description
The authors' intention was to examine those dimensions of personality which are likely to result in an individual's feelings of anomie. The nine-item anomy scale was one of several measures included in a large questionnaire. Answers to each item were either "agree" or "disagree," with one point given for each agree response. Scores ranged from 0-9. Those scoring 6-9 were highly anomie, 3-5 was the middle group, and 0-2 were low or non-anomic. The following distribution of scores was obtained in the two samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Sample</th>
<th>Minnesota Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (0-2)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (3-5)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (6-9)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(For those with low education, 61 percent of the national sample and 50 percent of the Minnesota sample scored high on the anomy scale. The overall correlation between anomie and education was -.43.)

The original source(s) of the items is not given. Through preliminary screening and pre-testing, a large pool of items was reduced and given to a sample of 273 Minnesota adults. Their responses were examined for internal consistency, subjected to a Guttman reproducibility procedure, and finally reduced to 9 items.

Sample
There were two samples. One was a cross-section of the population of Minnesota, designed by the Minnesota Poll in 1955, with an N of 1082. The other was a national sample drawn and administered by Gallup Poll in 1958 with an N of 1082.

Reliability
The corrected split-half reliability coefficient for the scale was .76. As a measure of unidimensionality, the reproducibility coefficient for the national sample was .80, and on another national sample of 3020 "political influentials" the reproducibility coefficient was .83.

Validity
The scale was also judged by several groups of graduate students in political science and psychology, and by 40 Fellows at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (Stanford). For each item, the proportion of affirmative judgments (i.e., that the item does embody some aspect of anomie) was high enough to satisfy the authors. (This proportion is not stated in the article.) A further indication (still indirect) of validity is indicated in the table of correlations with other variables given below:
Location

Administration
The questionnaire was self-administered. After an interviewer explained how it should be filled out, it was left with the respondent, who completed it and returned it by mail. The Minnesota questionnaire was composed of 512 items, and the national study contained 390 items.

Results and Comments
It is generally hypothesized that anomie feelings result when socialization and the learning of social norms are impeded, and that three psychological factors may impede the learning of these norms: cognitive factors, emotional factors, and an individual's beliefs and opinions. The authors summarize their results as follows:

"In order to determine the efficacy of psychological, as opposed to sociological, factors in producing anomie three groups of measures were correlated with anomie feeling. It was found that individuals whose cognitive capacity was deficient (as indicated by high scores on Mysticism and Acquiescence; and low scores on Education, Intellectuality, and Awareness) tended to score high on anomie. It was also found that individuals predisposed to maladjustive emotional states (such as inflexibility, strong anxiety and aggression, and low ego strength) are high on anomie. Finally, those individuals who held extreme beliefs and had a rejective attitude towards people were also found to be high on anomie. All of these correlations were strong and in the predicted direction."

The extent of these differences is examined quantitatively in the table on the next page.

Most importantly, all of these results are insignificantly affected when controls for measures of acquiescence, social status, and status frustration are imposed. The authors conclude:

"...it may be defensible to conceptualize anomie as a unique disease that afflicts men in certain kinds of societies. Anomie, in sum, may be only one of many symptoms expressing a negativistic, despairing outlook both on one's own life and on the community in which one lives."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>National Sample</th>
<th></th>
<th>Minnesota Sample</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COGNITIVE FUNCTIONING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Intellectuality</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>= 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Awareness</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Mysticism</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Acquiescence</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSYCHOLOGICAL INFLEXIBILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Intolerance of Ambiguity</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Rigidity</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Obsessiveness</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Inflexibility</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANXIETY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Manifest Anxiety</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Disorganization</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bewilderment</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EGO-STRENGTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Guilt</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Self-Confidence</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Need Inviolacy</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Alienation</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Status Frustration</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Pessimism</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Political Futility</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Dominance</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Social Responsibility</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGGRESSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Hostility</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Paranoia</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Intolerance for Human Frailty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Contempt for Weakness</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTREME BELIEFS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Totalitarianism</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Fascist Values</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Left Wing</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Right Wing</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISANTHROPY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Tolerance</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Faith in People</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Calvinism</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Elitism</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SAMPLE</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>= 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anomy

Percent Who Agree
National Sample
(N = 1484)

1. With everything so uncertain these days, it almost seems as though anything could happen. 82
2. What is lacking in the world today is the old kind of friendship that lasted for a lifetime. 69
3. With everything in such a state of disorder, it's hard for a person to know where he stands from one day to the next. 50
4. Everything changes so quickly these days that I often have trouble deciding which are the right rules to follow. 49
5. I often feel that many things our parents stood for are just going to ruin before our very eyes. 48
6. The trouble with the world today is that most people really don't believe in anything. 44
7. I often feel awkward and out of place. 37
8. People were better off in the old days when everyone knew just how he was expected to act. 27
9. It seems to me that other people find it easier to decide what is right than I do. 27
ANOMIA (Srole 1956)

Variable

Anomia is viewed as an individual's generalized, pervasive sense of social malintegration or "self-to-others alienation" (vs. self-to-other's belongingness).

Description

The scale consists of five items, each one measuring one aspect of anomia. They are presented as opinion statements, with possible answers of "agree," "disagree," and "can't decide." Only an unequivocal "agree" receives a score of 1. The possible range of scores, therefore, is 0-5. The distribution of the sample of 401 is given here in percent (average = 2.1) along with data on random sample of 981 Los Angeles adults (average 1.7) in 1961 (Miller and Butler 1966).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Anomia (Springfield)</th>
<th>Anomia (Los Angeles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(High)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample

The sample was drawn from Springfield, Mass. Since the study measured attitudes toward minority groups, members of minority groups were themselves excluded and the sample was limited to white, Christian, native born residents who were mass-transit riders. The sampling design combined random selection with age-sex quotas. There were 401 people between the ages of 16-69 (average being 40.3 years).

Reliability

The unidimensionality of the anomia scale was assessed by the procedures of latent structure analysis, and found to satisfy the criteria. In addition, in a study in New York City, it was determined that the anomia scale satisfied the requirements of a Guttman-type scale. No quantitative estimates or test-retest data are reported, although subsequent researchers (Streuning and Richardson, 1965; Miller and Butler, 1966) have demonstrated the essentially unidimensionality of these items by factor analytic criteria. Miller and Butler report the following item intercorrelation matrix (Pearson's r) for a random cross-section of Los Angeles adults in 1961:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bell (1957) found that the items had a coefficient of reproducibility of .90 and coefficient of scalability of .65.
Validity

The author noted that the full validity had yet to be established but added:

"A clue to its validity is found in a datum from the current NYC study, involving a geographic probability sample of 1660 resident adults. A single indicator of latent suicide tendency was the agree-disagree item: 'You sometimes can't help wondering whether anything is worthwhile anymore.' The correlation between this item and the Anomia scale scores is expressed by a tetrachoric coefficient of .50."

Bell (1957) found the anomia scale to relate significantly to social isolation.

Location


Results and Comments

The hypothesis that anomia is related to the formation of negative attitudes toward minorities was confirmed in the Springfield sample, the Pearson correlation between anomia and negative attitudes towards minorities being .43. These results held when controlled for social status.

When scores on authoritarianism are partialled out, the correlation is reduced from .43 to .35, indicating that the relationship between anomia (A) and minority attitudes (M) is independent of the personality trends measured by authoritarianism (F).

Holding A constant and investigating the relationship between F and M, however, reduces the correlation between F and M from .29 to .12. It could be concluded therefore that the correlation between F and M is partially due to anomia.

Anomia was found to be inversely related (r = -.30) to socioeconomic status. Consistent with this, Rose (1962) applied the items to 71 heads of organizations in Minnesota and found that only 3 percent of them agreed with any of the Srole items vs. 20 percent of a cross-section sample of married people in Minneapolis-St. Paul. Angell (1962) also found a significant negative correlation between the anomia scale and occupational status (r = -.25), income (-.19), and education (-.33) in a cross-section of Detroit residents. Older people (r = .16) and Negroes (r = .25) were also found to score higher on the scale.

Lenski and Leggett (1960) present a strong case that the scale in its present format is highly susceptible to agreement response set. Richard Christie (personal communication) reports that the following five negatively worded items may be useful in offsetting this response set:

1. Most people can still be depended upon to come through in a pinch.
2. If you try hard enough, you can usually get what you want.
3. Most people will go out of their way to help someone else.
4. The average man is probably better off today than he ever was.
5. Even today, the way that you make money is more important than how much you make.

Four of the five items were originally devised by Srole, although no further psychometric data on their use is reported.

Srole (personal communication) reports that translations of the scale into simple Spanish and simple English (for use with low SES people) are available from Dr. Stanley Lehmann at the Department of Psychology at New York University. The scale has also been translated into French.
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Anomia
(Score 1 for agreement with each item)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Miller and Butler 1966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>There's little use writing to public officials because they often aren't really interested in the problems of the average man.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four new items in the enlarged anomia scale are:

6. Most people really don't care what happens to the next fellow.

7. Next to health, money is the most important thing in life.

8. You sometimes can't help wondering whether anything is worthwhile.

9. To make money there are no right and wrong ways anymore, only easy and hard ways.

The wording of the first of the five original items has been slightly changed to read: Most public officials (people in public offices) are not really interested in the problems of the average man.
POWERLESSNESS (Neal and Seeman 1964)

Variable
The measure used here defines powerlessness as "low expectancies for control of events," with the events being in terms of mass society (e.g., control over politics, the economy, etc.).

Description
The scale consists of seven forced-choice items, which were reduced from an original pool of 50 items via pre-testing (actually 12 items were employed in this study but only 7 were found to be scalable). The items were originally devised to measure the individual's psychological orientation toward how much (internal) control he had over events in his environment vs. the view that these were outside his control (external). The scale was apparently developed through the joint efforts of sociologist Shepard Liverant and psychologist Julian Rotter at Ohio State University. Experience with these items has been developed from their use in a number of research studies (see below). One point is given for each response in the powerless (i.e., external) direction, making scores range from 0 (high power) to 7 (high powerlessness). The average score for the random sample of males in Columbus was 2.70.

Sample
The sample consisted of 609 male respondents (out of 1094 contacted by mail) chosen at random from the Columbus, Ohio city directory. Subsequent data collected from about a tenth of the 47 percent of the sample who did not return the mail questionnaires revealed that their powerlessness scores were no different than those who did respond.

Reliability/
Homogeneity
This seven item scale had a coefficient of reproducibility of .87. Neal and Rettig (1963) report for the same sample that ten of the original twelve items had factor loadings over .30 and seven loadings over .50 (which indicate inter-item correlations of about .15-.35). Using many of the same items, Seeman and Evans (1962) report a split-half reliability of .70 and Neal (1959) a reproducibility coefficient of .866.

No test-retest stability data have been reported.

Validity
As hypothesized, members of work-related organizations exhibited less powerlessness (2.54) than those who were unorganized (2.94). The results held for manual workers and for "mobility-oriented" non-manual (i.e., white-collar) workers, but not for white-collar workers who were not mobility-oriented.

Use of the Srole anomia scale did not result in such a clear pattern of findings. Neal and Rettig (1963) report that factor analysis revealed the anomia scale to be essentially independent of the powerlessness scale, although earlier Neal (1959) had reported a .32 correlation between anomia and an earlier version of the powerlessness scale. In their latest discussion of the relation of the two concepts (and many other alienation concepts), Neal and Rettig (1967) conclude that alienation can be seen as either unidimensional or multidimensional depending on one's level of analysis.

The present items were administered as part of a mail questionnaire.

The authors report the following very small differences in powerlessness by social mobility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downwardly mobile</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upwardly mobile</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data indicate practically no resultant feelings of powerlessness as a result of social mobility. One downwardly-mobile group did show quite high powerlessness (3.86)—those non-manuals, who were mobility-oriented but unorganized.

In an earlier study, Neal (1959) studied the relation between powerlessness and normlessness and found: "The maximum likelihood for both powerlessness and normlessness was found among older, downwardly mobile, manual workers who reject mobility values. By way of contrast, the least likelihood for both powerlessness and normlessness was found among the younger, stationary, non-manual workers who are mobility oriented."

Seeman and Evans (1962) found powerlessness to predict tuberculosis patients' lack of knowledge concerning their illness but not dissatisfaction with their medical care.

Neal and Rettig (1963 and 1967) found another aspect of alienation, normlessness, to be essentially independent of powerlessness and anomia and to be itself composed of two separate factors, political and economic. The items comprising the two factors were:

**Political Normlessness (The Necessity of Force and Fraud in Government)**

1. Those running our government must hush up many things that go on behind the scenes, if they wish to stay in office.
2. Having "pull" is more important than ability in getting a government job.
3. In order to get elected to public office, a candidate must make promises he does not intend to keep.
4. Those elected to public office have to serve special interests (e.g., big business or labor as well as the public's interest).
5. In getting a job promotion, some degree of "apple polishing" is required.
6. In getting a good paying job, it's necessary to exaggerate one's abilities (or personal merits).
7. In order to have a good income, a salesman must use high pressure salesmanship.
Economic Normlessness (The Necessity of Force and Fraud in Business)

1. Success in business and politics can easily be achieved without taking advantage of gullible people.*
2. In getting a good paying job, it's necessary to exaggerate one's abilities (or personal merits).
3. In order to have a good income, a salesman must use high pressure salesmanship.
4. For a strike to be effective, picket line violence is necessary.
5. One can be successful in business without compromising moral principles.*
6. A newspaper can build up its circulation without making news events (i.e., crime stories) seem more sensational than they really are.*

*Reverse scoring.
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THE POWERLESSNESS SCALE
(* powerless response)

This is a survey to find out what the public thinks about certain events which we face in our society. Each item consists of a pair of statements. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be true. Be sure to check the one you actually believe to be more nearly true, rather than the one you think you should check or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief; obviously, there are no right or wrong answers. Again, be sure to make a choice between each pair of statements.

1. I think we have adequate means for preventing run-away inflation.
   * There's very little we can do to keep prices from going higher.

2. * Persons like myself have little chance of protecting our personal interests when they conflict with those of strong pressure groups.
   I feel that we have adequate ways of coping with pressure groups.

3. A lasting world peace can be achieved by those of us who work toward it.
   * There's very little we can do to bring about a permanent world peace.

4. * There's very little persons like myself can do to improve world opinion of the United States.
   I think each of us can do a great deal to improve world opinion of the United States.

5. * This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
   The average citizen can have an influence on government decisions.

6. * It is only wishful thinking to believe that one can really influence what happens in society at large.
   People like me can change the course of world events if we make ourselves heard.

   I sometimes feel personally to blame for the sad state of affairs in our government.

Discarded Items

8. By studying the world situation, one can greatly increase his political effectiveness.
   * Whether one likes it or not, chance plays an awfully large part in world events.

9. * The international situation is so complex that it just confuses a person to think about it.
   Active discussion of politics can eventually lead to a better world.
10. * Wars between countries seem inevitable despite the efforts of men to prevent them.  
   Wars between countries can be avoided.

11. Those who do not vote are largely responsible for bad government.  
   * There's little use for me to vote, since one vote doesn't count very much anyway.

12. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.  
   * Some political corruption is a necessary evil of government.

(Neal and Rettig's (1967) factor analysis shows low loadings for item 1, and high loadings for item 8 and 9, indicating that some rearrangements of items to be included or discarded is desirable.)
POLITICAL ALIENATION (Olsen 1969)

Variable
Alienation is conceptualized as being of two distinct types: attitudes of incapability and attitudes of discontentment.

Description
The author contends that the failure to distinguish these two types of alienated attitudes have considerably restricted the value of research in this area. Included under feelings of incapability (where alienation is imposed involuntarily upon the person by the social system) are such attitudes as guidelessness, powerlessness, and normlessness. The four items measuring incapability were drawn from the Survey Research Center political efficacy scale. One point is given for each statement with which the respondent agrees. Scale scores therefore run from 0 (highly capable) to 4 (highly incapable). Average score for the sample was 1.29, with 36 percent of the sample classified as incapable (score 2, 3 or 4).

The author constructed his own four item scale to measure discontentment, whereby alienation is voluntarily chosen by the individual as an attitude toward the system. In counter-distinction to the attitudes of incapability, feelings subsumed here are dissimilarity, dissatisfaction, and disillusionment. Again one point is given for each agree response, with scores running from 0 (no discontent) to 4 (high discontent). Average score for the sample was 1.19, with 35 percent of the sample classified as discontented (score 2, 3 or 4).

Sample
A total of 154 respondents were interviewed, out of an original 200 selected by random methods in 1965 from the city directory for two census tracts in Ann Arbor, Michigan. One of the tracts was lower middle class, the other upper middle class.

Reliability/Homogeneity
The coefficient of reproducibility for the incapability scale was .893 and for the discontent scale .921. The two scales do correlate rather highly (eta = .46) but the author considers them as distinct. No test-retest data are reported.

Validity
The following differences in political participation were noted for the Incapability Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political media exposure</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political discussion</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting participation</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Involvement</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These differences were not as pronounced for the Discontent Scale (especially voting) as the author expected, since discontent is seen as more of an upper middle class phenomenon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political media exposure</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political discussion</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting participation</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political involvement</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author feels that the most significant findings of the study were differences by party affiliation and voting behavior. Over 80 percent of people scoring high on the incapability scale and low on the discontent scale voted Democratic in 1960 and 1964 vs. about 20 percent of those scoring low on incapability and high on discontentment.

Both measures were highly inversely related to respondent's education, occupation and income. The following average scores for education were obtained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Incapable</th>
<th>Discontent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some college or more</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school not complete</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike incapability, however, which characterized the disadvantaged, discontent was prevalent among the "old middle class."
POLITICAL ALIENATION

Political incapability/futility scale

1. I believe public officials don't care much what people like me think.
   Agree  Disagree

2. There is no way other than voting that people like me can influence actions
   of the government.

3. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that I can't really
   understand what's going on.

4. People like me don't have any say about what the government does.

Discontentment or cynicism with politics

1. These days the government is trying to do too many things, including some
   activities that I don't think it has the right to do.
   Agree  Disagree

2. For the most part, the government serves the interests of a few organized
   groups, such as business or labor, and isn't very concerned about the needs
   of people like myself.

3. It seems to me that the government often fails to take necessary actions on
   important matters, even when most people favor such actions.

4. As the government is now organized and operated, I think it is hopelessly
   incapable of dealing with all the crucial problems facing the country today.
ALIENATION VIA REJECTION (Streuning and Richardson 1965)

Variable

This set of items emerged as the first factor from a factor analysis of three related attitude domains.

Description

The scale consists of 16 items of the six-point Likert format. Five of the items are from the Srole scale (see scale description above). A number of sources were used to provide a pool of 300 from which the final 68 were chosen: half came from the scales of Adorno, Davids, Srole and others; the rest were derived from the concepts and theories of Durkheim, Fromm, Marx, May, Merton and Camus' novel The Stranger. No further explanation is given of the method of selection.

Sample

The sample of 442 people was provided a wide range of possible alienation scores. Sub-groups of the sample were as follows: 68 inmates of "criminally insane" ward, 49 long-term male mental patients, 31 hospitalized female mental patients, 39 institutionalized juvenile delinquents, 47 male mental patients ready for discharge, 30 persons over 75 years of age, 17 relatives of mental patients, 68 college undergraduates, 73 adult education students.

Reliability

Internal consistency coefficients (Spearman-Brown) for the alienation factor was .86 (for the purposelessness scale it was .65).

Validity

No data bearing on the validity of this scale are reported.

Results and Comments

The authors note that similar factor analyses using young undergraduates show distinct facets of this scale (e.g., cynicism) emerging as separate factors.

Scores on the alienation factor in the present study correlated as follows with scores on the other eight factors that emerged from the factor analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor (Number of items)</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional distance (4)</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism (8)</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposelessness (6)</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determinism (5)</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family authority (6)</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust and optimism (12)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventionality (4)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious orthodoxy (6)</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reader may find of interest the items in two of the three scales that correlated highest with alienation.

Emotional Distance

17. It is almost impossible for one person to really understand the feelings of another.
19. In this fast-changing world, with so much different information available, it is difficult to think clearly about many issues.

24. There will always be a great lack of understanding between the older and younger generations.

60. Parents often expect too much of their children.

**Purposelessness**

21. Too many people in our society are just out for themselves and don't really care for anyone else.

55. There are many people who don't know what to do with their lives.

56. Many people in our society are lonely and unrelated to their fellow human beings.

57. Many people are unhappy because they do not know what they want out of life.

58. In a society where almost everyone is out for himself, people soon come to distrust each other.

59. Everyone should have someone in his life whose happiness means as much to him as his own.
Alienation via Rejection

1. These days a person doesn't really know who he can count on.

2. There is not much chance that people will really do anything to make this country a better place to live in.

3. Success is more dependent on luck than real ability.

4. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.

5. It is hard to figure out who you can really trust these days.

6. It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.

7. In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse.

8. There's little use writing to public officials because they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man.

9. There are so many ideas about what is right and wrong these days that it is hard to figure out how to live your life.

10. So many people do things well that it is easy to become discouraged.

11. Things are changing so fast these days that one doesn't know what to expect from day to day.

12. Most people don't realize how much their lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret by others.

14. Few people really look forward to their work.

15. Our country has too many poor people who can do little to raise their standard of living.

16. It is usually best to tell your superiors or bosses what they really want to hear.

18. People will do almost anything if the reward is high enough.
PURPOSE-IN-LIFE TEST (Crumbaugh 1968)

Variable
This attitude scale is designed to measure the degree to which a person experiences a sense of meaning and purpose in life.

Description
The scale was devised to test Viktor Frankl's thesis that when meaning in life is not found, the result is existential frustration (or among mental patients, noogenic neurosis). The Purpose-in-Life Test (PIL) is made up of 20 items rated from 1 (low purpose) to 7 (high purpose). Total scores therefore range from 20 (low purpose) to 140 (high purpose). Average scores tend to skew toward the purposeful end of the scale, as noted for the following samples.

Sample
The following non-representative samples were interviewed in the present study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average score (s.d.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful businessmen and professionals</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>118.9 (11.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active and leading Protestant parishoners</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>114.3 (15.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College undergrads</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>108.5 (14.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigent hospital patients</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>106.4 (14.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurotics, outpatient</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>93.3 (21.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurotics, hospitalized</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>95.3 (18.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholics, hospitalized</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>85.4 (19.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizophrenics, hospitalized</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>96.7 (16.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotics, hospitalized</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>80.5 (17.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the above respondents were white and from the area of Columbus, Georgia. A group of 11 hospitalized Negro schizophrenics had an average score of 108.0.

Reliability/ Homogeneity
A split-half correlation of .85 was reported for 120 parishoners. No test-retest data are reported.

Validity
The average scores reported above give some support for the scale's validity. Within each of the two samples, PIL scores correlated .47 with ministers' ratings (for the parishoner sample) and .38 with therapist ratings (for the outpatient sample).

Location

Results and Comments
The PIL scale correlated significantly only with the depression scale of the MMPI (r = -.65). It also correlated about .40 with the Srole anomia scale. There is considerable overlap therefore with the constructs of depression and anomia (although the scale author does not agree with this conclusion).
The author concludes that low correlations with income and education "imply that either education or income alone do not assure the attainment of meaning in life," although he did not appear to examine the full range of socioeconomic status. No consistent sex differences are reported.

It is estimated by Frankl that about 20 percent of the clinic-load in mental health units fall into the nonogenic neurosis syndrome.
For each of the following statements, circle the number that would be most nearly true for you. Note that the numbers always extend from one extreme feeling to its opposite kind of feeling. "Neutral" implies no judgment either way. Try to use this rating as little as possible.

1. I am usually:
   1. completely bored
   2. (neutral)
   3. exuberant, enthusiastic

2. Life to me seems:
   1. always exciting
   2. (neutral)
   3. completely routine

3. In life I have:
   1. no goals or aims at all
   2. (neutral)
   3. very clear goals and aims

4. My personal existence is:
   1. utterly meaningless, without purpose
   2. (neutral)
   3. very purposeful and meaningful

5. Every day is:
   1. constantly new and different
   2. (neutral)
   3. exactly the same

6. If I could choose, I would:
   1. prefer never to have been born
   2. (neutral)
   3. like nine more lives just like this one

7. After retiring, I would:
   1. do some of the exciting things I have always wanted to do
   2. (neutral)
   3. loaf completely the rest of my life

8. In achieving life goals I have:
   1. made no progress whatever
   2. (neutral)
   3. progressed to complete fulfillment

9. My life is:
   1. empty, filled only with despair
   2. (neutral)
   3. running over with exciting good things

10. If I should die today, I would feel that my life has been:
    1. very worthwhile
    2. (neutral)
    3. completely worthless
11. In thinking of my life, I:
    often wonder why I exist (neutral) always see a reason for my being here

12. As I view the world in relation to my life, the world:
    completely confuses me (neutral) fits meaningfully with my life

13. I am a:
    very irresponsible person (neutral) very responsible person

14. Concerning man's freedom to make his own choices, I believe man is:
    absolutely free to make all life choices (neutral) completely bound by limitations of heredity and environment

15. With regard to death, I am:
    prepared and unafraid (neutral) unprepared and frightened

16. With regard to suicide, I have:
    thought of it seriously as a way out (neutral) never given it a second thought

17. I regard my ability to find a meaning, purpose, or mission in life as:
    very great (neutral) practically none

18. My life is:
    in my hands and I am in control of it (neutral) out of my hands and controlled by external factors

19. Facing my daily tasks is:
    a source of pleasure and satisfaction (neutral) a painful and boring experience

20. I have discovered:
    no mission or purpose in life (neutral) clear-cut goals and a satisfying life purpose
ALIENATION SCALE (Dean 1961)

Variable

The variable is alienation, defined and measured through three separate components: powerlessness, normlessness and social isolation.

Description

Beginning with 139 items gleaned from the literature, 7 judges (instructors and assistants in the department of sociology at Ohio State University), were requested to judge each item as to whether it specifically and exclusively referred to each of the 3 sub-scale concepts. It was necessary for at least 5 of the 7 judges to agree, for an item to be retained. The result was 9 items in the final scale for powerlessness, 6 for normlessness, and 9 for social isolation.

The alienation scale is composed of the sum of 24 items presented in standard 5-point Likert format from 4 (strongly agree) to 0 (strongly disagree); five of the items are worded in the reverse direction. Scale scores can thus vary between 0 (lowest alienation) to 96 (highest alienation). The following normative data are reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Powerless</th>
<th>Normless</th>
<th>Isolation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbus men (N=384)</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s.d.=13.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prot. college women (N=75)</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cath. college women (N=65)</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No reason is given for the lack of correspondence between total scale scores and the sum of the three components.

Scores form a normal curve of distribution, with scores extending almost the entire possible range.

Sample

Data were collected in Columbus, Ohio, from 4 of the 19 wards of that city, selected by criteria related to voting incidence and socioeconomic variables, as part of the author's study of political apathy. Precincts and individuals were selected by random sampling. The questionnaire was sent to 1108 individuals and 433 responded (38.8 percent). Of these, a final sample of 384 gave usable replies.

Reliability

The reliability of the subscales, tested by the split-half method and corrected by the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula, was as follows: Powerlessness: .78, Normlessness: .73, Social Isolation: .84, and the total Alienation scale, with items rotated to minimize a possible halo effect, had a reliability of .78.

The intercorrelations among the alienation scale components are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Normlessness</th>
<th>Social Isolation</th>
<th>Alienation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normlessness</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Isolation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This alienation scale correlated in the .30's with Srole's scale and Nettler's scale. It was hypothesized 1) that alienation and each of its components would correlate negatively with social status (as measured by North-Hatt Occupational Prestige Scale, amount of education, and income), 2) that advancing age would be positively correlated with alienation, and 3) that rural background and alienation would correlate negatively. While in most instances the hypotheses were sustained at levels of significance (.01 and .05), the correlation coefficients were considered too low to predict the degree of alienation from an individual's score on the 5 social factors. Status correlated negatively at about -.20, and the correlation coefficient for age and alienation was +.12.

It was suggested that much more research would be necessary to empirically validate the concept of alienation.


The components of Dean's scale were correlated with Adorno's authoritarianism scale and the results were as follows (with a pretest sample of 73 college students):

- Powerlessness and authoritarianism: .37
- Normlessness and authoritarianism: .33
- Social isolation and authoritarianism: .23
- Alienation and authoritarianism: .26

The author speculated that his variable might be a situation-relevant variable, rather than a personality trait, so that a person might score high on alienation in political activity, but low in religion. He also speculated that alienation might be a syndrome, rather than a unitary phenomenon.

In a subsequent study, Dean (1966) found that while his scale(s) predicted vote against a school levy, they were less powerful predictors than age and socioeconomic status.

Public Opinion Questionnaire

Below are some statements regarding public issues, with which some people agree and others disagree. Please give us your own opinion about these items, i.e., whether you agree or disagree with the items as they stand.

Please check in the appropriate blank, as follows:

____ A (Strongly Agree)
____ a (Agree)
____ U (Uncertain)
____ d (Disagree)
____ D (Strongly Disagree)

Powerlessness Items

2. I worry about the future facing today's children.

   _A _a _U _d _D

6. Sometimes I have the feeling that other people are using me.

9. It is frightening to be responsible for the development of a little child.

13. There is little or nothing I can do towards preventing a major "shooting" war.

15. There are so many decision that have to be made today that sometimes I could just "blow up."

18. There is little chance for promotion on the job unless a man gets a break.

20. We're so regimented today that there's not much room for choice even in personal matters.

21. We are just so many cogs in the machinery of life.

23. The future looks very dismal.

Normlessness Items

4. The end often justifies the means.

7. People's ideas change so much that I wonder if we'll ever have anything to depend on.

10. Everything is relative, and there just aren't any definite rules to live by.

12. I often wonder what the meaning of life really is.

16. The only thing one can be sure of today is that he can be sure of nothing.

19. With so many religions abroad, one doesn't really know which to believe.
Social Isolation Items

1. Sometimes I feel all alone in the world.

3. I don't get invited out by friends as often as I'd really like.

*5. Most people today seldom feel lonely.

*8. Real friends are as easy as ever to find.

*11. One can always find friends if he shows himself friendly.

*14. The world in which we live is basically a friendly place.

17. There are few dependable ties between people any more.

*22. People are just naturally friendly and helpful.

24. I don't get to visit friends as often as I'd really like.

* Reversed items.
ALIENATION (Middleton 1963)

Variable

Drawing heavily upon the conceptual distinctions made by Seeman, the author conceives of six types of alienation: powerlessness, normlessness, meaninglessness, cultural estrangement, social estrangement, and work estrangement.

Description

The six items in the scale (one for each type of alienation) are presented in agree-disagree format, agreement with each item indicating alienation. While the author does not analyze his items in terms of a scale, he does report that 28% of whites do not agree with any of five items (excluding the cultural item) and only 1% agree with all of them. The corresponding proportions for Negroes were 6% and 28% respectively.

Sample

The sample consisted of a random sample of 256 persons over 20 years of age drawn at random from a small city in central Florida in the summer of 1962. A special supplementary sample of 50 Negroes was also interviewed.

Reliability/ Homogeneity

The following inter-item correlations (Yule’s Q, which yields values considerably higher than the standard product-moment formulas) were obtained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P.</th>
<th>Me.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>SR</th>
<th>WE</th>
<th>CE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Powerless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningless</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normless</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Estrangement</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Estrangement</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Estrangement</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the cultural item excluded, a coefficient of reproducibility of .90 was attained.

No test-retest data are reported.

Validity

No data bearing on validity are reported.

Location


Results and Comments

The most striking results were differences noted between whites and Negroes, which held up when controlled for education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Whites (less than high school)</th>
<th>Negroes (less than high school)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Powerless</td>
<td>40% (57)</td>
<td>70% (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Meaningless</td>
<td>48% (80)</td>
<td>71% (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Normless</td>
<td>16% (22)</td>
<td>55% (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Estranged</td>
<td>27% (37)</td>
<td>60% (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work Estranged</td>
<td>18% (33)</td>
<td>66% (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Culture Estranged</td>
<td>34% (42)</td>
<td>35% (73)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALIENATION

1. There is not much that I can do about most of the important problems that we face today. (Powerlessness)
   Agree                      Disagree

2. Things have become so complicated in the world today that I really don't understand what is going on. (Meaninglessness)
   Agree                      Disagree

3. In order to get ahead in the world today, you are almost forced to do some things which are not right. (Normlessness)
   Agree                      Disagree

4. I am not much interested in the TV programs, movies, or magazines that most people seem to like. (Cultural Estrangement)
   Agree                      Disagree

5. I often feel lonely. (Social Estrangement)
   Agree                      Disagree

6. I don't really enjoy most of the work that I do, but I feel that I must do it in order to have other things that I need and want. (Estrangement from Work)
   Agree                      Disagree
| Variable | This instrument attempts to measure political alienation, which is seen as having two separate aspects: powerlessness, and consciousness of potentially menacing power. |
| - | |
| Description | The object of the development of this scale was to have a measure for determining if political negativism was a consequence of political alienation. The scale consists of four items, two measuring each aspect of alienation. Three of these items are of the agree-disagree type. The other item is in a multiple choice format. Neither the source, nor method of construction of the items is described. The powerlessness items were weighted equally for scoring. Those individuals who identified themselves as belonging in the last two categories of item one and agreeing with item two were deemed powerless. The power conscious were those who agreed with both of the awareness of power items. |
| Sample | Four hundred voters were selected by non-probability methods from two upstate New York communities after school-bond proposals had been defeated (1957 and 1958). In one town, at least five interviews were drawn from each of the school districts. In the other town, "a number of interviews were gathered proportionate to the total number of eligible voters in each election district." |
| Reliability | No reliability data are reported. |
| Validity | No data bearing directly on validity are reported, although the results (see below) would argue for the scale's validity. |
| Results and Comments | The data show that those who scored high on alienation were considerably more likely to vote against the referenda than those who scored low. In the university town 86 percent of the alienated individuals voted negatively as opposed to 25 percent of the non-alienated. In the company town the corresponding figures were 88 percent and 31 percent. Middle and upper class respondents were less likely to vote "No" than were lower or working class individuals, but the difference was only half as great as that between alienated and unalienated groups. Being a taxpayer increased the likelihood of voting at all, but degree of alienation dictated the direction of voting. From a consideration of their data the authors concluded that "the evidence thus supports the contention that, among the powerless who were power conscious, voting against the referenda may have been an expression of political protest, a vote against the local powers-that-be." |
POLITICAL ALIENATION

(*Powerless response)

Powerlessness:

1. People have different ideas of just how they fit into community affairs. Would you say that you are:

   1. A person who contributes to community decisions.
   2. A person who is active, but not one of the decision makers.
   *3. Just an ordinary person in the community.
   *4. Not a part of the community at all.

2. It doesn't matter which party wins the elections, the interests of the little man don't count.

   *Agree Disagree Don't know

Awareness of Power:

(For the Corning, New York sample)

1. Corning-Glass and Ingersoll-Rand run the show in this area.

   *Agree Disagree

2. The school board is just as much a special interest group as any other group in town.

   *Agree Disagree

(For the Ithaca, New York sample)

1. The University people run the show in Ithaca.

   *Agree Disagree

2. The school board is just as much a special interest group as any other group in town.

   *Agree Disagree
ALIENATION (Nettler 1957)

Variable
Alienation is defined as the subjective feeling of estrangement from society and culture it carries.

Description
Nettler's scale consists of 17 dichotomous items, scored either 1 (non-alienated) or 2 (alienated). The possible range of scores was from 17 (alienated) to 34 (unalienated).

The items fall into one of four domains: mass culture (4 items), familism (4 items), religiosity (3 items), politicism (6 items).

Sample
The test sample consisted of 515 anonymous respondents. They were:
   a. 41 enlisted men
   b. 22 members of an enlisted men's wives' club
   c. 42 members of the Hotel, Restaurant and Bartenders' Union
   d. 12 members of the Fish Cannery Workers' Union
   e. 27 members of the Hod Carriers and Laborers' Union
   f. 97 Naval officers
   g. 11 members of the PTA
   h. 12 adult volunteers
   i. 251 students - Monterey Peninsula College (about half of these in the evening school and a very heterogeneous group).

No specific information about age or sex distributions is given. All respondents were from the west coast.

This group was compared with a group of 37 "known aliens"--selected on the basis of their responses to descriptions in literature of alienated persons (e.g., Edmund Wilson and George Santayana). They were asked if they knew any people, including themselves, who felt like these literary models. Those who answered in the affirmative were then interviewed, and those who consistently expressed an alienated attitude were selected.

Reliability/ Homogeneity
For 162 subjects, a reproducibility coefficient of .866 was obtained. For the four subscales the values of the reproducibility coefficients were:
1. Vs. Mass culture (.880)
2. Vs. Familism (.870)
3. A - Religiosity (.940)
4. A - Politicalism (.915)

Further claims are made that the scale is reliable and unidimensional, but no other quantitative figures are given.

Validity
The mean score for the sample of 515 individuals was 28.6 (s.d. = 2.9).
The mean score for the 37 "aliens" was 17.05 (s.d. not given but must be extremely small).
Nettler's concept of alienation is not claimed to be synonymous with Srole's concept of anomia, but for 345 subjects the Pearson correlation coefficient for those two measures was +.31. With 83 subjects, Nettler's scale correlated +.25 with Rosenberg's misanthropy scale (see Chapter 8).

Results and Comments

A later 15-item version of the scale is given in Bonjean et al. (1967). The scale seems to reflect more active middle-class discontent than passive working class apathy.

Reference

 ALIENATION

(Alienated Reply Indicated)

1. Do you vote in national elections? (Or would you if of voting age?) (No)
2. Do you enjoy TV? (No)
3. What do you think of the new model American automobiles? (Disapprove)
4. Do you read Reader's Digest? (No)
5. Were you interested in the recent national elections? (No)
6. Do you think children are generally a nuisance to their parents? (Yes)
7. Are you interested in having children? (Or would you be at the right age?) (No)
8. Do you like to participate in church activities? (No)
9. Do national spectator-sports (football, baseball) interest you? (No)
10. Do you think most married people lead trapped (frustrated) lives? (Yes)
11. Do you think you could just as easily live in another society--past or present? (Yes)
12. Do you think most politicians are sincerely interested in the public's welfare, or are they more interested in themselves? (Themselves)
13. Do you think religion is mostly myth or mostly truth? (Myth)
14. "Life, as most men live it, is meaningless." Do you agree or disagree? (Agree)
15. For yourself, assuming you could carry out your decision or do things over again, do you think a single life or married life would be the more satisfactory? (Single)
16. Do you believe human life is an expression of a divine purpose, or is it only the result of chance and evolution? (Chance)
17. "Most people live lives of quiet desperation." Do you agree or disagree? (Agree)

Later items:

1. Our public education system is in pretty sorry shape. (Agree)
2. Are you generally interested in local elections? (Yes)
3. In the long run and with some rare exceptions, who gets elected or doesn't hasn't the slightest influence upon social welfare. (Agree)

(In this later version items 3, 11, 12, 14, and 17 were dropped.)
ANOMIE (Hyman, Wright and Hopkins 1962)

Variable

This scale was devised to summarize a person's views on the extent to which there are norms of proper conduct in our society which are still recognized and subscribed to by many people.

Description

The source and manner of selection of the items is not reported. The scale consists of eight items for which (except for one reversed item) agreement was scored as 2, disagreement as a 0. Don't know and no answer received scores of 1. Summing produced scores running from 0 (lowest anomie) to 16 (highest anomie). Median score (at the beginning of encampment) was 3.5.

Sample

The respondents all attended the Encampment for Citizenship in New York and California which brings together about a hundred dedicated young (mainly between the ages of 18 and 20) persons each summer in an equalitarian program designed to increase skills in democratic living. Studies during the sessions of 1955, 1957 and two separate camps in 1958 yielded a total sample of 364.

A battery of scales was administered each year of the study on the first day of the Encampment, at the end of the six week session and six weeks afterwards. In addition the 1955 group was tested four years later.

Reliability

No reliability data are reported

Validity

No validity data are reported.

Location


Results and Comments

The authors' primary concern was the evaluation of change of attitudes related to prejudice. The anomie scale was only a minor part of the study. Correlations between the various scales are not reported and change scores as a result of encampment were not large.

Here are two sets of results of median anomie scores:

a) Beginning of camp (3.5) vs. end of camp (2.3) vs. six weeks after camp (2.9)

b) End of encampment 1955 (2.1) vs. four years later 1959 (2.3)
ANOMIE

(*Reversed item)

Most people cannot be trusted.

Agree  Disagree  ?

*Since 1890 people's ideas of morality have changed a lot, but there are still some absolute guides to conduct.

Nobody cares whether you vote or not except the politicians.

Nobody cares whether you attend church or not except the clergy.

People talk a lot about being decent to Negroes and other minority groups, but when it comes right down to it, most people don't really care how you treat these groups.

Cheating on income taxes is nobody's business but the government's.

What really made Dr. Salk work so hard on the polio vaccine was the thought of the money or fame he would get.

Kinsey made his name with his report on sexual behavior, and the hope of publicity was what really led him to study sex in the first place.
### Variable

Beginning with Seeman's five variations of alienation, Gamson selects two, powerlessness and meaninglessness, and combines them under the label of *helplessness*.

### Description

The purpose of the study was to examine the attitudes that distinguish those who voted in favor of fluoridation in Cambridge, Mass. and those who opposed it. From a larger group of statements (several of which were taken from a Political Efficacy Scale developed at the Survey Research Center, according to a footnote in the article), 5 items were selected as appropriate. Through item analysis, two clusters resulted: Nos. 1, 2 and 3; and Nos. 4 and 5.

### Sample

From an initial probability sample of 190 registered voters living in one Cambridge, Mass. precinct, 141 interviews were completed (74 percent). This sample was primarily lower-middle, working class, 71 percent Catholic, and mostly second or third generation Irish and Italian.

### Reliability

No data bearing on reliability are reported.

### Validity

No data bearing on validity are reported.

### Location


### Results and Comments

On the first three statements: 32 percent of strong and moderate proponents of fluoridation (weak opponents and proponents were not included in results) agreed with all three statements, while 62 percent of opponents agreed with all three.

Controlling for age, education and income of head of household did not change the relationship between feelings of helplessness and attitude toward fluoridation. "With only one nonsignificant exception, opponents are more likely than proponents to agree with each of the first three statements in every age, education, and income category."
## HELPLESSNESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percent Who Agree with Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proponents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Public officials don't really care about what people like me think.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Very little of what we read in newspapers and magazines can really be trusted.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. With the types of rockets and weapons used nowadays, it would be easy for some official to push a button and plunge us into war.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALIENATION (Davids 1955)

Variable
Alienation was defined by high scores on "five interrelated disposi­tions: egocentricity, distrust, pessimism, anxiety and resentment."

Description
The scale consists of 50 items from an "Affect Questionnaire" which contains 80 statements (10 relating to each of the total of eight dispositions: optimism, trust and sociocentricity included with the five making up the alienation syndrome). Some of the items were drawn from a number of sources such as Stevenson's The Home Book of Quotations and Murray's Explorations in Personality; others were originated by the experimenters. There is no explanation as to how the final items were selected from the original pool. The items (which used a scale of 1 to 6 running from strongly disagree to strongly agree) tapping the eight dispositions were systematically randomized for admin­istration.

Sample
Subjects were 20 Harvard undergraduates enrolled in a large introductory course in psychology. They volunteered to participate in the experi­ment in return for payment.

Reliability
No test of item reliability is mentioned in this article although the correlation of the five areas making up the alienation scale were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Egocentricity</th>
<th>Distrust</th>
<th>Pessimism</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egocentricity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrust</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pessimism</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resentment</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlations with the sociocentricity and trust dispositions also tended to be quite significant. Only the optimism area failed to show significant correlation.

Validity
Prior to acceptance the respondents were given two brief personal interviews by a clinical psychologist, interceded by their writing of a detailed autobiography. The rank order of the subjects by the psychologis in terms of ego structure was correlated with their rank order on the alienation scale. The resulting correlation (tau = -.41) was significant at the .01 level.

Location

Administration
The items were given in a self-administered questionnaire.

Results and Comments
The author generated five hypotheses which he tested using his data. First treated by the data was the hypothesis that people who are high on alienation will be less accurate in their social apperceptions than
those who are low on alienation. The rank order correlation was found to be in the predicted direction but did not reach the .05 level of significance (tau = .14). This result led to the formulation of the hypothesis that those who are low on alienation will perceive others as being low; and those who are high will perceive others as being high. The author felt this hypothesis was confirmed by a tau of .45 (p < .01). Also confirmed were the author's hypotheses that students who are high on alienation show a greater negative discrepancy between their own ratings and those they attributed to the average student and that those who score high on alienation show the greatest discrepancy between their own values and those they attribute to their "ideal" person.
ALIENATION

Following are the first eight statements as they appear on the Affect Questionnaire (the remaining 72 items are not reported).

1. The most profound happiness is reserved for those who are capable of selfless dedication to a cause.

   Strongly Agree  Slightly Agree  Slightly Disagree  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

2. No longer can a young man build his character and his hopes on solid ground: civilization is crumbling, the future is dreadfully uncertain, and his life hangs by a thread.

3. People will be honest with you as long as you are honest with them.

4. A man who never gets angry at anything or anyone is not likely to be treated with respect.

5. There are days when one awakes from sleep without a care in the world, full of zest and eagerness for whatever lies ahead of him.

6. Beneath the polite and smiling surface of man's nature is a bottomless pit of evil.

7. There are times when it is absolutely necessary to use other people as tools in the accomplishment of a purpose.

8. The real substance of life consists of a procession of disillusionments, with but few goals that are worth the effort spent in reaching them.
ALIENATION WITHIN A SOCIAL SYSTEM (Clark 1959)

Variable
This scale measures alienation, defined as "The degree to which a man feels powerless to achieve the role he has determined to be rightfully his in specific situations...." or "the discrepancy between the power a man has and what he believes he should have."

Description
The scale consists of items which were developed for use with members of an agricultural cooperative. One of the items consists of an interviewer's rating, the other four are closed-ended questions.

The scores for the sample described below ranged from 4 to 20, with an average of 11.1 (s.d. = 3.1).

Sample
The sample consisted of 361 members of an agricultural cooperative randomly selected from the total membership of 3,000.

Reliability/
Homogeneity
Evidence for the unidimensionality of the scale is provided by the item-total score correlations for the five items of .62, .82, .64, .80, and .74. A Guttman reproducibility coefficient of 93.4 percent was obtained. The coefficient of reliability, computed by the split-half method, is .70.
No test-retest data are reported.

Validity
Evidence bearing on validity is given by the following correlations between alienation and respondent reports:

1.) Member's satisfaction in the organization = -.62
2.) Participation in the organization = -.37
3.) Knowledge-degree to which member is informed about the organization = -.30

Evidence concerning the basic validity of these three criteria is also reported.

Location
Clark, J. Measuring alienation within a social system, American Sociological Review, 1959, 24 (6), 849-852.
(Number in parentheses refer to score assigned to each code)

a. Interviewee's statement of who actually owns the cooperative.
   Farmer-members (0) Non-farm businessmen and others (4)

b. Interviewee's statement of how much influence he feels he has in the cooperative.
   Very much (0) Quite a bit (1) Some (2) Very little (3) None at all (4)

c. Interviewee's statement of how much "say" he feels members should have about how the cooperative is run.
   Less say (0) About the same (2) More say (4)

d. Interviewee's statement of the extent to which he feels a part owner of the cooperative.
   Very much (0) Quite a bit (1) Some (2) Not very much (3) None at all (4)

e. Interviewer's rating of the interviewee's feeling of belonging to or identification with the cooperative.
   Very much (0) Quite a bit (1) Some (2) Little (3) None at all (4)
CHAPTER 5 - AUTHORITARIANISM, DOGMATISM AND RELATED MEASURES

Systematic research on the authoritarian personality syndrome, as conceived by Adorno and others (1950) in a famous series of studies at the University of California, has been continuing for two decades. Few concepts have received so much attention in the literature of the social sciences. There are at least two reasons for continued interest in this area. First, the concept of authoritarianism represents an attempt to link deepseated personality dispositions with the socially significant forms of belief and social behavior involved in adhering to a rigid and dogmatic ideology and in discriminating against out-groups. Especially in the early years after World War II, but obviously still today, the motivation of intolerant, ethnocentric, rigid, and authority-dependent persons is of great practical as well as theoretical significance. Hence "authoritarianism" is an important variable for psychologists, sociologists, and political scientists. Second, in The Authoritarian Personality, Adorno et al. offered not only a general theoretical framework for understanding authoritarianism but also a scale to measure it that could be used in studies as diverse as laboratory experiments and nationwide sample surveys (the well-known F, for potential Fascism, Scale).

Since the publication of The Authoritarian Personality several criticisms have been leveled both at the theory advanced to explain authoritarianism and the methods used to identify it (summarized in Christie and Jahoda, 1954; and in Kirscht and Dillehay, 1967). We shall briefly consider the most important problems in order to explain the several scales now in existence which are considered to be relatives of the F Scale.

1. Ideological Content. The F Scale was designed primarily to tap fascistic proclivities--i.e., personality characteristics which make a person
susceptible to an extremely rightist or conservative political program--although it was hoped that it would also be able to identify authoritarianism regardless of specific ideological beliefs. Roger Brown (1965) has suggested that interest in measuring "authoritarianism of the left" grew as the Western nations became less concerned with the threat of Fascism and increasingly alert to the rise of Communism. Both ideologies were characterized as authoritarian ("anti-democratic"), but as lying at opposite ends of an assumed left-to-right ideological continuum. Also, several psychologists began to realize the importance of authoritarianism in totally apolitical social situations, such as school classrooms, and this instigated the development of more specialized and less ideological measures.

Three major attempts have been made to design scales that tap anti-democratic tendencies of a person without restriction to elements of a rightist political ideology. The first attempt was made by Eysenck (1954), who factor-analyzed forty items selected from published scales in the literature and extracted two orthogonal factors, "radical-conservative" and "toughminded-tenderminded." Eysenck has argued (1956a and 1956b) that Communists and Fascists both appear high on toughmindedness--which he sees as related to authoritarianism--although the Communists are radical and the Fascists conservative. This interpretation, while intuitively plausible and perhaps esthetically pleasing, has been seriously challenged because of Eysenck's questionable handling of data (Rokeach and Hanley, 1956; Christie, 1956a and 1956c).

A second approach has been offered by Rokeach (1960) who designed scales to measure "dogmatism"--theoretically a characteristic of people with "closed minds" independent of their particular ideology--and "opinionation," another characteristic of closed-minded individuals who, according to Rokeach, accept or reject other people on the basis of opinion-similarity. Although several
relevant studies have been done (Rokeach, 1960; see also the reviews by Kirscht and Dillehay, 1967; Ehrlich and Lee, 1969; and Vacchiano, Strauss, and Hochman, 1969), it is still not clear whether the Dogmatism Scale is sufficiently distinct from the F Scale to settle the debate concerning "authoritarianism of the left." Indications are, however, that radical leftists do show signs of rigid adherence to in-group authorities and intolerance of different opinions, even though they usually do not exhibit other signs of right-wing authoritarianism, such as ethnocentrism and traditional family ideology.

The third take-off from research employing the F Scale was prompted not only by dissatisfaction with ideological limitations of the scale, but also by the consistent finding of a negative relationship between F Scale scores and level of education or socioeconomic status (Christie, 1954). Christie expressed a major conclusion from his review of such findings as follows:

Recent research clearly indicates that (the F Scale) is highly correlated (negatively) with measures of education and social status. Thus it is excellent for the study of those who are of little political effectiveness but is not extremely discriminating when applied to those who are high in status and are involved in the power processes of society. Recent research in the area of political and other organizational forms of behavior has revived interest in those who make decisions and wield power in the formulation of problems to be decided. These are not the sorts of individuals who make high scores on the F Scale (Christie, 1956b, pp. 1-2).

Work stimulated by this problem has yielded several versions of a "Machiavellianism Scale" designed to measure manipulative tendencies in people who fill leadership roles and to tap "Machiavellianism" as a personality trait in members of more general populations. Because the resulting scale correlates only weakly with the F Scale and appears to measure fairly general attitudes toward other people in social situations, it is discussed at length in Chapter 8, which deals with attitudes toward other people.

2. Elements of the Authoritarian Syndrome. Several characteristics of
the "authoritarian mind" or personality were isolated by Adorno et al.; these included anti-Semitism, ethnocentrism, political and economic conservatism, idealization of parents and self, anti-intraception (avoidance of introspection), rigid conception of sex roles, concern for status, and a cognitive style characterized by rigidity and intolerance of ambiguity. These characteristics have suggested hundreds of hypotheses for later studies using the F Scale in conjunction with other paper-and-pencil survey measures or in laboratory experiments. Some of these studies attest to the validity of the original conception of the authoritarian "syndrome," while others contribute further questions or more confusion. To date it is still impossible to offer a concise, coherent picture of the authoritarian personality, and it is quite possible that much fruitful work could be done using only parts of the syndrome rather than the range represented by the F Scale (see Kirscht and Dillehay, 1967, for a comprehensive review of the literature and an excellent summary of the "dimensions of authoritarianism"). Consequently, we shall include some scales in this chapter which have been developed to measure specific facets of the authoritarian syndrome as it is presently conceived, even though not all of them have been closely tied empirically to the original work on the F Scale.

3. Acquiescence Response Set. The Anti-Semitism, Ethnocentrism, and F scales of the California study, as well as Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale, were all worded in such a way that endorsement of an item yielded a higher score. There was, therefore, a strong possibility that high scorers were displaying not only, say, fascistic predispositions but also a tendency to agree with questionnaire items in general (see, e.g., Cronbach, 1946; Couch and Kenniston, 1960).

Interest in this methodological problem has absorbed considerable research energy in the last several years, sometimes seeming to dwarf theoretical interest
in authoritarianism itself—especially since some investigators went so far as to conclude that acquiescence and authoritarianism were essentially synonymous. More recently, however, the importance of acquiescence as an explanation for research findings in the area of authoritarianism has been questioned (Rorer, 1965; Block, 1965; Campbell et al., 1967; Rokeach, 1967; Samelson and Yates, 1967; Bock et al., 1969).

Rokeach (1967), for instance, showed that a respondent might agree with oppositely worded statements in an authoritarian scale for three reasons: 1) because of response bias or acquiescence; 2) because he tells the truth when responding to the original items but lies when responding to reversed items; 3) because he has a weak need for cognitive consistency. The first explanation is independent of content, whereas the last two take content into account. The last two are plausible, says Rokeach, since a "high F" person may agree with prodemocratic items because such statements are supposedly normative in this culture, while also agreeing with antidemocratic items because he is an authoritarian personality. Rokeach then presents evidence that content is important in explaining numerous research findings in the dogmatism area, and that a response-bias interpretation is highly implausible in most of these cases.

Samelson and Yates (1967) present a slightly different argument for the possible endorsement of both a statement and its opposite. They show that unless an item and its opposite have the same neutral point (say, on a 7-point Likert scale), it will be possible to agree—or disagree, depending on how the response distributions overlap—with supposedly opposite statements. Furthermore,

---

1 For example, Bass (1955) claimed acquiescence accounted for 60 percent of F variance and Peabody (1964) decided it might determine 75 percent of the answers to all items; Couch and Kenniston even suggested F might be used as a criterion measure for acquiescence.
this need not involve any lapse in logic or "cognitive consistency." In a detailed analysis of earlier studies purporting to establish the existence of an agreement response set, and with the presentation of new data supporting their explanation, Samelson and Yates give convincing evidence that double-agreements are often reasonable. Of course, this does not rule out the possible influence of acquiescence in some cases, but it makes it much more difficult to have strong faith in the overwhelming influence of acquiescence in authoritarianism research.

Obviously this issue cannot be settled here. Having alerted the reader to it, we shall mention it repeatedly in presenting the various scales. Some of the scales in this chapter have been constructed specifically to avoid contamination by acquiescence response bias. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to bear in mind that no one yet knows how important response biases are in determining results in studies using authoritarianism scales and, while methodological care is always advisable, it is our opinion that enough theoretically interesting research has been done in this domain to justify further substantive studies. Incapacitation from fear that acquiescence will eventually be found to "explain" the behavior of supposed authoritarians could easily hinder progress in an important research field.

In this chapter, scales are grouped into four rough categories: (A) variants of the F Scale; (B) components of the F syndrome, according to the California studies; (C) Eysenck's factor scales; and (D) scales related to Rokeach's conception of closed-mindedness. Related research on "religious authoritarianism" is discussed in Chapter 9 (containing measures of religiosity).  

\[\text{2}^{\text{The often-cited and used Bass and Christie reversed, or negative-worded, F Scale items are included in the write-up of the California F Scale in the present chapter.}}\]
A. The F Scale, its variants, and highly similar measures. Under this heading the following scales are to be discussed:

1. The California F Scale (Adorno et al. 1950)
2. A New F Scale (Webster et al. 1955)
3. Forced Choice F Scale (Berkowitz and Wolkon 1964)
4. Forced Choice F Scale (Schuman and Harding c. 1962)
5. Balanced F Scale (Athanasiou 1968)
6. Shortened F for Political Surveys (Janowitz and Marvick 1953)
7. Four-Item F Scale (Lane 1955)
8. Ten-Item F Scale (Survey Research Center 1952)
9. Pensacola Z Scale (Jones 1957)
10. Fascist Attitudes Scale (Stagner 1936)
11. Unlabeled Fascist Attitudes (Edwards 1941)

They are difficult to list in a precise evaluative order, because a variety of different criteria led to the inclusion of these particular scales. The original F Scale is listed first because it has historical prominence and is often treated as a benchmark for validation of new scales. The Webster Scale is a useful large pool of items of the California F type which can be sampled for the construction of new scales or can be factor-analyzed in studies of components of the F syndrome.

The two forced-choice scales of Berkowitz and Wolkon and Schuman and Harding were constructed to eliminate acquiescence biases, as was the balanced scale reported by Athanasiou. The balanced scale is not completely satisfactory, since—as is often the case—reversed items are not as well correlated with original items as one would like. The forced-choice scales reduce this problem by presenting an item and its reverse together, clearly indicating to the respondent that they are meant to be logical opposites on some dimension. This procedure may well reduce the validity of the scales, however—and this is the opinion of Schuman and Harding—by making a rational choice of something that is theoretically supposed to be affective and irrational.

The scales reported by Janowitz and Marvick and by Lane, as well as the Survey Research Center items, tend to stress components of authoritarianism
that are most likely to be related to political attitudes and behavior, such as power-orientation. Political researchers will probably want to consider these most closely.

The Pensacola Z Scale was constructed in an attempt to measure the personality predispositions that make up the authoritarian syndrome without mentioning political content. The items are worded in a more personal way, similar to the format of standard personality tests. The scale is only moderately correlated (.43) with the F Scale, so there is some question about its adequacy as a substitute for that scale. Nevertheless, in personality studies--especially where anxiety, hostility, dependency, and rigidity as components of authoritarianism are expected to be important--the Z Scale may be useful.

Finally, the Stagner and the Edwards scales are included primarily for historical interest. They were published before the better-known work on authoritarianism came out, and thus demonstrate further the interest of social scientists around World War II in psychological correlates of adherence to a fascist ideology.

B. Scales related to authoritarianism according to the theory evolved in the California Study, such as intolerance of ambiguity, status-concern, and traditionalism regarding the family.

12. Anti-Semitism (Levinson and Sanford 1944)
13. Traditional Family Ideology (Levinson and Huffman 1955)
14. Status-Concern Scale (Kaufman 1957)
15. Rigidity Scale (Rehfisch 1958)
16. RAPH Scale (Meresko et al. 1954)
17. Rigidity Scale (Wesley 1953)
18. Intolerance of Ambiguity (Budner 1962)
19. Intolerance of Ambiguity (Martin and Westie 1959)
20. Desire for Certainty Test (Brim 1955)
21. Ethnocentric Democracy Scale (Hyman et al. 1962)

These scales could be supplemented almost indefinitely by political and racial attitude measures related to authoritarianism. Many of these have been
collected in a companion volume, *Measures of Political Attitudes* (Robinson, Rusk and Head, 1968). For example, that volume includes the California Study scales entitled Political-Economic Conservatism and Ethnocentrism, as well as several more recent scales along these lines. In the present chapter we have included only a few illustrative measures of components of the authoritarian syndrome.  

C. Eysenck's R and T Factor Scales. As mentioned above, Eysenck claimed to have discovered one contentless authoritarianism dimension, tender-tough-mindedness, and an orthogonal content dimension, radicalism-conservatism. Although these particular scales need refinement and perhaps even replacement, the ideas behind them are quite interesting and worthy of further research.

22. Toughmindedness (T) Scale (Eysenck 1954)

D. Scales related to Rokeach's conception of closed-mindedness. The notion of dogmatism was advanced by Rokeach as a suitable way to conceptualize general authoritarianism, as opposed to the rightist authoritarianism measured by the California F Scale. Several studies indicate the success of this effort. For example, Plant (1960) found the Dogmatism Scale to be a better measure of general authoritarianism than F in a large student population. Hanson (1968) found that F measures right authoritarianism while D measures general authoritarianism. In a factor-analytic study, Kerlinger and Rokeach (1966) discovered a "common core" of authoritarianism underlying both F and D Scales, but a second-order factoring revealed differences between the scales with D appearing to be more general. The exact connection between dogmatism

---

3 The reader interested in racial prejudice and its relation to authoritarianism may be interested in the extensive work by Gough (1951 a, b, c and d). For further research on status concern see the several papers by Seeman and his colleagues (e.g., Silberstein and Seeman, 1959; Neal and Seeman, 1964; Seeman, Rohan, and Argeriou, 1966). Levinson has constructed several scales related to authoritarianism, e.g., the Custodial Mental Illness Ideology Scale (Gilbert and Levinson, 1956), the Religious-Conventionalism Scale (Levinson, 1954), and the Internationalism Scale (Levinson, 1957).
and authoritarianism needs to be studied further in non-college populations, however.

In this chapter, the basic Rokeach scales will be presented, along with two short versions of the D Scale.

23. Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach 1956)
24. Short Dogmatism Scale (Schulze 1962)
25. Short Dogmatism Scale (Trolldahl and Powell 1965)
26. Opinionation Scale (Rokeach 1956)
27. Intellectual Conviction Scale (Rokeach and Eglash 1956)

The Schulze version of the D Scale was constructed on the basis of college student responses, and thus would be suitable where a short measure of dogmatism is needed in classroom studies. Trolldahl and Powell (1965) found, however, that only two of Schulze's items were among the top ten in field studies of more general populations. Thus the Trolldahl and Powell scale should be of most interest to field researchers who need a short dogmatism scale.

For readers interested in a good, up-to-date summary of research on dogmatism we recommend Vacchiano et al. (1969).
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CALIFORNIA F SCALE (Adorno et al. 1950)

Variable

The F Scale was designed to measure ethnic prejudice and "prefascist tendencies" simultaneously, without mentioning minority groups by name. Both of these characteristics come under the heading of authoritarian or "implicit antidemocratic" trends in a personality.

Description

The authors conceived of the authoritarian personality syndrome as comprising the following nine variables: conventionalism, authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, anti-intraception, superstition and stereotype, power and "toughness", destructiveness and cynicism, projectivity, and sex (Adorno et al., 1950, p. 228). The F Scale was not constructed by the method of selecting items from a large pool on a statistical basis; rather, each one was written specifically for the original scale on the basis of the authors' previous experience and theoretical considerations. Each item was meant to be related to both prejudice and one or more of the 9 personality variables listed above. In addition, each item had to be indirect and had to reflect a balance between irrationality and objective truth.

Form 78 contained 38 Likert-type items. The respondent indicated his degree of agreement or disagreement on a +3 to -3 scale, with the neutral point excluded. These scale points were then converted to the appropriate values from +1 to +7 by adding 4 to each response--except for 3 items (12, 20, 28) scored in the reverse direction because they expressed unprejudiced views. Thus, a high positive score reflected a high degree of authoritarianism. Item analysis according to the discriminatory power (D.P.) technique (Murphy and Likert, 1938) yielded an average D.P. of 1.80 which, although low, indicated that the items in general yield statistically significant differences between respondents having total scores in the high and low quartiles. 16 D.P.'s were above 2.00, 18 between 1.00 and 1.99, and 4 below 1.00.

Form 60 contained 34 items, 15 of which were newly devised for this scale. The remaining 19 were the best from Form 78 (with some minor changes in wording). Item analysis yielded a mean D.P. of 2.15 for these 34 items. 3 D.P.'s were above 3.00, 18 between 2.00 and 2.99, 12 between 1.00 and 1.99, and one below 1.00.

Form 40/45, containing 30 items, was meant to be an improved and shorter version of the F Scale. 7 items from Form 60 were dropped and 3 new ones were added. The mean D.P. for these 30 items, all of which differentiated significantly between high and low quartiles, was 2.85. One D.P. exceeded 4.00, 11 were between 3.00 and 3.99, 16 were between 2.00 and 2.99, and 2 were between 1.00 and 1.99.
Form 78 was administered to the following 4 groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>U.C. public speaking class women</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>U.C. public speaking class men</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>U.C. extension psychology class women</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Professional women</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>For Form 78</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Form 60 was administered to the following groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>University of Oregon student women</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>University of Oregon &amp; University of California student women</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>University of Oregon and University of California student men</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Oregon service club men</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Oregon service club men</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>For Form 60</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Form 45 and 40 were administered to the following groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Washington University women</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California service club men</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle class men</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle class women</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class men</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class women</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles men</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles women</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing class women</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Quentin men prisoners</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric clinic women</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric clinic men</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment service men veterans</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime school men</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL For Forms 45 and 40</td>
<td>1518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability

The reliability (split-half) of Form 78 over all groups was .74. Group reliabilities ranged from .56 to .88. Form 60 had a reliability of .87 over all groups tested with group reliabilities ranging from .81 to .91. Forms 45 and 40 had a reliability of .90 over all groups tested. Individual group means varied from .81 to .97.

Validity

For all groups receiving Form 78, the F Scale correlated .53 with the AS Scale, .65 with the E Scale and .54 with the PEC Scale. For all groups taking form 60, the F Scale correlated
.69 with the E Scale and .34 with the PEC Scale. The F Scale correlated .73 with the E Scale and .52 with the PEC Scale for groups receiving form 45. For all groups taking form 40, the F Scale correlated .77 with the E Scale and .61 with the PEC Scale.

For Form 78, the D.P.s of the items were computed using high and low quartiles on the A-S Scale in addition to the D.P.'s computed using high and low quartiles on the F Scale. Seventeen items have a significant relationship to the A-S Scale, that is D.P.'s greater than 1.00. Four items have negative D.P.'s ranging from -.08 to -1.18. The remaining items have D.P.'s falling between 0 and .99. The mean D.P. using the A-S Scale is .89. For Form 60, the D.P. of each item was computed using high and low quartiles of the E Scale. The average D.P. was 1.53. There were 28 items with significant D.P.'s, that is, D.P.'s over 1.00. The remaining D.P.'s were between .38 and .99. None was negative. There is no evidence that the items representing each of the variables comprising the authoritarian personality exist as item clusters. When every item on form 45 (N=517 women) was correlated with every other, the correlation ranged from .11 to .24. However, the items representing any one variable did not correlate with one another any better than they did with items representing other variables.

The overall item mean scores of Mack and Larry, two men who in extensive interviewing expressed Authoritarian and Democratic ideas respectively, were 4.31 and 2.95 (on Form 45 with an average D.P. of 1.80). Although the item mean scores of Mack and Larry definitely differ, both scores would barely be included in the extreme quartiles from which the D.P.'s are calculated.


Administration This scale is self administered. The amount of time required would depend on the form used (Figure roughly 1/2 minute per item). A subject's score is the sum of the converted responses (see description section). Scores are most often expressed in terms of item mean scores which are calculated by dividing sum score by the number of items.

Results and Comments The mean item scores for all groups taking Form 78 was 3.71, with group means ranging from 3.43 to 3.94. For groups receiving Form 60, the overall item mean was 3.50; group means ranged from 3.25 to 3.82. For forms 40 and 45 the mean was 3.84 with groups means ranging from 4.19 to 4.39.

As noted above, there was no statistical clustering of items into the 9 personality variables theoretically comprising the authoritarian
syndrome. This finding, despite high reliabilities for total scale scores, calls into question the existence of a true "syndrome" of separable traits and raises important issues about the dimensions of authoritarianism (Kirscht and Dillehay, 1967).

Form 45 of the F Scale was correlated with Form 45 of the E Scale (10 items), with a subset of 5 items concerning minority groups in general, and with the remaining 5 items expressing prejudice against Jews and Negroes (N=399). The F Scale correlated notably higher with the minority group items than with the four anti-Semitic and one anti-Negro items (r=.63 and .53, respectively). A similar result was obtained by comparing correlations between E and F with correlations between F and A-S. Thus, it would appear that the F Scale is more closely related to measures of general ethnocentrism than to attitudes toward particular ethnic groups (particularly the Jews).

Because the F Scale has been criticized for containing a large majority of positively worded items--thus confounding acquiescence with authoritarianism, we have included here two lists of item reversals (Bass, 1955; Christie, et al., 1958). There is considerable disagreement about the appropriateness of such items for measuring authoritarianism, however, especially since they appear to have lower reliabilities than the positively worded items (see Kirscht and Dillehay, 1967, for a complete discussion).
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2. Although many people may scoff, it may yet be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.

3. America is getting so far from the true American way of life that force may be necessary to restore it.

6. It is only natural and right that women be restricted in certain ways in which men have more freedom.

9. Too many people today are living in an unnatural, soft way; we should return to the fundamentals, to a more red-blooded, active way of life.

10. It is more than a remarkable coincidence that Japan had an earthquake on Pearl Harbor Day, December 7, 1944.

* 12. The modern church, with its many rules and hypocrisies, does not appeal to the deeply religious person; it appeals mainly to the childish, the insecure, and the uncritical.

14. After we finish off the Germans and Japs, we ought to concentrate on other enemies of the human race such as rats, snakes, and germs.

17. Familiarity breeds contempt.

19. One should avoid doing things in public which appear wrong to others, even though one knows that these things are right.

* 20. One of the main values of progressive education is that it gives the child great freedom in expressing those natural impulses and desires so often frowned upon by conventional middle class society.

23. He is indeed contemptible who does not feel an undying love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

24. Today everything is unstable; we should be prepared for a period of constant change, conflict, and upheaval.

* 28. Novels or stories that tell about what people think and feel are more interesting than those which contain mainly action, romance, and adventure.

30. Reports of atrocities in Europe have been greatly exaggerated for propaganda purposes.

31. Homosexuality is a particularly rotten form of delinquency and ought to be severely punished.

32. It is essential for learning or effective work that our teachers or bosses outline in detail what is to be done and exactly how to go about it.

35. There are some activities so flagrantly un-American that, when responsible officials won't take steps, the wide-awake citizen should take the law into his own hands.

38. There is too much emphasis in college on intellectual and theoretical topics, not enough emphasis on practical matters and on the homely virtues of living.

39. Every person should have a deep faith in some supernatural force higher than himself to which he gives total allegiance and whose decisions he does not question.

42. No matter how they act on the surface, men are interested in women for only one reason.

43. Sciences like chemistry, physics, and medicine have carried men very far, but there are many important things that can never be understood by the human mind.
46. The sexual orgies of the old Greeks and Romans are nursery school stuff compared to some of the goings-on in this country today, even in circles where people might least expect it.

47. No insult to our honor should ever go unpunished.

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

53. There are some things too intimate or personal to talk about even with one's closest friends.

55. Although leisure is a fine thing, it is good hard work that makes life interesting and worthwhile.

56. After the war, we may expect a crime wave; the control of gangsters and ruffians will become a major social problem.

58. What a man does is not so important so long as he does it well.

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

60. Which of the following are the most important for a person to have or to be? Mark X the three most important *

   ― Artistic and sensuous
   ― Popular, good personality
   ― Drive, determination, will power
   ― Broad, humanitarian outlook
   ― Neatness and good manners
   ― Sensitivity and understanding
   ― Efficiency, practicality, thrift
   ― Intellectual and serious
   ― Emotional expressiveness, warmth, intimacy
   ― Kindness and charity

65. It is entirely possible that this series of wars and conflicts will be ended once and for all by a world-destroying earthquake, flood or other catastrophe.

66. Books and movies ought not to deal so much with the sordid and seamy side of life: they ought to concentrate on themes that are entertaining or uplifting.

67. When you come right down to it, it's human nature never to do anything without an eye to one's own profit.

70. To a greater extent than most people realize, our lives are governed by plots hatched in secret by politicians.

73. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around so much and mix together so freely, a person has to be especially careful to protect himself against infection and disease.

74. What this country needs is fewer laws and agencies, and more courageous, tireless, devoted leaders whom the people can put their faith in.

75. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped.

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

* The scoring key for this item is not reported, although, since the item is supposed to tap conventionalism, the "popular," "drive," "neatness," and "efficiency" replies would probably be scored in the authoritarian direction.
Conventionalism: Rigid adherence to conventional, middle-class values.

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

6. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to be liked and accepted by decent people.

53. One main trouble today is that people talk too much and work too little.

Authoritarian submission: Submissive, uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities of the ingroup.

1. See above.

7. Science has carried man very far, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.

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

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

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

32. 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.

44. In order for us to do good work, it is necessary that our bosses outline carefully what is to be done and exactly how to go about it.

Authoritarian aggression: Tendency to be on the lookout for, and to condemn, reject and punish people who violate conventional values.

6. See above.

17. An insult to our honor should never go unpunished.

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

22. The trouble with letting everybody have a say in running the government is that so many people are just naturally stupid or full of wild ideas.

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

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

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

53. See above.

58. Homosexuals are nothing but degenerates and ought to be severely punished.

Anti-intraception: Opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, and tender-minded.

16. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.

30. Some cases of feeblemindedness are caused by overstudy.

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

53. See above.

Sex: Exaggerated concern with sexual "goings-on."

34. See above.

52. See above.

58. See above.
THE F SCALE

Forms 45 and 40

Conventionalism: Rigid adherence to conventional, middle-class values.
1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
12. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.
37. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.
41. The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.

Authoritarian submission: Submissive, uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities of the ingroup.
1. See above.
4. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
8. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
21. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
23. 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.
42. No sane, normal decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.
44. Nobody ever learned anything really important except through suffering.

Authoritarian aggression: Tendency to be on the lookout for, and to condemn, reject, and punish people who violate conventional values.
12. See above.
13. What youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
19. An insult to our honor should always be punished.
25. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.
27. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.
34. Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked, and feebleminded people.
37. See above.
39. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

Anti-intraception: Opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, and tenderminded.
9. 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.
31. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
37. See above.
41. See above.
Superstition and stereotypy: The belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate; the disposition to think in rigid categories.

4. See above.
8. See above.
16. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places.
26. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.
29. Some day it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.
33. Wars and social trouble may someday be ended by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world.

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.

2. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.
13. See above.
19. See above.
22. It is best to use some prewar authorities in Germany to keep order and prevent chaos.
23. See above.
26. See above.
38. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.

Destructiveness and cynicism: Generalized hostility, vilification of the human.

6. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.
43. Familiarity breeds contempt.

Projectivity: The disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outwards of unconscious emotional impulses.

18. 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.
31. See above.
33. See above.
35. 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.
38. See above.

Sex: Exaggerated concern with sexual "goings-on."

25. See above.
35. See above.
39. See above.
Astrology will never explain anything.

Sex criminals such as those who rape and attack children should be treated as sick people, not publicly whipped or worse.

A sane, normal decent person might have to hurt a close friend or relative.

Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas. As they grow up they ought to try to carry them out and not be content to get over them and settle down.

Weaknesses and difficulties can hold us back; will power is not enough.

Our lives are not at all controlled by plots hatched in secret places.

Decent people can get along with a person who has bad manners, habits and breeding.

Human nature being what it is, universal peace will come about eventually.

Familiarity does not breed contempt.

If people would discuss matters more before acting, everybody would be better off.

What a youth needs most is to be free to make up his own mind, to be flexible and to work and fight for what he considers right personally even though it might not be best for his family and country.

Nowadays, not enough investigating of personal and private matters is done.

The artist and the professor are much more important to society than the businessman and the manufacturer.

Because of science, it will be possible for the human mind to understand most important things.

Self-reliance, respect for democracy and lack of need to submit to authority are the most important virtues children should learn.

Many fine people honestly could never bring themselves around to feeling a great love, gratitude, and respect for their parents.

Some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it, are tame compared to the wild sex life of the Greeks and Romans.

A person does not have to worry about catching an infection or disease just because many different kinds of people move around and mix together a great deal nowadays.
Homosexuals are not criminals and should not be punished.

People cannot be divided into two distinct classes, the weak and the strong.

When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him to think about doing something about it, not be distracted by more cheerful things.

What this country needs most, more than a few courageous, tireless devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith, is better laws and political programs.

An insult to our honor should be studied, not punished.

No people are born with an urge to jump from high places.

No person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
It is highly unlikely that astrology will ever be able to explain anything.

Sex crime, such as rape and attacks on children, are signs of mental illness; such people belong in hospitals rather than in prison.

It's only natural for people to sometimes have thoughts about hurting a close friend or relative.

If it weren't for the rebellious ideas of youth there would be less progress in the world.

There are many difficulties a person cannot overcome no matter how much will power he has.

Many people have too great a fear of plots hatched in secret by politicians.

People should be willing to overlook failures in manners and unpleasant personal habits in other people.

Human nature doesn't make war inevitable; man may some day establish a peaceful world.

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.

It would be a good thing if people spent more time thinking and talking about ideas just for the fun of it.

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.

There are times when it is necessary to probe into even the most personal and private matters.

The artist and the professor are probably more important to society than the businessman.

The findings of science may some day show that many of our most cherished beliefs are wrong.

One of the most important things children should learn is when to disobey authorities.

Most honest people admit to themselves that they have sometimes hated their parents.

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.
Even though people of all sorts mix together nowadays, you don't have to worry very much about catching an infection or disease.

It's nobody's business if someone is a homosexual as long as he doesn't harm other people.

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.

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.

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.

Insults to our honor are not always important enough to bother about it.

An urge to jump from high places is probably the result of unhappy personal experiences rather than something inborn.

It's all right for people to raise questions about even the most sacred matters.
A NEW F (AUTHORITARIANISM) SCALE
(Webster, Sanford & Freeman 1955)

Variable
This scale was designed to measure the authoritarian or potentially anti-democratic personality as it was conceived in the California study (Adorno et al., 1950).

Description
This scale is composed of 123 true-false items. In constructing the scale, the authors administered the E and F Scales together with 677 true-false items from various personality tests. 178 of the 677 items were reported to have sufficient correlation with the F Scale and enough variance to comprise a new scale. These 178 items were then narrowed down to 123. The procedure for selecting the 123 is not described. The scale was cross- validated on a new sample the following year. All scale items had validates of .05 in both samples and .01 in at least one of the samples. The authors classified the items into the following categories: punitive morality, authoritarian submission, conventionality, religious fundamentalism, anti-intraception, ego-alien symptomatology, lack of self confidence, projectivity, cynicism, romanticism, circumscribed aggression, and sense of victimization.

13 of the 149 items listed are scored as false and the remaining items are scored as true. A high score indicates a high degree of authoritarianism.

Sample
The two samples consisted of 441 college freshmen and 402 college freshmen, respectively.

Reliability
The reliability coefficient for the first sample was .88. No reliability coefficient for the second sample was given.

Validity
In the first sample, the 123 item scale correlated .78 with the F Scale and .53 with the E Scale (E and F Scales correlated .59 in this sample). For the second sample, this scale correlated .74 with the F Scale. The estimated correlation with the F Scale if both samples were pooled using the 149 items would exceed .74.

Location

Administration
This scale is self administered and requires an estimated 30 minutes to complete.
Results and Comments

The original 32-item F Scale was believed, by the authors, to be too short to encompass all of the 30 to 40 variables that had come to be used in describing the authoritarian personality. The present scale was proposed to remedy this situation. The authors also felt that more successful attempts to factor analyze a measure of the authoritarian personality could be made with a longer scale.

Unlike the original F Scale, this scale was composed solely by empirical methods. It is thus interesting to note the close correspondence between the original nine personality variables supposed to comprise the authoritarian personality and the categories used by the authors to classify the items in this new scale. The authors state that the new scale is less ideological and more personality-centered than the F Scale. The authors also felt that the present scale would be less dependent upon the immediate cultural environment of the subject than the original F Scale since the new items are much less concerned with social relations, politics, or economics.

Unfortunately, only thirteen of the new items are false from the authoritarian point of view. Consequently, the contribution of acquiescence to a high positive score is an important consideration, both in using the scale and in interpreting correlations between it and the various scales used in the California study.
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A NEW F (AUTHORITARIANISM) SCALE

A. COMPULSIVENESS

1. Orderliness, carefulness, liking for routine
   T I always see to it that my work is carefully planned and organized.
   T I always like to keep my things neat and tidy and in good order.
   T I find that a well ordered mode of life with regular hours is congenial to my temperment.
   T I like to have a place for everything and everything in its place.
   T I do not like to see people carelessly dressed.
   T It bothers me when something unexpected interrupts my daily routine.
   T I would rather be a steady and dependable worker than a brilliant but unstable one.
   T I like to plan a home study schedule and then follow it.
   T I prefer a man to be dressed carefully rather than casually or carelessly.
   T I am very careful about my manner of dress.

2. Rigidity
   T Once I have my mind made up I seldom change it.

3. Intolerance of ambiguity
   T I often wish people would be more definite about things.
   T I don't like to undertake any project unless I have a pretty good idea as to how it will turn out.
   T I don't like things to be uncertain and unpredictable.
   T It is annoying to listen to a lecturer who cannot seem to make up his mind as to what he really believes.
   T Our thinking would be a lot better off if we would just forget about words like "probably", "approximately", and "perhaps".
   T People who seem unsure and uncertain about things make me feel uncomfortable.
   T Perfect balance is the essence of all good composition.
   T Straightforward reasoning appeals to me more than metaphors and the search for analogies.
   T I don't like modern art.

B. PUNITIVE MORALITY (AUTHORITARIAN AGGRESSION)

T I am in favor of a very strict enforcement of all laws, no matter what the consequences.
T Every family owes it to the city to keep their sidewalks cleared in the winter and their lawn mowed in the summer.
T I would disapprove of anyone's drinking to the point of intoxication at a party.
T I get pretty discouraged with the law when a smart lawyer gets a criminal free.
A NEW F (AUTHORITARIANISM) SCALE (Continued)

T Lawbreakers are almost always caught and punished.
T Every wage earner should be required to save a certain part of his income each month so that he will be able to support himself and his family in later years.
T The trouble with many people is that they don't take things seriously enough.
T I set a high standard for myself, and I feel others should do the same.
T There must be something wrong with a person who is lacking in religious feeling.
T Divorce is practically never justified.
T No man of character would ask his fiancee to have sexual intercourse with him before marriage.

C. AUTHORITARIAN SUBMISSION

1. Exaggerated respect for parents

T One of my aims in life is to accomplish something that would make my mother proud of me.
T Parents are much too easy on their children nowadays.
T Children should associate more with children and less with their elders.
T It is a pretty callous person who does not feel love and gratitude towards his parents.
F At times I have very much wanted to leave home.

2. Exaggerated respect for the state, laws, and prevailing moral agents

T Disobedience to the government is never justified.
T Army life is a good influence on most young men.
T It is the duty of a citizen to support his country, right or wrong.
T Only a fool would try to change our American way of life.
F Politically I am probably something of a radical.
T Communism is the most hateful thing in the world today.

3. Identification with power

T It's a good thing to know people in the right places so you can get traffic tags, and such things, taken care of.
T I would dislike being a member of a leaderless group.
T When I take a new job, I like to be tipped off on who should be gotten next to.
T I like to know some important people because it makes me feel important.
D. Conventionality

1. Self-righteous moralism

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I think I am stricter about right and wrong than most people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I always tried to make the best school grades that I could.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I never make judgments about people until I am sure of the facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I am known as a hard and steady worker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I prefer men who are never profane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I never attend a sexy show if I can avoid it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I have been inspired to a program of life based on duty which I have since carefully followed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>It is usually a good thing to be frank.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Conformity

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I would be uncomfortable in anything other than fairly conventional dress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>A person should adapt his ideas and his behavior to the group that happens to be with him at the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Before I do something I try to consider how my friends will react to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I would be uncomfortable if I accidentally went to a formal party in street clothes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>I dislike men who always follow the usual social conventions (manners, customs, etiquette, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>I like unconventional language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I dislike a man who is frequently blunt in his speech.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Preference for traditional feminine role

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I would never play cards (poker) with a stranger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Women should not be allowed to drink in cocktail bars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>I think I would like to drive a racing car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I would like to be a nurse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>I would like to be a journalist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Kindness and generosity are the most important qualities for a wife to have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I dislike women who disregard the usual social or moral conventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I like the sweet &quot;feminine&quot; type of girl as my friend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I used to like drop-the-hankerchief.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Religious Fundamentalism

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I feel sure that there is only one true religion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>In religious matters, I believe I would have to be called an agnostic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I believe in a life hereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>I pray several times every week.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T Everything is turning out just like the prophets of the Bible said it would.
T I go to church almost every week.
T I believe in the second coming of Christ.
T I am very religious (more than most people).
T I believe there is a Devil and a Hell in afterlife.

F. ANTI-INTRACEPTION

1. Emotional suppression

T A strong person doesn't show his emotions and feelings.
F I am fascinated by fire.
T Human passions cause most of the evil in the world.

2. Ideational suppression

T When a person has a problem or worry it is best for him not to think about it.
T I must admit that I have at times been worried beyond reason over something that really did not matter.
T Something exciting will almost always pull me out of it when I am feeling low.

3. Anti-intellectual attitudes

T I get sort of annoyed with writers who go out of their way to use strange and unusual words.
T The best theory is the one that has the best practical applications.
T I enjoy detective or mystery stories.

G. EGO-ALIEN SYMPTOMATOLOGY

F I almost never blush.
T I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be.
F I can read a long while without tiring my eyes.
F When I leave home I do not worry about whether the door is locked and the windows closed.
T At times I have fits of laughing and crying that I cannot control.
T I have more trouble concentrating than others seem to have.
T Sometimes some unimportant thought will run through my mind and bother me for days.
T I often think, "I wish I were a child again."
T It makes me nervous to have to wait.

H. LACK OF SELF-CONFIDENCE

T Even the idea of giving a talk in public makes me afraid.
T It is pretty easy for people to win arguments with me.
T It is hard for me to find anything to talk about when I meet a new person.
F I like to talk before groups of people.
T Clever, sarcastic people make me feel very uncomfortable.
T I have a tendency to give up easily when I meet difficult problems.
T I prefer team games to games in which one individual competes against another.
F I am an important person.
T I certainly feel useless at times.
T I frequently have to fight against showing that I am bashful.

I. PROJECTIVITY

1. Personal projectivity

T I am bothered by people outside, on streetcars, stores, etc., watching me.
T I have often felt that strangers were looking at me critically.

2. Impersonal projectivity

T The future is too uncertain for a person to make serious plans.
T I dread the thought of an earthquake.
T A large number of people are guilty of bad sexual conduct.
T It is better never to expect much; in that way, you are rarely disappointed.

J. CYNICISM

T I don't blame anyone for trying to grab all he can get in this world.
T Most people will use somewhat unfair means to gain profit or an advantage rather than lose it.
T Only a fool would ever vote to increase his own taxes.
T Most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people.
T People pretend to care more about one another than they really do.
T The man who provides temptation by leaving valuable property unprotected is about as much to blame for its theft as the one who steals it.
T Most people make friends because friends are likely to be useful to them.
T A person does not need to worry about other people if only he looks after himself.
T There will always be war as long as there are men.
T I feel that it is certainly best to keep my mouth shut when I'm in trouble.
T I think a great many people exaggerate their misfortunes in order to gain the sympathy and help of others.
T I dream frequently about things that are best kept to myself.
T I do not blame a person for taking advantage of someone who lays himself open to it.
T The average person is not able to appreciate art and music very well.
It's no use worrying my head about public affairs; I can't do anything about them anyhow.

If several people find themselves in trouble, the best thing for them to do is to agree upon a story and stick to it.

K. ROMANTICISM

In most ways the poor man is better off than the rich man.
There is something noble about poverty and suffering.
One of the marks of superior things in nature is that they develop from within rather than from without.
An invention which takes jobs away from people should be suppressed until new work can be found for them.

L. CIRCUMSCRIBED AGGRESSION

1. Overt but safe aggression

I must admit that I enjoy playing practical jokes on people.
There are certain people whom I dislike so much that I am inwardly pleased when they are catching it for something they have done.
I like to poke fun at people.
I sometimes tease animals.

2. Inhibited and transformed aggression

Animals should not be used in experiments if it is known that they will die as a result of it.
Men who look as though they could be brutal are repelling to me.
The thought of being in an automobile accident is very frightening to me.

M. SENSE OF VICTIMIZATION

Teachers often expect too much work from the students.
I have had more than my share of things to worry about.
I feel that I have often been punished without cause.
I have often had to take orders from someone who did not know as much as I did.
My way of doing things is apt to be misunderstood by others.
My mother or father often made me obey even when I thought that it was unreasonable.
People often disappoint me.
My parents have often disapproved of my friends.
Police cars should be specially marked so that you can always see them coming.
FORCED CHOICE F SCALE (Berkowitz and Wolkon 1964)

Variable
This scale was designed to measure authoritarianism as defined by the California study (Adorno et al., 1950) while avoiding two problems encountered with previous scales: 1) acquiescence response set and 2) inadequate counterbalancing which yields unreliability and perhaps multidimensionality.

Description
The authors presented each positively worded F Scale item along with its reversal. The respondent was instructed to select one statement of the pair and indicate the extent to which he agreed with it relative to its opposite. Three levels of agreement were provided: "slightly more", "somewhat more", and "a great deal more". Thus there were six scale points, three levels of agreement for each of the two alternatives. These were scored from 1 to 7, with 4 representing the absent midpoint.

Twenty-five items which appear in the original F Scale and also in both Bass' and Christie's sets of negatively phrased items were selected. These 75 items, 25 originals and two sets of reversals, arranged in random order, comprise Form I. From the items in Form I, two forced-choice scales were constructed. Form II (FCC) used the original items paired with Christie's reversals; each pair constituted an item. The items appeared in random order. Form III (FCB) was exactly the same as the previous one, except the Bass reversals were coupled with the original F statement. Stems appeared in the exact same random order used in Form II. In each forced choice form (FC), for 13 randomly chosen items, the original statement from the F Scale preceded its reversal, while in the other 12 items, the reversal came first. The original F+ statements appeared first in the same items of each FC form. In short, the only difference between the two forms used was in the set of reversed items employed in the pairing.

Sample
The various forms were administered to two major groups. The first comprised 153 Junior College students, who received the tests in the following different orders:

- Condition 1 (N=51): Form II (FCC) followed by Form I
- Condition 2 (N=54): Form I followed by Form III (FCB)
- Condition 3 (N=48): Form III (FCB) followed by Form I, followed by Form II (FCC)

The second sample included 135 students attending the summer school of the College of Liberal Arts of Boston University, who received the questionnaires in four different orders.

- Condition 1 (N=25): Form I followed by Form II (FCC)
- Condition 2 (N=23): Form I followed by Form III (FCB)
- Condition 3 (N=43): Form II (FCC) followed by Form I
- Condition 4 (N=44): Form III (FCB) followed by Form I

1See the write-up of the original F Scale in this chapter which also lists the Bass and Christie reversals.
For this sample, Form I was reduced from 75 to 50 items by eliminating the Bass reversals.

Reliability

The following reliability coefficients were obtained after combining across conditions. In each case the largest possible number of cases was used.

(Hoyt) Reliabilities of Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F+</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF-</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF-</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCB</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reliabilities of the reversed scales are larger than usually obtained, probably due to the length of the scales (CF- and BF-).

Validity

Scores obtained on the various forms were correlated with those from the original F Scale. To the extent that the new scales measure the same thing as the F Scale, these correlations should be high. The results are presented in table form below.

Validity (correlation with F+) of scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Validity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Validity</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CF-</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF-</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCC</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCB</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notice that both forced-choice scales yielded higher correlations with F+ than did the two F- scales. In addition, the FC scores correlated highly with F- scores. Thus, the authors reason, "the forced-choice form predicts well to both a measure confounded with agreement response set and another confounded with disagreement response set (while the two do not correlate as highly with each other). This seems to suggest that the FC format is relatively insensitive to each of these opposing response tendencies".

There was, however, some indication that order of presentation affected responding. Stems in which F+ preceded F- correlated only between .24 and .54 with items constructed in the reverse order. Nevertheless, this did not cause the items to exhibit differential association with F+ scores.


Administration This scale is self administered; each form of 25 items requires an estimated 15-20 minutes to complete.

Results and Comments The forced-choice technique appears to be one of the best solutions to the problem of agreement set. This scale correlates highly with F+ and F- subscales of balanced forms, although these subscales usually do not correlate highly with each other. This may be due in part to a change in the meaning of the negative items in the presence of their authoritarian opposites. One of the problems encountered in constructing negative items has been the difficulty of determining what changes were needed to create psychological opposition in statements that had several logical opposites. Perhaps putting the opposites together makes the implied underlying dimension more salient to the subject.

The authors discuss the difficulty of validating a new scale against an old one of questionable validity (i.e., the original F Scale), and suggest that further exploration of their scale needs to be done in studies of behavior. It is possible, as mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, that a forced choice scale makes rational considerations too salient, thus decreasing the validity of a scale designed to measure "deep" and irrational personality tendencies. This is little more than a conjecture, however. Only further empirical work will determine its worth.

FORM II (Forced Choice Christie)

(* Included on short form)

*1. a. It is highly unlikely that astrology will ever be able to explain anything.
   b. Someday it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.

2. 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 criminals such as those who rape and attack children, deserve more than mere imprisonment: such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.

3. 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.

*4. 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.

5. 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.

6. a. Many people have too great a fear of plots hatched in secret by politicians.
   b. Most people don't realize how much of our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.

7. a. A person with bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.
   b. People should be willing to overlook failures in manners and unpleasant personal habits in other people.

8. a. Human nature doesn't make war inevitable; man may some day establish a peaceful world.
   b. Human nature being what it is there will always be war and conflict.

   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.

*10. a. It would be a good thing if people spent more time thinking and talking about ideas just for the fun of it.
    b. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.

*11. a. What a youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
    b. 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.
12. a. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
   b. There are times when it is necessary to probe into even the most personal and private matters.

13. a. The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.
   b. The artist and the professor are probably more important to society than the businessman.

14. 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.

15. a. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
   b. One of the most important things children should learn is when to disobey authorities.

16. a. Most honest people admit to themselves that they have sometimes hated their parents.
   b. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

17. a. 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.
   b. 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.

18. 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.

19. 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.

20. 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.

21. a. 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.
   b. 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.
22. 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.

23. a. An insult to honor should always be punished.
   b. Insults to our honor are not always important enough to bother about it.

24. 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.

25. 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.
FORM III (Forced Choice Bass)

(* Included in short form)

*1. a. Astrology will never explain anything.
b. Someday it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.

2. a. Sex criminals such as those who rape and attack children should be treated as sick people, not publicly whipped or worse.
b. Sex criminals such as those who rape and attack children, deserve more than mere imprisonment: such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.

3. a. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.
b. A sane, normal decent person might have to hurt a close friend or relative.

*4. a. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas. As they grow up they ought to try to carry them out and not be content to get over them and settle down.
b. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.

5. a. Weaknesses and difficulties can hold us back; will power is not enough.
b. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.

6. a. Our lives are not at all controlled by plots hatched in secret places.
b. Most people don't realize how much of our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.

7. a. A person with bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.
b. Decent people can get along with a person who has bad manners, habits and breeding.

8. a. Human nature being what it is, universal peace will come about eventually.
b. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.

b. Familiarity does not breed contempt.

*10. a. If people would discuss matters more before acting, everybody would be better off.
b. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.

*11. a. What a youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
b. What a youth needs most is to be free to make up his own mind, to be flexible and to work and fight for what he considers right personally even though it might not be best for his family and country.
12. a. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
   b. Nowadays, not enough investigating of personal and private matters is done.

13. a. The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.
   b. The artist and the professor are much more important to society than the businessman and the manufacturer.

14. a. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
   b. Because of science, it will be possible for the human mind to understand most important things.

15. a. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
   b. Self-reliance, respect for democracy and lack of need to submit to authority are the most important virtues children should learn.

16. a. Many fine people honestly could never bring themselves around to feeling a great love, gratitude, and respect for their parents.
   b. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

17. a. 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.
   b. Some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it, are tame compared to the wild sex life of the Greeks and Romans.

18. a. A person does not have to worry about catching an infection or disease just because many different kinds of people move around and mix together a great deal nowadays.
   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.

19. a. Homosexuals are not criminals and should not be punished.
   b. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

20. a. People can be divided into two distinct classes, the weak and the strong.
   b. People cannot be divided into two distinct classes, the weak and the strong.

21. a. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him to think about doing something about it, not be distracted by more cheerful things.
   b. 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.
22. a. What this country needs most, more than a few courageous, tireless devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith, is better laws and political programs.
   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.

23. a. An insult to honor should always be punished.
   b. An insult to our honor should be studied, not punished.

24. a. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places.
   b. No people are born with an urge to jump from high places.

*25. a. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
   b. No person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
FORCED CHOICE F SCALE (Schuman and Harding c. 1962)

Variable
This scale is quite similar to that of Berkowitz and Wolkon, and was designed to eliminate acquiescence biases from the California F Scale.

Description
For a large study of racial prejudice (see Schuman and Harding 1963 and 1964 for partial results) the authors desired a relatively short authoritarianism scale free from response bias. In an initial pretest, 24 of the 30 original F items were paired with the Christie et al. (1958) reversals. The ten "best" were selected using two criteria: the ability of the item to discriminate between individuals high and low on the Ethnocentrism Scale, and a fairly even distribution of responses. A second pretest included a sample of college students and a mixed group of adults.

Scoring is accomplished as follows. The response alternative taken from the California F Scale is always considered "High" (H) and the matching Christie reversal "Low" (L). When the high alternative is chosen, an associated response of "Very sure" is scored 7, "Moderately sure," 6, and "Not very sure," 5. When the low alternative is chosen, "Very sure" is scored 1, and so on. Failure to respond is scored 4.

Sample
The samples for the pretests were described only as stated above. For their main study, Schuman and Harding surveyed two groups, a heterogeneous quota sample of 229 Boston adults and a sample of 112 girls from a northern Catholic college.

Reliability/ Homogeneity
Pooling the pretest samples (total N = 94), a split-half reliability check was made yielding a corrected coefficient of .67. In the two main samples, the reliabilities were only .48 (general sample) and .39 (college sample). These low figures should not be taken simply as "low reliability"; a test-retest study needs to be done. Probably the low split-half coefficients indicate multidimensionality.

Validity
The authors report somewhat lowered validity of this scale due to the forced choice format: "...we do have the impression that the paired alternative item encourages conscious reflection and considered choice, and that this format probably reduces the influence on responses of unconscious personality trends. Thus we believe there is some loss of validity."

Nevertheless, moderate to high correlations were obtained with several theoretically related variables, e.g., ethnocentrism, anti-internationalism, traditional family ideology, custodial attitude toward mental illness, conformity, and prejudice--thus lending evidence for the construct validity of the paired alternatives scale.

Administration This scale should take only about 10 minutes to complete.

Results and Comments Schuman and Harding were hesitant to recommend this scale for further use because of its relatively low split-half reliability and apparently decreased validity (in comparison with non-forced choice measures). The scale has not been previously published. Nevertheless, it represents an important methodological approach which could perhaps be used more effectively with more items (to increase reliability). Anyone wishing to use this item format might also want to run a test-retest correlation pretest study to determine whether reliability in this sense is satisfactory.

It would be useful to find out whether the apparently lowered validity is due to elimination of agreement bias or to the increased salience of rational deliberation, or both.


In the list below GS means general sample and SCS means college sample. For each item pair response distributions, mean score, correlation with the total scale and N are presented. Alternatives in the authoritarian direction are preceded with an H.

1. L It would be a good thing if people spent more time thinking and talking about ideas just for the fun of it.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

   L Most honest people admit to themselves that they have sometimes hated their parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. L Insults to our honor are not always important enough to bother about.

   H An insult to our honor should always be punished.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. L It's only natural for people to sometimes have thoughts about hurting a close friend or relative.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

   L If it weren't for the rebellious ideas of youth there would be less progress in the world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. H Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.

L Human nature doesn't make war inevitable; man may some day establish a peaceful world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GS</th>
<th>SCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. H What the youth needs most in strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.

L 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GS</th>
<th>SCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

L People should be willing to overlook failures in the manners and unpleasant personal habits in other people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GS</th>
<th>SCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. L There are times when it is necessary to probe into even the most personal and private matters.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GS</th>
<th>SCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. H No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.

L There are many difficulties a person cannot overcome no matter how much will power he has.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GS</th>
<th>SCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BALANCED F SCALE (Athanasiou 1968)

Variable
This scale was designed to measure authoritarianism as conceived in the California study (Adorno et al., 1950) using equal numbers of positively and negatively worded items.

Description
The author selected 14 stereopathic (positively worded) and 14 nonstereopathic ("reversed") six-point Likert-type items from an unpublished list developed by Christie and his associates. The 28 items were chosen on the basis of item analyses "against two internal criteria using a sample of Peace Corps Volunteers" (Smith, 1965). Stems which correlated positively with total score and negatively with "an indicator of agreement set" and which were not clearly concerned with religion and politics were retained. Scores on the stereopathic and nonstereopathic segments of the scale have ranged from -.18 to -.62 and have always been negative.

This 28-item scale was used in a study of the differences between college students who transferred out of engineering and those who continued through college as engineering majors. It was hypothesized that the transfer students would score lower on authoritarianism.

Sample
The sample included 347 engineering students and 111 students who, by their sophomore year, had transferred out of engineering. All were males. 98% were between 19 and 21 years of age. The modal residential area of their families was suburban and 71% had fathers whose occupational category was rated middle class or above. The religious break-down of the sample was reported: Protestants 63%, Catholics 20%, Jews 8%, and atheists or agnostics 9%.

Reliability
A test-retest study including 8 male and 11 female students yielded a coefficient of stability of .86 over a two-week period.

Validity
Validity is indirectly indicated by the findings reported below.

Location

Administration
This scale is self-administered and requires an estimated 20 minutes to complete.

Results and Comments
All but 4 items (9, 11, 23, 27) discriminated between "engineers" and transfers. The two groups also differed on a number of other variables theoretically related to authoritarianism: Transfers were more likely to be non-Christians, less likely to attend religious services, more likely to be only children, more likely to have foreign born parents, more likely to have a mother with
high education and a job, and more likely to have a high verbal SAT score. On a seven-point scale administered before these young men entered college, transfers as compared to "engineers" rated themselves as significantly more spontaneous than rigid, more politically liberal than conservative, more "open" than "closed", and more unconventional than conventional.

The correlation between stereopathic and nonstereopathic segments of the scale was - .31 for engineers and - .18 for transfers. A large negative coefficient would indicate lack of response bias, therefore the relatively low figures obtained suggest that the problem of item reversal has not been completely overcome. Moreover, in terms of proportional reduction in variance, the stereopathic items proved to be better predictors of transfer behavior than the nonstereopathic items.

The average item mean score on the nonstereopathic items was 3.82 for "engineers" and 4.00 for transfers, indicating mild acceptance of liberal positions in both groups. For the stereopathic items, the average item means were 2.90 and 2.44 for "engineers" and transfers, respectively, indicating stronger rejection of the authoritarian position by the transfers.
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BALANCED F SCALE

Items to which "engineers" indicated greater agreement than did "transfers." (p < .01) These items are all from the S subscale. Responses ranged from 1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree.

2. What our youth need most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.

3. The minds of today's youth are being hopelessly corrupted by the wrong kind of literature.

6. One of the best assurances for peace is for us to have the biggest bomb and not be afraid to use it.

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

13. Drunks and degenerates who end up in the gutter on skid row deserve their fate because of their lack of moral fibre.

14. There may be a few exceptions, but, in general, members of a racial group tend to be pretty much alike.

16. The poor will always be with us.

17. It usually helps the child in later years if he is forced to conform to his parents' ideas.

18. A sexual pervert is an insult to humanity and should be punished severely.

21. The worst danger to real Americanism during the last fifty years has come from foreign ideas and agitators.

22. A child ought to be whipped at once for any sassy remark.

24. Most homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

25. Army life is a good influence on most young men.

Items to which "transfers" indicated greater agreement than did "engineers." (p < .01) These items are from the N subscale.

1. Many modern paintings have both beauty and purpose.

4. Most censorship of books or movies is a violation of free speech and should be abolished.

7. Sex offenders should be treated with expert care and understanding rather than punishment.
10. What a youth needs most is the flexibility to work and fight for what he considers right personally even though it might not be best for his family and country.

28. As young people grow up they ought to try to carry out some of their rebellious ideas and not be content to get over them and settle down.

Items to which "transfers" indicated greater agreement than did "engineers." (p < .05)

5. Science declines when it confines itself to the solution of immediate practical problems.

8. One of the most important things for children to learn is when to question authority.

15. Poverty can be eliminated.

19. Strict discipline of children often interferes with the development of self-direction and personal responsibility.

20. Almost everyone has at some time hated his parents.

26. It is the duty of a citizen to criticize or censure his country whenever he considers it to be wrong.

Items which did not discriminate between engineers and transfers.

9. Human nature doesn't make war inevitable for man will some day establish a peaceful world. (N)

11. It is only natural and right for each person to think that his family is better than any other. (S)

23. It would probably be best to discourage feeble-minded people from having children. (N)

27. Without the friendly cooperation of many other nations, the United States probably could not survive for very long. (N)
SHORTENED F FOR POLITICAL SURVEYS
(Fillmore 1950; Janowitz and Marvick 1953)

Variable

This shortened F Scale emphasizes two of the several components of the authoritarian syndrome, chosen because they seemed relevant to political attitudes and behavior: (1) authoritarian submission, "a tendency in an individual to adopt an uncritical and submissive attitude toward the moral authorities that are idealized by his ingroup;" and (2) power and toughness, "a preoccupation with considerations of strength and weakness, domination and subservience, superiority and inferiority."

Description

Fillmore (1950) chose several items from the original F Scale (Adorno et al. 1950) and modified them slightly for use in an attitude survey in the Philadelphia area. Six of these were used in 1950 by the Survey Research Center (SRC) in an ongoing national study of public opinion regarding U.S. foreign policy. Results from this study were reported by Janowitz and Marvick (1953) and will be the basis for the present description of the scale. (Note: All of the items from the ten-item pool used in SRC studies are reported in a scale description below along with response frequencies from a national survey in 1952.)

A six-point Likert scale was used to assess degree of agreement-disagreement with each of the six statements. An analysis was performed to discover whether political self-confidence and participation were related to authoritarianism, and to see what the social origins of political authoritarianism might be.

For this purpose respondents were put in one of three authoritarianism categories—high, medium, and low, according to the following scheme:

Two criteria were used: cumulative score on all six questions, and ratio of agree to disagree responses. Numerical equivalents from 1 to 6 were assigned to responses ranging from strong agreement to strong disagreement. A low cumulative score for all six responses—a score of less than 19—was necessary in order to be classed as a high authoritarian while a high cumulative score—a score of at least 25—was necessary for classification as low authoritarian. The intermediate group thus included persons whose scores ranged from 19 through 24.

In addition, in order to be classified as low authoritarian, a respondent had to have disagreed with four of the six items; to be classified as high authoritarian, he had to agree with four. Only a very few respondents failed to fit both criteria simultaneously.

Sample

In November 1949 the SRC interviewed a national cross-sectional area probability sample regarding foreign policy. Fifty-eight percent (341) were reinterviewed in May 1950 and given the authoritarianism measure. This was not quite a random sub-sample of the original sample, because
only "consistent" scorers on a measure of isolationism were eligible for the May study. Janowitz and Marvick do not say how large this "consistent" group was.

At about the same time, another study, concerned with economic attitudes, included the same authoritarianism scale (N = 1227). The authors state: "It is of central importance that in every single relevant social relationship the findings based on the second sample population confirmed the conclusions based on the first sample population--the political attitude survey sample."

The classification system already described yielded the following breakdowns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Political Survey</th>
<th>Economic Survey</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Authoritarian</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Authoritarian</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability

No direct information on test-retest reliability or on item-test correlations appears in the article by Janowitz and Marvick.

Validity

Several of the research findings support the conception of authoritarianism put forward by Adorno and his colleagues. For example, three variables (education, age, and income) interact to predict authoritarianism. The highest scores were obtained by older, poorly educated persons in the lower halves of the middle and lower classes. Presumably these are the most frustrated. Moreover, authoritarianism predicts a number of the voters' conservative attitudes as well as non-voting behavior--also presumed to be signs of frustration.

Location


Administration

Although no time is mentioned by the authors, this scale would probably take only about five minutes to complete.

Results and Comments

Since only one of the six items is worded negatively, the issue of response bias, discussed in the introduction to this chapter, should be kept in mind. Otherwise, the scale seems to be reasonable for political survey use, being short, understandable, and of demonstrated usefulness. Recall, however, that it explicitly taps only two dimensions of the authoritarian syndrome. Research directed toward other dimensions would obviously require additional items or one of the other scales presented in this chapter.

The authors' conclusion is worth quoting as a summary of their results:
"... the application to nation-wide samples of the techniques used in this study indicates the feasibility of considering personality tendencies as dimensions of American political behavior. At least three conclusions underline the desirability of continued study of these personality tendencies in different political situations: (a) Personality tendencies measured by the authoritarian scale served to explain political behavior at least as well as those other factors traditionally included in political and voting behavior studies (age, education, class); (b) It was possible to locate in the national population a number of social groupings characterized by very high and very low authoritarian reactions...; (c) The incidence of authoritarianism not only was significantly related to political isolationism and to feelings of political ineffectiveness, but also to non-voting. Authoritarianism was helpful in explaining candidate preferences."
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SHORTENED F FOR POLITICAL SURVEYS

Items (Note: Only the last is reverse-scored.)

1. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.
2. A few strong leaders could make this country better than all the laws and talk.
3. Women should stay out of politics.
4. Most people who don't get ahead just don't have enough will power.
5. An insult to your honor should not be forgotten.
6. People can be trusted.
FOUR-ITEM F SCALE (Lane 1955)

Variable
Lane analyzed data collected by the Survey Research Center for a study of political attitudes and behavior (post-election, November 1952). Instead of using all ten items included in this survey (the ten-item scale appears in the next section of the present chapter; many of the results of the survey are reported in Campbell, Gurin, and Miller, 1954), Lane decided to construct a scale that would satisfy Guttman criteria, thus increasing the likelihood of unidimensionality. After some experimentation, four items were chosen which, at the same time, seemed to measure authoritarianism and to satisfy the requirements for a Guttman scale.

Description
Three of the four items are the same used by Janowitz and Marvick (1953; also see summary in the present chapter). The remaining item (the first in the list below), although available to Janowitz and Marvick also, was omitted from their analysis because so many people agreed with it. In constructing a Guttman scale, Lane used the item for just this reason.

The four items, along with the associated response distributions from a random national sample in 1952, are as follows:

1. What young people need most of all is strict discipline by their parents. (agree: 76%; disagree: 25%; NA: 1%)

2. Most people who don't get ahead just don't have enough will power. (agree: 64%; disagree: 35%; NA: 1%)

3. A few strong leaders could make this country better than all the laws and talk. (agree: 51%; disagree: 48%; NA: 1%)

4. People sometimes say that an insult to your honor should not be forgotten. Do you agree or disagree with that? (agree: 25%; disagree: 73%; NA: 2%)

Respondents actually had two degrees of agreement and two of disagreement from which to choose (e.g., "agree quite a bit;" "agree a little"), but Lane collapsed these categories in computing the percentages reported above. Throughout his article, he discusses "high" versus "low" authoritarians without saying precisely how respondents were classified.

Sample
The 585 respondents were a subgroup chosen randomly from a random stratified sample of American adults in 1952.

Reliability
The four-item Guttman scale yielded a coefficient of reproducibility of 90.4. The coefficients of error for each question were as follows: 1 - 7.6; 2 - 12.7; 3 - 12.0; and 4 - 7.4.
Validity
Since the items were modified versions of original F scale items, they would obviously correlate at least moderately with other close relatives of the original scale. Beyond this, there was evidence for construct validity in several of the findings reported by Lane (see summary below).

Location

Administration
This scale would take only a few minutes to self-administer.

Results and Comments
Again, as in most of the F scales, one should notice that all four items are positively stated, i.e. in such a way that agreement is always scored as authoritarianism. See the introduction to this chapter for a discussion of this problem.

Obviously, the scale is extremely short, making it attractive to large-scale survey researchers but, at the same time, perhaps reducing its reliability and certainly its coverage of all the dimensions included in the original F Scale. Nevertheless, Lane says in an appendix to his book, Political Ideology (1962), that the four-item scale is better as a measure of authoritarianism than the longer, balanced ten-item version used by Campbell et al. (1960) and by Lane in his 1962 study.

Using the four-item scale, Lane reached the following conclusions:

"Taking the authoritarian syndrome for illustrative purposes, we have shown its influence upon political participation... in terms of a sense of political efficacy and the effect of multiple group membership... The Republicanism of the authoritarians was due partly to a greater traditional identification with the Republican party, which in turn could be traced partly to disidentification with the underdog groups seen as allied to the Democratic party. The better-educated authoritarians' position on Korea is in accord with what would be expected of people with this personality characteristic (intolerance of ambiguity about the outcome) and is in accord with the position of the Republican party; and the same is true of their position on the welfare state. With respect to their candidate orientation, authoritarianism seems to inhibit criticism of General Eisenhower but not to be associated with praise of the General in personal terms."
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Because the two scales just described were based on the ten items used in the 1952 post-election survey of the Survey Research Center, they are included here along with the response distributions obtained from a national cross-section of 585 adults.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q. 36. Now, I'd like to read some of the kinds of things people tell me when I interview them, and ask you whether you agree or disagree with them. I'll read them one at a time, and you just tell me whether you agree or disagree with them, and whether you agree or disagree a little or quite a bit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q. 36a. Human nature being what it is, there must always be war and conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>1. Agree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>2. Agree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>4. Disagree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>5. Disagree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9. DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-. NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q. 36b. What young people need most of all is strict discipline by their parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>1. Agree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>2. Agree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>4. Disagree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>5. Disagree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9. DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-. NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q. 36c. A few strong leaders could make this country better than all the laws and talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>1. Agree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>2. Agree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>4. Disagree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>5. Disagree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9. DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-. NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>1. Agree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>2. Agree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>4. Disagree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>5. Disagree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9. DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-. NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. 36d. Most people who don't get ahead just don't have enough will power.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>1. Agree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>2. Agree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>4. Disagree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>5. Disagree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9. DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-. NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. 36e. Women should stay out of politics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1. Agree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>2. Agree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>4. Disagree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>5. Disagree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9. DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-. NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. 36f. People sometimes say that an insult to your honor should not be forgotten. Do you agree or disagree with that?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>1. Agree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>2. Agree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>4. Disagree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>5. Disagree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9. DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-. NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. 36g. People can be trusted.
Q. 36h. One main trouble today is that people talk too much and work too little.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>1. Agree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>2. Agree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>4. Disagree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>5. Disagree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9. DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-. NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. 36i. Sex criminals deserve more than prison; they should be whipped publicly or worse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>1. Agree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>2. Agree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>4. Disagree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>5. Disagree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9. DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-. NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. 36j. It is only natural and right that women should have less freedom than men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1. Agree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>2. Agree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>4. Disagree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>5. Disagree quite a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9. DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-. NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PENSACOLA Z SCALE (Jones 1957)

Variable
This scale attempts to measure authoritarianism by using personal items instead of those with specific social or political content found on the F Scale. Due to the strong association between the term "authoritarianism" and the F Scale, the author has chosen to call the dimension of personality measured by the Pensacola Z Scale "heteronomy". The scale is composed of four factors: Anxiety, Hostility, Dependency, and Rigidity.

Description
Four inventories, the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale, the Wesley Manifest Rigidity Scale, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperment Survey, and the Thurstone Temperment Schedule were administered to the subjects in addition to the F Scale. The factors of Anxiety, Hostility and Rigidity were found to have the strongest and the most unambiguous relation to the authoritarian personality (as measured by the F Scale). Solely on a priori grounds, the author chose to add a fourth factor, dependency, to these three. Fifty forced choice items were then written for each factor. These 200 items and the F Scale were then administered to a new sample. To be included on the final test, an item had to meet three criteria: 1) the item had to relate to the F Scale in the theoretically expected direction, 2) less than 85% of the subjects had to answer the item in the same way, 3) the correlation of the item with the F Scale had to be significant at the .20 probability level or better. The final scale is composed of 66 forced choice items, of which 19 measure Dependency, 20 Rigidity, 15 Anxiety, and 12 Hostility.

The item analysis showed 20 items with a significance level of .20, 11 with .10, 20 with .05 and 15 with .01.

One point is scored for each authoritarian (or heteronomous) response. Thus, the range of scores is from 0 to 66 with high scores indicating high heteronomy.

Sample
All subjects used in the construction of this test were Naval Aviation Cadets. The cadets were single, between 18 and 25 years of age, and came from all sections of the country. Approximately 20% came from the fleet and had all graduated from high school. The remainder came from civilian life and had all had at least two years of college. The mean F score per item for these cadets was 3.90 (with a S.D. of .75) which, the author states does not differ greatly from the values reported in The Authoritarian Personality. In the construct of the test, a total of 411 cadets received the F Scale and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. 211 received the F Scale and the Wesley Manifest Rigidity Scale. 628 received the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperment Survey and the F Scale. 304 received the Thurstone Temperment Schedule and the F Scale. A sample of 306 cadets received the pool of 200 items and the F Scale.
Reliability

For a sample of 187 cadets, the test-retest coefficient over a 24 hour period was .87. The test-retest coefficient was .74 when 123 cadets were tested and retested four weeks later.

Validity

Cross-validation using a sample of 311 cadets yielded a correlation of +.43 between the Z Scale and the F Scale. When two samples of enlisted personnel were given the Pensacola Z Scale and the General Classification Test, the correlations between the two scales were -.28 and -.17 indicating a negative relationship between the Pensacola Z Scale and scholastic aptitude.

Location


Administration

This scale is self administered. Less than 30 minutes are needed for the subject to complete the scale. A subject's score is computed by adding one point for each "authoritarian" response.

Results and Comments

An advantage of the Z Scale is that it is not "fakable". The scale was tested for fakability in two ways. Two distinct groups received the 66 items, one group getting the standard instructions, and the other group getting instructions to check what they thought was the best answer regardless of whether or not it applied to them. The 66 items were administered twice to a third group, once with the usual instructions and once with instructions to give the "best" answer. Instructions to "fake" did not alter the test scores significantly in either of these two testing situations.

Although this scale appears to have face validity, its construct validity is open to question. The scale is supposedly a measure of authoritarianism (or heteronomy, to use the author's term). There is evidence that there are four clusters of items corresponding to the four original factors (the average item between-group correlation is .03 while the average within-group correlation is .10.) However, it is questionable whether these four factors, Anxiety, Hostility, Dependency and Rigidity, tap the same dimension of personality tapped by the F Scale. Sanford summarized the several hypothetical clusters of authoritarianism around which the F Scale was based as follows: conventionalism, authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, anti-intraception superstition and stereotype, power and toughness, destructiveness and cynicism, projectivity, and sex.

There is another reason why these two scales might not be measuring the same personality dimension. The direct personal items of the Z Scale may elicit a different response set from the subject than the indirect items with socio-political content of the F Scale. The author reports a correlation of .43 for the two scales which, although adequate, is not as high as it might be. In a sample of 766 cadets, the mean of the Z Scale was 35.51 and the standard deviation was 6.33.
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THE PENSACOLA Z SCALE

In this test you will find pairs of statements having to do with personal characteristics. One member of the pair is labeled A and the other B. You are to select from each pair the statement that BEST describes you. Consider the example shown below.

1. A) You are attractive.
   B) You are strong.

If you think "You are strong" describes you better than "You are attractive", you would put a mark under B on your answer sheet.

If you marked B on your answer sheet, it would not necessarily mean that you are extremely strong or that you are not attractive. It would mean that ON THE WHOLE, "You are strong" describes you better than "You are attractive".

Be sure that you select ONE statement from EVERY pair. You are not permitted to omit any pair of statements. Mark your answers on your answer sheet starting with number 1 and continuing through number 66. You should finish the test in approximately 15 minutes.

1. A) You are too friendly for your own good. (r)
   B) Your opinions are often incorrect.

2. A) Taking advantage of a person sexually makes you feel bad.
   B) You have no scruples in sex. (H)

3. A) You are anxious. (a)
   B) You are conceited.

4. A) To you life is a jungle. (A)
   B) To you life is a bowl of cherries.

5. A) You day-dream politically.
   B) You don't formulate opinions about issues over which you have no control. (d)

6. A) In political activities you confine your efforts to group action. (d)
   B) In political activities you frequently indulge in individual endeavor.

7. A) You like a tightly organized group. (d)
   B) You like a loosely organized group.

8. A) You haven't made any mistakes in your life.
   B) You can't get the mistakes you have made out of your mind. (a)

9. A) There are some people you could never feel for. (H)
   B) Sometimes you feel a real compassion for everyone.

10. A) You like instructions to be specific. (d)
    B) You like instructions to be general.
THE PENSACOLA Z SCALE

(Continued)

11. A) You are sexually appealing.
    B) You are faithful. (D)

12. A) You are responsible for most of your troubles.
    B) You sometimes get confused without any reason. (a)

13. A) You frequently laugh at yourself.
    B) You don't like your favorite habits ridiculed. (r)

14. A) You frequently get away with murder.
    B) People often blame you for things you didn't do. (a)

15. A) You are not attracted to prudish people.
    B) You are not attracted to unkempt people. (r)

16. A) You want badly to "belong". (D)
    B) You don't care whether you "belong" or not.

17. A) You like a clean, neat house. (R)
    B) You like good food.

18. A) You can never forget that love is more than just sex. (R)
    B) You can take pleasure in sex as sex.

19. A) You are always on the lookout for new ways of attacking a problem.
    B) In general, you find the tried-and-true methods work best. (r)

20. A) You are rebellious.
    B) You like discipline. (D)

21. A) You don't like to gamble on getting a good break. (a)
    B) You usually figure on getting a good break.

22. A) You get more credit than you deserve.
    B) You get less credit than you deserve. (a)

23. A) You get into scraps you didn't start. (a)
    B) When you get into trouble it is almost always your fault.

    B) Some people are secretly trying to get the better of you. (h)

25. A) You positively like to be different from your immediate associates.
    B) Being different from your immediate associates makes you uncomfortable. (D)

26. A) People are either your friends or your enemies. (r)
    B) People are rarely either real friends or real enemies.
27. A) Your hardest battles are with other people rather than with yourself. (h)
   B) You are cocky.

28. A) You could like anyone if you tried.
   B) There are some people you know you could never like. (H)

29. A) You are forgetful.
   B) You have a meticulous memory. (R)

30. A) There are some people you would like to tell off. (h)
   B) You are occasionally taken in.

31. A) People criticize you unjustly. (a)
   B) People give you more breaks than you deserve.

32. A) You are charming.
   B) You are firm and resolute. (R)

33. A) Disappointments affect you so little that you seldom think about them twice. (A)
   B) Your daydreams are often about things that can never come true.

34. A) You would like to counsel a friend on his personal problem.
   B) You would like to give first aid to a friend. (d)

35. A) You collect things. (R)
   B) You lose things.

36. A) You like haphazard living.
   B) You like routine. (R)

37. A) Stuffed-shirts amuse you.
   B) Stuffed-shirts get under your skin. (h)

38. A) You keep calm in an emergency.
   B) You can obey orders. (d)

39. A) You are difficult to please.
   B) You like to do favors. (D)

40. A) You are aware of dripping water in the kitchen. (r)
   B) You are not observant.

41. A) You don't mind a coward.
   B) You can't stand a coward. (h)

42. A) You just can't stay mad even when you think you should.
   B) There are some people you would like to take apart. (H)
43. A) You admire spontaneity in people.  
   B) You admire efficiency in people. (R)

44. A) You don't particularly like to march.  
   B) You like to march with a group you feel proud to belong to. (d)

45. A) You need someone in whom you can confide completely. (D)  
   B) You are selfish.

46. A) You play fair. (D)  
   B) You are an individualist.

47. A) There are some magazines to which you particularly turn for the substantiation of your political ideas. (d)  
   B) Your political ideas tend to be peculiar to yourself.

48. A) You can't help feeling antagonistic to people who hold important opinions radically different from yours. (h)  
   B) You like a lot of people who disagree with you violently on important issues.

49. A) Your interest in general principles occasionally gets you up in the clouds.  
   B) You are a stickler for precision. (R)

50. A) You have felt so sorry for someone you have cried.  
   B) You have gotten so mad you cried. (h)

51. A) Yours is a quick and ready sympathy.  
   B) You are stern. (H)

52. A) You are independent.  
   B) You are loyal. (D)

53. A) You are talkative.  
   B) Often you're sure you've forgotten something important. (A)

54. A) You would be happier if you felt more secure. (a)  
   B) You would be happier if you were less gullible.

55. A) You never change your basic beliefs. (r)  
   B) All your beliefs are open to debate.

56. A) You follow your conscience.  
   B) You have ethical standards which you follow. (d)

57. A) You are very proud of your membership in some groups (d)  
   B) You don't go for groups.
58. A) You are indifferent to most people.  
   B) You like or you dislike people. (r)

59. A) You don't worry about physical disorders.  
   B) Sometimes you figure you're a sure thing for ulcers. (a)

60. A) You are dogmatic. (R)  
   B) You are sloppy.

61. A) There are some people you admire so much you would not question their opinions. (D)  
   B) You don’t admire anybody very much.

62. A) Concerning your past actions you figure, "If I did it, it can't be too bad."  
   B) If you had your life to live over, there would be a lot of things you'd do differently. (A)

63. A) You admire careful, rigorous thinking. (r)  
   B) You admire brilliant, penetrating thinking.

64. A) The details of life are important to you. (R)  
   B) You are often thoughtless.

65. A) You are well coordinated. (r)  
   B) You seek new opinions.

66. A) You are self-confident.  
   B) You are a good Joe. (A)

One point is scored for each response with a letter in parenthesis after it.

These letters refer to further subscales that can be built from the full 197 items. There are 40 items that form subscales that tap each of four traits (or 160 items) and they are marked with capital letters as follows:

D -- Dependency
R -- Rigidity
A -- Anxiety
H -- Hostility

Items marked with small letters fall into one of these domains but are not part of one of the 40 item subscales.
FASCIST ATTITUDES SCALE (Stagner 1936)

Variable
This scale represents one of the earliest attempts to measure "attitudes of sympathy for fascism." Stagner realized that mentioning fascism explicitly would evoke normative anti-fascist responses, so he attempted to disguise the true purpose of the scale. This was, then, an early attempt to do what Adorno and his colleagues did years later--devise a subtle scale to measure authoritarian predispositions in personality.

Description
Fascist documents were reviewed to discover the key characteristics of German and Italian Fascism. Seven more or less distinct concepts were found: nationalism, or opposition to internationalism; imperialism; militarism; racial antagonism; anti-radicalism; middleclass-consciousness, "which may be defined as a superior attitude toward the working class"; and the benevolent despot or strong-man philosophy of government. Thirty-five opinion statements were gathered from various sources (or devised by Stagner) to illustrate these concepts. In order to disguise the purpose of the study, fascism was never mentioned, and 15 extra statements about general economic conditions were intermingled with the 35 fascism items. The resulting questionnaire was administered in true-false format with the hopefully deceptive title, "Opinions about the Depression." One point was given for each "pro-fascist" response.

Sample
Respondents were 224 college students in three middle-western institutions. Scores for the three groups were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A came mostly from working class families. Group B came from a large university. Their mean scores were not significantly different. Group C "is from an expensive institution attended by well-to-do young people whose leanings are very conservative." The mean from this group was reliably different from the other two. There was no significant sex difference.

Reliability
The correlation between items 1-21 and 22-50 was .77 (corrected) for 91 students from Group A. Although moderately high, this suggests non-unidimensionality--not a surprising finding considering the heterogeneous sources of items.

Validity
Only the reasonable pattern of group results was offered as evidence for validity.

Location

Administration
The scale is self-administered. With the filler items, about half an hour would be needed to complete it.
Results and Comments

In an attempt to find out more about the characteristics of high and low responders, and to determine whether there was a single, general "pro-fascist" attitude underlying high scores, Stagner took the 46 highest and 46 lowest scorers and computed a critical ratio for each item based on the endorsement percentage difference between these two groups. The result is shown below, where the items are organized into three sets according to critical ratio.

Looking at the best items, Stagner concluded:

The essence of the general "pro-fascist" attitude which seems to be indicated by this study lies in the attitude of class superiority taken by many individuals toward the elements of the population which are below them in an economic and industrial sense. The anti-radical attitude is also markedly involved, and nationalism and racial antagonism are manifested.
FASCIST ATTITUDES SCALE

Items receiving a C.R. of 5.00 or more
(The numbers at the left show the position of each statement in the mimeographed scale.)

3. Recovery has been delayed by the large number of strikes.
4. The U.S. should stop immigration to give American workers more jobs.
8. If we buy European made goods, we make the depression in this country last longer.
11. Building a bigger navy would give men jobs and protect our foreign markets, so that should be done.
12. Most labor trouble happens only because of radical agitators.
13. The unemployed should be given military training so our country could be protected in time of war.
16. The people who complain most about the depression wouldn’t take a job if you gave it to them.
21. Any able-bodied man could get a job right now if he tried hard enough.
23. Most people on relief are living in reasonable comfort.
24. We must protect our trade in the Philippines against the Japanese.
27. The government must first balance the budget.
28. CCC camps where the boys learned military discipline and self-control would be a good idea.
30. The president was justified in protecting U.S. interests in Cuba.
34. Labor unions are all right, but we can’t have strikes.
37. The U.S. should make these European countries pay off their war debts.
42. While raising the standard of living we must safeguard property rights as guaranteed by the Constitution.
43. Unemployment insurance would saddle us with a nation of idlers.
46. These unemployed organizations are just a bunch of chronic complainers.

Items receiving a C.R. between 3.00 and 4.99

7. What we need is a strong president who will make people cooperate for recovery.
10. Recognition of Soviet Russia was a big mistake.
14. Capital and labor should get together for a fair wage and a fair profit.
15. The sales tax is an unfair way of raising relief money.
17. We must all sacrifice a little to build a strong American nation.
18. The president was all right until he became influenced by communistic ideals.
33. The formation of big trusts bankrupted many small businesses and so brought on the depression.
39. If the government didn’t meddle so much with business everything would work out all right.
40. We should consider our duty to our country first in this time of crisis.
44. America has plenty of plans--what it needs is strong men who are willing to work for recovery.
45. If we have unemployment, we should deport the excess workers back to their home countries.
47. The NRA would have worked if so many strikes hadn’t been organized.
48. People should not be allowed to vote unless they are educated and intelligent.
1. Conditions are likely to get better in 1935.
2. The farmers have been hit harder than the city workers.
3. The depression has caused an increase in crime.
4. This country should try to get more foreign markets so as to increase prosperity.
5. Many workers have been unemployed for five years through no fault of their own.
6. What we need is more international cooperation, not less.
7. Prosperity would come back if we could show businessmen that they could invest money at a profit.
8. Munitions makers probably don't have near as much to do with starting wars as the papers claim.
9. Italy has taken the wrong way out of the depression.
10. We will always have depressions.
11. The average person isn't intelligent enough to vote his way out of the depression.
12. Inflation would solve most of the problems of the depression.
13. There is no excuse for depressions.
14. The Wall Street bankers brought on the depression to clean up on the little fellows.
15. If we had stayed out of the World War, we would never have had this depression.
16. We'd get out of the depression quicker if we had a strong intelligent man with full power to run things.
17. The collapse in 1929 was due primarily to overproduction.
18. The U. S. ought to demand its fair share of trade with China.
19. What we need is more businesslike government.

Items receiving a C.R. of 3.00 or less
UNLABELED FASCIST ATTITUDES (Edwards 1941)

Variables
This scale is designed to measure fascist attitudes, and differs from other fascism scales by omitting reference to such basic elements of the attitude as militarism and nationalism. Instead, the items are concerned with topics about which the fascist point of view is more subtle and less anti-democratic (such as birth control, education, status of women, and status of religion).

Description
The final scale consists of 22 five-point Likert-type items. Statements concerning various aspects of fascism were selected from earlier studies by Stagner, Gundlack, and others; and from the writings of Childs, Mann, and Kolnai. The statements were rated as either pro- or anti-fascist by five judges and discarded if found to be ambiguous. The remaining 26 statements were subjected to an item analysis which determined the median ratings on each item for the 16 highest and the 16 lowest scores. Four items with critical ratios of less than 2.00 were eliminated from the final scale.

Total score is the sum of item scores, and response values range from 5, for strongly agree, to 1, for strongly disagree; thus indicating agreement with fascist attitudes. For the final scale (22 items) the range of possible scores is from 22 to 110.

Sample
The original 91 subjects were students in general psychology classes at the University of Akron. The revised 22 item scale was administered to 146 students at Ohio University and a new group of 97 at the University of Akron. This group of 243 contained 89 males and 154 females. Range of obtained scores was 25-87.

Reliability/ Homogeneity
The split-half reliability coefficient (corrected) for the sample of 91 on the 26 item scale was .93. The split-half reliability coefficient (corrected) was .84 for the sample of 243 on the 22 item scale.

Validity
Very few data from which to judge the validity of this scale are reported. No correlation coefficients between this scale and any other independent measure of fascism are given. The ability of the 22 items to discriminate between high and low scoring subjects provides an internal consistency check.

Location

Administration
This scale is self-administered and requires an estimated 15 minutes to complete.
Further analysis of the sample of 243 yielded the following results: the variability of the scores was greater among juniors and seniors than among freshmen and sophomores (critical ratio of difference = 2.88); variability is greater among those 21 and over than among those 18 and under (critical ratio difference = 2.88); and Independents score lower than either Republicans or Democrats (critical ratio difference = 3.29 and 3.01, respectively).

In a study (1944), the author administered his scale to a sample described as 250 Akron, Ohio residents aged 20-67, earning incomes of under $1000 to over $20,000 per year. He obtained a split-half reliability of .84 (corrected) for this sample, and found that subjects falling in the lowest of three socioeconomic groupings achieved the lowest means on the attitude scale, with middle and high socioeconomic status groups following in order. Below are some of the means of the groups studied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-65</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewives</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school teachers</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This scale, although constructed prior to 1941, is still of interest because the dimension of fascism, which it attempts to measure, is closely related to the dimension now called authoritarianism. Many of the items on this scale bear a close resemblance to items found on the F Scale. The underlying assumption upon which claims for the validity of this measure are based, that an attitude of fascism is revealed in opinions concerning a variety of topics, is also found in the theoretical conception of "the authoritarian personality," where this term implies a syndrome of various personality traits manifested in different ways but stemming from a common core.

Reference


UNLABELED FASCISM SCALE

1. Children should be taught to be more obedient and to have more respect for authority by the public schools.

_______ I strongly agree with this statement
_______ I agree with this statement
_______ I am uncertain about this statement
_______ I disagree with this statement
_______ I strongly disagree with this statement

2. Whatever best serves the interests of government is generally right.

*3. The public schools should place more emphasis upon physical training and loyalty and less upon the development of intellectual functions.

*4. Everyone should have the full liberty of propagandizing for what he believes to be true.

5. The masses of people are capable of determining what is and what is not good for them.

6. America has reached a higher state of civilization than any other country in the world and as a consequence has a culture which is superior to any other.

*7. People should be given the opportunity to hear all sides of a question, regardless of how controversial it is.

8. Over 10% of the population is incapable of democratic participation in government by reason of their lack of inherited abilities.

9. Generally speaking, women are less intelligent and efficient than men.

10. The superior people in any culture are justified in dominating national affairs by force if necessary, because of the very fact that they are superior.

*11. Many people who claim they believe in democracy have unconscious prejudices and attitudes which would make them sympathetic to a fascist movement.

12. Because many of the minor political parties merely confuse national issues, all political parties except the two major ones should be abolished.

13. The right to vote should be restricted to those individuals who have a specified amount of private property and therefore have a direct concern in the welfare of the country.
14. A large percent of the taxes which citizens pay is wasted in an effort to educate individuals who are not capable or worthy of being educated.

15. The right of the working classes to call a general strike should be abolished because it is a potential threat to democracy and is not in the general interest of society.

16. Patriotism and loyalty to one's country are more important than one's intellectual convictions and should have precedence over them.

17. A standing army of 2,000,000 men or over is necessary for our national defense at all times.

18. Government should attempt to persuade people to have more children and if necessary restrict birth control information for the benefit of our national defense.

19. In the national interest, private schools should either be abolished or restricted in their teachings so that the control of education is largely in the hands of the federal government.

20. Regardless of who our next president is, he must be a strong intelligent man and be given full power to run things in the interest of the people.

21. Certain religious sects whose beliefs do not permit them to salute the flag, should either be forced to conform or else be abolished.

22. There will always be superior and inferior races in the world and in the interests of all concerned it is best that the superior continue to dominate the inferior.

23. Our foreign markets are a vital necessity to our prosperity and must be protected at all costs.

24. Women have more ability and are more efficient at tasks around the home and as a result their rightful place is in the home and not in the business world.

25. Minor forms of military training such as drill, marching, and simple commands should be made a part of the elementary school educational program.

26. Academic freedom is all right in principle, but instructors in high schools and colleges should not be allowed to express their convictions concerning their subject matter.

* These items were not included in the revised scale, since it was found that they failed to discriminate between subjects with low total scores and those with high total scores.
ANTI-SEMITISM (A-S) SCALE (Levinson and Sanford 1944)

Variable
This scale is designed to measure anti-Semitism, which the authors defined as "an ideology, that is, as a relatively organized, relatively stable system of opinions, values, and attitudes concerning Jews and Jewish-Gentile relations."

Description
The scale consists of 52 six-point Likert-type items, and is divided into the following five sub-scales:

1. Jews as personally offensive (PO) - 12 items
2. Jews as socially threatening (ST) - 10 items
3. Attitudes about what should be done to or against Jews (A) - 16 items
4. Jews as being too seclusive (S) - 8 items
5. Jews as being too intrusive (I) - 8 items

A few items were included on more than one sub-scale. The final scale also included 4 "neutral" items (N) which were not part of any of the sub-scales. The sub-scales are not intended to be received as representing the theoretical components of anti-Semitism or as statistically independent measures. But merely as being convenient ways of grouping items. Nonetheless, each sub-scale does seem to measure a fairly definable aspect of anti-Semitism.

The original 52 items on the total Anti-Semitism Scale were formulated especially for that scale. The items were not designed to tap the violent anti-Semitic feelings, but rather the more widely spread tempered anti-Semitic feelings.

The discriminatory power (DP) of each of the 52 items was computed for the first group of subjects. Four items were less than 2.0, 15 were between 2.0 and 3.0, and 33 were greater than 3.0. The discriminatory power of each of the 52 items was computed for the second group of subjects. The average DP was 2.85. Five items were above 4.0, 21 were between 3.0 and 3.9, 15 were between 2.0 and 2.9, and 11 were between 1.2 and 1.9. For the third group of subjects, the average DP on the 10-item form of the A-S Scale was 3.68, with two items between 2.0 and 3.0, 4 items between 3.0 and 4.0, and 4 items over 4.0.

Response choices were coded +3 to -3 for strong agreement to strong disagreement (the neutral point, 0, was omitted). Scoring is accomplished by adding +4 to each response and then summing the values. Scores have a possible range of 52 to 364. A high score indicates high anti-Semitism.
A 10-item form of the A-S Scale is also available. The 10 items were selected from the original 52 on a statistical and a theoretical basis. Items selected had to have adequate DP's. An attempt was made to cover the 5 sub-scales and keep duplication of content at a minimum.

Sample

Group 1 consisted of 77 female students in introductory psychology classes at the University of California. Group 2 consisted of 144 female students in introductory psychology at the University of California. This group included 19 members of major minority groups such as Jews, Negroes, and Chinese. Group 3 received only the 10-item form. This group consisted of 140 women in a public speaking class, 52 men in the same class, 40 adult women in an extension class in psychology, and 63 professional women including nurses, teachers, and social workers.

Reliability

For group 1, the split-half reliability was .98 (corrected). The average interrelation among the sub-scales was .79; the correlation with the total scale of the "offensive", "threatening", and "attitudes" sub-scales were .96, .94, and .93, respectively.

For group 2, the split-half reliability (with parts I and II administered a week apart) was .92. The average intercorrelation among the sub-scales was .79; the correlation with the total scale of the "offensive", "threatening", and "attitudes" sub-scales was .92, .93, and .94, respectively.

For group 3, reliabilities of .89 to .94 with an average of .92 were obtained.

Validity

The scale was administered to 13 non-Jewish graduate students and faculty members of the Department of Psychology who responded naively under normal test conditions. This criterion group composed of people who possessed liberal social attitudes and who openly opposed chauvinism and prejudice, achieved scores ranging from 57-120 and a mean of 86.0.

When group 1 (77 women) was broken down into various sub-groups, the following results were obtained: Republicans had higher scores than Democrats (critical ratio, 2.81). Protestant sectarians and Catholics had higher scores than the non-religious and non-sectarian "Protestants" (critical ratio 4.90). Sorority members had higher scores than non-members (critical ratio 4.57).

Further evidence for the validity of this scale is found in two case studies. It was found that the item responses reflected accurately the attitudes expressed in the case study interviews. The prejudiced man had an item mean score of 4.6 while the man who revealed very little prejudice had an item mean score of 1.2.
Levinson, D.J. and Sanford, R.N., A scale for the measurement of anti-Semitism, *Journal of Psychology*, 1944, 17, 2, 339-370.

**Administration**
This scale is self-administered, and requires an estimated 25 minutes to complete.

**Results and Comments**
Group 1 had a mean score of 158.17, SD 67.3. Group 2 had an item mean score of 2.7, SD 1.11. Group 3 had an item mean score of 3.16, SD 1.41 (10-item scale).

All of the items are negative, that is, they express unfavorable and hostile attitudes toward the Jews. The authors felt that positive items would elicit the "self-righteous" tolerance response set demanded by democratic ideology, whereas negative items could be formulated which would not be obviously anti-Semitic and thus not violate "democratic" ideals. The main argument against the use of all negative items is that the subject's score will be influenced by his tendency to "agree" or "disagree" independently of the variable being measured.

This scale deals with what the author terms "pseudo-democratic" rather than openly anti-democratic attitudes. Consequently, those people who insist that they are not prejudiced and preface their anti-Semitic statements with "I'm not prejudiced, but..." will score highly on this test, in addition to those few who openly express violent prejudice.

The 52-item form of the A-S Scale correlated .80 with the total E Scale (for group 2). The short form of the A-S Scale correlated .68 with the short form of the E Scale (for group 3). The short form of the A-S Scale correlated .43 with the short form of the PEC Scale (for group 3). The short form of the A-S Scale correlated .53 with the short form of the F Scale (for group 3).

**Reference**
ANTI-SEMITISM SCALE

This is an investigation of general public opinion concerning Jewish people. The following are statements with which some people agree and others disagree.

Questionnaire A

1). Jews seem to prefer the most luxurious, extravagant, and sensual way of living. (PO)

2). The Jews must be considered a bad influence on Christian culture and civilization. (ST)

3). In order to maintain a nice residential neighborhood it is best to prevent Jews from living in it. (A)

4). A major fault of the Jews is their conceit, overbearing pride, and their idea that they are a chosen race. (PO)

5). One trouble with Jewish businessmen is that they stick together and connive, so that a Gentile doesn't have a fair chance in competition with them. (ST & I)

6). Colleges should adopt a quota system by which they limit the number of Jews in fields which have too many Jews now. (A)

7). No matter how Americanized a Jew may seem to be, there is always something basically Jewish underneath, a loyalty to Jewry and a manner that is never totally changed. (PO)

8). Jewish power and control in money matters is far out of proportion to the number of Jews in the total population. (ST)

9). A step toward solving the Jewish problem would be to prevent Jews from getting into superior, profitable positions in society, for a while at least. (A)

10). Districts containing many Jews always seem to be smelly, dirty, shabby, and unattractive. (PO)

11). There are too many Jews in the various federal agencies and bureaus in Washington, and they have too much control over our national policies. (T & I)

12). The Jewish problem is so general and deep that one often doubts that democratic methods can ever solve it. (A)

13). There are a few exceptions, but in general Jews are pretty much alike. (PO)
14). Jews tend to lower the general standard of living by their willingness to do the most menial work and to live under standards that are far below average. (ST)

15). It is wrong for Jews and Gentiles to intermarry. (A)

16). The Jews should not pry so much into Christian activities and organizations nor seek so much recognition and prestige from Christians. (PO & I)

17). Much resentment against Jews stems from their tending to keep apart and to exclude Gentiles from Jewish social life. (S)

18). It is best that Jews should have their own fraternities and sororities since they have their own particular interests and activities which they can best engage in together, just as Christians get along best in all-Christian fraternities. (A)

19). One thing that has hindered the Jews from establishing their own nation is the fact that they really have no culture of their own; instead, they tend to copy the things that are important to the native citizens of whatever country they are in. (I)

20). The Jews should give up their un-Christian religion with all its strange customs (kosher diet, special holidays, etc.) and participate actively and sincerely in the Christian religion. (S)

21). It is sometimes all right to ban Jews from certain apartment houses. (A)

22). One big trouble with Jews is that they are never contented, but always try for the best jobs and the most money. (N)

23). Jews tend to remain a foreign element in American society, to preserve their old social standards and to resist the American way of life. (S)

24). Anyone who employs many people should be careful not to hire a large percentage of Jews. (A)

25). Jews go too far in hiding their Jewishness, especially such extremes as changing their names, straightening noses, and imitating Christian manners and customs. (I)

26). There is little doubt that Jewish pressure was largely responsible for the U.S. getting into the war with Germany. (N)

Questionnaire S

1). The Jews should make sincere efforts to rid themselves of their conspicuous and irritating faults, if they really want to stop being persecuted. (PO)
2). Wars show up the fact that the Jews are not patriotic or willing to
make sacrifices for their country. (ST)

3). It would hurt the business of a large concern if it had too many
Jewish employees. (A & I)

4). There is something different and strange about Jews; one never knows
what they are thinking or planning, nor what makes them tick. (PO)

5). Jews may have moral standards which they apply in their dealings with
others, but with Christians they are unscrupulous, ruthless, and
undependable. (ST)

6). The best way to eliminate the Communist menace in this country is to
control the Jewish element which guides it. (A)

7). The trouble with letting Jews into a nice neighborhood is that they
gradually give it a typically Jewish atmosphere. (PO & I)

8). The Jew's first loyalty is to Jewry rather than to his country. (ST)

9). In order to handle the Jewish problem, the Gentiles must meet fire
with fire and use the same ruthless tactics with the Jews that the
Jews use with the Gentiles. (A)

10). I can hardly imagine myself marrying a Jew. (PO)

11). Jews seem to have an aversion to plain hard work; they tend to be a
parasitic element in society by finding easy, nonproductive jobs. (ST)

12). It is not wise for a Christian to be seen too much with Jews, as he
might be taken for a Jew, or be looked down upon by his Christian
friends. (A)

13). One general fault of Jews is their overaggressiveness, a strong tendency
always to display their Jewish looks, manners, and breeding. (PO & S)

14). There seems to be some revolutionary streak in the Jewish makeup as
shown by the fact that there are so many Jewish Communists and
agitators. (ST)

15). One of the first steps to be taken in cleaning up the movies and
generally improving the situation in Hollywood is to put an end to
Jewish domination there. (A)

16). Jews should be more concerned with their personal appearance, and not
be so dirty, smelly, and unkempt. (PO)

17). The Jewish districts in most cities are results of the clannishness and
stick-togtherness of Jews. (S)
18). Most hotels should deny admittance to Jews, as a general rule. (A)

19). The true Christian can never forgive the Jews for their crucifixion of Christ. (I)

20). Jewish millionaires may do a certain amount to help their own people, but little of their money goes into worthwhile American causes. (S)

21). Jewish leaders should encourage Jews to be more inconspicuous, to keep out of professions and activities already overcrowded with Jews, and to keep out of the public notice. (A)

22). There is little hope of correcting the racial defects of the Jews, since these defects are simply in their blood. (N)

23). The Jews keep too much to themselves, instead of taking the proper interest in community problems and good government. (S)

24). It would be to the best interests of all if the Jews would form their own nation and keep more to themselves. (A)

25). When Jews create large funds for educational or scientific research (Rosewald, Heller, etc.) it is mainly due to a desire for fame and public notice rather than a really sincere scientific interest. (I)

26). On the whole, the Jews have probably contributed less to American life than any other group. (N)

---

Short Form Form 78

11). Anyone who employs many people should be careful not to hire a large percentage of Jews. (A)

16). One trouble with Jewish businessmen is that they stick together and connive, so that a Gentile doesn't have a fair chance in competition. (ST & S)

21). The Jewish districts in most cities are results of the clannishness and stick-togetherness of Jews. (S)

26). Persecution of the Jews would be largely eliminated if the Jews would really make sincere efforts to rid themselves of their harmful and offensive faults. (PO)

33). Jewish leaders should encourage Jews to be more inconspicuous, to keep out of the professions and activities already overcrowded with Jews, and keep out of the public notice. (A)

40). I can hardly imagine myself marrying a Jew. (PO)
The trouble with letting Jews into a nice neighborhood is that they gradually give it a typically Jewish atmosphere. (PO & I)

No matter how Americanized a Jew may seem to be, there is always something different and strange, something basically Jewish underneath. (PO)

There may be a few exceptions, but, in general, Jews are pretty much alike. (PO)

There are too many Jews in the various federal agencies and bureaus in Washington, and they have too much control over our national policies. (ST & I)
This scale is designed to assess differences in family ideology along an autocratic-democratic continuum and is based on five personality factors: conventionalism, authoritarian submission, exaggerated masculinity and femininity, extreme emphasis on discipline, and a moralistic rejection of impulse life.

This scale is composed of 40 six-point Likert-type items, each of which was intended to represent as many of the five factors as possible. The theoretical basis of the authoritarian-democratic personality dimension is described in The Authoritarian Personality (Adorno et al., 1950). These five factors are not regarded as being statistically or conceptually independent. No further information about the source of the items or the selection of those composing the final scale is given. Of the scale items, 34 were regarded as autocratic and six as democratic. Responses to each item were given a value on a scale ranging from +3 (strong agreement) to -3 (strong disagreement) and were converted into item scores by the addition of +4. Scoring was reversed for the democratic items. The range of scores was 40-280, with a high score indicating adherence to a traditional autocratic family ideology. For convenience, the mean score per item (1-7), computed by dividing the total score by 40, was multiplied by 10 to yield a range of scores from 10 to 70. The item DP's averaged 2.0 and varied from .04 to 3.5.

The sample contained 109 adults in evening classes in psychology at Cleveland College, 67 men and 42 women between the ages of 20 and 40, either full-time students of college age or part-time students from various occupational groups.

The (corrected) split-half reliability for the Traditional Family Ideology scale (TFI) was .84. Further data are reported under Results and Comments.

In an item analysis, it was found that the discriminating power of five of the items did not achieve the five percent significance level. The TFI Scale was correlated with two shortened forms of the E and F Scales (which statistically approximated their longer original forms) yielding values of .65 and .73, respectively.

As with the E and F Scales, TFI scores varied from high to low across religious denominations in the following order: Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and "unaffiliated." TFI scores increased, on the average, with church attendance. On four projective questions concerning various family roles and practices, the responses of the lowest and the highest scoring quarters on the TFI were compared, and "authoritarian" vs. "equalitarian" scoring categories were formulated. The results indicated that the categories which differentiate high and low scorers reflect the variables on which the TFI Scale was originally constructed.

Administration

Estimated administration time is about 25 minutes.

Results and Comments

The mean for the sample of 109 was 33.3 (s.d.=7.8), which is slightly on the democratic side of the theoretically neutral point of 40.

An abbreviated 12-item form of the TFI Scale (items starred twice on the 40 item scale below) was presented to five groups (total of 507 subjects) in Boston. The group means averaged 32.6 (the s.d.'s 10.7). In these groups, the TFI Scale correlated .6 with the E Scale, .7 with the F Scale, and .5 with a religious conventionalism scale.

The following table presents specific data for the 12 item scale administered to these 5 groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>RC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Harvard Summer Session</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Boston University Sophomores</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Boston University Freshmen</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Registered Nurses</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Nurses</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-all</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Harvard summer session group had a 6-week test-retest reliability of .93 and a split-half reliability on the initial test of .92.

The authors' hypothesis that individuals are relatively consistent in their tendency to take a democratic or an autocratic stand in various ideological spheres is supported by the significant correlations between the TFI Scale and the E and RC (Religious Conventionalism) Scales. It appears that an individual's family ideology overlaps with his ideological views of other social institutions. The significant correlations obtained between the TFI Scale and the F Scale demonstrate a close relationship between the democratic-autocratic continuum of family ideology and the equalitarian-authoritarian continuum of personality.
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### TRADITIONAL FAMILY IDEOLOGY SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>D.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Parent-child relationships: child-rearing techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>39. A child should not be allowed to talk back to his parents, or else he will lose respect for them. (II, IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>40. There is a lot of evidence such as the Kinsey Report which shows we have to crack down harder on young people to save our moral standards. (IV, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>58. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents. (II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>33. A well-raised child is one who doesn't have to be told twice to do something. (II, IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>56. A woman whose children are messy or rowdy has failed in her duties as a mother. (II, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>15. It isn't healthy for a child to like to be alone, and he should be discouraged from playing by himself. (I, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>22. If children are told much about sex, they are likely to go too far in experimenting with it. (I, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>57. A child who is unusual in any way should be encouraged to be more like other children. (I, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>45. The saying &quot;Mother knows best&quot; still has more than a grain of truth. (I, II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9. Whatever some educators may say, &quot;Spare the rod and spoil the child&quot; still holds, even in these modern times. (IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>21. It helps the child in the long run if he is made to conform to his parents' ideas. (II, IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>*3. A teen-ager should be allowed to decide most things for himself. (II, IV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Agreement with these items is given a low score, disagreement a high score.

The numbers in parentheses at the end of each item refer to the personality variables they are thought to tap. The numbers are given here for their possible suggestive value; it is not assumed that any item is a "pure" expression of any variable. The variables are named as follows: I. Conventionalism; II. Authoritarian Submission; III. Exaggerated Masculinity and Femininity; IV. Extreme Emphasis on Discipline; V. Moralistic Rejection of Impulse Life.
### B. Husband and wife roles and relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>D.P.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>31. Women who want to remove the word obey from the marriage service don't understand what it means to be a wife. (II, III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>20. Some equality in marriage is a good thing, but by and large the husband ought to have the main say-so in family matters. (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>28. One of the worst problems in our society today is &quot;free love,&quot; because it mars the true value of sex relations. (I, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>34. It is only natural and right for each person to think that his family is better than any other. (I, II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4. A marriage should not be made unless the couple plans to have children. (I, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>38. A man who doesn't provide well for his family ought to consider himself pretty much a failure as husband and father. (I, III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>14. Faithlessness is the worse fault a husband could have. (I, III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>44. In choosing a husband, a woman will do well to put ambition at the top of her list of desirable qualities. (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7. A wife does better to vote the way her husband does, because he probably knows more about such things. (II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8. It is a reflection on a husband's manhood if his wife works. (III, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>43. Women should take an active interest in politics and community problems as well as in their families. (I, III)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. General male-female relationships; concepts of masculinity and femininity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>D.P.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>46.</td>
<td>A man can scarcely maintain respect for his fiancee if they have sexual relations before they are married. (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>50.</td>
<td>It goes against nature to place women in positions of authority over men. (II, III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>37.</td>
<td>It is a woman's job more than a man's to uphold our moral code, especially in sexual matters. (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>49.</td>
<td>The unmarried mother is morally a greater failure than the unmarried father. (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>26.</td>
<td>The most important qualities of a real man are strength of will and determined ambition. (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Women can be too bright for their own good. (II, III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>*10.</td>
<td>Women have as much right as men to sow wild oats. (III, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Petting is something a nice girl wouldn't want to do. (III, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Women think less clearly than men and are more emotional. (III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Almost any woman is better off in the home than in a job or profession. (I, III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>32.</td>
<td>It doesn't seem quite right for a man to be a visionary; dreaming should be left to women. (III, V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>*19.</td>
<td>Even today women live under unfair restrictions that ought to be done away with. (II, III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>It's a pretty feeble sort of man who can't get ahead in the world. (III)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. General values and aims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>D.P.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>55.</td>
<td>The family is a sacred institution, divinely ordained. (I, II)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Some equality in marriage is a good thing, but by and large the husband ought to have the main say-so in family matters.

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

3. Women who want to remove the word obey from the marriage service don't understand what it means to be a wife.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12. 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.
STATUS-CONCERN SCALE (Kaufman 1957)

Variable
This scale attempts to measure directly attitudes toward status and mobility, that is, the value placed on symbols of status and in the attainment of higher status. It was hypothesized that concern with status would vary directly with anti-Semitism.

Description
The scale consists of ten Likert-type items. No information concerning the selection of the final items was given. Response format is a six-point agreement-disagreement continuum requiring response on a +3 (agreement) to -3 (disagreement) scale with 0 omitted. Responses are converted into item scores by the addition of +4 to each response value. Range of possible scores is 10-100 with high scores indicating high concern with status.

Sample
The scale was administered to 213 non-Jewish college undergraduates from a "middle-class" population.

Reliability/ Homogeneity
The split-half reliability corrected for double length was .78. The author states that the items did not meet the 90 percent reproducibility criterion for a Guttman scale.

Validity
The differences between the item means of high and low scores were significant at the .01 level for each item. The Status-Concern (SC) Scale correlated .71 with the F Scale and .66 with the Anti-Semitism Scale for the sample of 213. The F Scale correlated .53 with the AS Scale. However, with SC Scale held constant, the AS Scale correlated .12 with the F Scale, a non-significant correlation.

Location

Administration
An estimated time of less than ten minutes is needed to complete this scale.

Results and Comments
In this particular sample, concern for status was more closely related to anti-Semitism than was authoritarianism, and the relationship between authoritarianism and anti-Semitism seemed to be largely explained by their mutual relationship to status-concern.

This study took an interesting approach to the relationship between status, mobility, and prejudice. In most related studies correlations are hypothesized between actual status and prejudice. Here an attempt was made to measure attitudes toward status and mobility. Similar studies have been done by Seeman and his associates (e.g., Silberstein and Seeman, 1959; Seeman et al., 1966) and, as in Kaufman's study, the results suggest that such attitudes are more important than actual status.
References


1. The extent of a man's ambition to better himself is a pretty good indication of his character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. In order to merit the respect of others, a person should show the desire to better himself.

3. One of the things you should consider in choosing your friends is whether they can help you make your way in the world.

4. Ambition is the most important factor in determining success in life.

5. One should always try to live in a highly respectable residential area, even though it entails sacrifices.

6. Before joining any civic or political association, it is usually important to find out whether it has the backing of people who have achieved a respected social position.

7. Possession of proper social etiquette is usually the mark of a desirable person.

8. The raising of one's social position is one of the more important goals in life.

9. It is worth considerable effort to assure one's self of a good name with the right kind of people.

10. An ambitious person can almost always achieve his goals.
RIGIDITY SCALE (Rehfisch 1958)

Variable
This scale is designed to measure personality rigidity which is characterized by the following qualities: (a) constriction and inhibition, (b) conservatism, (c) intolerance of disorder and ambiguity, (d) observational and perseverative tendencies, (e) social introversion, (f) anxiety and guilt.

Description
The scale consists of 39 true-false items. The original pool of 957 items included items from the MMPI and the California Psychological Inventory and items specially constructed for this scale. These items were administered to subjects who had been rated on a number of personality variables, including rigidity by IPAR (Institute for Personality Assessment and Research) staff members.

The final items were selected on the basis of their ability to discriminate between the quartiles rated highest and lowest on rigidity among the entire criterion sample revealed 20 items discriminating significantly at the .01 level, 18 at the .05 level, and one at the .06 level.

Cross validation for two preliminary forms of the scale was accomplished by the following procedure. The first preliminary scale was constructed from the responses of the quartiles rated highest and lowest on rigidity among 80 graduate students, 80 medical students, and 20 Air Force captains. A cross validation coefficient of .35 (two-tailed test: p < .01) was obtained by correlating scores on this scale with rigidity ratings (for a sample of 60 Air Force captains not used in constructing this preliminary scale). A second preliminary scale was constructed on the basis of the responses of these 60 Air Force captains. The scores of 70 medical school applicants on the second preliminary scale were correlated with their IPAR staff ratings on various personality variables. The following results were obtained: (a) in interpersonal situations tends to be a good listener or spectator .54; (b) constriction .51; (c) tends toward over-controls of his needs and impulses... delays gratification unnecessarily .44; (d) manifest anxiety .39; (e) has a readiness to feel guilty .36; (f) tends to delay or avoid decision .33; (h) tends to ruminate and have obsessive thoughts .30; (i) is uncomfortable with uncertainties and complexities .30; (j) follows routine in living, is orderly .28; (k) rigidity .19.

Negative correlations are with (a) is self-indulgent -.51; (b) fluency of ideas -.45; (c) verbal fluency -.40; (d) impulsivity -.35; (e) originality -.35.
One point is assigned for each "rigid" response yielding a range of scores from 0 to 39. A high score indicates high rigidity.

Sample
The following groups served as subjects for the construction of this scale: 80 graduate students from the University of California, 80 senior medical students from the University of California, 70 applicants to the University of California Medical School, and 100 Air Force captains. The total number of subjects was 330. All subjects were male.

Reliability/Homogeneity
A new sample of 60 Air Force captains was used to determine reliability. Corrected split-half reliability was .72.

Validity
The number of IPAR staff members rating each subject varied but was never fewer than five and averaged eight. Interrater reliability, computed by an analysis of variance technique, ranged, across the samples, from .50 to .81 and averaged .73.

In addition to the cross validation discussed above, further cross validation data were obtained from an item analysis of IPAR staff ratings for each subject on the Gough Adjective Check List. An adjective composite for each of the 70 Medical School applicants was then constructed from adjectives checked by three or more staff members. The adjective composite for the 18 highest and 18 lowest scorers on the second preliminary rigidity scale were compared. The following adjectives were found to differentiate significantly (.05 level) between high and low scorers.

Adjectives more often checked by high scorers: anxious, conscientious, conservative, deliberate, dependent, gentle, inhibited, mild, moderate, modest, painstaking, peaceable, quiet, reserved, retiring, serious, shy, sincere, submissive, thorough, timid, withdrawn, worrying.

Adjectives more often checked by low scorers: active, adaptable, aggressive, argumentative, assertive, clear-thinking, confident, curious, demanding, energetic, independent, irritable, organized, outgoing, outspoken, painful, poised, quick, resourceful, self-centered, self-confident, self-seeking, sociable, spontaneous, talkative, versatile.

Location

Administration
Estimated administration time is 20 minutes.
For a sample of 343 Air Force captains and 70 medical school applicants, the mean on the Rigidity Scale was 15.77 (s.d. 5.21).

The author states that the low correlation between the Rigidity (Ri) Scale and the rigidity ratings (.19) could be a result of either error in the scale or error in the ratings. However, because the correlations of the scale with the ratings of other traits along the rigidity-flexibility dimension were as expected, the author feels that the accuracy or the comprehensiveness of the rigidity ratings could be open to question.

In another study using two samples of Air Force captains the author found the Ri Scale to be significantly positively related (at the .01 level) to the MMPI scales of social introversion and anxiety and significantly negatively related (at the .01 level) to the K Scale and rules of ego-strength and leadership. The author also found negative correlations of equal significance between the Ri Scale and a scale of the CPI measuring sociability, social presence, interest in scholastic achievement, and intellectual efficiency.

Further research needs to be done to see how the items in this instrument relate to the apparently similar measures of dogmatism, authoritarianism, intolerance of ambiguity, intolerance, and so on.

Reference

THE RI (RIGIDITY) SCALE

Anxiety and Constriction in Social Situations

1. I usually don't like to talk much unless I am with people I know very well. True* False
2. I like to talk before groups of people. True False*
3. It is hard for me to start a conversation with strangers. True* False
4. I would like to be an actor on the stage or in the movies. True False*
5. It is hard for me to act natural when I am with new people. True* False
6. I feel nervous if I have to meet a lot of people. True* False
7. I usually feel nervous and ill at ease at a formal dance or party. True* False
8. When I work on a committee I like to take charge of things. True False*
9. I usually take an active part in the entertainment at parties. True False*
10. I am a better talker than listener. True False*
11. I try to remember good stories to pass them on to other people. True False*
12. I am embarrassed with people I do not know well. True* False
13. A strong person doesn't show his emotions and feelings. True* False

Need for a stable, orderly, predictable environment; perseverative tendencies

14. I must admit that it makes me angry when other people interfere with my daily activity. True* False
15. I find that a well-ordered mode of life with regular hours is congenial to my temperament. True* False
16. It bothers me when something unexpected interrupts my daily routine. True* False
17. I don't like to undertake any project unless I have a pretty good idea as to how it will turn out. True* False
18. I find it hard to set aside a task that I have undertaken, even for a short time. True* False
19. I don't like things to be uncertain and unpredictable. True* False

Slowness in coming to a decision--compulsive doubting

20. I am very slow in making up my mind. True* False
21. At times I feel that I can make up my mind with unusually great ease. True False*

Conservatism and conventionality

22. I must admit I try to see what others think before I take a stand. True* False
23. I do not like to see women smoke. True* False
24. I would be uncomfortable in anything other than fairly conventional dress. True* False
25. I keep out of trouble at all costs. True* False
26. It wouldn't make me nervous if any members of my family got into trouble with the law.  
   True False*

27. I must admit that I would find it hard to have for a close friend a person whose manners or appearance made him somewhat repulsive, no matter how brilliant or kind he might be.  
   True* False

28. I would certainly enjoy beating a crook at his own game.  
   True False*

29. I would like the job of a foreign correspondent for a newspaper.  
   True False*

Self-doubt and sensitivity to negative criticism.

30. I get very tense and anxious when I think other people are disapproving of me.  
   True* False

31. I am certainly lacking in self-confidence.  
   True* False

32. Criticism or scolding makes me very uncomfortable.  
   True* False

Misanthropy and parsimony

33. Most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people.  
   True* False

34. I am against giving money to beggars.  
   True* False

35. Many of the girls I knew in college went with a fellow only for what they could get out of him.  
   True* False

Emphatic concern with work and study

36. I always follow the rule: business before pleasure.  
   True* False

37. I get disgusted with myself when I can't understand some problem in my field, or when I can't seem to make any progress on a research problem.  
   True* False

Miscellaneous

38. I have never been made especially nervous over trouble that any members of my family have gotten into.  
   True* False

39. I have no fear of spiders.  
   True* False

* Indicates rigid response.
RAPH SCALE (RIGIDITY OF ATTITUDES REGARDING PERSONAL HABITS)
(Meresko, Rubin, Shontz and Morrow 1954)

Variable
This scale is designed to measure rigidity as manifested by attitudes concerning personal habits. The authors define psychological rigidity as a person's resistance or lack of readiness to be influenced by motivationally relevant stimulation in such a way as to adjust to his environment as effectively as his behavior-repertory permits.

Description
The RAPH Scale consists of 20 six-point Likert-type items. The 20 items can be grouped according to which of two aspects of rigidity they reflect. The first, opposition to change as such, includes traditionalism, rule-riddeness, opposition to any change of judgment and opposition to any change of plans. The second aspect is intolerance of ambiguity, either regarding a specific situation or regarding plans or expectation for the future. Some items reflect both aspects.

In constructing the scale from an original 32 items, 12 items were excluded by an item analysis. No further information pertaining to the construction of this scale was given.

A subject score is the sum of the numerical values assigned to each of his responses, 0-6, with the value 3 being a neutral category indicating omission of response. All items are positively scored except 1 and 14. The range of possible scores is from 0 to 120 with a high score indicating high rigidity.

Sample
The sample used for constructing this scale was a group of 60 undergraduate college students, otherwise undescribed.

Reliability/ Homogeneity
The corrected odd-even reliability coefficient on the original sample was .75. On a sample of 188 college students given the final 20-item scale, the corrected odd-even reliability coefficient was .78. Every item on the final scale showed a significant correlation with total scale scores.

Validity
No information directly pertaining to validity was reported.

Location

Administration
This test is self-administered. To complete this test, an estimated 15 minutes would be required.
The 32 preliminary items correlated .82 with a 20-item form of the F Scale for the sample of 60. The final form of the RAPH Scale correlated .62 with the same form of the F Scale for a sample of 188. For this same sample, all 20 items showed discriminatory power beyond the .01 level.

The main purpose of the article from which this scale was taken was to test hypotheses regarding the attitudes of American college students. Consequently, a minimum amount of information regarding the RAPH Scale itself (which was constructed to help test the hypotheses) was reported. No test-retest reliability coefficients are reported and, as noted above, there is almost no information given about construction procedures, subjects, or item-analysis.

More information about validity is needed for this scale, as well as a better understanding of the overlap between rigidity (as measured by this scale), "intolerance of ambiguity" (theoretically a characteristic of authoritarian personalities), and other dimensions of authoritarianism.
THE RAPH SCALE
(* Reversed items)

(a) Traditionalism

6. In whatever one does, the "tried and true" ways are always the best.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(b) Rule-riddeness

5. A self-respecting person should never permit himself to relax his vigilance over personal habits; seemingly minor lapses can easily grow into complete breakdown of self-discipline.

9. The rules of logic are the rules of life.

10. If I had a new car, I'd always keep it nicely cleaned and polished.

11. "A place for everything and everything in its place" is a pretty good motto to live by.

15. One of the major aims of education should be to give us a few simple rules of behavior to apply in every situation.

16. The biggest advantage man possesses over lower animals is his ability to regulate himself and live by definite and unchanging rules of conduct.

19. Every person should live by a few good and unchanging rules of conduct; that way he can never go wrong.

(c) Opposition to any change of judgment

8. It's a good idea to have a strong point of view about things because that makes it easier to decide what's wrong or right.

17. A person who seldom changes his mind can usually be depended upon to have sound and reliable judgment on matters of importance.

18. Once a person makes up his mind about something he should stick to his conclusion instead of repeatedly rehashing the question.

(d) Opposition to any change of plans

* 1. I rather like the idea of having friends drop in unexpectedly at odd hours.
2. I dislike doing anything just on the spur of the moment.

4. Few things are more upsetting than a sudden unexpected change of plans.

7. I never start anything I can't finish.

13. Once a person starts going off his budget, even by small amounts, he's on the road to financial difficulty.

20. The only way to make sure that things get done right is to set up a definite and fixed schedule and never depart from it.

(e) Intolerance of ambiguity manifested in specific situations

3. I don't much like the kind of painting that doesn't tell a story or doesn't portray something in a clear, unambiguous fashion.

(f) Intolerance of ambiguity regarding expectations or plans for the future

12. The best way to enjoy a vacation is to plan every detail carefully before you leave.

* 14. I rather like the idea of having my meals at odd hours and of going to bed when the mood strikes me.
RIGIDITY SCALE (Wesley 1953)

Variable

Wesley defines rigidity as the "tendency to persist in responses that may previously have been suitable in some situation or other but that no longer appear adequate to achieve current goals or to solve current problems."

Description

The Wesley Rigidity Scale consists of 67 items, 50 of which are used to measure rigidity. The remaining 17 items used as filler items, are taken from the Minnesota Multiphase L, P, and P+ Scales. The subject responds "true" or "false" to each item indicating whether or not the statement applies to himself. He receives one point for every rigid answer (see list of items for rigid answer key). The 50 rigidity items were selected from a pool of 90 which the author drew from various personality tests (notably the Gough-Sanford Rigidity Scale) or constructed herself. Five clinical psychologists rated each item in the pool on the degree of rigidity it expressed. The 50 items selected were judged by all five judges to express a high degree of rigidity.

Sample

The original sample receiving the test was an unspecified number of undergraduates taking psychology courses. From this group, the following three groups were selected for Wesley's study on the basis of their scores on the Wesley Rigidity Scale and the "Manifest Anxiety Scale."

1) Rigid Group: 21 subjects who scored in the upper tenth of the Rigidity Scale (28 and above) and below the 60th percentile of the Anxiety Scale.

2) Anxious Group: 21 subjects who scored in the upper tenth of the Anxiety Scale and below the median (23) on the Rigidity Scale.

3) Normal Group: 30 subjects scoring below the median on both scales.

All subjects received a T Score of 50 or less on the L Scale of the MMPI.

Reliability

No reliability data were given, other than the fact that the five clinical psychologists rated all 50 items as "high."

Validity

The three groups selected for the study were required to learn a card sorting task resembling the Wisconsin Card-Sorting Test, which involves the formation of concepts and the shifting of the concepts. When the scores on this task were corrected for differences in rate of original learning, the rigid group took significantly longer to shift sets on subsequent series and gave significantly more preservative responses. Thus, rigidity as measured by this scale seems to be related to a behavioral measure of this concept (as defined by Wesley and quoted above).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>The test of 67 items would take approximately 25 minutes for a subject to complete. He receives one point for each rigid answer given in response to the 50 items that comprise the scale (see item list for rigid response key).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results and Comments</td>
<td>In a separate study by Wrightsman (private communication), 207 subjects received this scale. His subjects had a mean of 22.16 and an s.d. of 6.13. The ability of this scale to discriminate among different amounts of &quot;rigidity&quot; seems open to question. If the upper divide is 28 and above and the median is 23 (according to Wesley's data) then 40 percent of his subjects have scored between 23 and 28 on a 50 point scale. The relationship between the sort of rigidity measured by this scale and dogmatism or authoritarianism remains to be studied. Looking at the items, however, points up at least some overlap--notice, for example, the mention of church-attendance, duty, sexual freedom for women, and conventionalism. Also Rokeach has reported relevant evidence, thought not based on this particular scale (1948; 1960).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RIGIDITY SCALE

+ I am often the last one to give up trying to do a thing. True* False
+ There is usually only one best way to solve most problems. True* False
+ I prefer work that requires a great deal of attention to detail. True* False
+ I often become so wrapped up in something I am doing that I find it difficult to turn my attention to other matters. True* False

I prefer doing one thing at a time to keeping several projects going. True* False
+ I dislike to change my plans in the midst of an undertaking. True* False
+ I never miss going to church. True* False
+ I would like a position which requires frequent changes from one kind of task to another. True False*
+ I usually maintain my own opinions even though many other people may have a different point of view. True* False
+ I find it easy to stick to a certain schedule, once I have started on it. True* False
+ I believe women ought to have as much sexual freedom as men. True False*
+ I do not enjoy having to adapt myself to new and unusual situations. True* False
+ I prefer to stop and think before I act even on trifling matters. True False*
+ I would not like the kind of work which involves a large number of different activities. True* False
+ I try to follow a program of life based on duty. True* False
+ I have kept a careful diary over a period of years. True* False
+ My interests tend to change quickly. True False*
+ I usually find that my own way of attacking a problem is best, even though it doesn't always seem to work in the beginning. True* False
+ I dislike having to learn new ways of doing things. True* False
+ I like a great deal of variety in my work. True False*
+ I am a methodical person in whatever I do. True* False
+ I am usually able to keep at a job longer than most people. True* False
RIGIDITY SCALE (Continued)

+ I think it is usually wise to do things in a conventional way. True* False

+ I always finish tasks I start, even if they are not very important. True* False

People who go about their work methodically are almost always the most successful. True* False

When I have undertaken a task, I find it difficult to set it aside, even for a short time. True* False

+ I often find myself thinking of the same tune or phrases for days at a time. True* False

+ I usually check more than once to be sure that I have locked a door, put out the light, or something of the sort. True* False

+ I have never done anything dangerous for the thrill of it. True* False

It is always a good thing to be frank. True* False

I have a habit of collecting various kinds of objects. True* False

I have taken a good many courses on the spur of the moment. True False*

+ I believe that promptness is a very important personality characteristic. True* False

My interests change very quickly. True False*

It is the slow, steady worker who usually accomplishes the most in the end. True* False

+ I am always careful about my manner of dress. True* False

I usually dislike to set aside a task that I have undertaken until it is finished. True* False

I am inclined to go from one activity to another without continuing with any one for too long a time. True False*

I prefer to do things according to a routine which I plan myself. True* False

+ I always put on and take off my clothes in the same order. True* False

* Answers that show rigidity
+ Items taken from the Gough-Sanford Rigidity Scale, an adaption of which is included in the well-known California Personality Inventory.

Note: The copy of Wesley's items made available to us only contained 41, rather than 50, items.
INTOLERANCE OF AMBIGUITY (Budner 1962)

Variable

Intolerance of ambiguity is defined as "the tendency to perceive (i.e., interpret) ambiguous situations as sources of threat;" tolerance of ambiguity as "the tendency to perceive ambiguous situations as desirable." Ambiguity arises in situations characterized by novelty, complexity, or insolubility. Threat responses include repression and denial, anxiety and discomfort, destructive behavior and avoidance behavior. Budner classifies these responses under four headings: phenomenological submission and denial, and operative (behavioral) submission and denial.

Description

An initial pool of 33 items, conforming to the three types of ambiguous situations and four kinds of threat responses mentioned above, were administered in three pretests (in six-point Likert form). Only items yielding a Pearson \( r \) of .35 or higher were included in the final scale. Ten positively worded and eight negatively worded items met this criterion; two of the positive were dropped to yield a balanced 16-item scale (presented below). Scoring is accomplished by assigning 7 to strong agreement, 1 to strong disagreement, and so on, then adding across all items. (Notice that negatively-worded items are scored in the reverse direction.)

Samples

Pretest

1. Two introductory sociology classes (combined) in the adult education division of a private university in New York City (N = 35).

2. An evening session class in graduate business administration at a university in New York City (N = 37).

3. Two elective classes in education (combined) at one of the municipal colleges in New York City (N = 45).

Further study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. An introductory psychology class, all freshmen, at a college in New York City suburbs (N = 50)</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. An evening introductory psychology class in the same school (N = 57)</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Two elective sociology classes (combined) at a private women's college in New York City (N = 41)</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Two classes of engineering students (combined) in a required social studies course at a municipal college in New York City (N = 58)</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Two advanced classes in sociology (combined) at a private college in New York City (N = 33)</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sample Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A group of first-year student nurses at a local hospital in New York City (N = 34)</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two classes in a special English course (combined) at one of the elite high schools in New York City (N = 62)</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first-year class at an eastern medical school (N = 79)</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second-year class at the same school (N = 75)</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The third-year class at the same school (N = 75)</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first-year class at a midwestern medical school (N = 83)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second-year class at the same school (N = 80)</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The third-year class at the same school (N = 86)</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reliability

Reliabilities reported above were computed by Cronbach's alpha formula (Guilford 1954). A 17th sample of 15 graduate students was used in a test-retest study over a period of two to four weeks, and a correlation of .85 was obtained. Although the alpha reliabilities appear lower than the more common split-half coefficients, the instrument seems to have acceptable reliability considering its probable multidimensionality.

### Validity

A measure of acquiescence or "agreement response set" did not yield significant correlations with Budner's scale, nor did Edwards' Scale of Social Desirability.

From sample #7 above, scores on three other tolerance of ambiguity scales were obtained: Coulter Scale (Eysenck 1954), Walk Scale (O'Connor 1952), Princeton Scale (Saunders 1955). They correlate as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. . . . . . . . .</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Taken from Saunders, 1955
b Taken from Eysenck, 1954
b Taken from O'Connor, 1952
* ≤ .05
Other validity studies, involving interjudge agreement on ratings of respondents' intolerance of ambiguity, also supported the validity of the Budner scale.

Finally, in a long series of correlational studies the ambiguity scale was found to correlate with conventionality, belief in divine power, attendance at religious services, dogmatism about one's religious beliefs, and favorable attitudes toward censorship. The scale also correlated moderately with F (a balanced version constructed by Christie, Havel, and Seidenberg, 1958) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Suburban day</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Suburban night</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Women's college</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Municipal college</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Private college</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Nursing students</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. First-year eastern medical students</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Second-year eastern medical students</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Third-year eastern medical students</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05


Administration: This scale is self-administered and would take between 10 and 15 minutes to complete.

Results and Comments: This appears to be a good scale for measuring intolerance of ambiguity as it was conceptualized by the early writers on authoritarianism. Its moderate correlation with the Christie F Scale suggests trait overlap, but not complete congruence. Intolerance of ambiguity is most likely just one of several characteristics that contribute to high F scores.

The reader interested in empirical correlates of Budner's scale, mentioned briefly under "validity" above, should consult his article. It is quite long and includes detailed information about several interesting correlational studies. Also, Budner's dissertation (1960) may be of interest.


INTOLERANCE OF AMBIGUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive items:</th>
<th>Designed to tap(^a)</th>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Type of Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. An expert who doesn't come up with a definite answer probably doesn't know too much</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is really no such thing as a problem that can't be solved</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A good job is one where what is to be done and how it is to be done are always clear</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In the long run it is possible to get more done by tackling small, simple problems rather than large and complicated ones</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What we are used to is always preferable to what is unfamiliar</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A person who leads an even, regular life in which few surprises or unexpected happenings arise, really has a lot to be grateful for.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I like parties where I know most of the people more than ones where all or most of the people are complete strangers.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The sooner we all acquire similar values and ideals the better.</td>
<td>OD</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative items:</th>
<th>Designed to tap(^a)</th>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Type of Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. I would like to live in a foreign country for a while.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. People who fit their lives to a schedule probably miss most of the joy of living.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It is more fun to tackle a complicated problem than to solve a simple one.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Often the most interesting and stimulating people are those who don't mind being different and original.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. People who insist upon a yes or no answer just don't know how complicated things really are.</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Many of our most important decisions are based upon insufficient information.</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teachers or supervisors who hand out vague assignments give a chance for one to show initiative and originality.</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A good teacher is one who makes you wonder about your way of looking at things.</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Codes are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of response</th>
<th>Type of situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD - phenomenological denial</td>
<td>I - insolubility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS - operative submission</td>
<td>C - complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS - phenomenological submission</td>
<td>N - novelty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OD - operative denial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTOLERANCE OF AMBIGUITY SCALE (Martin and Westie 1959)

Variable
This scale was designed to measure intolerance of ambiguity as conceptualized in the original work on the authoritarian syndrome (e.g., Frenkel-Brunswik, 1949; 1951). According to this conceptual scheme, intolerant and authoritarian persons tend to perceive dimensioned stimuli as absolutely dichotomized, to seek unambiguous solutions for complex problems, to demonstrate rigid, categorical thinking, and so on.

Description
In a study of prejudice toward Negroes, Martin and Westie (1959) attempted to characterize the "tolerant personality"---one who is neither extremely negative or extremely positive in his attitudes. Tolerance was assessed with Westie's (1953) Summated Difference Scales; two groups were selected from 429 initial respondents----41 who were relatively neutral (tolerant) and 59 who were conspicuously prejudiced against Negroes. These groups were then compared on several other dimensions, including intolerance of ambiguity.

The scale used for this latter dimension contains eight items, each scored along a five-point agree-disagree continuum (Likert-type). Scoring is accomplished simply by summing across items.

Sample
The sampling universe for this study was all "white adults (21 years of age or older) residing within the city limits of Indianapolis in blocks containing no Negro residents." From 429 initial respondents who completed a short prognostic scale (used to avoid detailed interviews of too many prejudiced respondents), 41 qualified as "tolerant" and 59 were chosen who had high prejudice scores.

Reliability
No information given.

Validity
The intolerance of ambiguity scale bears close resemblance to several items on the original F Scale, thus suggesting relevant face validity. Further, the scale significantly distinguished between the tolerant and prejudiced respondents (p < .001) and correlated as follows with related measures:

Correlation matrix of scale scores of tolerant subjects (N=41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nationalism</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Intolerance of ambiguity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Superstition-pseudo-science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Threat-competition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &quot;F&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Religiosity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Child rearing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly different from zero at the .05 level.
CORRELATION MATRIX OF SCALE SCORES OF PREJUDICED SUBJECTS (N=59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nationalism</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Intolerance of ambiguity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Superstition-pseudo-science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Threat-competition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &quot;P&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Child rearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significantly different from zero at the .05 level.

Location


Administration

This scale would take only about five minutes to complete.

Results and Comments

The findings of this research were quite consistent with the original work by Adorno, et al., (1950) on authoritarianism. Specifically, tolerant persons do differ significantly on several components of an authoritarian "syndrome", including intolerance of ambiguity. (The other "components" are listed in the correlation tables above. The measure of religiosity is discussed later in Chapter 9 of this volume.) The Martin and Westie scale, however, could use further study, especially with regard to reliability. Also, it would be useful to see how it relates to the other measures of intolerance and cognitive rigidity presented in the present chapter.
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INTOLERANCE OF AMBIGUITY SCALE

1. There are two kinds of people in the world: the weak and the strong.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

2. A person is either a 100% American or he isn't.

3. A person either knows the answer to a question or he doesn't.

4. There are two kinds of women: the pure and the bad.

5. You can classify almost all people as either honest or crooked.

6. First impressions are very important.

7. It doesn't take very long to find out if you can trust a person.

8. There is only one right way to do anything.
 Variable

This scale was constructed to measure individual differences in motivation for certainty. It is closely related conceptually to "intolerance of ambiguity" as this is viewed by researchers on authoritarianism (see especially Else Frenkel-Brunswik 1949; 1951). (Some important qualifications regarding empirical similarity are mentioned below in "Results and Comments.")

Description

The Desire for Certainty Test comprises 32 statements about everyday events; e.g., "The chances that an American citizen will believe in God are about ____ in 100." Respondents place a probability value in the blank space in each such sentence. In addition, they indicate their confidence in each estimate by rating it on a five-point certainty scale from 1 (very sure) to 5 (not sure at all).

The statements included four from each of eight different subject-matter areas: education, recreation, politics, economics, religion, health, family, transportation and communication. Half were in agreement with generally accepted American values, half were not. Each had a different estimated true probability value drawn from a set of 32 values between 1 and 46 or 54 and 99. Combinations of the three criteria—subject matter, value-agreement, and true probability—were determined randomly, and then a statement was written to conform to each particular combination of these criteria.

Scoring is based on the assumption that a strong desire for certainty will be expressed by two tendencies: 1) to select probability values close to the extremes of 0 and 100; and 2) to express confidence in these extreme choices. Thus, the authors took the distance of each probability estimate from its nearest end point (0 or 100) and multiplied this value by its certainty score (very sure = 1; not sure at all = 5). The products were then summed over all 32 test items. Notice that by this procedure a low score indicates a high desire for certainty.

Sample

Reliability and validity information was reported for several different groups of college students, all of whom were enrolled in introductory sociology courses. (The tests were administered during class periods.)

Reliability/ Homogeneity

For one group of students (N = 50), a corrected split-half reliability coefficient of .81 was obtained.

Validity

For 500 students the test scores "appeared" normally distributed. For a sub-sample of 200 there was no relationship between test scores and "standard socioeconomic variables." For a subsample of 100 there was no relationship with intelligence (r = -.07; the intelligence measure was not specified). Notice, however, that since all respondents were college students the range of SES and intelligence variables was not as great as would be found in a more general sample.
A study by Brim and Hoff (1957) offers construct validity for the scale. "Desire for certainty" was found to be significantly related to extreme responding on several measures, including a variety of attitude scales and judgments of roommates' personality traits. In an experiment some subjects were frustrated in an attempt to achieve perceptual order and clarity, while others were "satisfied" in this attempt. A third (control) group received no manipulation. There were significant differences between all groups on the Desire for Certainty Test, with the "frustrated" group showing the strongest "desire."

Finally, it should be noted that a marginally significant curvilinear relationship was obtained between this test and the original F Scale (see Results and Comments below).

Location

Administration
No time estimate was mentioned by Brim, but the test would probably take about 20 minutes for self-administration.

Results and Comments
It is not clear whether this test measures intolerance of ambiguity as conceived by Frenkel-Brunswik (1949, 1951), because instead of obtaining a linear relationship with F scores, as did Frenkel-Brunswik, Brim found a curvilinear relationship. This suggests that respondents who are on one extreme or the other of the authoritarianism scale are also at the extremes on the Desire for Certainty Test. Clearly, this relationship deserves further study because of its possible connection with the issues of dogmatism independent of ideological content and general response biases.

It is worth noting again that Brim and Hoff used only college student samples, so their finding of no relationship between desire for certainty and education or SES needs further study in other groups.

The successful experimental manipulation of "desire for certainty" lends credence to the validity of the theoretical notions behind Brim's scale, and makes further understanding of the relationship between authoritarianism, intolerance for ambiguity, and desire for certainty a fruitful topic for further work.
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1. The chances that an adult American male will earn at least $4000 a year are about .... in 100.
2. The chances that a student entering law school will quit before getting his law degree are about .... in 100.
3. frequent thumbsucking during childhood will make teeth stick out (cause buck teeth) ____________.
4. the president of the United States will be a man without a college education ____________.
5. a major league baseball team will win the pennant if it is in first place July 4th ____________.
6. a sexual pervert will have a low intelligence (IQ 80 or less) ____________.
7. a highschool graduate will go on to a freshman year in college ____________.
8. a couple getting married this year will later have divorce ____________.
9. an American male now at the age of 40 will live beyond the age of 55 ____________.
10. an American family will live in a place without a telephone ____________.
11. an American family will own its own home ____________.
12. the telephone number you call will be busy ____________.
13. an American citizen will believe in God ____________.
14. a varsity football player in an American university will be subsidized (given money for his football ability) ____________.
15. an American city of over 50,000 people will have a chapter of the League of Women Voters ____________.
16. the governor of a state will be elected for a second term in office ____________.
17. a son will go into the same kind of work as his father ____________.
18. a man 70 years old will need financial help from someone to support himself ____________.
19. spanking a child will make him tell the truth next time ____________.
20. __________ an American-born baby will get a poor and inadequate diet during his first year of life __________.

21. __________ an adult male will stay home instead of going to church on Sunday __________.

22. __________ a sixth grade teacher in the public schools will be a man __________.

23. __________ a child whose parents are divorced will be neurotic __________.

24. __________ in the United States that a girl will be married before the age of 17 __________.

25. __________ a world's champion boxer comes from a poor family __________.

26. __________ an American citizen will be bilingual (speak two languages) __________.

27. __________ a five card deal will have two cards of the same kind (one pair) __________.

28. __________ a man with a broken neck will die __________.

29. __________ a crime in the United States will be solved (someone arrested and convicted for it) __________.

30. __________ the number of auto accidents in a year will be higher than for the year just before __________.

31. __________ a small business (for examples, gas station, motel) will fail within 2 years after starting __________.

32. __________ the person one marries will have the same religion __________.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>The items in this scale reflect the degree to which a person rejects practices in democratic countries,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The scale consists of nine descriptions of practices in democracies. The respondent is asked to judge whether each practice is &quot;thoroughly democratic,&quot; &quot;undemocratic but tolerable,&quot; or &quot;thoroughly undemocratic.&quot; One point is scored for each &quot;thoroughly undemocratic&quot; response, and hence scores run from 0 (low ethnocentrism) to 9 (high ethnocentrism). Median score for the sample in question was around 3.1 before &quot;encampment.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>The sample consisted of 364 young persons who attended the &quot;Encampment for Citizenship&quot; in 1955-58. These young people were chosen to attend the camp because of their democratic orientations and leadership qualities in order to improve upon these skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability/ Homogeneity</td>
<td>No reliability data are reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>No validity data are reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results and Comments</td>
<td>Median scores after encampment were about 2.9, which was not a significant change. This scale is included here because of the potentially fruitful approach it represents. Much further work on it is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ETHNOCENTRIC IMAGE OF DEMOCRACY

In some democracies there are certain customs or laws which you personally might or might not regard as democratic. Look over the following list and check whether each practice appears thoroughly democratic, somewhat undemocratic but tolerable in a democracy, or thoroughly undemocratic in your personal opinion:

1. In Australia, every citizen is required by law to vote.
   
   This practice seems to me: thoroughly democratic, undemocratic but tolerable, thoroughly undemocratic.

2. Until recently, in Sweden, most babies were automatically registered as members of the Lutheran Church, the state religion.

3. Until recently, in Sweden, the amount of alcohol that a person could buy each month was regulated by law.

4. In France, you must pay for a license in order to have a radio set in your home.

5. In the United States, all children must be vaccinated against smallpox.

6. In Great Britain, under the law, doctors no longer collect their fees from patients but bill the government.

7. In Norway, any Jesuit is prohibited by law from entering the country.

8. In Japan, all school children wear uniforms.

9. In the United States, one may legally have only one husband or wife at a time.
TOUGHMINDEDNESS (T) SCALE (Eysenck 1954)

Variable

This scale was not constructed as a measure of a specific personality variable but rather emerged from an attempt to discern the primary dimensions underlying people's social attitudes and beliefs. Factor analysis yielded two basic dimensions which the author has labeled "radicalism-conservatism" and "tendermindedness-toughmindedness."

Description

The original scale was composed of 40 five-point Likert-type items chosen from a pool of 500 attitude items. All items in the literature were included "which had been shown to have high saturations on any factor isolated by any method whatever." A factor analysis was carried out using Burt's Summation Method. The first factor, accounting for 18 percent of the variance, was labeled "radicalism-conservatism," and included 14 items; put together, these make up the R Scale. An orthogonal dimension emerged, accounting for 8 percent of the variance and labeled "tendermindedness-toughmindedness," which is assessed by the 14-item T Scale. Eleven of the 14 items in the T Scale are identical to those in the R Scale.

One point was awarded for agreement (of either degree) with the response key (see below) and a zero for disagreement or a neutral answer.

Sample

This scale was administered to 750 respondents: 250 were conservatives, 250 liberals, and 250 socialists. They were matched for sex and age (over or under 30); all were middleclass, urban Britihers. This group was obtained by Eysenck's students from contacts with family and friends, so it is not necessarily representative.

Reliability

The two scales (R and T) were divided randomly into halves (labeled R1, R2 and T1, T2 in the list below). The split-half correlation for the entire sample was .81 for the R Scale and .64 for the T Scale.

Validity

One rough index of validity was obtained by having students rate what they thought relatives and friends should answer. These agreed 98 percent with the actual ratings, but were probably contaminated by discussion with respondents, and so on.

In his 1954 book, Eysenck cites evidence that the T Scale is related to independent measures of introversion-extroversion. This supports his view that, whereas the R Scale measures attitude-content, the T Scale measures the effect of underlying personality dynamics on social attitudes.

Location


The scale would take about 10 minutes to complete.

In 1956, after the digestion of Eysenck's 1954 book, two sets of heated attacks on it appeared in the Psychological Bulletin, one set by Rokeach and Hanley (1956 a, b) and the other by Christie (1956 a, b). Eysenck replied to both (1956 a, b). The main criticisms included improper computations, unrepresentative sampling, unusual scoring techniques, and faulty interpretation of data. The last is most significant because it challenges Eysenck's interesting claim that Communists and Fascists—representatives of both ends of the R dimension—are about equally high on toughmindedness, a characteristic similar to authoritarianism and related to extroversion. Recapitulating this discussion is beyond the scope of this book, but we recommend that anyone planning to use this scale as it stands read it. Overall, it is our belief that Eysenck's (1954) theoretical position is interesting enough to encourage further work, even though improvement of both the T and R Scales may be necessary. The R Scale is further described in our main volume, Measures of Political Attitudes.
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TOUGHMINDEDNESS SCALE

(Agreement with R+ items indicates Radicalism)
(Agreement with T- items indicates Toughmindedness)

1. Colored people are innately inferior to white people \[ R_2^- \quad T_2^- \]

3. War is inherent in human nature. \[ R_2^- \quad T_2^- \]

5. Persons with serious hereditary defects and diseases should be compulsorily sterilized. \[ T_1^- \]

8. In the interests of peace, we must give up part of our national sovereignty. \[ R_1^+ \quad T_1^+ \]

9. Sunday-observance is old-fashioned, and should cease to govern our behavior. \[ R_2^+ \quad T_2^- \]

10. It is wrong that men should be permitted greater sexual freedom than women by society. \[ T_2^+ \]

12. Ultimately, private property should be abolished, and complete socialism introduced. \[ R_2^+ \]

13. Conscientious objectors are traitors to their country, and should be treated accordingly. \[ T_1^- \]

15. The laws against abortion should be abolished. \[ R_1^+ \quad T_1^- \]

16. Only by going back to religion can civilization hope to survive. \[ R_2^- \quad T_2^+ \]

23. Divorce laws should be altered to make divorce easier. \[ R_2^+ \quad T_1^- \]

26. Crimes of violence should be punished by flogging. \[ R_1^- \]

27. The nationalization of the great industries is likely to lead to inefficiency, bureaucracy, and stagnation. \[ R_1^- \]

28. It is right and proper that religious education in schools should be compulsory. \[ R_1^- \quad T_1^+ \]

29. Men and women have the right to find out whether they are sexually suited before marriage (e.g., by companionate marriage). \[ R_1^+ \quad T_2^- \]

36. The death penalty is barbaric, and should be abolished. \[ R_2^+ \quad T_2^+ \]

39. The Japanese are by nature a cruel people. \[ R_1^- \quad T_1^- \]
DOGMATISM SCALE (Rokeach 1956)

Variable
This scale is designed to measure individual differences in openness or closedness of belief systems. Rokeach states that the extent to which a person's belief system is open is "the extent to which the person can receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic merits, unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside". (Rokeach, 1960, p. 57)

Description
This scale has been revised several times in an attempt to improve the reliability and also to make use of the refinements in the theoretical formulation. (The attached copy of items includes forms D & F). Form D is composed of 66 6-point Likert-type items. Form E is composed of the 40 best items from these 66. A total of 89 items were used throughout the various revisions. Each item had to go beyond any specific belief content and penetrate the structure of how the belief was held. People who dogmatically hold viewpoints as diverse as Communism, Capitalism, or Catholicism, should all score on one end of the continuum on the D Scale.

The items on forms D & E can be grouped according to a variety of categories. These categories are listed on the attached copy of the items. Responses were scored along a + 3 to -3 agree-disagree scale, with the 0 point excluded. These scores were converted to a 1 to 7 scale by adding the constant 4 to each score. The range of possible scores is from 66-462 on form D, and from 40-280 on form E. A high score indicates a high degree of dogmatism.

Subjects
Form A was administered to 202 MSU students. 207 students in New York City colleges received form B. Form C was given to the 207 New York City college students and to two groups of MSU students, 153 and 186. Form D was administered to 137 students at University College in London. 80 students at Birbeck College (England) and 60 English workers received form E.

Reliability
The following split-half reliabilities were obtained for the different forms.
### Corrected Reliability of Successive Forms of the Dogmatism Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>MSU I</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>182.50</td>
<td>26.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>N.Y. Colleges</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>141.35</td>
<td>27.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(N.Y. Colleges</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>.84)*</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>19.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MSU II</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>126.92</td>
<td>20.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MSU III</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>128.34</td>
<td>19.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>English Colleges I</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>219.10</td>
<td>28.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>English Colleges II</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>152.80</td>
<td>26.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Workers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>175.80</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based upon a rescoring of the 36 best items out of the 43 items in form B.

### Validity

The following table presents the results of an item analysis on forms D and E.

#### Item Analysis of the Dogmatism Scale, Form D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Total Group (N=137)</th>
<th>Highs (N=37)</th>
<th>Lows (N=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Based upon the structure of dogmatism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. U.S. and Russia have nothing in common.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communism &amp; Catholicism have nothing in common.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My principles are different from most others.</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People bring up irrelevant issues.</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Belief in democracy run by most intelligent.</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Belief in free speech, but not for all.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Force is wrong, but sometimes necessary.</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Masses intelligent, but also stupid.</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Worst crime is to attack those of similar beliefs.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Guard against subversion from within.</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Groups tolerating diverse opinions can't exist.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Better knowledge of beliefs than disbeliefs.</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Certain &quot;isms&quot; really the same, not different.</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Total Group (N=137)</td>
<td>Highs (N=37)</td>
<td>Lows (N=37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*14. To know what's going on, rely on leaders.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*15. Reserve judgment until you hear leaders' opinion.</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*16. Pick friends who believe as you do.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Don't waste money on reading opposing views.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Keep young people away from confusing books.</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*19. Present unhappy. The future is what counts.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. To progress, return to glorious past.</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. For happiness in future, present injustice necessary.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*22. To accomplish mission, gamble all or nothing.</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*23. Most people don't understand what's going on.</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*24. Most people don't know what's good for them.</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Nothing new under the sun.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. If you understand, it's easy to predict future.</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Force necessary to advance ideal.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Based upon formal content of dogmatism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Total Group (N=137)</th>
<th>Highs (N=37)</th>
<th>Lows (N=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*28. Just a handful of great thinkers.</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*29. I hate some people because of what they stand for.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*30. A man without a cause hasn't lived.</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*31. Life meaningful when there is devotion to cause.</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*32. There is only one correct philosophy.</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*33. Person believing in too many causes is &quot;wishy-washy&quot;.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*34. To compromise is to betray own side.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*35. In religion, we should not compromise.</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*36. To consider only one's own happiness is selfish.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*37. To compromise is to appease.</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*38. Two kinds of people; those for, those against truth.</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*39. My blood boils when others won't admit they're wrong.</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*40. One who thinks of own happiness beneath contempt.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Total Group (N=137) M</th>
<th>Highs (N=37) M</th>
<th>Lows (N=37) M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>337. Most printed ideas aren't worth paper printed on.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I'm too critical of others' ideas.</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Based upon the function of dogmatism.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Man on his own is helpless and miserable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. World is a lonesome place.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Most people don't give a &quot;damn&quot; for others.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I want to find someone to solve my problems.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Natural to fear future.</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. So much to do, so little time to do it in.</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Once I get wound up, I can't stop.</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. I repeat myself to make sure I'm understood.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. I don't listen.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. I interrupt others to put across my own views.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Better be dead hero than live coward.</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Hardest battles are with myself.</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. I'm no good.</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. I'm afraid people will find out what I'm really like.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Secret ambition is to become a great man.</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Main thing in life is to do something important.</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. If given chance I'd benefit world.</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Greatness more important than happiness.</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. People won't practice what they preach.</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Most people failures and the system is responsible.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Strangers look at me critically.</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Only natural to have guilty conscience.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. People say insulting things about me.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. I'm talked about.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Item retained in final 40-item scale.
The following table presents the intercorrelation among Dogmatism, Authoritarianism, and Ethnocentrism. (D, F, and E, respectively.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D,F</th>
<th>F,E</th>
<th>D,E</th>
<th>(D,F) E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU I</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y. Colleges Jewish sub-sample</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU II</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU III</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Colleges I</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Colleges II</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Workers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There were 21 Jews in the English colleges I group, 11 Jews in the English Colleges II group, one Jew in the English worker group. These Ss were excluded in computing the correlations between F and E, and between D and E (N=116, 69, 59, respectively).

The following table compares different political groups in England on the Dogmatism Scale and other variables.

Comparisons Among Various Political Groups in England on Opinionation, Dogmatism, F and E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Left Opinionation</th>
<th>Right Opinionation</th>
<th>Total Opinionation</th>
<th>Dogmatism</th>
<th>F Scale</th>
<th>Ethnocentrism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Conservatives</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56.15</td>
<td>83.04</td>
<td>139.20</td>
<td>258.76</td>
<td>115.51</td>
<td>29.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Liberals</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68.67</td>
<td>68.18</td>
<td>136.85</td>
<td>242.91</td>
<td>98.40</td>
<td>24.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attleeitees</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>76.78</td>
<td>59.15</td>
<td>135.94</td>
<td>252.60</td>
<td>101.79</td>
<td>22.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bevanites</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>96.52</td>
<td>44.52</td>
<td>141.05</td>
<td>249.78</td>
<td>90.37</td>
<td>23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communists</td>
<td>13b</td>
<td>107.86</td>
<td>46.62</td>
<td>154.48</td>
<td>261.62</td>
<td>82.93</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The N on which the mean E scores are based are 51, 16, 23, 14, and 10 for groups 1,2,3,4, and 5, respectively. Jewish Ss were excluded from these computations.

* The N for the English Colleges I Is 137. Seven of these gave "other" political affiliations (e.g., Anarchist, Trotskyite, ex-Communist, Celtic Alliance). Five of the 13 Communists were from English Colleges II, and the full 60-item Dogmatism Scale was scored (form D) for these five Ss for purposes of the present analysis.
Different religious groups in the New York college students and the MSU students are compared regarding their scores on the Dogmatism Scale and other variables.

Comparisons Among Various Religious Groups in the New York Colleges Group on Opinionation, Dogmatism, F and E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Left Opinionation</th>
<th>Right Opinionation</th>
<th>Total Opinionation</th>
<th>Dogmatism</th>
<th>F Scale</th>
<th>Ethnocentrism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Catholic</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58.26</td>
<td>86.37</td>
<td>144.64</td>
<td>147.38</td>
<td>105.24</td>
<td>26.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Protestants</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56.71</td>
<td>88.84</td>
<td>145.55</td>
<td>138.34</td>
<td>95.80</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jews</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>70.18</td>
<td>76.41</td>
<td>146.59</td>
<td>139.53</td>
<td>94.73</td>
<td>20.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94.35</td>
<td>61.01</td>
<td>155.36</td>
<td>147.20</td>
<td>93.69</td>
<td>18.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons Among Various Religious Groups In the MSU I Group on Opinionation, Dogmatism, F and E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Left Opinionation</th>
<th>Right Opinionation</th>
<th>Total Opinionation</th>
<th>Dogmatism</th>
<th>F Scale</th>
<th>Ethnocentrism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Catholics</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58.43</td>
<td>94.71</td>
<td>153.14</td>
<td>191.10</td>
<td>109.79</td>
<td>34.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Protestants</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>58.47</td>
<td>86.41</td>
<td>144.88</td>
<td>180.10</td>
<td>99.24</td>
<td>29.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. None</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67.73</td>
<td>76.67</td>
<td>144.40</td>
<td>174.60</td>
<td>91.60</td>
<td>24.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dogmatism and F Scale scores were both correlated with 2 measures of liberalism-conservatism (the PEC Scale and a measure derived from the Opinionation Scale).
The Dogmatism and F Scales in Relation to Liberalism-Conservatism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(R.O.-L.O.)</td>
<td>(R.O.-L.O.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU I</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y. Colleges</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU II</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU III</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Colleges I</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Colleges II</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Workers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Right-opinionation score minus left-opinionation score. Positive differences indicate a rightist orientation; negative differences indicate a leftist orientation.
b The P.E.C. Scale was not employed in the English research.

In addition to the above, an attempt was also made to validate this scale by the method of "known groups." In the first study professors "nominated" high and low dogmatic students from graduate students working with them (a variety of different fields was used). No differences in either Dogmatism or Opinionation were found between the highs and the lows. In the second study, graduate students in psychology were asked to "nominate" other graduate students (outside the field of psychology) as being high or low in Dogmatism. The highs scored significantly higher on both Dogmatism and Opinionation. However the highs also scored significantly higher on the E and F Scales. Consequently, the statement that the D and O Scales measure general authoritarianism and intolerance as compared with the authoritarianism and intolerance of the right measured by the F and E scales, is not supported by the data.

Location: Rokeach, M., Political and religious dogmatism: an alternative to the authoritarian personality, Psychological Monograph, No. 425, 1956, 70, No. 18.

Administration: This test is self administered. An estimated 30 minutes would be needed to complete form D and 20 minutes to complete form E.
Results and
Comments: The author constructed this scale to be a measure of general
authoritarianism, or closed mindedness. This scale differs from the
F scale in that general authoritarianism is viewed as concerning
the way an individual adheres to a belief and not the specific
content of that belief. The author claims that the F Scale is
concerned with the specific content of a belief, that is
authoritarianism of the right, fascism, etc.

The general trends in the data tend to support the author's
distinction between the variables measured by his scales and those
measured by the California scales. The fact that the correlations
between D and E are consistently smaller than the correlations
between F and E, and the fact that the correlations between D and F
are only slightly reduced when E is held constant, lead the author
to conclude that the D Scale measures differences in authoritarianism
independent of the degree of ethnic intolerance. Dogmatism
correlated negligibly with liberalism-Conservatism in every group
tested. These correlations are always smaller than those between
the F Scale and Liberalism-Conservatism.

From these results, the author concludes that the D Scale comes
closer to measuring general authoritarianism than does the F Scale.
Dogmatism correlates positively with both right and left
opinionation which are negligibly or sometimes negatively correlated
with each others. The E and F scales correlate relatively high
with right opinionation, but negligibly or negatively with left
opinionation. In every sample Dogmatism correlates more highly with
total opinionation than with either left or right. The E, F, and
P.E.C. scales correlate less with total opinionation than with right
opinionation. These results all indicate that the author's scale
has accomplished the purpose for which it was constructed.

References: Rokeach, M. Political and religious dogmatism: an alternative to
the authoritarian personality, Psychological Monograph, No. 425,
1956, 43, p. 70, no. 18.

Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind, New York: Basic Books,
1960.
DOGMATISM SCALE

Form D - consists of all following items
Form E - contains * items

A. ISOLATION WITHIN AND BETWEEN BELIEF AND DISBELIEF SYSTEMS.

A.1. Accentuation of differences between the belief and the disbelief systems.

*1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.
2. Communism and Catholicism have nothing in common.
3. The principles I have come to believe in are quite different from those believed in by most people.

A.2. The perception of irrelevance.

4. In a heated discussion people have a way of bringing up irrelevant issues rather than sticking to the main issue.

A.3. The coexistence of contradictions within the belief system.

*5. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.
*6. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.
7. While the use of force is wrong by and large, it is sometimes the only way possible to advance a noble ideal.
8. Even though I have a lot of faith in the intelligence and wisdom of the common man I must say that the masses behave stupidly at times.

B. RELATIVE DEGREES OF DIFFERENTIATION OF THE BELIEF AND THE DISBELIEF SYSTEM.

B.1. Relative amount of knowledge possessed.

*9. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.

B.2. Differentiation within the disbelief system.

10. There are certain "isms" which are really the same even though those who believe in these "isms" try to tell you they are different.

C. SPECIFIC CONTENT OF PRIMITIVE BELIEFS.

C.1. Beliefs regarding the aloneness, isolation, and helplessness of man.

*11. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.
*12. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.
*13. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.
*14. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.

C.2a. Beliefs regarding the uncertainty of the future.

*15. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.
C.2b. A feeling of urgency.

*16. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.

C.2c. Compulsive repetition of ideas and arguments.

*17. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.
*18. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.
*19. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what others are saying.
20. In a discussion I sometimes interrupt others too much in my eagerness to put across my own point of view.

C.3a. Need for martyrdom.

*21. It is better to be a dead hero than a live coward.

C.3b. Conflict within the self.

22. My hardest battles are with myself.

C.3c. Self-depreciation.

23. At times I think I am no good at all.
24. I am afraid of people who want to find out what I'm really like for fear they'll be disappointed in me.

C.4. Self-aggrandizement as a defense against self-inadequacy.

C.4a. Concern with power and status.

*25. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.
*26. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.
*27. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.
28. If I had to choose between happiness and greatness, I'd choose greatness.


29. It's all too true that people just won't practice what they preach.

C.5. Paranoid outlook on life.

30. Most people are failures and it is the system which is responsible for this.
31. I have often felt that strangers were looking at me critically.
32. It is only natural for a person to have a guilty conscience.
33. People say insulting and vulgar things about me.
34. I am sure I am being talked about.

D. FORMAL CONTENT OF THE INTERMEDIATE BELIEF REGION.

D.1a. Beliefs in positive and negative authority.

*35. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.
*36. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.
D.1b. **Belief in a cause.**

*37. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.
*38. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.
*39. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.
*40. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.
*41. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.
*42. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.
*43. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.

**44. To compromise with our political opponents is to be guilty of appeasement.**

D.2. **Intolerance.**

D.2a. **Toward the renegade.**

*45. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.
*46. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.
*47. A group which tolerates too many differences of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.

D.2b. **Toward the disbeliever.**

*48. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.
*49. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.
*50. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.
*51. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.
52. I sometimes have a tendency to be too critical of the ideas of others.

E. **INTERRELATIONS AMONG PRIMITIVE, INTERMEDIATE, AND PERIPHERAL BELIEFS.**

E.1. **Tendency to make a party line change.**

*53. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.
*54. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.

E.2. **Narrowing: selective avoidance of contact with facts, events, etc. incongruent with one's belief-disbelief system.**

*55. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.
56. There's no use wasting your money on newspapers which you know in advance are just plain propaganda.
57. Young people should not have too easy access to books which are likely to confuse them.
F. ATTITUDE TOWARD THE PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE.

*58. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.
39. It is by returning to our glorious and forgotten past that real social progress can be achieved.
60. To achieve the happiness of mankind in the future it is sometimes necessary to put up with injustices in the present.

G. KNOWING THE FUTURE.

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

H. BELIEF IN FORCE AS A WAY TO REVISE THE PRESENT.

66. It is sometimes necessary to resort to force to advance an ideal one strongly believes in.
SHORT DOGMATISM SCALE (Schulze 1962)

Variable
This scale was designed to measure dogmatism as conceived by Rokeach (1960) with fewer items than appear in the original scale (40).

Description
Guttman's scalogram analysis was used to select the ten items from Rokeach's D-Scale which best met the criteria of unidimensionality, item consistency, and reproducibility. Two samples were used to test the validity of the resulting 10-item scale (D10 Scale).

Sample
The first sample consisted of one hundred questionnaires which were randomly selected from 227 administered by Bonier (1957) in a study of the relationship between time perspective and dogmatism. (The subjects presumably were college students.) The second sample comprised 172 students in introductory sociology at Michigan State University.

Reliability
The D10 yielded a reproducibility coefficient (CR) of .83. Although not as high as the .90 which Guttman recommended, this CR was claimed to be as high as one could get using a 10-item subset of the D-Scale. The author attributes the low CR to the intrusion of variables such as anxiety, rigidity, authoritarianism, self-rejection and paranoia. Hence, this scale is not unidimensional, but neither is the original D-Scale.

Validity
Two indicants of validity were reported, the correlation between the D and D10 scales and the correlation between the latter and measures of anxiety. Fruchter, Rokeach, and Novak (1958) have reported that "dogmatism was found to have factorial content in common with anxiety".

In the first sample, D and D10 correlated .76, and D10 correlated .19 with the Heineman (1953) anxiety scale. The 40-item D-scale correlated .32 with this measure of anxiety.

In the second sample, D and D10 correlated .73, but when the overlapping items were removed from D this fell to .46. The correlation between D10 and the Welch (1952) anxiety scale was .29; between the 40-item D-scale and Welch anxiety, .37; and between the nonoverlapping 30 items and anxiety .35.

Location

Administration
This scale is self-administered and should take less than 10 minutes to complete. For suitable instructions, see those used with the D-Scale.
Results and Comments

Although this scale has adequate credentials, it would be worthwhile to explore its utility in further detail before relying heavily upon it. In both of the samples tested the 10 items were included in a large questionnaire which contained the remainder of the D-Scale items and an anxiety scale. Part of the evidence for validity could be based on a consistent set that would not be maintained were the 10 items to stand alone. Also, test-retest measures should be obtained to indicate the reliability of such a short scale.
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(The ten items are listed in descending order of "difficulty", i.e., the smallest number of respondents agreed with the first).

1. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lovely place.

2. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.

3. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.

4. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.

5. Most people just don't know what's good for them.

6. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.

7. The worst crime a person can commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.

8. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what is going on is to rely upon leaders or experts who can be trusted.

9. 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.

10. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, I sometimes have the ambition to become a great man like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.
SHORT DOGMATISM SCALE (Troldahl and Powell 1965)

Variable
This scale was designed to reduce the length of Rokeach's (1960) dogmatism scale so that it could be included in survey studies. The authors were also interested in discovering whether Schulze's (1962) D1O Scale, developed from college student samples, could be considered appropriate for more heterogeneous samples.

Description
The 40-item dogmatism scale was included in an interview survey of Boston suburbanites and also in a field study in Lansing, Michigan. In the Boston study interviewers read the items to respondents and asked two questions: whether they agreed or disagreed, and then how much they agreed or disagreed in the following terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Agree a little</td>
<td>1. Disagree a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agree on the whole</td>
<td>2. Disagree on the whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Agree very much</td>
<td>3. Disagree very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Don't know" responses were coded as zeros.

In the Lansing study the scale was self-administered, but the same answer categories were used. The authors used the Boston study to select the best items to be included in shorter scales, and then cross-validated these items with the Lansing results. The items finally selected for inclusion had to meet the following criteria:
1) Average item-total score correlation coefficients were computed for each item, weighing the interview and self-administered versions equally (and employing Fisher's Z transformation). The 20 items selected were listed in order according to the coefficients.
2) An item was selected only if its item-total score correlation reached or exceeded .30 in each study.
3) One item meeting these criteria was dropped because it seemed difficult for people to understand in the interview study.

Sample
The Boston sample included 227 suburbanites who subscribed to a county agricultural newspaper. In the Lansing study respondents were 84 adults sampled by quota-control and stratified by social status.

Reliability/ Homogeneity
In the Boston study a "corrected" split-half reliability coefficient of .84 was obtained for the 40-item scale. Item-total score correlations ranged from .18 to .59, with seven of .50 or above and 19 of .40 or above. Short forms of the scale, containing 10, 15 and 20 items, were selected on the basis of these correlations.
On the basis of the Lansing cross-validation, the following reliabilities are approximated for each version of the scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 items</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 items</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 items</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 items</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity

The short forms scores were correlated with total 40-item scores in each sample studied, yielding the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Data</th>
<th>Lansing Cross-Validation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-item vs. 40-item score</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-item vs. 40-item score</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-item vs. 40-item score</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location


Administration

This scale is self-administered and takes about 45 seconds per item to complete, hence 7½, 11½/4, and 15 minutes for the 10-, 15-, and 20-item versions, respectively. In the list below the first 10 items comprise the 10-item scale; the first 15, the 15-item scale.

Results and Comments

This study serves to emphasize the importance of sampling in the construction of a scale: Only 2 of Schulze's 10 items, selected on the basis of college student's scores, fell among the best 10 in the present field research.

The authors suggest that the 20-item scale can be used without reluctance in field studies, while the shorter forms should be used only where a relatively gross estimate of dogmatism is required.

Unfortunately, no information on validity other than correlations with the total dogmatism scale scores is given. Hence, this scale's relationships to anxiety and other theoretically relevant variables and behaviors remain to be explored.
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SHORT-FORM DOGMATISM SCALE

1. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or expects who can be trusted. .60
2. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong. .59
3. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth. .59
4. Most people just don't know what's good for them. .56
5. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct. .56
6. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent. .54
7. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important. .53
8. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems. .52
9. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on. .51
10. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature. .51
11. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful. .49
12. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others. .48
13. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side. .47
14. 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. .47
15. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts. .45
16. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common. .44
17. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.

18. 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.

19. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.

20. It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.
The Opinionation Scale was designed to measure general intolerance, or the extent to which we accept others because they agree with our opinions and reject others because they disagree with our opinions.

The final forms of the scale, form C, used in the U.S., and form Ce, used in England, both consist of 40 six-point Likert-type items. These two forms are essentially the same as the two earlier forms, forms A and B, in that half of the items are classed as "opinionated" rejection (speaker rejects particular belief and therefore rejects all those who accept it) and half are classed as "opinionated acceptance" (speaker holds certain belief and therefore accepts all those who accept it). To keep the scale free from any specific ideological content, half of the items in each item group were designed to tap right opinionation and the remainder, left opinionation. The final tests contain four groups of ten statements each: opinionated rejected-right opinionation, opinionated rejected-left opinionation, opinionated acceptance-right opinionation, and opinionated acceptance-left opinionation. Responses to forms C and Ce were scored along a +3 to -3 agree-disagree continuum with the 0 point excluded. These scores were converted to a 1 to 7 scale by adding the constant 4 to each answer. The scores can range from 40 to 280. High scores indicate a high degree of opinionation.

Form A contained 20 pairs of statements, each pair containing one left-opinionated statement and the corresponding right-opinionated statement. The subject rated these statements on the usual six-point Likert Scale. Form B contained the best 16 pairs from form A. These items were rated on a three point agree-disagree scale.

Form A was administered to 202 Michigan State University students and 207 students from New York University, form B was administered to 153 Michigan State University students, form C was administered to 186 Michigan State University students, and form Ce was administered to 137 students at University College, London, to 80 students at Birkbeck College, England, and to 60 English workers.

The following table presents the obtained reliabilities for the different forms of the Opinionation Scale.
Corrected Reliabilities of the Total Opinionation Scale (T.O.),
Left Opinionation (L.O.), Right Opinionation (R.O.),
And Liberalism-Conservatism (R.O.-L.O.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>MSU I</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>N.Y. Colleges</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>MSU II</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>English Colleges I</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Colleges II</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Workers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity
The following table presents the results of an item analysis of form C for the Michigan State University group of 186.

Item Analysis of the Opinionation Scale,
Form C for the MSU III Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Total Group (N=186)</th>
<th>Higns (N=47)</th>
<th>Lows (N=47)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Opinionation, Opinionated Rejection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pro-Roosevelt</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No race differences</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pro Truman's Fair Deal</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anti-loyalty oaths</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Russia not imperialistic</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Anti-real estate interests</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Government &amp; education not Red-infiltrated</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Anti-universal military training</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Anti-government support of religion</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Anti-McCarthy</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Opinionation, Opinionated Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pro-Rosenbergs</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Anti-MacArthur</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Anti-big business</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Pro-social security</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Anti-Congressional investigating committees</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Total Group (N=186)</td>
<td>Higns (N=47)</td>
<td>Lows (N=47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Anti-American Legion</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Pro-soak-the-rich taxes</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Rich getting richer, poor getting poorer</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Capitalism causes depressions and wars</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Anti-Hoover</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Opinionation, Opinionated Rejection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Anti-socialized medicine</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Pro-Eisenhower</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Reds yell about civil rights</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Anti-Labor</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Anti-Democratic Party</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Pro-God</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Anti-government ownership of utilities</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. U.S. no warmonger</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Anti-socialism</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Anti-Red China</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Opinionation, Opinionated Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. U.S. rearms to stop aggression</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Prejudice removable by education</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. U.S. should send military aid</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Pro-Churchill</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. U.S. rearms to preserve freedom</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Pro-Chiang Kai Shek</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. U.N. a failure</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Businessman contributes most to society</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Pro-Franco</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Alger Hiss a traitor</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table presents the obtained correlations of Left, Right, and Total Opinionation with the Dogmatism Scale, the F Scale, the E Scale, and the PEC Scale.
## Left, Right, and Total Opinionation: Correlation with Other Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Dogmatism and--</th>
<th>F Scale and--</th>
<th>Ethnocentrism(^a) and--</th>
<th>P.E.C. Scale(^b) and--</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left Opin.</td>
<td>Right Opin.</td>
<td>Total Opin.</td>
<td>Left Opin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU I</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y. Colleges</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU II</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU III</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Colleges I</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Colleges II</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Workers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)The N's for the English Colleges I, II, and English Worker samples are 116, 69, and 59 respectively, since Jewish Ss were omitted.

\(^b\)Not given in England.
The following tables present the mean scores achieved, by different religious groupings on right, left, and total opinionation in adding to other tests.

Comparisons Among Various Religious Groups in the MSU I Group on Opinionation, Dogmatism, F and E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Left Opinionation</th>
<th>Right Opinionation</th>
<th>Total Opinionation</th>
<th>Dogmatism</th>
<th>F Scale</th>
<th>Ethnocentrism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Catholic</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58.43</td>
<td>94.71</td>
<td>153.14</td>
<td>191.10</td>
<td>109.79</td>
<td>34.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Protestants</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>58.47</td>
<td>86.41</td>
<td>144.88</td>
<td>180.10</td>
<td>99.24</td>
<td>29.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. None</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67.73</td>
<td>76.67</td>
<td>144.40</td>
<td>174.60</td>
<td>91.60</td>
<td>24.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons Among Various Religious Groups
In the New York Colleges Group on Opinionation, Dogmatism, F and E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Left Opinionation</th>
<th>Right Opinionation</th>
<th>Total Opinionation</th>
<th>Dogmatism</th>
<th>F Scale</th>
<th>Ethnocentrism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Catholics</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58.26</td>
<td>86.37</td>
<td>144.64</td>
<td>147.38</td>
<td>105.24</td>
<td>26.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Protestants</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46.71</td>
<td>88.84</td>
<td>145.55</td>
<td>138.34</td>
<td>95.80</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jews</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>70.18</td>
<td>76.41</td>
<td>146.59</td>
<td>139.53</td>
<td>94.73</td>
<td>20.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94.35</td>
<td>61.01</td>
<td>155.36</td>
<td>147.20</td>
<td>93.69</td>
<td>18.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following procedure was used to decide if a statement should be labeled "left" or "right". A given statement was considered "right" if it could be placed to the "right" of its ideological opposite. The statement of its ideological opposite could then be considered "left". To check this means of classifying statements, two colleagues were asked to rate each statement as either "left" or "right". Both men agreed 100% with the author.
Location  Rokeach, M.  Political and religious dogmatism, an alternative to the authoritarian personality, Psychological Monographs, 1956, 43(18), 70.

Administration  Estimated administration time is 20 minutes.

Results and Comments  The following table presents the means and s.d. achieved by the different groups of subjects on the different forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Left Opinionation</th>
<th>Right Opinionation</th>
<th>Total Opinionation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opinionation</td>
<td>Opinionation</td>
<td>Opinionation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>MSU I</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>59.20</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>87.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.Y. Colleges</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>79.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>MSU II</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>MSU III</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>61.17</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>80.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>English Colleges I</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>77.77</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>67.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Colleges II</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76.60</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>62.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Workers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75.40</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>80.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the E (Ethnocentrism) Scale is considered to be a measure of intolerance of the right, this scale is designed to be a measure of general intolerance. The Opinionation Scale contains a broad range of topics and attempts to assess the structure of one's intolerance rather than its specific content.

One of the more interesting findings of this investigation is the difference in correlations between the Left and Right-Opinionation Scales for different samples. Michigan State University students had correlations of -.22, .09, .00. New York University students had correlations of -.51. English groups had correlations of -.65, -.61, and -.62. This finding would suggest that there are sharp differences in organization of attitudes among these three groups, regarding the left-right dimension.

Opinionated Rejection - Left

1. It is quite stupid to say that the Bevanites follow the Communist line.
2. A person must be pretty stupid if he still believes in differences between races.
3. There are two kinds of people who opposed the Labour Government post-war programme: the selfish and the stupid.
4. A person must be pretty shortsighted if he thinks that the Conservatives represent the best interest of the British people.
5. It is the people who believe everything they read in the papers who are convinced that Russia is pursuing a ruthless policy of imperialist aggression.
6. It is mainly those who support the viewpoint put out by the landlord who believe that rents should be increased.
7. A person must be pretty gullible if he really believes that the Communists have actually infiltrated into the teaching profession.
8. It's mostly those who want a third World War who want to rearm Western Germany.
9. It is very foolish to advocate government support of religious education.
10. Only a simple-minded fool would think that the present Colonial Secretary is interested in Freedom.

Opinionated Rejection - Right

21. It is simply incredible that anyone should believe that Dr. Jagan had the interest of the people of British Guiana at heart.
22. A person must be very ignorant if he thinks that Churchill is going to let big business run this country.
23. It's the Communists and fellow travellers who are always bringing up the issue of freedom for the Colonies.
24. It's the fellow travellers or Communists who are always going on about the right to strike.
25. It is foolish to think that the Labour party is really the party of the common man.
26. You just can't help but feel sorry for the person who believes that the world could exist without a Creator.
27. It's usually the trouble-makers who talk about state ownership.
28. Only a misguided idealist would believe that the Soviet Union is for peace.
29. It's mostly the noisy radicals who try to tell us that we will be better off under socialism.
30. It's the agitators and left-wingers who want to get Red China into the United Nations right away.

Opinionated Acceptance - Left

11. It's perfectly clear to any thinking person that the execution of the Rosenbergs has done the United States more harm than good.
12. Any person with even a brain in his head knows that it would be dangerous to let our country be run by men like Lord Beaverbrook.
13. The truth of the matter is this: It is big business which wants to continue the cold war.
14. Make no mistake about it! The best way to achieve security is for the government to guarantee full employment.
15. It's perfectly clear to all decent people that all this fuss about communism does more harm than good.
16. Thoughtful persons know that the Tories are not really interested in democracy.
17. It's perfectly clear to any thinking person that the way to solve our financial problems is by soak-the-rich taxation.
18. It's all too true that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer.
19. History clearly shows that it is the private enterprise system which is at the root of depression and wars.
20. Anyone who truly understands America will tell you that the sooner we stop following in their footsteps the better off we will be.

Opinionated Acceptance - Right

31. Any intelligent person can plainly see that the real reason Britain is spending so much for defense is to stop aggression.
32. Plain common sense tells you that nationalization of industry has gone far enough.
33. Anyone who is really for democracy knows very well that the only way for Britain to avoid revolution and civil war is to support American foreign policy.
34. History will clearly show that Churchill's victory over the Labour Party in 1951 was a step forward for the British people.
35. The American re-armament program is clear and positive proof that they are willing to make sacrifices to preserve their freedom.
36. This much is certain: The only way is to wipe out the Mau Mau terrorists.
37. It's already crystal clear that the United Nations is a failure.
38. A study of British history clearly shows that it is the British merchant who has contributed most to our society.
39. Even a person of average intelligence knows that to defend ourselves against aggression we should welcome any kind of help—including Franco's.
40. Anyone who knows what's going on will tell you that the Foreign Office diplomats who disappeared in 1952 were traitors to their country.
Opinionated Rejection - Left

1. It's just plain stupid to say that it was Franklin Roosevelt who got us into the war.
2. A person must be pretty stupid if he still believes in differences between races.
3. There are two kinds of people who fought Truman's Fair Deal Program: the selfish and the stupid.
4. A person must be pretty short-sighted if he believes that college professors should be forced to take special loyalty oaths.
5. It's the people who believe everything they read in the papers who are convinced that Russia is pursuing a ruthless policy of imperialist aggression.
6. It's mainly those who believe the propaganda put out by the real estate interests who are against a federal slum clearance program.
7. A person must be pretty gullible if he really believes that the Communists have actually infiltrated into government and education.
8. It's mostly those who are itching for a fight who want a universal military training law.
9. It is very foolish to advocate government support of religion.
10. Only a simple-minded fool would think that Senator McCarthy is a defender of American democracy.

Opinionated Rejection - Right

21. It's simply incredible that anyone should believe that socialized medicine will actually help solve our health problems.
22. A person must be pretty ignorant if he thinks that Eisenhower is going to let the "big boys" run this country.
23. It's the fellow travellers or Reds who keep yelling all the time about labor's right to strike.
24. It's the radicals and labor racketeers who yell the loudest about labor's right to strike.
25. It is foolish to think that the Democratic Party is really the party of the common man.
26. You just can't help but feel sorry for the person who believes that the world could exist without a Creator.
27. It's usually the trouble-makers who talk about government ownership of public utilities.
28. Only a misguided idealist would believe that the United States is an imperialist warmonger.
29. It's mostly the noisy liberals who try to tell us that we will be better off under socialism.
30. It's the agitators and left-wingers who are trying to get Red China into the United Nations.

Opinionated Acceptance - Left

11. It's perfectly clear that the decision to execute the Rosenbergs has done us more harm than good.
12. Any person with even a brain in his head knows that it would be dangerous to let our country be run by men like General MacArthur.
13. The truth of the matter is this! It is big business which wants to continue the cold war.
14. Make no mistake about it! The best way to achieve security is for the government to guarantee jobs for all.
15. It's perfectly clear to all decent Americans that Congressional committees which investigate communism do more harm than good.
16. Thoughtful persons know that the American Legion is not really interested in democracy.
17. It's perfectly clear to all thinking persons that the way to solve our financial problem is by a soak-the-rich program.
18. It's all too true that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer.
19. History clearly shows that it is the private enterprise system which is at the root of depressions and wars.
20. Anyone who's old enough to remember the Hoover days will tell you that it's a lucky thing Hoover was never re-elected.

**Opinionated Acceptance - Right**

31. Any intelligent person can plainly see that the real reason America is rearming is to stop aggression.
32. Plain common sense tells you that prejudice can be removed by education, not legislation.
33. Anyone who is really for democracy knows very well that the only way for America to head off revolution and civil war in backward countries is to send military aid.
34. History will clearly show that Churchill's victory over the Labour Party in 1951 was a step forward for the British people.
35. The American rearmament program is clear and positive proof that we are willing to sacrifice to preserve our freedom.
36. This much is certain! The only way to defeat tyranny in China is to support Chiang Kai-Shek.
37. It's already crystal-clear that the United Nations is a failure.
38. A study of American history clearly shows that it is the American businessman who has contributed most to our society.
39. Even a person of average intelligence knows that to defend ourselves against aggression we should welcome all help—including Franco's Spain.
40. Anyone who knows what's going on will tell you that Alger Hiss was a traitor who betrayed his country.
INTELLECTUAL CONVICTION SCALE (Rokeach and Eglash, 1956)

Variable
This scale is designed to distinguish people with intellectual convictions or rational beliefs from those with dogmatic convictions or beliefs held on other than logical rational grounds.

Description
The scale consists of 20 six-point Likert-type items. It is based on the assumption that persons with strong intellectual convictions will reject statements of acceptably rational beliefs when such statements are supported by unacceptable reasons or rationalizations.

In a preliminary study, 52 "intellectual conviction" statements were administered to 101 subjects. The 20 most discriminating items were retained for the final scale. No further information about the selection of these items was given. The response alternatives required expression of agreement or disagreement on a scale ranging from +3 to -3 with 0 excluded. Negative scores were eliminated by the addition of +4 to each item score. Possible range of total scores is thus 20-140, with a high score indicating less intellectual conviction.

Sample
All subjects were college sophomores in social science or introductory psychology classes. One hundred and one received the original 52 items. Two samples of 153 and 186 received the final 20 items, along with other tests designed to measure authoritarianism, rigidity, dogmatism, ethnocentrism, opinionation, political-economic conservatism, and anxiety. (Scales used were those constructed by the authors of California Study, and by Gough, Rokeach, and Welsh).

Reliability/ Homogeneity
The split-half reliability for the sample of 101 on the 52 items was .93 (corrected). The corrected reliability for the two samples of 153 and 186 on the 20 item scale was .76 and .73, respectively.

Validity
The Intellectual Conviction Scale was correlated with the other measures administered as shown in the following table.
### Study I (N=153) vs. Study II (N=186)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study I</th>
<th>Study II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Conviction</td>
<td>.76*</td>
<td>.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism (P Scale)</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>-.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigidity</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einstellung (Luchins Test)</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinionation--Total Scale</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Opinionation</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Opinionation</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinionated Rejection</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinionated Acceptance</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism (Right Opinionation-Left Opinionation)</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism (PEC Scale)</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Corrected by Spearman-Brown formula.

** Point bi-serial correlation (N=72).

All correlations were negative and significant at the .05 level. Notice that the Intellectual Conviction Scale correlated -.27 with the Einstellung Problem Test. This correlation is of special interest since these problems are a "behavioral" measure of "mental set" rather than a "paper and pencil" measure as are the other scales used to assess validity.

** Location **


** Administration **

Estimated administration time is ten minutes.

** Results and Comments **

Despite the evidence for the reliability and validity of this scale, it does have one potentially serious limitation. By the very nature of the scale's items, it does no more than identify instances where a rationalization is accepted. In short, if agreement with the scale may be a good criterion for the absence of intellectual conviction, disagreement with the scale items does not necessarily indicate the presence of intellectual conviction. The assumption that individuals rejecting an item have done so only because they do not accept the rationalization supporting that item may not be correct. The authors acknowledge that validating one scale against another which uses the same measuring techniques is not as meaningful a validation as one would desire. The obtained correlations could be the result of intelligence or response set. The low but statistically significant correlation of the scale with the Einstellung Problems, an independent measure of mental set, is good supporting validation evidence.
Even considering its limitations, this scale is based on an interesting theoretical notion, and further research to determine the possible SES and response set biases involved in score interpretations can easily be carried out.
INTELLECTUAL CONVICTION SCALE

1. The reason we should show consideration for others is that they will reciprocate and show consideration for us.

2. Radio and TV programs should employ only loyal Americans, so as not to lose their audiences.

3. What is wrong with socialization, as seen in England, is that it results in severe rationing.

4. The reason you should not criticize others is that they will turn around and criticize you.

5. The American economic and political system is preferable to the Russian, because the Soviet system means long hours at poor wages.

6. The fallacy in Hitler's theories is shown by the fact that, after all, he lost the war.

7. The reason that criticism is a poor policy is that it prevents you from making and keeping friends.

8. Do unto others as they do unto you.

9. It's better not to talk about people behind their back, because sooner or later it gets back to them, and you get a reputation as a gossip.

10. Negroes deserve equal treatment, because there is as yet no scientific evidence showing there is any real difference in body odors.

11. The fact that God exists is proven by the fact that so many millions of people believe in Him.

12. The trouble with Communism is that, in all of human history, it has never worked.

13. Taxation without representation is wrong because sooner or later people rebel.

14. If a man fails to practice what he preaches, there's something wrong with what he preaches.

15. You should only criticize others when you are above reproach yourself.

16. The reason it's better to let people make up their own mind is because they won't follow your advice anyway.

17. Whether it's all right to manipulate people or not, it is certainly all right when it's for their own good.

18. Appreciation of others is a healthy attitude, since it is the only way to have them appreciate you.
19. Generosity is a healthy way of life, because he who casts his bread upon the waters shall have it returned ten-fold.

20. Whether one approves of filibustering or not, it is all right if it's for a good cause.
CHAPTER 6 - OTHER SOCIO-POLITICAL ATTITUDES

By and large, the scales in this chapter belong in our major volume, Measures of Political Attitudes. It can be seen by the recent dates of these scales, however, that they became available (or came to our attention) only after this volume was in print. On the other hand the first three scales are more social-psychological than political in nature. The seven scales are:

1. National Involvement Scales (DeLamater et al. 1968)
2. Beliefs about Distribution of Power (Form and Rytina 1969)
3. Social Responsibility Scale (Berkowitz and Lutterman 1968)
4. New Left Scale (Christie et al. 1969)
5. Radicalism-Conservatism (Comrey and Newmeyer 1965)
6. Inputs to the Political System (Milbrath 1968)
7. Opinion Leadership (Scheuch 1960)

The DeLamater et al. scales have the most advanced underlying theoretical rationale of the four. However, their internal consistency seems quite low and it is unclear from the study results to date whether the scales really provide any more than an insightful description of class and/or educational differences in the ways in which individuals identify themselves with their country. Nevertheless, the author's scales do considerably advance our understanding of these processes and some of the basic tenets of public opinion that may flow from them.

The Form and Rytina measure actually consists of a single question, in which the respondent is asked to choose which of three descriptions most aptly fits the way in which power in America is distributed. The three descriptions follow the basic philosophies of Reisman, Marx or Mills. While the Reisman (or pluralist) view is endorsed by most respondents, especially the better educated and more affluent, their replies to other questions indicate that these beliefs are inconsistent with other political beliefs.

The social responsibility scale of Berkowitz and Lutterman follows closely from earlier measures of this phenomenon devised by Harris and by
Gough. The present scale benefits from having been applied to a state-wide probability sample in which a number of impressive correlations with a wide variety of associated behaviors and attitudes were obtained. The items in the scale have been constructed so as to allow for control of agreement response set.

The new left scale of Christie et al. is still in process of development but if present campus behavior continues it is likely to receive wide application in the years to come. The scale items show relatively high internal consistency and satisfactory validity on the small sample of students to whom they have been applied. Many of the items, however, seem likely to become time-bound and culture-bound to the college-aged youth of the late 1960's.

The Comrey-Newmeyer scale of radicalism-conservatism suffers from many of the liabilities of measures of this variable that were discussed in Measures of Political Attitudes. However compared to many of these measures, the one of Comrey and Newmeyer contains better written and less-dated items, items split into parallel forms (with an extremely high correlation between forms), a sophisticated item-analytic basis, and content from a variety of areas. On the other hand, the authors present no validational data.

The final two scales clearly belong in Chapter 11 of Measures of Political Attitudes, which is devoted to measures of political participation.

The Milbrath scale of "inputs to the political system" consists of general participation in politics, making it more similar to the Woodward-Roper and Matthews-Prothro scale in Chapter 11 than to the scales of Campbell, et al. and Robinson which deal with activity during a specific campaign. Milbrath's scale is a promising start in the direction of a multi-dimensional measure of political participation. As yet, however, exact
scoring instructions and norms on the instrument as a scaling device are not available. Milbrath does present some interesting data on the scale's reliability and relative freedom from agreement response set.

Scheuch's opinion leadership scale is based more on evidence of associated political activity than on actual opinion leadership. That is, the scale assumes that greater participation in associations and greater use of the mass media will result in an individual's being an opinion leader. There is sound research evidence to substantiate this assumption (and Scheuch himself presents data showing a fairly strong relationship between participation and political knowledge). However, evidence relating this measure to reported or observed opinion leadership is needed before a proper evaluation of this scale is possible.
NATIONAL INVOLVEMENT SCALES
(DeLamater, Katz, and Kelman 1968)

Variable
The scales attempt to separate three mechanisms by which an individual can be nationalistic: symbolic (by national symbols), normative (by rewards and sanctions), and functional (by material benefits).

Description
The three mechanisms follow from Katz and Kahn's (1966) distinction between the major means by which a role system is integrated: through values, norms, and roles. In terms of some of the different orientations that are hypothesized as being associated with each role:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude toward:</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Functional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Flag, leaders, etc.</td>
<td>strong and positive</td>
<td>mild positive</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Role of an &quot;American&quot;</td>
<td>most important to learn and low tolerance for deviation</td>
<td>as important as other roles</td>
<td>in terms of political and social responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Criticism of American way of life</td>
<td>defensive and hostile</td>
<td></td>
<td>tolerated if in the national interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extending American way of life</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>disapprove because want to preserve</td>
<td>only if in other countries' national interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Policies that might weaken U.S. power</td>
<td>oppose</td>
<td>accept if agreed upon by national leaders</td>
<td>support if in national interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Involvement in political life</td>
<td>passive (as reflected in their political apathy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>active (as reflected in their greater participation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initially, 15-20 items tapping each orientation were included in the interview schedule, but only those were included which either (a) correlated at the .05 level with one other item or (b) seemed on an a priori basis to tap the aspect in question. Eight items remained in the symbolic and normative scales, and six in the functional scale. Items on each scale employ a variety of question formats. The score categories and the percentage of the sample falling into each score category are as follows:
Sample
A probability sample of 129 residents of Ann Arbor, Michigan. People affiliated with the University of Michigan were excluded from the sample.

Reliability/Homogeneity
The following average inter-item correlation coefficients (phi) were obtained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score category</th>
<th>Symbolic</th>
<th>Normative</th>
<th>Functional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5-8 (28%)</td>
<td>4-5 (19%)</td>
<td>3-5 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Medium</td>
<td>3-4 (28%)</td>
<td>3 (23%)</td>
<td>2 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Medium</td>
<td>1-2 (22%)</td>
<td>1-2 (38%)</td>
<td>1 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-4-0 (22%)</td>
<td>-4-0 (20%)</td>
<td>0 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values of .17 are significant at the .05 level for this size sample.

The correlation between the three scales was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sym</th>
<th>Norm</th>
<th>Func</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity
As might be expected, there was a strong relation between education and type of role involvement. While 84% of the Functional group had been to college, only 40% of the Normative group and 0% of the Symbolic group had attended college. The same relation held in terms of fathers' education--47% of the Functional group had fathers who had been to college vs. 30% of Normatives and 14% of Symbolics. Other indirect evidence of validity is provided by the verbal behavior of the various types of respondents when asked open-ended questions about political issues and events. For example, the Symbolic group was especially likely to report strong affect (e.g., anger, sorrow) as their reaction to the assassination of President Kennedy. These people also placed highest values on children's learning to be "good Americans" and were least tolerant of deviation from role prescriptions (e.g., by not believing in God, or being an ex-Communist). On the other hand, the Normative group (mainly working-class) were most likely to feel that violators of norms are not "good" Americans, in mentioning interpersonal morality as something "a person ought to do to be a good American." They are most likely also to accept government policies that are generally agreed upon.

Finally the Functional group were better informed politically, most likely to stress helping one's fellow man as a value in child-rearing, more favorable toward the United Nations, more favorable toward disarmament and international negotiation, and least likely to do nothing if a dictatorship came to power in this country.

As the authors note, this is a pilot study conducted with a relatively small sample. Undoubtedly, controls for education (possible with a larger sample) would result in considerably attenuated relations from those found here. For now, these scales still comprise a most interesting way of conceptualizing educational differences in the manner in which people identify themselves with their country.

The major author has expanded his study of nationalism into Yugoslavia and work on this study is in progress. He has added a fourth form of commitment, namely Ideological (Sample item: How should income in the country be distributed?).

### SYMBOLIC COMMITMENT SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions and Codes</th>
<th>Response Distribution (w=129)</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1: &quot;Suppose a person criticizes the government in time of national crisis. In your opinion, could he be a good American?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could be; Yes</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends: on kind of criticism, nature of crisis</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, unqualified</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2: &quot;Suppose a person doesn't stand when the Star Spangled Banner is being played. Do you think he could be a good American?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, unqualified</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, if he had a reason--physical, religious</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, qualified</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, unqualified</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3: &quot;Do you happen to own a flag?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other; once did, NA</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-(For those who own flag) &quot;Do you ever display it on national holidays?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always; yes</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually; sometimes</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never; no</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other; inappropriate</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4: &quot;Some observers have complained that the American public nowadays does not pay proper respect to the American flag. Would you agree or disagree with this complaint?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5: &quot;What would you think of an American who says that he takes no particular pride in our armed forces?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve; he has a right to say that</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent; nothing; don't know</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove, general</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove: not a good American</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 6: "Imagine the American Peace Corps comes up in a conversation between yourself and a foreigner and he laughs at it. How do you think you would react when this occurs--would you regard this as an insult, or a sign of poor taste, or a personal opinion to which he is entitled?"

An insult 10.1 1
A sign of poor taste 16.3 0
An opinion to which he is entitled 61.2 0

Item 7a: "How would you feel if a foreigner criticized racial segregation in the U.S.?
7b: "How would you feel if a foreigner attacked the free enterprise system?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 7a</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Item 7b</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An insult; poor taste; would be mad</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is wrong; would argue with him</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends: where he's from, what he says</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An opinion to which he's entitled</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to talk to him</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is right; would agree with him</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**One point only if coded in this category on both items

Item 8: "How do you feel about the following quotation:
Do you strongly agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, or strongly disagree? 'Whereas some people feel that they are citizens of the world, that they belong to mankind and not to any one nation, I, for my part, feel that I am first, last, and always an American.'"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly agree</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly disagree</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NORMATIVE COMMITMENT SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions and Codes</th>
<th>Response Distribution (%)</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 1:</strong> &quot;What do you think a person ought to do in order to be a good American?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentioned formal requirements: vote, pay taxes, serve in Army, support constitution.</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not mention the above</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 2:</strong> &quot;What do you think a person ought to do in order to be a good American?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentioned conformity to norms: obey laws, be honest, stay out of trouble, do the right things, be loyal, live properly, live a clean life, etc.</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not mention the above</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 3:</strong> &quot;Some people say that a person should go along with whatever his country does even if he disagrees with it. How do you feel about that?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree, unqualified; he should</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He should go along with majority</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no choice, has to go along</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends: on the issue, the person</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree: he has a right to criticize</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree: government could be wrong</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 4:</strong> &quot;Suppose a law was passed raising income taxes by fifty percent. Would you pay the tax without question, refuse to pay if a good many other people refused, or refuse regardless of what others did?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay without question</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse if others did</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse regardless</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 5: "Suppose a law was passed requiring all citizens to be fingerprinted and to carry identity cards. Would you obey without question, not obey if a good many others also refused to obey, or not obey regardless of what others did?"

- Obey without question: 82.9
- Refuse if others did: 4.7
- Refuse regardless: 7.8

Items: "Here is a list of things that a government might ask its citizens to do."

- a. First, go through this list and tell me which things the government should require people to do.
- b. Now go through the list and tell me which of these things you think the government should encourage people to do, but which they have a right to refuse if they prefer.
- c. Finally, go through the list and pick out those things which you think the government should leave completely to the individual."

Item 6: "Serve in the armed forces."

- Government should require people to: 78.3
- Government should encourage people to: 17.8
- Government should leave to the individual: 2.3

Item 7: "Pay taxes."

- Government should require people to: 95.3
- Government should encourage people to: 3.1
- Government should leave to the individual: .8

Item 8: "Send their children to school."

- Government should require people to: 90.7
- Government should encourage people to: 8.5
- Government should leave to the individual: .8
FUNCTIONAL COMMITMENT SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions and Codes</th>
<th>Response Distribution (%)</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 1:</strong> &quot;What are some of the things that particularly remind you that you are an American?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentioned opportunity: affluence, standard of living, free enterprise; accomplishment, progress</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not mention the above</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 2:</strong> &quot;What do you think a person ought to do in order to be a good American?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentioned participation: be informed, participate in public affairs, use citizenship rights; take part in community, vote intelligently, etc.</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not mention the above</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 3:</strong> &quot;Are there any people you know or have heard about who you think are not good Americans?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentioned apathetic persons: people who don't appreciate what they have, our opportunities; people who don't accept their responsibilities as citizens.</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not mention the above</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 4:</strong> &quot;What do you think people mean when they talk about the American way of life?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentioned affluence: high standard of living, free enterprise, freedom (defined in terms of consumption), security, happiness</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not mention the above</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 5:</strong> &quot;What do you think are the most important things that make America different from other countries?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentioned opportunity: advancement, chance to get ahead</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not mention the above</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 6:</strong> &quot;What do you think are the most important things that make America different from other countries?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentioned affluence: high standard of living, ease of living, convenience; modern civilization; industrialization; free enterprise</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not mention the above</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BELIEFS ABOUT THE DISTRIBUTION OF POWER  
(Form and Rytina, 1969)

Variable
This attitude item taps whether individuals believe that power in the United States is distributed according to the positions advocated by David Riesman (political pluralism), C. Wright Mills (a power elite), or Marxists (control by big business).

Description
The task for the respondent is to pick one of the three formulations of how power is distributed in this country. The following distribution was obtained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formulation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pluralistic</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elitist</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic dominance</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statements of the employee and managerial society were originally included but later dropped because so few respondents considered them meaningful.

Sample
The sample consisted of a cross-section of 186 respondents in Muskegon, Michigan, plus supplementary samples of poor and rich respondents bringing the total sample up to 354. These people were interviewed sometime in the mid-1960's.

Reliability/ Homogeneity
No reliability data are reported, although only test-retest measures would be appropriate.

Validity
No data bearing directly on validity are reported. However, the authors feel that the fact that the pluralistic belief is reported more often by those with higher incomes supports their presupposition that this view would be expected from people who get more rewards from the system. On the other hand, the authors note that although higher income respondents reported belief in the pluralist ideology, very few rejected the task of selecting which interest groups were most powerful when asked to give such ratings. (Such ratings would constitute a violation of the pluralistic conception of politics.)

Location

Results and Comments
Larger differences were found in ideological beliefs by education than by the factors of income or race. The pluralistic view was endorsed by 73% of college graduates but only 33% of those who had not completed grade school. This view was held by 55% of the poor and 65% of the rich.
Those choosing the economic dominance model varied from 40% of the less than grade school educated to 8% of college graduates. Negroes (37%) were much more likely to take this view than whites (18%) and poor whites (23%) more than rich whites (12%).

As noted above, separate questions dealing with which of twelve interest groups ought to have most influence over the way things were run in Washington were also included in this study. While espousing the pluralist ideology, only 38% of the better educated said that all groups should have equal say vs. 52% of the least educated. Close to 15% of the college-educated and 30% of the rich said that big business ought to be most powerful vs. well under 10% of the poor and middle income groups, or the less-educated.

In terms of who had most actual power at the time (ed. note: during a Democratic administration), over 50% of the rich and college-educated said labor unions vs. about 25% of the rest of the sample.
DISTRIBUTION OF POWER SCALE

I am going to read you three ways in which people think that power in this country is distributed. Which of these, in your opinion, is the most accurate description?

(Riesman) No one group really runs the government in this country. Instead, important decisions about national policy are made by a lot of different groups such as labor, business, religious, and educational groups, and so on. These groups influence both political parties, but no single group can dictate to the others, and each group is strong enough to protect its own interests.

(Mills) A small group of men at the top really run the government in this country. These are the heads of the biggest business corporations, the highest officers in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and a few important senators, congressmen and federal officials in Washington. These men dominate both the Republican and Democratic parties.

(Marx) Big businessmen really run the government in this country. The heads of the large corporations dominate both the Republican and Democratic parties. This means that things in Washington go pretty much the way big businessmen want them to.
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY SCALE (Berkowitz and Lutterman 1968)

**Variable**
This scale attempts to assess a person's traditional social responsibility, an orientation toward helping others even when there is nothing to be gained from them.

**Description**
Six of the eight items in the SRS scale are drawn from a social responsibility scale for children derived by Harris (1957); these in turn are similar to items constructed earlier by Gough et al. (1952). The items in the present scale are especially tied into traditional values and are therefore likely to have essentially a conservative individualist theme. The scale is also conceived of as a polar opposite of alienation.

The items were given in straightforward Likert scale format, with five response options from strongly agree through strongly disagree. Four items are worded in the responsible direction, the other four in the opposite direction. No further scoring instructions are given but the following distribution of scores along the scale are reported:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Middle Class</th>
<th>Working Class</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample**
The SRS scale was administered to a statewide probability sample of 766 Wisconsin adults in early fall, 1963. Response rate was 88%.

**Reliability/ Homogeneity**
The scale was constructed on the basis of item analyses with samples of college students. The internal consistency of the scale in the present sample was "very satisfactory", although no statistical data are reported. No test-retest data were apparently collected.

**Validity**
Most of the following behavioral correlates are based on respondent descriptions and therefore cannot be considered as completely objective estimates of validity. Among both working class and middle class respondents, those scoring high on the SRS scale were more likely to:

1. Make financial contributions to an educational or religious institution
2. Be active in organizations or church work
3. Show great interest in national and local politics and to be active politically
4. To vote in elections and know the names of candidates for office.
However, high SRS people were also more likely to oppose more govern­ment involvement in problems in unemployment and to oppose extending social security.


High SRS scorers among both middle and working class respondents tended to affiliate more with the Republican party. This result held even when controlled for city size, except for the rural working class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Republican</th>
<th>Low SRS</th>
<th>High SRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle class, urban</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle class, rural</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class, urban</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working class, rural</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was concluded that "all in all, high scorers on SRS generally were least inclined to deviate from the political traditions of their class and community."

High SRS types however were not "other-directed conformists" in the sense that they were less likely (than those with low SRS) to place a high value on being well-liked or popular as important things for children to learn, and more likely to place a high value on thinking for oneself. High SRS people in the working class were less likely than low SRS people to disagree with the view that big business was too powerful.

It is reported that SRS is strongly associated with education, but the authors note that college students, homogeneous on this factor, evidence behaviors in experiments congruent with their SRS scores. Finally, all of these results run counter to McClosky's (1958) description of conservatives as alienated and hostile.


Social Responsibility Scale (SRS)
(* responsible reply)

1. It is no use worrying about current events or public affairs; I can't do anything about them anyway.

   Strongly agree Agree Undecided *Disagree *Strongly disagree

2. Every person should give some of his time for the good of his town or country.

   *Strongly agree *Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

3. Our country would be a lot better off if we didn't have so many elections and people didn't have to vote so often.

   Strongly agree Agree Undecided *Disagree *Strongly disagree

4. Letting your friends down is not so bad because you can't do good all the time for everybody.

   Strongly agree Agree Undecided *Disagree *Strongly disagree

5. It is the duty of each person to do his job the very best he can.

   *Strongly agree *Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

6. People would be a lot better off if they could live far away from other people and never have to do anything for them.

   Strongly agree Agree Undecided *Disagree *Strongly disagree

7. At school I usually volunteered for special projects.

   *Strongly agree *Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

8. I feel very bad when I have failed to finish a job I promised I would do.

   *Strongly agree *Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
NEW LEFT SCALE  (Christie et al. 1969)

Variable
This scale is an exploratory attempt to measure agreement with the principles expoused by the under-30 New Left, mainly concerning discontent with the existing social order.

Description
A total of 62 items were derived from open-ended responses of Columbia students arrested during spring 1968 demonstrations as well as from various New Left publications (items referring to tactics were deliberately excluded). Of these, 56 items correlated at the .05 level with total scale scores.

Items are given in Likert-scale format from 1 (strongly disagree), through 4 (no opinion), and up to 7 (strongly agree). Items are worded in both pro-Left and anti-Left directions.

Sample
A total of 153 freshmen at Columbia participated in this first phase of instrument construction. These freshmen were recruited from a pool of 254 who returned questionnaires (out of 700 entering freshmen). Efforts were made to ensure that the 153 would contain a proportionate number of radical students. (It turned out that 30% of these students had participated in politically relevant activities.)

Reliability/ Homogeneity
Average item-test correlations for the 20 best items was .54 (comparable F scale items had an average of .33). No test-retest data have been reported.

Validity
The following average scores (from 1, anti-Left, to 7, pro-Left) were obtained from students according to their degree of participation in civil rights and peace movements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No activity (N = 54)</th>
<th>Moderate activity (N = 36)</th>
<th>High activity (N = 40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location

Administration
The items should take less than 30 minutes to complete. Note that the average scores (noted on the following description of items) of negatively-worded items have the reverse interpretation of the positive items.

Results and Comments
This scale is still in process of development. Interested researchers may find that the first 10 or 20 items will be sufficient for their research purposes.
The following average item scores for students with preferences with 1968 political candidates was as follows:

Nixon, Reagan, Wallace (N = 25) 3.1
Humphrey, Johnson (N = 17) 3.1
Rockefeller, Kennedy, McCarthy (N = 56) 3.5
McCarthy alone (N = 15) 3.7
Cleaver, Gregory (N = 18) 4.3
**NEW LEFT SCALE**

(in order of item-scale correlation)

* agree response scored anti-Left

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Likert Score</th>
<th>$r_{\text{IRS}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>&quot;The Establishment&quot; unfairly controls every aspect of our lives; we can never be free until we are rid of it.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>You can never achieve freedom within the framework of contemporary American society.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The United States needs a complete restructuring of its basic institutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A mass revolutionary party should be created.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Authorities must be put in an intolerable position so they will be forced to respond with repression and thus show their illegitimacy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The solutions for contemporary problems lie in striking at their roots, no matter how much destruction might occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Disruption is preferable to dialogue for changing our society.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Even though institutions have worked well in the past, they must be destroyed if they are not effective now.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The structure of our society is such that self-alienation is inevitable.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Sexual behavior should be bound by mutual feelings, not by formal and legal ties.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>A problem with most older people is that they have learned to accept society as it is, not as it should be.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The bureaucracy of American society makes it impossible to live and work spontaneously.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Radicals of the left are as much a threat to the rights of the individual as are the radicals of the right.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

$a/ 

$r_{\text{IRS}}$ is the product-moment correlation of each subject's score on each item (i) with his total score on the 62-item New Left Scale.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. While man has great potential for good, society brings out primarily the worst in him.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The processes of rebuilding society are of less immediate importance than the processes of destroying it.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The political structure of the Soviet Union is more like that of the United States than that of Red China.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The streets are a more appropriate medium for change in our society than printing presses.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*18. Competition encourages excellence.</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Marriage unfairly restricts one's personal freedom.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*20. The right to private property is sacred.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. No one should be punished for violating a law which he feels is immoral.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*22. The courts are a useful vehicle for responsible change.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*23. There are legitimate channels for reform which must be exhausted before attempting disruption.</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. You learn more from ten minutes in a political protest than ten hours of research in a library.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*25. Although our society has to be changed, violence is not a justified means.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*26. Society needs some legally based authority in order to prevent chaos.</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*27. Representative democracy can respond effectively to the needs of the people.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*28. Police should not hesitate to use force to maintain order.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Real participatory democracy should be the basis for a new society.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*30. If people worked hard at their jobs, they would reap the full benefits of our society.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Groups with a formal structure tend to stifle creativity among their members.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. A social scientist should not separate his political responsibilities from his professional role. 4.1  
33. People should not do research which can be used in ways which are contrary to the social good. 3.3  
*34. Abrupt reforms in society usually lead to such a severe backlash that they will be self-defeating. 4.3  
*35. Traditions serve a useful social function by providing stability and continuity. 4.7  
*36. The very existence of our long-standing social norms demonstrates their value. 2.4  
37. If the structure of our society becomes non-repressive, people will be happy. 3.6  
38. The distinction between public and private life is unnecessary. 2.8  
*39. Compromise is essential for progress. 5.1  
40. Extensive reform in society only serves to perpetuate the evils; it will never solve problems. 2.6  
*41. Voting must be a pragmatic rather than moral decision. 3.5  
*42. Anyone who violates the law for reasons of conscience should be willing to accept the legal consequences. 5.3  
*43. It is possible to modify our institutions so that the blacks can be incorporated on an equal basis into our contemporary society. 4.7  
44. Although men are intrinsically good, they have developed institutions which force them to act in opposition to their basic nature. 3.4  
45. Educational institutions should espouse political doctrines. 2.4  
*46. Change in our society should be based primarily on popular elections. 4.2  
*47. A minority must never be allowed to impose its will on the majority. 3.7  
*48. Spontaneity is often an excuse for irresponsibility. 4.4
49. An individual can find his true identity only by detaching himself from formal ideologies.  
\[ \text{Average Rating: 4.4, } \text{FIRS: .24} \]

*50. Being put in positions of leadership brings out the best in men.  
\[ \text{Average Rating: 3.6, } \text{FIRS: -.24} \]

51. Political factions cannot cooperate with each other without sacrificing their integrity.  
\[ \text{Average Rating: 2.9, } \text{FIRS: .23} \]

52. It is more important that people be involved in the present rather than concerned with the past or the future.  
\[ \text{Average Rating: 3.9, } \text{FIRS: .23} \]

53. A commitment to action is more socially relevant than a commitment to any specific philosophy.  
\[ \text{Average Rating: 4.1, } \text{FIRS: .22} \]

*54. Commitment to a meaningful career is a very important part of a man's life.  
\[ \text{Average Rating: 5.7, } \text{FIRS: -.21} \]

*55. One's personal life can be kept separate from one's political life.  
\[ \text{Average Rating: 3.1, } \text{FIRS: -.20} \]

*56. A group without a clear-cut pattern of leadership cannot function effectively.  
\[ \text{Average Rating: 4.9, } \text{FIRS: -.18} \]

57. Freedom of expression should be denied to racist and neo-fascistic movements.  
\[ \text{Average Rating: 1.9, } \text{FIRS: .15} \]

*58. Provocation of the police should only be a by-product, not a goal, of mass action.  
\[ \text{Average Rating: 5.7, } \text{FIRS: .12} \]

*59. A liberal society is more conducive to revolutionary change than is a fascistic one.  
\[ \text{Average Rating: 3.9, } \text{FIRS: -.12} \]

*60. We must strive for the democratization of decision-making bodies within the existing government.  
\[ \text{Average Rating: 5.4, } \text{FIRS: -.11} \]

61. The only way to combat violence is to use violent means.  
\[ \text{Average Rating: 2.1, } \text{FIRS: .09} \]

62. You should always be candid with your friends even though you may hurt their feelings.  
\[ \text{Average Rating: 3.9, } \text{FIRS: .04} \]
RADICALISM - CONSERVATISM (Comrey and Newmeyer 1965)

Variable: This scale was derived from factor analyses of twenty-five socio-political attitude variables.

Description: A total of 120 items tapping the 25 variables were rated on nine-point Likert scales from 1 (agree very strongly) through 9 (disagree very strongly). When these items were formed into indices of the 25 variables and factor analyzed, 9 factors emerged. When factor scores for these nine factors were themselves factor analyzed, the primary "second-order" factor was comprised of five of the nine first-order factors (welfare-state, punitiveness, nationalism, religion, and racial tolerance). Out of the original 120 items, 67 loaded on this major second-order factor called radicalism-conservatism.

From these 67 items, two parallel forms (A and B) of 30 items each were constructed. Scores thus can vary between 30 (radical) to 270 (conservative) on both forms. For the sample below the average score on Form A was 159.0 (s.d. = 41.3) and for Form B, 158.4 (s.d. = 41.8) and the distribution of scores was "approximately normal" around these average scores.

Sample: A total of 212 volunteers from universities, organizations, and randomly-selected blocks in Los Angeles participated in the study. The volunteers were two-thirds male and had a median age of 29 and a median 15 years of education. Less than 10% professed extreme political beliefs.

Reliability/ Homogeneity: For this sample, Forms A and B correlated .96, although this estimate would be somewhat less if applied to a new sample.

Validity: No data bearing on validity are reported.


Results and Comments: The authors note close resemblance between factors found in British studies (Religionism, Humanitarianism, Nationalism) and three of the factors extracted in this study (Religion, Punitiveness, Nationalism). Moreover they predict that the British results would yield the same single factor, if a second-order factor analysis were performed.

The reader will note that the instrument contains items from only 13 of the 25 variables originally investigated by the authors. The 12 variables not included in the final scale are: population control, pay based on ability, partisanship, rapid social change, fatalism, traditional moral values, fascism, respect for age, indoctrination, belief in people, cultural ethnocentrism, and education for adjustment.
RADICALISM - CONSERVATISM SCALE

Form A
(*Reversed item)

(Religiosity) 1. Every child should have religious instruction.
   Agree very strongly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Disagree very strongly

2. God exists, in the form in which the Bible describes him.
3. This country would be better off if religion had a greater influence in daily life.
4. All people alive today are the descendants of Adam and Eve.

(Pacifism) *5. This country should disarm regardless of whether or not other countries do.
*6. If my country had been destroyed, I still would not push the button to wipe out the attacking enemy nation.
7. Our country should be engaged constantly in research to develop superior weapons for our national defense.

(Welfarism) *8. The average man today is getting less than his rightful share of our national wealth.
*9. The government should guarantee every citizen enough to eat.

(Anti-Unionism) 10. Many large unions have officers with criminal records.
11. Most unions do not elect officers by honest, secret-ballot elections.

(Weak Federal Government) 12. Central government should run only those things which cannot be run effectively at the local level.
13. The federal government has too much power over citizens and local government.
14. Greater decentralization of power would be better for this country.
15. A greater degree of government control over business would result in a weakening of this country's economy.

(Moral Censorship) 16. If a man is showing a sex movie to friends in his own home, the police should stop it.
17. Every city should prevent the sale of objectionable books.
18. Sexual relations between unmarried people should be illegal.
19. The police should hunt down homosexuals and put them in jail.
Abortion should be legalized.

Employers should be prevented by law from hiring only people of their own race.

Criminals convicted of three separate felonies should never be released.

In our country, the sentences handed out to criminals are usually too light.

A mentally ill man who attacks and kills a little girl should be executed.

A gunman who kills someone in an armed robbery should receive the death sentence.

Every able bodied male should willingly serve for a period of time in his country's military service.

A man who is ready to die for his country deserves the highest honor.

The United States should work peacefully for a strong world government.

The United States should be willing to surrender some of its rights to strengthen the United Nations.

Laws which benefit the people are more important than laws which strengthen the nation.

1. School teachers should believe in God.
2. It should be against the law to do anything which the Bible says is wrong.
3. Moses got the ten commandments directly from God.
4. All the miracles described in the Bible really happened.

Under no circumstances should our country use nuclear bombs against anybody.

I would rather have a foreign power take over our country than start another world war to stop it.

Our country should prepare to employ every available weapon to destroy any major power that seriously attacks us.

It is the responsibility of the government to take care of people who can't take care of themselves.

If the government must go deeper in debt to help people, it should do so.
10. Most unions try to prevent the efficient use of labor.

11. Many union leaders use threats and violence to keep themselves in power.

12. The federal government should not interfere in the affairs of individual states unless absolutely necessary.

13. The strength of this country today is largely a product of the free enterprise system.

14. Regulation of business by government usually does more harm than good.

15. When something is run by the government, it is apt to be inefficient and wasteful.

16. Motion pictures which offend any sizeable religious group should be banned.

17. Public libraries should contain only books which are morally sound.

18. A woman who has sexual relations with a man for money should go to jail.

19. More restrictions should be imposed to prevent young people from having sexual relations before marriage.

20. Birth control devices should be made readily available to anyone who wants to use them.

21. Marriages between persons of different races should be socially acceptable.

22. Teenage hoodlums should be punished severely.

23. Our laws give too much protection to criminals.

24. A dictator who orders the extermination of thousands of innocent people should be executed for his crimes.

25. Someone who plans and carries out the murder of his or her spouse should be executed.

26. If called upon to do so, a citizen should be willing to sacrifice his life for his country.

27. Patriotism is one of the great virtues.

28. The United States eventually should give up its military power to a strong world government.

29. Present nations should become states within an all powerful world government.

30. The welfare of the individual is more important than the welfare of the country.
INPUTS TO THE POLITICAL SYSTEM (Milbrath 1968)

Variable
This measure of general political participation is based on the premise that "beliefs are important determinants of the political behavior of ordinary citizens."

Description
There are a total of 21 inputs to the political system. In this investigation, each of these inputs was listed separately on a card and the respondent was told to place each statement into one of four piles headed:

- Things you do regularly (4)
- Things you do fairly often (3)
- Things you seldom do (2)
- Things you never do at all (1)

The numbers in parentheses refer to the numerical value associated with each response.

In addition to sorting the 21 cards under this "real" condition, respondents were also asked to place the statements under an "ideal" condition into one of the following four categories:

- Things you feel it is essential to do (4)
- Things you have an important responsibility to do (3)
- Things you have some responsibility to do (2)
- Things you feel you have no responsibility to do (1)

Sample
An unspecified sample of about 960 residents of the Buffalo, New York area were interviewed. Of these, about 260 were Negro and about 700 white.

Reliability/Homogeneity
The author reports the following factors emerging from a factor analysis of the 21 items:

1) Party and Campaign Participation (Items 1, 9, 10, 13, 14, and 19)
2) Protest and Question (Items 4, 5, 6, and 17)
3) Teach Children (Items 11, 15, and 18)

The following inter-item correlation matrix is reported for five of the items in the first factor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Validity
No data bearing directly on validity are reported. The author presents the following findings which indirectly relate to validity.

1) The substantial correlations (in the .30 to .60 range) between responses on the real and ideal card sorts

2) A substantial correlation (tau-beta = .57) between the card sort and an open-ended question on the same topic

3) Some laudible evidence on the lack of systematic bias due to agreement response set.

Location

Administration
The real and ideal sorts together take about 10 minutes to administer. The author does not give any special instructions for scoring the items as if they comprised a scale. This is true both for all 21 items and those subsets which comprise the factors discussed above under Reliability/Homogeneity.

Results and Comments
In addition to inputs, Milbrath has constructed a similar set of 23 statements dealing with "outtakes from the political system." Respondents also sort these statements into four "real" piles and four "ideal" piles. The statements and piles are listed below after the input items.

Milbrath offers the following tentative generalizations from this study:

"Most people are plugged into the political system in at least a minimal way; they pay taxes, they are loyal, they try to keep informed, they try to vote, and they try to teach their children to be good citizens. More than half of the people feel that their duty as a citizen ends there. Interestingly, people who take this minimal view of their political inputs are somewhat more likely than others to wish to confine governmental outputs (outtakes) to standard old-fashioned governmental duties such as keeping public order (minimal inputs and minimal outtakes are significantly correlated).

A minority of people feel some responsibility to take an active role in politics and an even smaller percentage actually do so. Conventional participation by this minority seems to have kept the political system functioning reasonably adequately up to now. For a very small
group, non-conventional participation (demonstrations and riots) may be used, Negroes being somewhat more willing to do this than Whites. In fact, our data show that Negroes are somewhat more likely than Whites to use both conventional and non-conventional means of political participation. Negroes seem to be developing a sense of racial identity and a sense of political skill and effectiveness that they did not possess a few years ago. At the same time one can see from the out-takes data that Negroes are much less happy with the performance of the political system than are Whites while also believing that the system has greater responsibility to do things for them than the Whites are likely to request.

One could expect, then, in the near future of American city politics that Negroes will act increasingly as a tight bloc, using both conventional and un-conventional tactics, trying to get the political system to do many things that more conventional and traditional Whites will think inappropriate for government to do. The conflict will be intense and emotional and may significantly transform the nature of government and the way that citizens relate to their government.
INPUTS TO THE POLITICAL SYSTEM

1. Participate in a political party between elections as well as at election time
   - Real (Ideal) Mean Scores
   - Negro: 1.72 (2.21) 1.69 (2.06)
   - White: 2.75 (2.96) 3.01 (3.14)
2. Keep informed about politics
   - Negro: 3.46 (3.59) 3.39 (3.68)
   - White: 4.1 (4.22) 4.1 (4.22)
3. Vote in elections
   - Negro: 1.62 (2.24) 1.64 (2.22)
   - White: 1.52 (2.19) 1.50 (2.13)
4. Send messages of support to political leaders when they are doing well
   - Negro: 1.83 (2.43) 1.88 (2.28)
   - White: 1.39 (1.56) 1.21 (1.21)
5. Send protest messages to political leaders when they are doing badly
   - Negro: 1.23 (1.43) 1.10 (1.19)
   - White: 1.69 (2.20) 1.58 (1.99)
6. Protest both vigorously and publicly if the government does something that is morally wrong
   - Negro: 1.69 (2.20) 1.58 (1.99)
   - White: 2.34 (2.52) 2.40 (2.26)
7. Join in public street demonstrations
   - Negro: 2.10 (2.30) 1.91 (2.13)
   - White: 3.67 (3.59) 3.71 (3.70)
8. Support (correct political wrongs)
   - Negro: 3.14 (3.36) 3.15 (3.49)
   - White: 2.33 (2.63) 2.17 (2.49)
9. Take an active part in political campaigns
   - Negro: 2.15 (2.59) 2.05 (2.65)
   - White: 3.67 (3.59) 3.71 (3.70)
10. Engage in political discussion
    - Negro: 2.10 (2.30) 1.91 (2.13)
    - White: 3.67 (3.59) 3.71 (3.70)
11. Teach my children the importance of give and take in the democratic way of life
    - Negro: 3.11 (3.24) 3.09 (3.38)
    - White: 3.72 (3.69) 3.81 (3.79)
12. Pay all taxes
    - Negro: 1.23 (1.44) 1.14 (1.42)
    - White: 2.10 (2.30) 1.91 (2.13)
13. Be a candidate for public office
    - Negro: 2.15 (2.59) 2.05 (2.65)
    - White: 3.67 (3.59) 3.71 (3.70)
14. Inform others in my community about politics
    - Negro: 2.10 (2.30) 1.91 (2.13)
    - White: 3.67 (3.59) 3.71 (3.70)
15. Teach my children to participate in politics beyond voting
    - Negro: 2.15 (2.59) 2.05 (2.65)
    - White: 3.67 (3.59) 3.71 (3.70)
16. Have undivided loyalty and love for my country
    - Negro: 2.15 (2.59) 2.05 (2.65)
    - White: 3.67 (3.59) 3.71 (3.70)
17. Question the legitimacy of regulations issued by authorities before obeying them
    - Negro: 3.14 (3.36) 3.15 (3.49)
    - White: 2.33 (2.63) 2.17 (2.49)
18. Personally see to it that my children understand and accept the responsibilities of citizenship
    - Negro: 2.48 (2.71) 2.30 (2.63)
    - White: 2.64 (2.96) 2.52 (2.76)
19. Join and support a political party
    - Negro: 2.48 (2.71) 2.30 (2.63)
    - White: 2.64 (2.96) 2.52 (2.76)
20. Be a calming and informing influence in my own community
    - Negro: 2.48 (2.71) 2.30 (2.63)
    - White: 2.64 (2.96) 2.52 (2.76)
21. Actively support community organizations
    - Negro: 2.48 (2.71) 2.30 (2.63)
    - White: 2.64 (2.96) 2.52 (2.76)

N = about 260 N = about 700
1. Being careful in using public money and trust
2. Taking actions that make me proud of my country
3. Taking actions that make me proud of my city
4. Trying to even out differences in wealth and prestige
5. Arranging things so it is easy for citizens to move from place to place, job to job, class to class
6. Providing a chance to make a good living
7. Seeing to it that every man who wants a job can have a job
8. Insuring equal opportunity for citizens to participate in making political decisions
9. Providing protection and security
10. Providing public order: for example, traffic regulations
11. Securing civil rights and liberties for all
12. Providing justice for all
13. Providing national system of health insurance for people of all ages
14. Making it possible for a person to be heard when he feels he has something to say
15. Competently handling foreign affairs
16. Providing welfare services
17. Provide courts for resolving conflicts between private parties
18. Providing strong leadership
19. Arranging things so that business is left alone
20. Providing free university education for all who can qualify
21. Intervening to stop an individual or group from persecuting another individual or group
22. Providing stability in society even if it means slowing down the role of progress
23. Make it possible for a person with the means to live where he wishes to live.
Real Sort Piles

1. Things the government does a very effective job of providing
2. Things the government does a moderately effective job of providing
3. Things the government is not very effective in providing
4. Things the government does ineffectively or not at all

Ideal Sort Piles

1. Things you feel it is essential for the government to do
2. Things the government has an important responsibility to do
3. Things the government has some responsibility to do
4. Things you believe the government should not attempt to do at all
This tentative index of opinion leadership was developed on a West German sample.

The intention of the scale was "to separate a presupposed proportion of roughly 10% of the adult population who can be considered active in the sense of opinion moulding." Two sets of criteria make up the scale:
- a) political and organizational participation and
- b) exposure to the mass media

Individuals who were active politically and heavy users of the mass media were designated as opinion leaders, the others being categorized as either "leaders" or "apathetic." Using this scheme, 12% of the sample scored as opinion leaders, 33% as leaders, and 55% as apathetic.

An unspecified sample of 1843 persons in West Germany were interviewed for empirical data on the scale.

The following table shows the relation between the two criteria used in the index for the sample of 1843 respondents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Used</th>
<th>Very Active</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation (Yule's Y) between these two criteria is .45.

No data bearing directly on the validity of the scale are reported, although a definite relation between participation and amount of information was found. While 39% of those who were "very active" scored as very well informed, only 5% of those qualifying as "inactive" scored as very well informed.

Scheuch, E. Determination of opinion leadership. Unpublished paper available from the author who is at the Department of Sociology, Köln University, West Germany.
The following scoring scheme for opinion leadership was employed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Used</th>
<th>Very Active</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>opinion leader</td>
<td>opinion leader</td>
<td>leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>opinion leader</td>
<td>leader</td>
<td>leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>leader</td>
<td>leader</td>
<td>apathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>leader</td>
<td>apathetic</td>
<td>apathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>apathetic</td>
<td>apathetic</td>
<td>apathetic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The specific questions used to measure media usage are not reported in this article.
I. PARTICIPATION

1.) Do you perhaps pursue any other kind of activity or hold any other kind of office outside your job—such as listed on this card?

- As councillor in rural areas,
- As city councillor, or county representative
- In a refugee organization
- In a professional or trade organization
- As village or county selectman
- As a representative on the shop committee
- In a trade union
- In a political party
- In a youth organization
- In a fraternity
- In a business organization
- In a voluntary association or club
- None of this

1a.) (If "none of this")—or do you perhaps pursue some similar activity or office which is not listed here?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.) About how often do you attend meetings or gatherings at which also economic or political questions are discussed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.) Are you a member of a club, association, trade union or political party?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Member of voluntary association</th>
<th>Member of trade union</th>
<th>Member of a political party</th>
<th>No membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. MEDIA USAGE

(Exact questions are not reported)
The empirical investigation of values remains an isolated area within the field of social psychology, although it is usually assumed important in this field. In the related disciplines of anthropology, sociology and philosophy it has received considerable attention. This chapter contains a brief review of the historical development of empirical instruments to measure values and a discussion of a few of the important theoretical issues currently left unsettled.

In the 1930's a number of similar value scales appeared in the literature. Of these, the Allport-Vernon Study of Values (1931) emerged as the most popular instrument and, as Dukes (1955) noted in a review of studies of values, "...it has (since) received widespread, sometimes uncritical usage." A perusal of three key reviews of the literature on values -- Cantril and Allport (1933), Duffy (1940), and Dukes (1955) -- clearly indicates the dominance of this scale. In order to gain some perspective on values research, it is worthwhile to look briefly at some of the other scales developed during the same period as the Study of Values, although few have been employed by later investigators and none will be given detailed presentation in this chapter.

Lurie (1937) carried out a factor analysis of items based on Spranger's (1928) work and obtained factors differing from Allport and Vernon's, but he failed to validate these adequately. Van Dusen et al. (1939) constructed a Likert-type inventory based on the previous conceptions of Spranger and Lurie. Muller and Glaser's (1939) Interest-Values Inventory was founded in part upon Thurstone's (1931) factor analysis of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank and in part upon the earlier work of Allport and Vernon and of
Lurie. Four value categories were proposed: social, economic, theoretic, and aesthetic. Harding (1941, 1944) developed two more value assessment tests based on five different value areas, each of them subdivided into two antithetical categories. Finally, Wickert (1940) constructed a test to assess the relative strengths of nine personal "goal-values."

Most of these instruments conceived of values as personal goals or interests rather than as moral imperatives. Perhaps all were influenced directly or indirectly by Spranger's contention that there were various "types of men" who could be identified by their dominant interests. Although these early efforts at scale construction have been largely ignored, the theory and techniques evolved during their development may still be of interest to the reader about to undertake a serious assessment of personal values.

During the two or three decades in which these early attempts were made to characterize human values, anthropologists and sociologists for the most part (rather than psychologists) have made the major contributions in the conceptualization of values. Anthropologists have examined culture patterns and life styles; sociologists have studied ideologies and mores, while psychologists have tended to focus on more narrowly circumscribed constructs such as attitudes, motives, valences, and cathexes.

No doubt the reasons for largely ignoring values within psychology are varied and complex, but two seem particularly salient. The first has to do with psychologists' desire to define their discipline as a part of the larger enterprise of scientific research, with its emphasis on rigorous objective methods. Patterning themselves after physicists, differentiating themselves from philosophers, many psychologists consider value judgements
to be outside the boundaries of an empirical discipline. They seem to have confused making value judgements, which is incompatible with scientific objectivity, with studying objectively how other people make them -- a phenomenon as amenable to psychological study, in principle, as other forms of human learning and choice.

Related to this was a more reasonable view: that because values were based on irrational or inexpressible feelings they were not accessible to available psychometric techniques. Thurstone (1954; 1959) disputed this claim, saying that the problem of developing a subjective metric was manageable with existing measurement procedures. Catton (1954) offered specific demonstrations of three methods for eliciting information about six "infinite" or ultimate values -- choosing between paired alternatives, selecting the "most infinite" value, and rating values according to ultimacy or importance -- and these were found to intercorrelate almost perfectly. Even when the measurement issue is settled in principle, however, there remains another difficulty related to the nature of values conceived as deep, irrational forces: their resistance to manipulation in laboratory experiments. Unlike more superficial attitudes, values are assumed to be central to the way an individual structures his world and defines himself and thus are not subject to experimental change. Although this problem seems to have encouraged psychologists to avoid the study of values, more recent work -- for example Rokeach (1968) -- indicates that it is not insurmountable.

The second major problem, once the psychological study of values is accepted as legitimate, is to find a fruitful conceptual or theoretical framework from which to initiate research. The rubric "values" has included everything from utilities in decision theory (Becker and McClintock, 1967) to preferred "ways of life" (Morris, 1956). A brief review of a few con-
ceptualizations of the value domain will provide a general background for
the discussion of specific scales included in the present chapter.

Adler (1956) outlined four approaches to the definition of values which,
taken in combination, exhaust most of the conceptual possibilities. First,
values may be considered as absolutes, existing as "eternal ideas" or as
parts of the "mind of God." Second, values may be thought to inhere in ob­
jects, as the potential of those objects to satisfy needs or desires. Third,
values may be seen as present in man (or men), as preferences held by people
(whether learned, innate, or both). Finally, values may be conceptualized
in terms of action, and this is the view adopted by Adler: that knowing
what people do is all that can be known objectively about what they value.
Equating values with behavior may, however, present more problems than it
solves; for which, if not all, actions then represent values? How can a reason­
able class of values be isolated for study?

For most psychologists Adler's third definition is preferred. "Value"
then becomes a hypothetical construct -- a kind of "meta-attitude" -- not
directly accessible to observation but inferable from verbal statements
and other behaviors and useful in predicting still other observable and
measurable verbal and nonverbal behavior.

Among social scientists who have attempted to classify values, Kluck­
hohn (1951) has offered one of the most comprehensive analyses. Values\(^1\) are
categorized in terms of the several dimensions: modality; content, includ­
ing three categories -- aesthetic, cognitive, and moral; generality; in­
tensity and other dimensions. Explication of these dimensions and of

\(^1\)Kluckhohn proposes the following definition: "A value is a conception,
explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a
group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes,
means, and ends to action."
Kluckhohn's provocative essay would take us beyond the scope of the present chapter. However, Kluckhohn has written one of the most complete and sophisticated attempts to arrive at adequate conceptual definitions and integration, and his work is recommended to anyone seeking a theoretical foundation for research on values.

Another way of classifying values has been proposed by Morris (1956). Actual preferences among real alternatives are called operative values. Ideal conceptions of what should be or actual choices that people feel ought to be made are conceived values. Means-end relationships are object values; the preferred means to a particular end may be operative or conceived. Operative values are studied by observing preferential behavior (similar to the approach chosen by Adler), conceived values by the relationship between symbols and preferential behavior. Object values have yet to be satisfactorily operationalized in Morris' work.

Still others have divided values into moral, aesthetic, and social classes—moral values involving a personal sense of "ought," social values containing a sense of "ought" regarding maintenance of the collective welfare, and aesthetic values being a matter of "taste" (preference for certain kinds of sensations).

 Philosophical distinctions in the study of values have also been utilized. Included among those which have influenced psychological conceptions are the differences between intrinsic (inseparable from an object or situation) and extrinsic values; between instrumental (means) and inherent or terminal (ends) values (e.g., see the discussion of Rokeach's work later in this chapter); implicit (known only to the subject) and explicit (known to outside observers) values. Factor analysis may reveal empirical dimensions of value initially known to neither respondent nor researcher. Additional conceptual and theoretical work on values
has been done by Perry (1926), Lepley (1949), Pepper (1958), Maslow (1959), and Catton (1959).

From all the positions reviewed so far, it is possible to collect a fairly comprehensive list of value characteristics which must eventually be included in an adequate theoretical framework. These include distinctions between values that are individual and collective, explicit and implicit, and that fall into five broad categories: 1) telic, referring to ultimate means and ends; 2) ethical, dealing with good and evil; 3) aesthetic, defining beauty and ugliness; 4) intellectual (or epistemological), outlining how truth is to be known; and 5) economic, dealing with definitions of both preferences and the preferable in the realm of social exchange. These categories seem exhaustive but not mutually exclusive. Operationalizing them successfully presents a formidable challenge.

**Measuring Values**

To the social psychologist, the theoretical distinctions and numerous conceptual classes may reduce to these simpler notions when it comes to operations. The value realm consists of enduring and central clusters of beliefs, thoughts, and feelings which influence or determine important evaluations or choices regarding persons, situations, and ideas (propositions). Values differ operationally from attitudes only in being fewer in number, more general, central and pervasive, less situation-bound, more resistant to modification and perhaps tied to developmentally more primitive or dramatic experiences. Values influence judgements and actions beyond an immediate or specific situation or goal by providing an abstract frame of reference for perceiving and organizing experience and for choosing among
courses of action. When pressed for a decision, then, about where attitude shades into value, the attitude researcher is usually at a loss for criteria more definite than those suggested above.

Within this chapter a small sample of instruments claimed to measure values are presented in detail. These were selected with several characteristics in mind: recency, inclusiveness, diversity, and relevance to empirical social psychology. All the scales presented were either developed or revised within the last 20 years. Nevertheless, some of these incorporate earlier work -- for example, Rettig and Pasamanick (1959) employ items developed by Crissman in 1927. Only scales or instruments tapping general values were selected. Those dealing only with achievement, occupational, religious, and other unidimensional values were omitted. Changes in values as a result of psychotherapy or college attendance are not reviewed here (see, respectively, Rosenthal, 1955, and Newcomb and Feldman, 1968), nor are value measures designed specifically for children (Hawkes, 1952) or for high school students (Asher, 1954).

The scales to be presented in the following pages were based on several

2 The Psychological Abstracts, Sociological Abstracts, and Social Sciences and Humanities Index from 1949 to 1969 provided the major sources for these scales. For the period 1920-1949 only the Psychological Abstracts were consulted.

3 For occupational measures see our companion volume, Robinson et al. (1968); for a study of the aesthetic value see Cohen (1941); references for measures of achievement values are listed in Bonjean, et al. (1967). American "core" values are discussed by Gruen (1966).

Measures of values based on hypothetical situations are discussed by Carter (1956) and by Stoffer and Toby (1951). For a comparison of verbal and behavioral value measures see Grace and Grace (1952). An excellent introduction to the problems of relating verbally assessed values and attitudes to behavior can be found in Brown (1965, Ch. 8).
different definitions of "value"; each represents a slightly different approach to the problem of measurement. Included are:

1. Study of Values (Allport, Vernon, and Lindzey 1960)
2. Test of Value Activities (Shorr 1953)
3. Survey of Interpersonal Values (Gordon 1960)
4. Personal Value Scales (Scott 1965)
5. Value Profile (Bales and Couch 1969)
6. Dimensions of Values (Withey 1965)
7. Changes in Moral Values (Rettig and Pasamanick 1959)
8. Inventory of Values (Ewell 1954)
9. Value Survey (Rokeach 1968)
10. Ways to Live (Morris 1956)
11. Variations in Value Orientations (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck 1961)
12. Social Values Questionnaire (Perloe 1967)

A problem common to authors of all these scales is proper specification of the universe from which value items are to be sampled. When one chooses to assess basic values, items either selected or written must be neither too general nor too specific. If too general, the items may elicit only cultural cliches; individual differences in value systems will be missed. If too specific, the items may tap constructs better labeled more specifically as attitudes, beliefs, motives, etc.

Another common problem is to overlook the important theoretical and methodological distinction between values as "what is preferred" vs. "what is preferable" -- what is desired as opposed to what ought to be desired. In some cases there may be little difference. For example, in a study by Scott (1965) it was shown that most college students expected others to hold the same ultimate values as they did, and others were judged on the basis of conformity to these personal values. Moreover, the extensive literature on cognitive dissonance indicates that when a person is induced to make a choice, he generally comes to see the chosen alternative as increasingly preferable. (Festinger, 1957; Abelson et al., 1968)

Nevertheless, the relationship between what is desired by an individual or
by a group consensus and what is held by individuals or groups to be the morally proper choice should not be prejudged.\(^4\)

The scales presented in this chapter are organized loosely according to this distinction -- values as choice vs. values as the standards by which choices ought to be made. It should be kept in mind, however, that this is not a distinction considered by many of the authors, and some of the scales do not fit perfectly into either category.

**Values as What is Desired**

The Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values ascertains relative preferences for six different kinds of ideas and activities: theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious. This instrument has been used most often to type college students according to their dominant interests. A few questions are couched in terms of "should" or "ought," but, in general, personal preferences are what is measured.

Shorr's Test of Value Activities assesses the intensity with which an individual avoids or shows interest in four kinds of activities: theoretical, social, aesthetic, and economic. It is similar to the Study of Values but does not force a respondent to choose one activity at the expense of another.

Gordon's Interpersonal Values survey also appears to measure what is desired, although here the "objects" of value are social-psychological states (support, conformity, recognition, independence, benevolence, and leadership) important to the respondent. The line between values and central

\(^4\) Philosophers point to the so-called "positivistic fallacy" of equating the desired with the desirable, of viewing the majority preference as the worthy preference.
personality traits here becomes very hazy. Operationally there appears to be little difference, for example, between personality, attitude, and value survey measures of conformity or independence.

**Values as what ought to be desired**

Scott is primarily concerned with judgements of college students of rightness/wrongness and goodness/badness in the area of interpersonal relations. For this purpose, Scott's instruments appear to be among the most sophisticated and comprehensive in the recent literature.

The Bales and Couch Value Profile also focuses on values related to social interaction. Unlike Scott, who conceived of his several value dimensions and then designed items for each, Bales and Couch factor analyzed a pool of items and turned up four useful empirical dimensions. The Withey instrument is based on the most important items from this Value Profile. It is included here because data from a representative national sample, when factored, yielded the same four dimensions as the Value Profile -- acceptance of authority, expression vs. restraint, equalitarianism, and individualism -- thus adding considerable support to the reliability of this dimensional scheme.

The measures designed by Rettig and Pasamanick and by Ewell tap what is more commonly called *morality*. Acts such as cheating on exams, lying under certain conditions, using birth control methods, and so on are judged according to whether they are right or wrong. This is a direct method for the assessment of personal values as expressed in norms governing behavior.
Scales Based on a Mixed Conception of Values

In Rokeach's Value Survey respondents are instructed to rank order 18 terminal and 18 instrumental values -- ends and means -- in terms of their importance as guiding principles. Although this procedure is exceptionally simple, Rokeach has already produced interesting results in value-change and behavior-change experiments using the Survey. For some discussion of these and for an enlightening conceptual exploration of beliefs, attitudes, values, and their systematic relations, see his recent book (Rokeach, 1968).

Morris' Ways to Live scale contains 13 complex paragraphs which include values both as what is desired and as what should be preferred. Instructions ask the respondent what he prefers, but some data have been gathered by asking the respondent what he feels he ought to prefer. This instrument is particularly useful in comparing value differences among distinct social groups, and has been used in extensive cross-cultural research.

Also of particular relevance to cross-cultural investigations is the interview questionnaire proposed by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, who based their research on the assumption that people in all cultures have to face the same fundamental problems and so must develop normative and preferential ways to deal with these. Although their measures need much further work, this seems to be a productive beginning at combining the insights of psychologists, sociologists, and anthropologists.

Perloe's work contains both conceptions of values, with one of his four factor dimensions running from acceptance of a moral obligation to emphasis on individual preference with reference to behavior toward secondary groups.
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STUDY OF VALUES (Allport, Vernon and Lindzey 1960)

**Variable**

First developed in 1931, the Study of Values assesses the relative importance of six basic interests or personality motives: theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious. This classification is based on Spranger's *Types of Men*. Described in terms of men, the six values are elaborated as follows:

1) The theoretical man most values the discovery of truth. He is empirical, critical, and rational, aiming to order and systematize his knowledge.

2) The economic man most values that which is useful. He is interested in practical affairs, especially those of business, judging things by their tangible utility.

3) The aesthetic man most values beauty and harmony. He is concerned with grace and symmetry, finding fulfillment in artistic experiences.

4) The social man most values altruistic and philanthropic love. He is kind, sympathetic, unselfish, valuing other men as ends in themselves.

5) The political man most values power and influence. He seeks leadership, enjoying competition and struggle.

6) The religious man most values unity. He seeks communion with the cosmos, mystically relating to its wholeness.

**Description**

The test is composed of 45 items, 30 of which are forced choice (Part I), and 15 of which require rank ordering of 4 alternatives (Part II). In Part I the subject can express a strong or weak preference for his choices by the way he distributes three points. Thus, a strong preference for alternative a over alternative b would be indicated by marking alternative a as 3 and marking alternative b as 0. A slight preference for a over b would be indicated by marking a as 2 and b as 1, etc. Each value is represented by 10 of the 60 possible answers. In Part II the subject rank orders 4 statements from 1 to 4, where 4 indicates greatest preference. Again each value is represented 10 times in the 60 possible answers. Scores are obtained by summing item scores and adding or subtracting correction figures.

**Sample**

About 1,400 students from a number of colleges were used in devising and refining the original test. The test has since been administered to thousands of people, primarily college students. (See, for example, references in Newcomb and Feldman (1968), p. 321.) New norms provided in the 1960 edition are based on 1,816 college students.
Reliability

Split-half reliabilities (N = 100) show Spearman-Brown product moment correlations ranging from .84 (theoretical) to .95 (religious). A Z transformation provides a mean reliability coefficient of .90. A final item analysis (N = 780 male and female subjects at 6 different colleges) indicates that every item is positively correlated at the .01 level with the total score for its value. Test-retest reliabilities after one month (N = 34, 1951) and after two months (N = 53, 1957) range from .84 to .93 for the economic and religious scales, respectively, for the 1957 sample. For the 1951 study, .89 was the Z transformed mean repeat reliability coefficient; for the 1957 study, this figure was .88. In a recent study (Hilton and Korn 1964), the Study of Values was administered 7 times to 30 subjects at monthly intervals. Repeat reliability Z's ranged from .74 (political scale) to .89 (religious scale).

Validity

Much external validation has been done on this test. Two surveys review issues of validation for the 1931 form: Cantril and Allport (1933) and Duffy (1940). Indirect validation is suggested by findings such as those of Newcomb (1943) which indicate that values change in the direction predicted by a particular kind of college education. The scale does distinguish among groups differing in occupation, religion, and other interests in predicted ways. There are many studies showing correlations between the scales and other variables such as group memberships, occupational and educational choices. Researchers interested in different assessments of validity for the different scales or for the test as a whole should consult the literature (see, for example, Hunt 1968).

Location


Administration

The test is self-administered, requiring, according to the authors, about 20 minutes to complete. The test is also self-scoring, and both taking and scoring the test can be completed within 1 hour. Norms are provided for men and women so that the subject can interpret his own profile of values.

Results and Comments

This test is so widely used that an adequate summary is beyond the scope of this review (see references in Mental Measurements Yearbooks (1959, 1965) and in Newcomb and Feldman 1968). It has been used in vocational guidance, counseling, and a variety of areas of research, some of which are referenced in the manual.

Limitations of this instrument are also well known. This scale measures only the relative strength of each value; thus, a high score on one scale necessitates a corresponding reduction on one or more of the other scales. This is not necessarily a deficiency in the test, but it is a fact that both must not be forgotten in evaluating scores and may make interpretation difficult by imposing negative correlations and making prediction more troublesome. For example, someone moderately religious but disinterested in the other five areas could score higher on the religious scale than the very religious person with strong interests in the other five areas. Another limitation is that the test is standardized on college students who are primarily
in liberal arts. A systematic sampling of colleges has not been completed, and despite some studies of non-collegiate groups, there is still insufficient data to allow for generalization beyond this narrow range of subjects. Furthermore, the test vocabulary is difficult enough to require a fairly high level of education, although less complex, but equivalent, versions have been written (Levy, 1958). The revised 1951 form simplified and updated the 1931 version, improved item diagnostic power, shortened and modified the scoring system, increased the test reliability and offered new norms. The social value was redefined to measure altruistic love or philanthropy rather than the broader conception of Spranger. Spranger had included love in any form in the social value. The 3rd edition, 1960, makes changes in the manual and score sheet only, not in the test itself. More normative data are also provided. The new scoring system requires the subject to check boxes in the test booklet. Correlations between the revised and old forms after a 2 week interval were, according to the manual, "significantly high" for a sample of 50 college men. Nevertheless, the meaning of the scores may be different: the redefined social value correlated only $r = .31$ with the old form; other correlations ranged from $.45$ (political) to $.75$ (religious).

In sum, this test looks at the relative importance of 6 areas of interest or values. It measures preferences, not what ought to be preferred. Internal consistency and split-half reliability for group use are adequate, and scores do consistently relate as predicted by the theory. It is easy to administer and, not without reason, in spite of the criticisms and limitations noted, is one of the best and certainly the most ubiquitous of scales of values.
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STUDY OF VALUES SCALE

Sample Items

Part I (30 questions—choose one answer and note strength of preference)

1. The main object of scientific research should be the discovery of truth rather than its practical application.
   (a) Yes (b) No

4. Assuming that you have sufficient ability, would you prefer to be:
   (a) a banker?
   (b) a politician?

15. At an exposition, do you chiefly like to go to the buildings where you can see:
   (a) new manufacturing products?
   (b) scientific (e.g., chemical) apparatus?

Part II (15 questions—rank order highest preference with a 4, next highest with a 3, next with a 2, and least preferred with a 1)

3. If you could influence the educational policies of the public schools of some city, would you undertake
   ___ a. to promote the study and participation in music and fine arts?
   ___ b. to stimulate the study of social problems?
   ___ c. to provide additional laboratory facilities?
   ___ d. to increase the practical value of courses?

12. Should one guide one's conduct according to, or develop one's chief loyalties toward
   ___ a. one's religious faith?
   ___ b. ideals of beauty?
   ___ c. one's occupational organization and associates?
   ___ d. ideals of charity?
TEST OF VALUE ACTIVITIES (Shorr 1953)

Variable
This scale assesses the intensity with which individuals hold four kinds of values: theoretical, social, aesthetic and economic-political. The scales are similar to those of Allport, Vernon and Lindzey's Study of Values, but no religious scale was included on the assumption that the scores on this scale may represent, as Super (1949) suggested, answers showing "neither deep religious feeling nor intellectual doubts concerning religion". Furthermore, in Shorr's measure the economic and political scales are combined.

Description
Numerous items covering a broad range of activities were gathered. Each item was then rated by 11 judges familiar with tests and theories of values on an 11 point scale of intensity of interest ranging from avoidance to great interest. Twenty questions for each scale, totaling 80 items, of minimum variability were selected; each scale value from 1 to 11 was represented by two items. No negative questions were used, and all items with a median scale-value from 1.00 to 1.75 were given a value of 1. The same procedure was used throughout; thus, a 2.65 score would be given a value of 2.

Sample
The sample consisted of 389 females--126 college sophomores, 263 high school seniors--and 352 males--121 college sophomores, 231 high school seniors.

Reliability
Split-half reliability for each scale was easily computed since each scale had two items of the same weight. The reliability coefficients obtained from the scores of 126 female college sophomores were .84 (theoretical), .82 (aesthetic), .78 (economic-political), and .72 (social scale).

Validity
No measures of validity are reported.

Location
Shorr, J. The development of a test to measure the intensity of values, Journal of Educational Psychology, 1953, 44, 266-274.

Administration
The test is self-administered, and should take under five minutes to complete.

Results and Comments
No significant differences were found between college sophomores and high school seniors, but sex differences were found on all four scales. This scale is useful in that it measures intensity of different kinds of values rather than only the relation of one set of values to another. Whether or not this scale represents a wider range of value-relevant items that the Allport-Vernon Study of Values (which it was meant to improve) is a moot question. The lack of data on validity is an unfortunate omission. Anyone wanting to use this measure in a large study should explore its validity first.
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Each item in the scale is coded as follows:
A - theoretical
B - economic-political
C - aesthetic
D - social

Total scores for each area are calculated by summing for each "yes" response, the number associated with the response on the scale items below. Taking the A (theoretical) scale as an example, if the respondent replies Yes only to A items 19, 58 and 60, his total score on the theoretical dimension would be 6 (2 + 3 + 1). The following percentile norms developed on the above sample are to be used in interpreting scale scores.

**PROFILE SHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% PERCENTILE</th>
<th>THEORETICAL</th>
<th>ECON-POLITICAL</th>
<th>AESTHETIC</th>
<th>SOCIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THEORETICAL** - A high score indicates that the individual prefers and considers most worthwhile those activities which involve a problem-solving attitude and are related to investigation, research, and scientific curiosity.
**ECONOMIC-POLITICAL** - A high score indicates that an individual prefers and considers most worthwhile those activities which involve the accumulation of money and the securing of executive power.

**AESTHETIC** - A high score indicates that an individual prefers and considers most worthwhile those activities which involve art, music, dance and literature.

**SOCIAL** - A high score indicates that an individual prefers and considers most worthwhile those activities which involve service and help to people, and which exhibit a definite desire to respond and be with people socially.
A Test of Value Activities

Direction: Read each statement in turn then circle both the number and letter appearing next to either yes or no that best indicates your feeling of like or dislike for the activity described. Be sure to answer each question. A sample response is as follows:

"Enjoy eating ice cream"  2A Yes  2A No

1. Meet new people and get acquainted with them.  5D Yes  5D No
2. Take a car load of children for an outing.  6D Yes  6D No
3. Serve as a companion to an elderly person.  7D Yes  7D No
4. Like to be with people despite their physical deformities.  8D Yes  8D No
5. Work with a group to help the unemployed.  9D Yes  9D No
6. Work with labor and management to help solve their conflicts.  10D Yes  10D No
7. Go with friends to a movie.  4D Yes  4D No
8. Help distribute food at a picnic.  3D Yes  3D No
9. Serve as a companion to an elderly person.  7D Yes  7D No
10. Go with your school friends to a movie.  4D Yes  4D No
11. Collect specimens of small animals for a zoo or museum.  5A Yes  5A No
12. Do algebra problems.  6A Yes  6A No
13. Develop an international language.  7A Yes  7A No
14. Do an experiment with the muscle and nerve of a frog.  8A Yes  8A No
15. Study the various methods used in scientific investigations.  9A Yes  9A No
16. Do research on the relation of brain waves to thinking.  10A Yes  10A No
17. Visit a research laboratory in which small animals are being tested in a maze.  4A Yes  4A No
18. Plan the defense and offense you are to use before a tennis game.  3A Yes  3A No
19. Read the biography of Louis Pasteur.  2A Yes  2A No
20. See moving pictures in which scientists are heroes.  1A Yes  1A No
21. Judge entries in a photo contest.  5C Yes  5C No
22. Sketch action scenes on a drawing pad.  6C Yes  6C No
23. Participate in a summer theatre group.  7C Yes  7C No
24. Compare the treatment of a classical work as given by two fine musicians.  8C Yes  8C No
25. Mould a statue in clay.  9C Yes  9C No
26. Be a ballet dancer.  10C Yes  10C No
27. Be a sign painter.  4C Yes  4C No
28. Plant flowers and shrubbery around a home.  3C Yes  3C No
29. Listen to "jive" and "jazz" records.  2C Yes  2C No
30. Play the juke box.  1C Yes  1C No
31. Lead a round-table discussion.  5B Yes  5B No
32. Be a chairman of an organizing committee.  6B Yes  6B No
33. Buy a run-down business and make it grow.  7B Yes  7B No
34. Borrow money in order to "put over" a business deal.  8B Yes  8B No
35. Run for political office.  9B Yes  9B No
36. Own and operate a bank.  10B Yes  10B No
37. Be a bank teller.  4B Yes  4B No
38. Take a course in Business English.  3B Yes  3B No
39. Major in commercial subjects in school.  2B Yes  2B No
40. Collect luncheon money at the end of a school cafeteria line.  1B Yes  1B No
41. Send a letter of condolence to a neighbor.  5D Yes  5D No
42. Help people to be comfortable when traveling.  6D Yes  6D No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>7D Yes</th>
<th>7D No</th>
<th>8D Yes</th>
<th>8D No</th>
<th>9D Yes</th>
<th>9D No</th>
<th>10D Yes</th>
<th>10D No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Belong to several social agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Treat wounds to help people get well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Help an agency locate living places for evicted families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Be a medical missionary to a foreign country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Attend a dance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Dine with classmates in the school cafeteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Play checkers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ride in a bus to San Francisco or a neighboring city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Be a laboratory technician.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Be a scientific farmer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Develop new kinds of flowers in a small greenhouse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Solve knotty legal problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Develop improved procedures in a scientific experiment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Develop new mathematical formulas for research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Look at the displays on astronomy in an observatory exhibit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Visit the fossil display at a museum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Keep a chemical storeroom or physical laboratory.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Sell scientific books.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Judge window displays in a contest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Collect rare and old recordings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Be an interior decorator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Make a comparative study of architecture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Write a new arrangement for a musical theme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Paint a mural.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Visit a flower show.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Make and trim household accessories like lamp shades, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Dance to a fast number.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Paint the kitchen with colors of your choice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Install improved office procedures in a big business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Plan business and commercial investments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Be an active member of a political group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Address a political convention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Operate a race track.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Become a U. S. Senator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Purchase supplies for a picnic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Live in a large city rather than a small town.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Work at an information desk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Be a private secretary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SURVEY OF INTERPERSONAL VALUES (Gordon 1960)

Variable

This test is designed to measure the relative importance ascribed to each of six factored interpersonal value dimensions. These values include both the subject's relations with others and others with him. The six dimensions are:
1) support—being treated with understanding, encouragement, kindness and consideration;
2) conformity—doing what is socially correct, accepted and proper;
3) recognition—being admired, looked up to, considered important and attracting favorable notice;
4) independence—being able to do what one wants to do, making one's own decisions, doing things in one's own way;
5) benevolence—doing things for other people, sharing and helping;
6) leadership—being in charge of others, having authority or power.

Description

This is a brief, forced choice test instrument. There are 30 groups of 3 statements in each group in this test; within each triad, each of the three statements presented reflects an interpersonal value. The respondent checks the statement most and least important to him. The items within each triad have been, according to the manual, equated for social desirability. Responses are scored by hand by using a punched overlay stencil.

Sample

The sample was developed on 232 subjects, and this form, as well as 4 succeeding revisions were given to a number of high school, college, industrial and other adult samples.

Reliability

Test-retest reliability coefficients range from .78 to .89 for the six value scores; median value is r = .84. The Kuder-Richardson reliability results range from .71 to .86; median estimate is r = .82.

Norms are available for college and high school males and females, although there is no explanation of who was selected or how this selection was done. College norms are based on samples from 12 different universities and colleges throughout the country. High school norms are based on 4 schools in California.

Validity

The manual supplement (1963) suggests that test users validate the SIV for the particular situation in which it is to be used. The results of over 25 studies illustrating the use of the SIV are presented. The SIV has been used as a predictor of job and educational success, as a way of examining cross-cultural differences, and as a way to measure change resulting from educational or other changes. For example, one study using this scale (Gordon and Mensch 1962) on 208 medical students concluded that there was a downward trend in benevolence from freshmen to senior students. Decrease in this kind of value has often been noted in other studies of medical students (Eron 1955; and Becker and Geer, 1958).
Location


Administration

The test is self-administered and should take about 15-20 minutes to complete.

Results and Comments

A comprehensive discussion of the development of the SIV is lacking. It is not clear how the items were initially selected, and the factor analysis is not presented in sufficient detail. However, the manual is clear and pertinent. Although some studies of dubious value are included in the review summaries, most studies support the usefulness of this instrument, and correlations between the SIV and other tests are of interest. The items are transparent and may invite faking. Norms on non-academic populations will increase the usefulness of this instrument, as will additional research. Nevertheless, it has potential use in personnel selection and counseling and a variety of other areas, but the caveat of the author concerning validation must be kept in mind.

References


Survey of Interpersonal Values

Instructions

In this booklet are statements representing things that people consider to be important to their way of life. These statements are grouped into sets of three. This is what you are asked to do: Examine each set. Within each set, find the ONE STATEMENT of the three which represents what you consider to be most important to you. Blacken the space beside that statement in the column headed M (for most). Next, examine the remaining two statements in the set. Decide which one of these statements represents what you consider to be least important to you. Blacken the space beside that statement in the column headed L (for least).

For every set you will mark one statement as representing what is most important to you, one statement as representing what is least important to you, and you will leave one statement unmarked...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be in a position of not having to follow orders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To follow rules and regulations closely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have people notice what I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to do pretty much as I please</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be in charge of some important project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To work for the good of other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have others approve of what I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To make decisions for the group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To share my belongings with other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have people admire me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To always do the approved thing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be able to leave things lying around if I wish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERSONAL VALUE SCALES (Scott 1965)

| Variable | Scott defined personal values as follows: "a personal value (or moral ideal) is any individual's conception of an ideal relationship between people--a state of affairs that he considers ultimately, absolutely, and universally good. A value is...identified, not by its content..., but by the attitude of the person toward it. No matter what state a given individual, regards as ultimately, absolutely, and universally good, that state constitutes, for him, a value."

| Description | Scott developed scales to measure personal values in a study of University of Colorado fraternities and sororities. The following 12 were chosen in part because they seemed a priori to be relevant to Greek student organizations, in part because most were mentioned in a preliminary open-ended survey (Scott 1959): 1) intellectualism, 2) kindness, 3) social skills (being charming, popular, etc.), 4) loyalty (to one's group), 5) academic achievement, 6) physical development, 7) status leadership), 8) honesty, 9) religiousness, 10) self-control, 11) creativity, and 12) independence.

Up to a dozen statements were written for each value area, and these were administered to "try-out samples of students," usually of about 200 in size. Item analysis resulted in the elimination of all but four to six items for each scale.

The resulting instrument was administered to a sample of general psychology students to test for homogeneity within each scale. The results are reported under Reliability below.

The final instrument requires a respondent to check one of the following categories in response to each value statement: Always Admire, Depends on Situation, Always Dislike. In most cases "Always Admire" is scored 1, and the other two responses are scored 0 (the only exceptions are the few reversed items, for which "Always Admire" and "Depends" are scored 0). Total scores for each value are obtained by summation.

Because Scott needed a relatively short instrument, he used this 60 item questionnaire despite its having only moderate reliability. Following this research, however, he designed additional items for each scale, which we have included in the list reported below. These additional items also provide a control for agreement response set, a possible bias inherent in the original instrument.

| Sample | For the pretest phases of Scott's research, respondents were University of Colorado students, usually selected in an unspecified manner, although for the test-retest stability study general psychology students were used. |
For the major research project, the sample consisted of the members of six fraternities and four sororities, plus a control group—representative of the entire undergraduate body—containing 108 independents and 64 Greeks. Over 900 subjects were tested.

In developing the longer version of the values instrument, Scott employed a sample of students taking general psychology (N = 254).

Reliability

As a measure of reliability Scott used Cronbach's (1951) coefficient alpha. In the following list, the first coefficient refers to alpha for the short scales, the second to two-week test-retest stability of the short scales, the third to alpha for the long scales, and the fourth to the correlation of each long scale with its corresponding original scale.

Intellectualism (.68, .64, .82, .66); kindness (.66, .68, .85, .76); social skills (.70, .74, .87, .76); loyalty (.71, .58, .89, .79); academic achievement (.69, .68, .82, .75); physical development (.77, .74, .89, .81); status (.65, .70, .83, .67); honesty (.61, .74, .80, .75); religiousness (.78, .77, .88, .81); self-control (.68, .72, .85, .78); creativity (.64, .66, .84, .62); independence (.55, .73, .82, .74). Notice that in each case alpha is considerably higher for the longer scale. The correlations between the original scales and their lengthened counterparts are less than perfect, probably for at least two reasons: reduction of agreement biases and slight alterations in content.

Validity

Concurrent validity was assessed by asking a group of students (N = 208) to rate the items for "rightness" or "wrongness" (right, wrong, or neither) and according to "how other people should feel" (should admire the trait, should disapprove the trait, people might differ in their opinion on the matter). The items were also rated according to admirability to self. The intercorrelations between these three assessments were quite high.

Another attempt to infer validity involved asking a group of students (N = 218) to say how bothered they would be if each value were transgressed (e.g., for intellectualism, "if you were unable to read any books or magazines for several weeks, how would you feel: would not bother me at all...would bother me a lot"). Correlations between scale scores and transgression scores were statistically significant in nine of 12 cases (exceptions were loyalty, status, and creativity—which may have been the most difficult to propose transgressions for).

Finally, known group validation was attempted with several scales. For example, Jesuit seminarians scored higher on religiousness than male students at the University of Colorado; members of the Women's Physical Education Club scored higher
than a cross-section of university women; art majors scored higher on creativity; members of the University Players Club, reputed to be nonconformists, scored higher on independence; high grade-point students scored higher than academically mediocre students on the academic achievement scale.

Location


Administration

Both versions of the values instrument are self-administered. The 60-item version would take about half an hour to complete, while the 240-item version would take something over an hour.

Results and Comments

Considerable care was exercised in developing the Personal Value Scales. (See his earlier study developing a way to assess both values and ideologies; Scott 1959.) For student populations similar to Scott's (from a large state university) and for purposes similar to his (measuring several values important to students) these scales are recommended. Even for other groups most of Scott's items would appear to be applicable; only a few, such as "studying hard to get good grades in school," seem to be "student specific."

Scott's research on Greek organizations confirmed several interesting hypotheses; for example, that a student's initial values are useful in predicting whether he will join such an organization, that these organizations do tend to recruit new members with values similar to those of old members, and that the sociometric ratings a person receives from others depend in part on the rater's values. There were several more such findings—collectively supporting the construct validity of Scott's scales and the worth of including personal values among a list of important social psychological variables.

For an interesting study relating personal values to international values or ideology, see Scott (1960).
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VALUE SCALES

Instructions

Please read over the following statements, and for each one indicate (by a check in the appropriate space) whether it is something you always admire in other people, or something you always dislike, or something that depends on the situation whether you admire it or not.

Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always Admire</th>
<th>Depends on Situation</th>
<th>Always Dislike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Having a strong intellectual curiosity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Creating beautiful things for the enjoyment of other people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Items preceded by an asterisk were included in both short and long versions of the instrument. Items in parentheses were included in the short but not the long version. All other items appeared only in the long version.)

Intellectualism

Direct-scored items

*Having a keen interest in international, national, and local affairs.
*Having a strong intellectual curiosity.
*Developing an appreciation of the fine arts—music, drama, literature, and ballet.
*Having an active interest in all things scholarly.
Having cultural interests.
Striving to gain new knowledge about the world.
Enjoying books, music, art, philosophy, and sciences.
Keeping abreast of current events.
Knowing what's going on in the world of politics.
Keeping up with world news through regular reading or by watching informative programs.
(Being an intellectual.)

Reverse-scored items

Having restricted and narrow interests.
Having no knowledge of current events.
Being interested only in one's work.
Having no opinions about the world situation.
Knowing only one's specialty.
Having little interest in arts, theater, music, and other cultural activities.
Being uninterested in national and world affairs.
Showing little interest in the finer things of life.
Ignoring what goes on in the world around one.
Reading only things that don't pose any intellectual challenge.

Kindness

Direct-scored items

*Being kind to people, even if they do things contrary to one's beliefs.
*Helping another person feel more secure, even if one doesn't like him.
*Helping another achieve his own goals, even if it might interfere with your own.
*Turning the other cheek, and forgiving others when they harm you.
Being considerate of others' feelings.
Finding ways to help others less fortunate than oneself.
Being utterly selfless in all one's actions.
Having a deep love of all people, whoever they are.
Going out of one's way to help someone new feel at home.
Being concerned about the happiness of other people.

Reverse-scored items

Looking out for one's own interests first.
Ridiculing other people.
Being selfish.
Ignoring the needs of other people.
Revengeing wrongs that other people have done to one.
Being unable to empathize with other people.
Hurting other people's feelings.
Making jokes at the expense of other people.
Letting each person go it alone, without offering help.
Refusing any aid to people who don't deserve it.

Social Skills

Direct-scored items

*Being well mannered and behaving properly in social situations.
*Dressing and acting in a way that is appropriate to the occasion.
*Being able to get people to cooperate with one.
*Being poised, gracious, and charming under all circumstances.
Always doing the right thing at the right time.
Being informed in proper etiquette.
Being able to plan social functions smoothly.
Being popular with everyone.
Always behaving properly in public.
Being concerned about what kind of impression one makes on others.
(Being able to get along with all kinds of people, whether or not they are worthwhile.)
(Being the person in the group who is the most popular with the opposite sex.)

Reverse-scored items

Being a social isolate.
Dressing sloppily.
Displaying unpleasant personal habits in public.
Interrupting others while they are talking.
Constantly making social blunders.
Talking constantly and attracting attention to oneself.
Having bad manners.
Being discourteous.
Being unable to act in a way that will please others.
Being ignorant of the rules of proper behavior.

Loyalty

Direct-scored items

*Defending the honor of one's group whenever it is unfairly criticized.
*Working hard to improve the prestige and status of one's groups.
*Helping organize group activities.
Attending all meetings of one's groups.
Upholding the honor of one's group.
Supporting all activities of one's organizations.
Doing more than one's share of the group task.
Performing unpleasant tasks, if these are required by one's group.
Remembering one's group loyalties at all times.
Taking an active part in all group affairs.
(Treating an attack on one's group like an attack on oneself.)
(Concealing from outsiders most of one's dislikes and disagreements with fellow members of the group.)
(Doing all one can to build up the prestige of the group.)

Reverse-scored items

Betraying one's group to outsiders.
Letting other people do all the work for the group, and not getting involved oneself.
Letting people get away with unfair criticism of one's group.
Being unconcerned with what other people think about one's group.
Being uncooperative.
Failing to support group functions.
Paying little attention to what the members of one's group think.
Criticizing one's own group in public.
Getting by with as little involvement in organizations as possible.
Not taking one's group memberships seriously.

Academic Achievement (Grades)

Direct-scored items

*Studying hard to get good grades in school.
*Working hard to achieve academic honors.
Trying hard to understand difficult lectures and textbooks.
*Striving to get the top grade-point average in the group.
*Studying constantly in order to become a well educated person.
Being studious.
Getting the top grade on a test.
Treating one's studies as the most important thing in college life.
Doing well in school.
Priding oneself on good grades.

Reverse-scored items

Being content with a "gentlemanly C" grade.
Making fun of academic grinds.
Being satisfied with poor grades.
Priding oneself on being able to get by in school with little work.
Not doing well in one's coursework.
Not letting studies interfere with one's college life.
Doing one's best to avoid working hard in a course.
Being proud of poor grades.
Paying no attention to lectures and textbooks that are difficult.
Taking snap courses that don't require any work.

Physical Development

Direct-scored items

*Being graceful and well coordinated in physical movements.
*Taking good care of one's physical self, so that one is always healthy.
*Being good in some form of sport.
*Developing physical strength and agility.
Developing an attractive body that others will admire.
Having a good figure or physique.
Having good muscular coordination.
Being a well developed outdoors type who enjoys physical activity.
Keeping in good physical shape.
Exercising regularly.
Reverse-scored items

Being physically weak and puny.
Being an indoor type, and avoiding outdoor activities.
Being poorly proportioned physically.
Being uninterested in sports.
Being listless and uninterested in strenuous activity.
Being awkward in bearing and walk.
Being unable to do anything that requires physical effort.
Being unskilled in any form of athletics.
Ignoring one's own physical condition.
Avoiding any form of exercise.

Status

Direct-scored items

*Being respected by people who are themselves worthwhile.
*Gaining recognition for one's achievements.
*Being in a position to direct and mold others' lives.
Making sure that one is respected.
Doing what one is told.
Being in a position to command respect from others.
Having all the respect that one is entitled to.
Being dignified in bearing and manner.
Being looked up to by others.
Enjoying great prestige in the community.
(Having the ability to lead others.)
(Showing great leadership qualities.)

Reverse-scored items

Acting beneath one's dignity.
Not being able to do anything better than other people.
Not being recognized for one's true worth.
Being in a subordinate position.
Having little effect on other people's actions.
Being unable to exert any influence on things around one.
Failing to develop contacts that could improve one's position.
Being content with an inferior position all one's life.
Associating with worthless people.
Not taking pride in one's achievements.

Honesty

Direct-scored items

*Never cheating or having anything to do with cheating situations, even for a friend.
Always telling the truth, even though it may hurt oneself or others.
Never telling a lie, even though to do so would make the situation more comfortable.
Sticking up for the truth under all circumstances.
Always representing one's own true thoughts and feelings honestly.
Speaking one's mind truthfully, without regard for the consequences.
Testifying against friends, if need be, in order that the truth be known.
Presenting oneself completely and honestly, even if it is unnecessary to do so.
Going out of one's way to bring dishonest people to justice.
Volunteering information concerning wrongdoing, even if friends are involved.

Reverse-scored items

*Helping a close friend get by a tight situation, even though one may have to stretch the truth a bit to do it.
Taking things that don't belong to one.
Telling white lies.
Deceiving others.
Using others' property without asking permission.
Telling falsehoods in order to help other people.
Helping a friend through an examination.
Using a false ID card to get into restricted places.
Stealing when necessary.
Being dishonest in harmless ways.

Religiousness

Direct-scored items

*Being devout in one's religious faith.
*Always living one's religion in his daily life.
*Always attending religious services regularly and faithfully.
*Avoiding the physical pleasures that are prohibited in the Bible.
*Encouraging others to attend services and lead religious lives.
Saying one's prayers regularly.
Seeking comfort in the Bible in time of need.
Adhering to the doctrines of one's religion.
Having an inner communication with the Supreme Being.
Having faith in a Being greater than man.

Reverse-scored items

Being an atheist.
Denying the existence of God.
Paying little attention to religious matters.
Treating man, rather than God, as the measure of all things.
Abstaining from trivial religious rituals.
Not falling for religious mythology.
Taking a skeptical attitude toward religious teachings.
Seeking scientific explanations of religious miracles.
Treating the Bible only as an historical or literary work.
Regarding religions as crutches for the primitive peoples of the world.

Self-control

Direct-scored items

*Practicing self-control.
*Replying to anger with gentleness.
*Never losing one's temper, no matter what the reason.
*Not expressing anger, even when one has a reason for doing so.
Suppressing hostility.
Keeping one's feelings hidden from others.
Suppressing the urge to speak hastily in anger.
Hiding one's feelings of frustration from other people.
Keeping one's hostile feelings to himself.
Not getting upset when things go wrong.
(Always being patient with people.)

Reverse-scored items

Losing one's temper easily.
Showing one's feelings readily.
Telling people off when they offend one.
Expressing one's anger openly and directly when provoked.
Getting upset when things don't go well.
Letting others see how one really feels.
Letting off steam when one is frustrated.
Swearing when one is angry.
Becoming so angry that other people know about it.
Letting people know when one is annoyed with them.

Creativity (Originality)

Direct-scored items

*Being able to create beautiful and artistic objects.
*Developing new and different ways of doing things.
*Constantly developing new ways of approaching life.
*Inventing gadgets for the fun of it.
*Trying out new ideas.
Being original in one's thoughts and ways of looking at things.
Always looking for new roads to travel.
Doing unusual things.
Creating unusual works of art.
Being an innovator.
(Creating beautiful things for the enjoyment of other people.)
(Devoting one's entire energy to the development of new theories.)

Reverse-scored items

Doing routine things all the time.
Not having any new ideas.
Always doing things in the same way.
Enjoying a routine, patterned life.
Doing things the same way that other people do them.
Abiding by traditional ways of doing things.
Repeating the ideas of others, without any innovation.
Working according to a set schedule that doesn't vary from day to day.
Painting or composing or writing in a traditional style.
Keeping one's life from changing very much.

Independence

Direct-scored items

Being a freethinking person, who doesn't care what others think of his opinions.
*Being outspoken and frank in expressing one's likes and dislikes.
Being independent.
Standing up for what one thinks right, regardless of what others think.
Going one's own way as he pleases.
Being a non-conformist.
Being different from other people.
Encouraging other people to act as they please.
*Thinking and acting freely, without social restraints.
Living one's own life, independent of others.
(Being independent, original, non-conformist, different from other people.)

Reverse-scored items

*Conforming to the requirements of any situation and doing what is expected of one.
Going along with the crowd.
Acting in such a way as to gain the approval of others.
Keeping one's opinions to himself when they differ from the group's.
Being careful not to express an idea that might be contrary to what other people believe.
Always basing one's behavior on the recognition that he is dependent on other people.
Acting so as to fit in with other people's way of doing things.
Always checking on whether or not one's intended actions would be acceptable to other people.
Never acting so as to violate social conventions.
Suppressing one's desire to be unique and different.
(Working and living in harmony with other people.)
This general purpose inventory of values was developed for interpersonal relations research. A value statement "in the concrete interaction context is a statement of the basis of an existing norm, or a proposal for the basis of a new norm." Factor analysis yielded four orthogonal factors: acceptance of authority, need-determined expression vs. value-determined restraint, equalitarianism, and individualism.

This questionnaire contains 252 items, each of which is a sentence that is evaluated on a 7 point scale, from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Six categories of agreement were used. A weight of 4, the mean value, was utilized in cases where there was no response. Items were obtained by recording group discussions, and by examining several books. Although neither random nor systematic, this sampling procedure was an attempt to represent as many value areas as possible. 163 items were obtained from subjects' conversations; 11 from the Allport-Vernon-Lindsey Study of Values; 30 items from one of the author's a priori classificatory scheme of ideological issues in small groups. 16 items were based on the work of Florence Kluckhohn; 120 items from Morris' Ways to Live. Other questionnaires, scales, and descriptions relating to values and personality provided additional items, in particular those associated with Adorno et al.'s Authoritarian Personality and Henry Murray's Explorations in Personality. For the factor analysis the 252 items were reduced in number. Items which did not discriminate among subjects were eliminated as were items that overlapped so that the factor analysis was based on the intercorrelations of 144 variables.

The major sample was composed of Harvard undergraduates who answered a newspaper advertisement. Some Harvard faculty, graduate students, and Radcliffe undergraduates also participated, making a total of 388 respondents. About 80 Bennington College students and 80 officer candidates at Maxwell Airforce Base were tested, bringing the total sample size to 552.

The range of factor loadings for authoritarianism is .56 to .76, for need expression .29 to .62, for equalitarianism .35 to .57, and for individualism .28 to .49. This would indicate average inter-item correlations in the .40's for the authoritarian items and in the high teens for the other scales. No test-retest data are reported.

No validity measures are reported.

The test is self-administered. The authors do not note its duration, but it should probably take from 25-40 minutes to complete.
Results and Comments

Despite the unfortunate lack of information on tests for validity, this scale is useful because it is extremely comprehensive, seemingly representing a very large domain of value positions on which people differ. The authors note that "the underlying factor space seems to be congruent with that obtained by Morris and others..." This, in fact, seems to be the case, but more detailed comparisons are necessary. Since various rotations give various factors, the underlying space should be the basis of comparisons made.

The value profile seems easy to use for a variety of respondents. It appears to be an instrument of much utility, although this possibility cannot be adequately evaluated from the information available in the article reviewed.
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VALUE PROFILE

Directions:

This questionnaire is designed to measure the extent to which you hold each of several general attitudes or values common in our society. On the following pages you will find a series of general statements expressing opinions of the kind you may have heard from other persons around you. After each statement there is a set of possible responses as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

You are asked to read each of the statements and then to circle the response which best represents your immediate reaction to the opinion expressed. Respond to each opinion as a whole. If you have reservations about some part of a statement, circle the response which most clearly approximates your general feeling.

VP Scale Factor I

Acceptance of Authority

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

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

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

4. You have to respect authority and when you stop respecting authority, your situation isn't worth much.

5. Patriotism and loyalty are the first and the most important requirements of a good citizen.

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

7. A child should not be allowed to talk back to his parents, or else he will lose respect for them.

8. 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.

9. Disobeying an order is one thing you can't excuse -- if one can get away with disobedience, why can't everybody?

10. A well-raised child is one who doesn't have to be told twice to do something.
VP Scale Factor II

Need-determined Expression vs. Value-determined Restraint

1. Since there are no values which can be eternal, the only real values are those which meet the needs of the given moment.

2. Nothing is static, nothing is everlasting, at any moment one must be ready to meet the change in environment by a necessary change in one's moral views.

3. Let us eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we die.

4. The solution to almost any human problem should be based on the situation at the time, not on some general moral rule.

5. Life is something to be enjoyed to the full, sensuously enjoyed with relish and enthusiasm.

6. Life is more a festival than a workshop or a school for moral discipline.

7. The past is no more, the future may never be, the present is all that we can be certain of.

8. Not to attain happiness, but to be worthy of it, is the purpose of our existence. (reverse scored)

9. No time is better spent than that devoted to thinking about the ultimate purposes of life. (reverse scored)

10. Tenderness is more important than passion in love. (reverse scored)

VP Scale Factor III

Equalitarianism

1. Everyone should have an equal chance and an equal say.

2. There should be equality for everyone -- because we are all human beings.

3. A group of equals will work a lot better than a group with a rigid hierarchy.

4. Each one should get what he needs -- the things we have belong to all of us.

5. No matter what the circumstances, one should never arbitrarily tell people what they have to do.

6. It is the duty of every good citizen to correct anti-minority remarks made in his presence.

7. Poverty could be almost entirely done away with if we made certain basic changes in our social and economic system.
8. There has been too much talk and not enough real action in doing away with racial discrimination.

9. In any group it is more important to keep a friendly atmosphere than to be efficient.

10. In a small group there should be no real leaders -- everyone should have an equal say.

**VP Scale Factor IV**

**Individualism**

1. To be superior a man must stand alone.

2. In life an individual should for the most part "go it alone," assuring himself of privacy, having much time to himself, attempting to control his own life.

3. It is the man who stands alone who excites our admiration.

4. The rich internal world of ideals, of sensitive feelings, of reverie, of self knowledge, is man's true home.

5. One must avoid dependence upon persons or things, the center of life should be found within oneself.

6. The most rewarding object of study any man can find is his own inner life.

7. Whoever would be a man, must be a non-conformist.

8. Contemplation is the highest form of human activity.

9. The individualist is the man who is most likely to discover the best road to a new future.

10. A man can learn better by striking out boldly on his own than he can by following the advice of others.
DIMENSIONS OF VALUES (Withey 1965)

Variable
These short scales are used to tap four basic dimensions of value.

Description
The items were taken from the four basic value dimensions of Bales and Couch (see previous scale). The three highest loading items on each factor of this instrument were adapted for use on a nationwide study of public civil defense practices to observe whether such behavior could be explained by value orientations.

The items are given in straightforward Likert format from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree), and therefore all scales run from 3 (high agreement with value) to 15 (low agreement with value). Average scores for the nationwide sample were:

- Acceptance of authority: 5.5
- Need-determined expression: 8.3
- Equalitarianism: 7.5
- Individualism: 7.2

Sample
The sample consisted of a nationwide probability sample of 1475 adult Americans interviewed in the fall of 1961.

Reliability
In an unpublished paper Robinson performed one factor analysis on the twelve items which essentially replicated the four dimensional structure originally obtained by Bales and Couch. The factor loadings were smaller than those obtained originally. Average inter-item correlations for the items in the various scales varied between .10 and .33.

No test-retest data were collected.

Validity
No data bearing directly on validity were collected, although some of the findings reported below suggest some construct validity.

Location

Administration
The test is self administered and should take under five minutes to complete.

Results and Comments
The items in their present format were highly susceptible to agreement response set, especially for this cross-section sample (whose rates of agreement were noticeably higher than those obtained in Bales and Couch's relatively well-educated sample). This is reflected by the fact that only one item (#6) out of the twelve received more disagreement than agreement and by the intercorrelation matrix showing only three negative coefficients out of the sixty-six...
inter-item correlations. One factor analysis actually yielded a single factor on which all items loaded positively.

Withey found the small minority of people who had built atomic shelter facilities (or who planned to build such facilities) to be rather more authoritarian. He also found the authoritarians describing the "cold war" in terms of Russia "acting like a delinquent" in a "fight between two ways of life", while rejecting the conflict's origins as "a lack of mutual understanding".

While contamination attributable to agreement response set precludes definitive conclusions, it is interesting to note that agreement with the authoritarian items was highest for this cross-section sample, while the "expression" items received highest endorsement in the Bales-Couch sample. In terms of relative rates of agreement, the better-educated were more likely to agree with the authoritarian items than any other (although in absolute terms they were the group least likely to agree with these items). Change in the wording of item 4 (original wording, "It is the man who starts off bravely on his own who excites our admiration") resulted in its loading higher on the authoritarian factor than the original individualism factor.
Dimensions of Value

Here are some statements about some of the things that some people believe and others don't. Would you tell me whether you agree or disagree with the statement I read, and whether you feel strongly about it or only fairly sure. If you don't know how you feel, say so.

Acceptance of authority

1. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them.
   - Strongly Agree
   - In between; Disagree
   - Strongly Agree
   - Don't know; Disagree
   - Mixed

2. The solution to almost any human problem should be based on the situation at the time, not on some general idea of right or wrong.

3. A group of people that are nearly equal will work a lot better than one where people have bosses and ranks over one another.

4. We should all admire a man who starts out bravely on his own.

5. You have to respect authority and when you stop respecting authority, your situation isn't worth much.

6. Everyone should have an equal chance and an equal say in most things.

7. Everyone should have what he needs, the important things we have belong to all of us.

8. Since no values last forever, the only real values are those that fit the needs of right now.

9. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important things in character that children should learn.

Need-determined expression (vs. Value-determined restraint)

2. The solution to almost any human problem should be based on the situation at the time, not on some general idea of right or wrong.

3. Do what you want to do that's fun and worry about the future later.

10. Since no values last forever, the only real values are those that fit the needs of right now.

Equalitarianism

3. A group of people that are nearly equal will work a lot better than one where people have bosses and ranks over one another.

7. Everyone should have an equal chance and an equal say in most things.

11. Everyone should have what he needs, the important things we have belong to all of us.

Individualism

4. We should all admire a man who starts out bravely on his own.

Average* (s.d.)

- 1.9 (.7)
- 1.8 (.7)
- 1.8 (.8)
- 2.6 (1.0)
- 3.7 (1.0)
- 3.0 (1.1)
- 2.9 (1.1)
- 2.1 (1.1)
- 2.5 (1.0)

* Where 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree.
8. In life a person should for the most part "go it alone," working on his own and trying to make his own life.

12. One should not depend on other persons or things, the center of life should be found inside oneself.

\[ \text{Average} \quad (\text{s.d.}) \]

\[ 2.9 \quad (1.1) \]

\[ 2.4 \quad (1.0) \]
CHANGES IN MORAL VALUES (Rettig and Pasamanick 1959)

Variable
This study compares the moral values of a sample of college students with similar data gathered by Crissman (1942, 1950). Subjects evaluate the "rightness" or "wrongness" of several acts.

Description
Since the authors were interested in the change of moral judgments over time they used a questionnaire Crissman had given to college populations in 1929, 1939, and 1949. The questionnaire consists of 50 items describing behaviors which are evaluated on a 1 - 10 point scale of morality. These instructions preceded the questions:

This questionnaire presents 50 acts or situations which you are to evaluate in terms of "rightness" or "wrongness" ranging from 1 to 10. Encircle the 1 if the item seems least wrong or not wrong at all, and the 10 if the item is judged most wrong or "wrongest" possible. Use the in-between numbers for in-between degrees of "wrongness," the higher the number the more wrong it becomes.

Sample
The sample was 489 freshmen and sophomore students in an elementary sociology course at Ohio State University, 204 males and 285 females.

Reliability
The Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficient was .93. No other information about reliability was reported.

Validity
No measure of validity is reported for this instrument. Crissman does not report the validity of his scale in the several published reports of its use. That a meaningful pattern of results has been obtained with this instrument over a period of thirty years may, however, be interpreted as some measure of validity.

Location


Administration
This questionnaire is self-administered and should take about a half hour to complete.

Results and Comments
A Thurstone factor analysis of the 1958 data yielded six factors from the 50 item intercorrelation matrix--basic morality, religious morality, family morality, "puritanical morality," exploitative-manipulative morality, and economic morality. The data indicate increased severity of those moral standards associated with the sanctity of individual life and with democratic governing procedure, and a simultaneous decrease in the severity of judgments of immoral collective acts. The findings are provocative: in 1958 it is "more acceptable to use a poison gas on the civilian enemy than it is to forge a check or to commit adultery."
A lack of stability of responses is readily apparent. The average judgment changes 6.5 ranks over the 30 years, and, according to the authors, moral values seem to change with socio-economic conditions.

However, the various college samples differed in terms of region, age, class, and religion, so obtained differences may be in part a factor of initially different populations, rather than actual changes in moral values over time. An important question that remains to be investigated is the generality of these findings.

A later study by the authors (1960) considered changes in moral values in relation to age. They have also studied the effect of class (1961) and have begun comparisons with subjects of other cultural backgrounds (1962) and among subjects of different generations (1966). This scale covers a wide variety of behaviors and is one of the few on which there is extensive longitudinal data.

References


Moral Values

1. Killing a person in defense of one's own life: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2. Kidnapping and holding a child for ransom:
3. Having sex relations while unmarried:
4. Forging a check:
5. Habitually failing to keep promises:
6. Girls smoking cigarettes:
7. An industry maintaining working conditions for its workers known to be detrimental to their health:
8. A doctor allowing a badly deformed baby to die when he could save its life but not cure its deformity:
9. A legislator, for a financial consideration, using his influence to secure the passage of a law known to be contrary to public interest:
10. Testifying falsely in court when under oath:
11. Betting on horse races:
12. A nation dealing unjustly with a weaker nation over which it has power:
13. A jury freeing a father who has killed a man for rape against his young daughter:
14. Living beyond one's means in order to possess luxuries enjoyed by friends and associates:
15. Bootlegging under prohibition law:
16. Having illicit sex relations after marriage:
17. Driving an automobile while drunk but without accident:
18. A prosperous industry paying workers less than a living wage:
19. Holding up and robbing a person:
20. Not giving to charity when able:
21. Not taking the trouble to vote at primaries and elections:
22. A strong commercial concern selling below cost to crowd out a weaker competitor:
23. Falsifying about a child's age to secure reduced fare:
24. A student who is allowed to grade his own paper reporting a higher grade than the one earned:
25. Not giving to support religion when able:
26. Keeping over-change given by a clerk in mistake:
27. Copying from another's paper in a school examination:
28. Speeding away after one's car knocks down a pedestrian:
29. Charging interest above a fair rate when lending money:
30. Falsifying a federal income tax return:
31. Buying bootleg liquor under prohibition law:
32. Married persons using birth-control devices:
33. Seeking divorce because of incompatibility when both parties agree to separate (assuming no children):
34. Depositing more than one ballot in an election in order to aid a favorite candidate:
35. Living on inherited wealth without attempting to render service to others:
36. Taking one's own life (assuming no near relatives or dependents):
37. Using profane or blasphemous speech:
38. Being habitually cross or disagreeable to members of one's own family:
39. Seeking amusement on Sunday instead of going to church:
40. Refusing to bear arms in a war one believes to be unjust:
41. Advertising a medicine to cure a disease known to be incurable by such a remedy:
42. Misrepresenting the value of an investment in order to induce credulous persons to invest:
43. Taking money for one's vote in an election:
44. Newspapers treating crime news so as to make hoodlums and gangsters appear heroic:
45. A man having a vacant building he cannot rent sets it on fire to collect insurance:
46. Nations at war using poison gas on the homes and cities of its enemy behind the lines:
47. Slipping out secretly and going among people when one's home is under quarantine for a contagious disease:
48. A man deserting a girl whom he has got into trouble without himself taking responsibility:
49. Disbelieving in God:
50. A man not marrying a girl he loves because she is markedly his inferior socially and in education:
INVENTORY OF VALUES (Ewell 1954)

Variable
This inventory was designed to measure moral rigidity regarding several kinds of social relationships: sexual, social, legal and religious, family, and business relationships.

Description
The final instrument contained 100 statements describing acts to be judged "always right," "generally right," "neither right nor wrong," "generally wrong," or "always wrong." Five subscales were designed to measure the areas mentioned above (under "Variable"). Each subscale contained 20 items. The 100 items included were taken from a list of 205 statements submitted by members of the Psychology Department at the VA Hospital in Lyons, New Jersey. These 205 statements were rated, using the rightness categories, by 75 attendants at the hospital. Only items yielding nearly even distributions across the three rigidity classes ("always," "generally," "neither") were retained for the 100 item final version. For final scoring, an "always" response was scored 2; a "generally," scored 1; and a "neither," scored 0. Subscale scores were computed by addition.

Sample
The subjects for Ewell's dissertation research were 90 patients from two veterans' hospitals. They were all WWII veterans, Catholics, between 20 and 50 years old, white males, and none had received intensive psychotherapy. He formed three groups: 30 "nonpsychiatrics," suffering only physical disabilities; 30 psychiatric patients who had received privilege cards and 30 "non-privileged" psychiatric patients showing more severe functional symptoms and kept under tighter security. Age and education levels were reported as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean age</th>
<th>Mean years education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-psychiatric</td>
<td>31.47</td>
<td>11.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privileged</td>
<td>31.07</td>
<td>11.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-privileged</td>
<td>32.37</td>
<td>11.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability
A split-half measure of reliability yielded a coefficient of .90.

Validity
Nothing other than face validity was claimed for this instrument.

Location

Administration
This test is self-administered and should take from 10-15 minutes to complete.

Results and Comments
This instrument is included here primarily because the concept of moral rigidity and its operationization seemed worth further consideration. Also, Ewell seems to have chosen an interesting and diverse set of items that may be of use to other researchers, especially those concerned with samples of the general public rather than college students. It must be clear, however, that the present inventory has not been factor analyzed, and there is nothing more than face validity claimed either for the items or for the five supposed subscales.
INVENTORY OF VALUES SCALE

This inventory consists of a number of things which people might do, some of which some people regard as right and some of which some people regard as wrong. In the list of statements below, you are to check each statement in one of five columns.

If you consider a statement to represent something which is always right, you should check Column 1. If you consider the statement to represent something that is usually but not always right, you should check Column 2. If you consider the statement to represent something which is neither right nor wrong, you should check Column 3. If you consider the statement to represent something which is usually but not always wrong, you should check Column 4. If you consider the statement to represent something which is always wrong, you should check Column 5.

Please answer every item. There is no time limit on answering these questions.

1. To crash a party you have not been invited to.

   1 2 3 4 5
   Always Generally Neither Generally Always
   Right Right Right nor Wrong Wrong

2. To gamble.

3. To use slugs in pin-ball machines.

4. To take "sick leave" when you want to go to a baseball game.

5. To belong to secret societies.

6. To make huge profits.

7. To be a pacifist.

8. To defend a Negro.

9. To get mad enough to hit your brother.

10. To get a divorce.

11. To use birth control methods.

12. To pass counterfeit money which was passed to you.
13. To take advantage of mistakes in a contract.
14. To encourage sterilization.
15. To go to church regularly.
16. To have some sort of sexual expression at least every day.
17. To play the stock market.
18. To "bill and coo" with your wife in the presence of your children.
19. For a man to be an interior decorator.
20. To sneak something through customs.
21. Not to have any sexual experiences before marriage.
22. To confess your sins.
23. To kill an enemy soldier.
24. To play with a woman's breasts.
25. To read "dirty" stories.
26. To lie about the speed you were doing when you hit the other car.
27. To tell your mother-in-law off.
28. To abandon a burning building before seeing that others are safe.
29. To talk back to your supervisor.
30. To get on the good side of your supervisor.
31. To have a mistress.
32. To hide the defects of your car when you sell it so as to get as much as possible for it.
33. To eat with your fingers.
34. To have your parents live with your family.
35. To bribe a cop to avoid a ticket.
36. To buy something you can't afford.
37. To gossip.
38. To go through a red light.
39. To exaggerate damages or loss in settling an insurance claim.
40. To go to a prostitute.
41. To tell your children about sex.
42. To whip your children.
43. To buy things that are embargoed which are still available.
44. For a girl to be a tomboy.
45. To follow the saying "Finders keepers, losers weepers."
46. To use profanity.
47. To get a parking ticket fixed.
48. To display affection for a man openly.
49. To cash in on the reputation of your family to get a job.
50. To look at "dirty" pictures.
51. To ask your boss for a raise.
52. To let your wife run the family's money.
53. To allow your daughter to marry someone you do not like.
54. To criticize how the government is run.
55. To allow your 8-year old son and 6-year old daughter to sleep in the same room.
56. To force an older child to give in to a younger child.
57. To take the blame for a co-worker's mistake.
58. To lie to a policeman.
59. To take the blame for a buddy's mistake.
60. To answer your child's questions about sex, childbirth, etc.
61. To go swimming nude.
62. To avoid orgasm until the woman is ready.
63. To undersell a competitor.
64. To experiment with various positions for sex.
65. To get a job by pull.
66. To get drunk.
67. To exaggerate your business experience to get a better job.
68. For a boy to be a sissy.
69. To have a two year old child sleep in the same room as his parents.
70. To tell "fish stories."
71. To try to take another man's girl away from him.
72. To use contraceptives.
73. To urinate outside.
74. To belch openly.
75. To take drugs.
76. To agree always with your boss because you need the job.
77. To pad an expense account.
78. To go to banned movies.
79. To kill an enemy prisoner.
80. To go into bankruptcy to avoid paying debts.
81. To let your 6-year old son dress up in his mother's clothes.
82. To have extra-marital intercourse.
83. To have sex in any but the usual way.
84. To follow a book on bringing up children.
85. To play golf on Sunday.
86. To lend your brother money.
87. To masturbate.
88. To go on wild-cat strikes.
89. To play the horses.
90. To be seen undressed by others of the opposite sex.
91. To get an erection by thinking about a girl.
92. To take your employer's customers away from him by going into business yourself.
93. To allow your 5-year old son and 6-year old daughter to take a bath together.

94. To be a conscientious objector.

95. To allow an 18-year old daughter to kiss her boyfriend.

96. To allow your wife to have dinner with another man when you are away from home.

97. To allow your children to play on your neighbor's property.

98. To defend a Jew.

99. To exceed the speed limit.

100. To offer someone advice even if he doesn't ask for it.

101. To copy from someone else's examination paper.

102. To pay for something you break.

103. To keep the temperature low in your tenant's apartment to save fuel.

104. To tell your son it is wrong to masturbate.

105. To carry life insurance.

106. To tell a buddy his wife is unfaithful.

107. To buy a drink for a minor.

108. To turn in to lost and found a wallet you find someone has left on a bus.
Variable
This instrument assesses a respondent's hierarchical arrangement of two kinds of values: instrumental and terminal. Instrumental values refer to preferable modes of conduct; terminal, to preferable end states of existence.

Description
Subjects rank order 18 alphabetically listed terminal values along a dimension of the relative importance of each of these values to themselves. On the next page, they then rank order 18 alphabetically listed instrumental values, again in terms of relative personal importance. Each value is printed on a gummed label. Subjects are instructed to arrange and rearrange the order of the labels until they determine the ordering which best represents the relative importance of each value to them.

Sample
Rokeach's ongoing research in this area has included samples of 50 policemen, 141 unemployed whites, 28 unemployed blacks, 75 Calvinist students, 298 students in a Michigan State University psychology class, and an unspecified number of other subjects.

Reliability
Test-retest reliabilities, after seven weeks, are reported in the .60's for form A, the initial form composed of 12 instrumental and 12 terminal values. Test-retest reliabilities, after seven weeks, are reported in the .70's for form D, the final version of 18 instrumental and 18 terminal values.

Validity
How the values were initially selected and modified is not reported. Only predictive validity is noted: the rank order of the terminal value salvation highly predicts church attendance. The relationship between the average relative positions of the values equality and freedom differentiates among those who are "sympathetic and have participated" (freedom ranked #1, equality #3), "sympathetic but have not participated" (freedom ranked #1, equality #6) and "unsympathetic" (freedom ranked #2, equality #11) to civil rights demonstrations. Additional data provide some validation: salvation was ranked 1st among 12 terminal values by Lutheran ministers and students in a Calvinist college, but it was typically ranked last by Jewish students and those expressing no religious preference.

Location
Rokeach, M. Beliefs, attitudes, and values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968. (See Chapter 7, Organization and change within value-attitude systems, 156-178.)

Administration
The test is self-administered and may take from 10 minutes to a half hour to complete.

Results and Comments
The distinction between terminal and instrumental values is useful in delineating types of values. Nevertheless, terminal values may sometimes function as means to attain other values. For example, loving in a mature way may be seen as the instrumental means to happiness. For some, being intellectual (an instrumental value) may be instead a preferable end state of existence and therefore a
terminal value. Rokeach is concerned with the functional relationships among values, attitudes and their respective systems. He describes these elements as hierarchically arranged within an individual, with terminal values being both the smallest in number and the most central or inclusive. Positioning that individuals strive for consistency both within and among the several sub-systems, Rokeach suggests that change may be induced by exposing an individual to the states of inconsistency already existing in his own value system. Thus a subject who ranks freedom first and equality last "may be revealing something about himself that others might interpret as anti-democratic or logically inconsistent or, even, as hypocritical." Rokeach has experimental evidence indicating that when this inconsistency is pointed out, subjects tend to change their rank ordering of these and other values.

In a recent lecture at the Institute for Social Research (Spring 1969), Rokeach reported that calling attention to such inconsistencies can also induce behavioral changes. In one study, for example, experimental subjects (college students) were asked to notice where they had ranked freedom and equality relative to each other, and then an experimenter suggested that people who rank freedom high relative to equality seem to value their own freedom more than they value the freedom of others. In a control group this was not mentioned. Three months later all subjects received membership invitations from the NAACP, and it was found that significantly more experimental than control subjects paid to join this civil rights organization in response to their invitation.

It is worth noting, in addition, that subjects were asked to answer a question about how dissatisfied they were with their ratings following the experimenter's interpretation of the relative placements of freedom and equality. And, as anticipated, the more dissatisfied were more likely to show behavioral changes later. This suggests that some people have a satisfactory way to justify placing freedom above equality and they therefore experience little dissonance when the apparent inconsistency is pointed out. In fact, Rokeach has shown by content-analyzing the writings of political figures that rightist ideologists firmly hold such views, whereas leftists tend to stress equality at the relative expense of freedom.

Finally, note that Rokeach's test forces the subject to order one value at the expense of the other, since the relative rather than the absolute importance of each value is sought. It is therefore impossible to know whether, for a given individual, the values are equally spaced along the importance continuum, or cluster together at a few points (e.g., a few being very important and all others being generally irrelevant).
VALUE SURVEY SCALE

Instructions

On the next page are 18 values listed in alphabetical order. Your task is to arrange them in order of their importance to YOU, as guiding principles in YOUR life. Each value is printed on a gummed label which can be easily peeled off and pasted in the boxes on the left-hand side of the page.

Study the list carefully and pick out the one value which is the most important for you. Peel it off and paste it in Box 1 on the left.

Then pick out the value which is second most important for you. Peel it off and paste it in Box 2. Then do the same for each of the remaining values. The value which is least important goes in Box 18.

Work slowly and think carefully. If you change your mind, feel free to change your answers. The labels peel off easily and can be moved from place to place. The end result should truly show how you really feel.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | A COMFORTABLE LIFE  
a prosperous life |
| 2 | AN EXCITING LIFE  
a stimulating, active life |
| 3 | A SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT  
lastling contribution |
| 4 | A WORLD AT PEACE  
free of war and conflict |
| 5 | A WORLD OF BEAUTY  
beauty of nature and the arts |
| 6 | EQUALITY  
brotherhood,  
equal opportunity for all |
| 7 | FAMILY SECURITY  
taking care of loved ones |
| 8 | FREEDOM  
independence, free choice |
| 9 | HAPPIINESS  
contentedness |
| 10 | INNER HARMONY  
freedom from inner conflict |
| 11 | MATURE LOVE  
sexual and spiritual intimacy |
| 12 | NATIONAL SECURITY  
protection from attack |
| 13 | PLEASURE  
an enjoyable, leisurely life |
| 14 | SALVATION  
saved, eternal life |
| 15 | SELF-RESPECT  
self-esteem |
| 16 | SOCIAL RECOGNITION  
respect, admiration |
| 17 | TRUE FRIENDSHIP  
close companionship |
| 18 | WISDOM  
a mature understanding of life |

When you have finished, go to the next page.
Below is another list of 18 values. Arrange them in order of importance, the same as before.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AMBITIOUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>hard-working, aspiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BROADMINDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>open-minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAPABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>competent, effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHEERFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>lighthearted, joyful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>neat, tidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COURAGEOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>standing up for your beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FORGIVING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>willing to pardon others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HELPFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>working for the welfare of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HONEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>sincere, truthful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMAGINATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>daring, creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDEPENDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>self-reliant, self-sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTELLECTUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>intelligent, reflective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOGICAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>consistent, rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOVING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>affectionate, tender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBEDIENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>dutiful, respectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POLITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>courteous, well-mannered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESPONSIBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>dependable, reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SELF-CONTROLLED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>restrained, self-disciplined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WAYS TO LIVE (Morris 1956)

Variable

This scale measures conceptions of the good life. The 13 ways to live include values promulgated by the major religious and philosophical systems. Briefly characterized, the ways are as follows:

1. preserve the best that man has attained
2. cultivate independence of persons and things
3. show sympathetic concern for others
4. experience festivity and solitude in alternation
5. act and enjoy life through group participation
6. constantly master changing conditions.
7. integrate action, enjoyment and contemplation
8. live with wholesome, carefree enjoyment
9. wait in quiet receptivity
10. control the self stoically
11. meditate on the inner life
12. chance adventuresome deeds
13. obey the cosmic purposes

Description

The Ways to Live document consists of 13 paragraphs describing different notions of what is good in life. The respondent rates each way on a 1-7 Likert-type scale in terms of how much this is the kind of life he personally would like to live. He then ranks all 13 ways along the same dimension. The first seven ways were developed by combining various strengths of the three basic components of personality Morris had delineated in Paths of Life. These three components of personality are buddhistic, dionysian and promethian. The three components yielded six patterns, and a seventh possibility, that of all three components being approximately equal in strength, was added. After testing these seven ways on several hundred college students, Morris added three more ways as a result of their responses. Several years later, the last three ways were added in order to include more extreme alternatives. All the alternatives are positive in tone, concerned with "healthy" values only.

A factor analysis of the data from 250 male college students yielded five factors: social restraint and self-control (positive loadings on ways 1 and 10; negative, on way 4), enjoyment and progress in action (positive loadings on ways 12, 5, and 6; negative, on way 2), withdrawal and self-sufficiency (positive loadings on ways 11 and 2; negative, on way 5), receptivity and sympathetic concern (positive loadings on ways 13 and 9) and self-indulgence or sensuous enjoyment (positive loadings on ways 8 and 4; negative, on way 13).
Sample
The 13 alternative form of this instrument has been used (primarily with college students) in the United States, India, China, Japan, Italy, Norway, Canada, England and other countries. 2,015 college men and 831 college women, primarily in liberal arts, were tested in the United States from 1945-1952. Data from China were gathered in 1948 from 523 male and 220 female students. In India, between 1949 and 1950, 724 male and 410 female students were tested. Samples from the U.S., India and China were the most extensive.

Reliability
The estimated repeat reliability rate for college students is .85, although no rigorous investigation has yet been undertaken. Twenty college students, after a three week interval, showed an average product-moment correlation of .87. Thirty college students, after a 14 week interval, showed a correlation of .78. For 56 college women, rank-order correlations taken three weeks apart on the first six ways averaged .93. The ways themselves (based on 21 students after a three week interval) have a mean reliability of .67.

Validity
There is no information on the extent to which respondents, prior to taking the test, saw the ways as distinctly different, conceptually clear and unambiguous. Morris notes: "It is merely believed that the thirteen alternatives, because of the considerations mentioned in the construction of the document, do represent a good sample of the regions in such a space, thus providing a valid instrument in the technical sense of the term." Validation seems to refer only to statistical procedure, and not to any other kinds of validity, a most unfortunate omission. (See Winthrop, 1961 for an excellent critical review of the validity and other problems of this test.)

Location

Administration
The test is self-administered and may take from one half to one hour to complete. The paragraphs are long and complex, perhaps necessitating several re-readings before evaluations can be made.

Results and Comments
Morris notes that three major results have emerged: "...the attainment of a cross-cultural interval scale for measuring values, the isolation of five value dimensions that appear (with minor variations) in the three main cultural samples (e.g., United States, China and India); and the accumulation of a body of evidence supporting in its totality a field conception of values." Furthermore, the five value dimensions have been found in the six cultures reported in this book, with factors A and B being the most favored in all cultures, although in each culture each way was selected as most preferred by some respondents. (See Morris, 1951, for more cross-cultural data.) Way 7 is most preferred by students in the United States. Morris presents a plethora of statistical information; unfortunately the results are presented in a variety of ways -- as factors, first choice, scale values, etc. -- and
often neither integrated nor interpreted sufficiently. Discussion of scaling procedures and other methodology may be found in Morris and Jones (1955).

This brief summary cannot do justice to Morris' work; most of the book explicates the determinants -- social, psychological, biological and ecological -- of conceived values. Numerous measures ranging from somatotype to beliefs have been employed to assess these determinants (see Jones and Morris, 1956).

A major problem with this instrument is the complexity and abstract quality of each paragraph. Both positive and negative imperatives, preferences, cliches, specific activities and even poetry (way 6 suggests life tends"...to become sickled o'er with the pale cast of thought") may be found, in differing combinations in these paragraphs. The phrasing is often so lacking in rigor and clarity that precisely what the subject was responding to becomes unclear. (See Osgood, Ware, and Morris', 1961, use of the semantic differential to tap connotative meanings.) In short, very abstract rich stimuli are presented and only a simple response is asked. Dempsey and Dukes (1966) using a Q-sort technique to assess the coherence of these paragraphs found discordancy (negative within-path inter-item r's) in 11 of the paths. They prepared both a revised form eliminating discordant statements and a shortened form that may well be helpful to those interested in, but critical of, the Ways to Live instrument. (See Gorlow and Barocas for another Q-sort of the Ways to Live which yielded clusters different from those of Morris.)

The scales do overlap a great deal: reflection and self-knowledge elements are found in ways 2, 4, 11 and, negatively, in ways 5 and 6. The value of intellectual activities is neglected, and since some items in all statements are normatively appropriate cliches or even shibboleths it is strange that respondents are expected to utilize a scale ranging from"I like it very much"to"I dislike it very much."

In sum, Morris has amassed an impressive collection of data of multidisciplinary interest. The test is a careful and creative effort, and his main conclusions are adequately supported.
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WAYS TO LIVE

Instructions: Below are described thirteen ways to live which various persons at various times have advocated and followed.

Indicate by numbers which you are to write in the margin how much you yourself like or dislike each of them. Do them in order. Do not read ahead.

Remember that it is not a question of what kind of life you now lead, or the kind of life you think it prudent to live in our society, or the kind of life you think good for other persons, but simply the kind of life you personally would like to live.

Use the following scale of numbers, placing one of them in the margin alongside each of the ways to live:

7 I like it very much
6 I like it quite a lot
5 I like it slightly
4 I am indifferent to it
3 I dislike it slightly
2 I dislike it quite a lot
1 I dislike it very much

WAY 1: In this "design for living" the individual actively participates in the social life of his community, not to change it primarily, but to understand, appreciate, and preserve the best that man has attained. Excessive desires should be avoided and moderation sought. One wants the good things of life but in an orderly way. Life is to have clarity, balance, refinement, control. Vulgarity, great enthusiasm, irrational behavior, impatience, indulgence are to be avoided. Friendship is to be esteemed but not easy intimacy with many people. Life is to have discipline, intelligibility, good manners, predictability. Social changes are to be made slowly and carefully, so that what has been achieved in human culture is not lost. The individual should be active physically and socially, but not in a hectic or radical way. Restraint and intelligence should give order to an active life.

WAY 2: The individual should for the most part "go it alone," assuring himself of privacy in living quarters, having much time to himself, attempting to control his own life. One should stress self-sufficiency, reflection and meditation, knowledge of himself. The direction of interest should be away from intimate associations with social groups, and away from the physical manipulation of objects or attempts at control of the physical environment. One should aim to simplify one's external life, to moderate those desires whose satisfaction is dependent upon physical and social forces outside of oneself, and to concentrate attention upon the refinement, clarification, and self-direction of oneself. Not much can be done or is to be gained by "living outwardly." One must avoid dependence upon persons or things; the center of life should be found within oneself.
WAY 3: This way of life makes central the sympathetic concern for other persons. Affection should be the main thing in life, affection that is free from all traces of the imposition of oneself upon others or of using others for one’s own purposes. Greed in possessions, emphasis on sexual passion, the search for power over persons and things, excessive emphasis upon intellect, and undue concern for oneself are to be avoided. For these things hinder the sympathetic love among persons which alone gives significance to life. If we are aggressive we block our receptivity to the personal forces upon which we are dependent for genuine personal growth. One should accordingly purify oneself, restrain one’s self-assertiveness, and become receptive, appreciative, and helpful with respect to other persons.

WAY 4: Life is something to be enjoyed—sensuously enjoyed, enjoyed with relish and abandonement. The aim in life should not be to control the course of the world or society or the lives of others, but to be open and receptive to things and persons, and to delight in them. Life is more a festival than a workshop or a school for moral discipline. To let oneself go, to let things and persons affect oneself, is more important than to do—or to do good. Such enjoyment, however, requires that one be self-centered enough to be keenly aware of what is happening and free for new happenings. So one should avoid entanglements, should not be too dependent on particular people or things, should not be self-sacrificing; one should be alone a lot, should have time for meditation and awareness of oneself. Solitude and sociality together are both necessary in the good life.

WAY 5: A person should not hold on to himself, withdraw from people, keep aloof and self-centered. Rather merge oneself with a social group, enjoy cooperation and companionship, join with others in resolute activity for the realization of common goals. Persons are social and persons are active; life should merge energetic group activity and cooperative group enjoyment. Meditation, restraint, concern for one’s self-sufficiency, abstract intellectuality, solitude, stress on one’s possessions all cut the roots which bind persons together. One should live outwardly with gusto, enjoying the good things of life, working with others to secure the things which make possible a pleasant and energetic social life. Those who oppose this ideal are not to be dealt with too tenderly. Life can’t be too fastidious.

WAY 6: Life continuously tends to stagnate, to become “comfortable,” to become sickled o’er with the pale cast of thought. Against these tendencies, a person must stress the need of constant activity—physical action, adventure, the realistic solution of specific problems as they appear, the improvement of techniques for controlling the world and society. Man’s future depends primarily on what he does, not on what he feels or on his speculations. New problems constantly arise and always will arise. Improvements must always be made if man is to progress. We can’t just follow the past or dream of what the future might be. We have to work resolutely and continually if control is to be gained over the forces which threaten us. Man should rely on technical advances made possible by scientific knowledge. He should find his goal in the solution of his problems. The good is the enemy of the better.
WAY 7: We should at various times and in various ways accept something from all other paths of life, but give no one our exclusive allegiance. At one moment one of them is the more appropriate; at another moment another is the most appropriate. Life should contain enjoyment and action and contemplation in about equal amounts. When either is carried to extremes we lose something important for our life. So we must cultivate flexibility, admit diversity in ourselves, accept the tension which this diversity produces, find a place for detachment in the midst of enjoyment and activity. The goal of life is found in the dynamic integration of enjoyment, action, and contemplation, and so in the dynamic interaction of the various paths of life. One should use all of them in building a life, and no one alone.

WAY 8: Enjoyment should be the keynote of life. Not the hectic search for intense and exciting pleasures, but the enjoyment of the simple and easily obtainable pleasures: the pleasures of just existing, of savory food, of comfortable surroundings, of talking with friends, of rest and relaxation. A home that is warm and comfortable, chairs and a bed that are soft, a kitchen well stocked with food, a door open to the entrance of friends--this is the place to live. Body at ease, relaxed, calm in its movements, not hurried, breath slow, willing to nod and rest, grateful to the world that is its food--so should the body be. Driving ambition and the fanaticism of ascetic ideals are the signs of discontented people who have lost the capacity to float in the stream of simple, carefree, wholesome enjoyment.

WAY 9: Receptivity should be the keynote of life. The good things come of their own accord, and come unsought. They cannot be found by resolute action. They cannot be found in the indulgence of the sensuous desires of the body. They cannot be gathered by participation in the turmoil of social life. They cannot be given to others by attempts to be helpful. They cannot be garnered by hard thinking. Rather do they come unsought when the bars of the self are down. When the self has ceased to make demands and waits in quiet receptivity, it becomes open to the powers which nourish it and work through it; and sustained by these powers it knows joy and peace. To sit alone under the trees and the sky, open to nature's voices, calm and receptive, then can the wisdom from without come within.

WAY 10: Self-control should be the keynote of life. Not the easy self-control which retreats from the world, but the vigilant, stern, manly control of a self which lives in the world, and knows the strength of the world and the limits of human power. The good life is rationally directed and holds firm to high ideals. It is not bent by the seductive voices of comfort and desire. It does not expect social utopias. It is distrustful of final victories. Too much cannot be expected. Yet one can with vigilance hold firm the reins to his self, control his unruly impulses, understand his place in the world, guide his actions by reason, maintain his self-reliant independence. And in this way, though he finally perish, man can deep his human dignity and respect, and die with cosmic good manners.
WAY 11: The contemplative life is the good life. The external world is no fit habitat for man. It is too big, too cold, too pressing. Rather it is the life turned inward that is rewarding. The rich internal world of ideals, of sensitive feelings, of reverie, of self-knowledge is man's true home. By the cultivation of the self within, man alone becomes human. Only then does there arise deep sympathy with all that lives, an understanding of the suffering inherent in life, a realization of the futility of aggressive action, the attainment of contemplative joy. Conceit then falls away and austerity is dissolved. In giving up the world one finds the larger and finer sea of the inner self.

WAY 12: The use of the body's energy is the secret of a rewarding life. The hands need material to make into something: lumber and stone for building, food to harvest, clay to mold. The muscles are alive to joy only in action, in climbing, running, skiing and the like. Life finds its zest in overcoming, dominating, conquering some obstacle. It is the active deed which is satisfying, the deed adequate to the present, the daring and adventuresome deed. Not in cautious foresight, not in relaxed ease does life attain completion. Outward energetic action, the excitement of power in the tangible present--this is the way to live.

WAY 13: A person should let himself be used. Used by other persons in their growth, used by the great objective purposes in the universe which silently and irresistibly achieve their goal. For persons and the world's purposes are dependable at heart, and can be trusted. One should be humble, constant, faithful, uninsistent. Grateful for the affection and protection which one needs, but undemanding. Close to persons and to nature, and secure because close. Nourishing the good by devotion and sustained by the good because of devotion. One should be a serene, confident, quiet vessel and instrument of the great dependable powers which move to their fulfillment.

Instructions for ranking your preferences: Rank the thirteen ways to live in the order you prefer them, putting first the number of the way to live you like the best, then the number of the way you like next best, and so on down to the number of the way to live you like the least:

Final Word: If you can formulate a way to live you would like better than any of the thirteen alternatives, please do so....
This study attempts to develop an interview instrument to measure the dominant and variant value orientations found in 5 different cultures. The definition of "value orientation" is:

Value orientations are complex but definitely patterned (rank-ordered) principles, resulting from the transactional interplay of three analytically distinguishable elements of the evaluative process—the cognitive, the affective, and the directive elements—which give order and direction to the ever-flowing stream of human acts and thought as these relate to the solution of "common human problems."

The five common human problems and their postulated solutions are presented in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Postulated Range of Variations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evil</td>
<td>Mixture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muta-</td>
<td>immutable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Muta-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muta-</td>
<td>immutable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man-nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjugation to</td>
<td>Harmony with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mastery over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being</td>
<td>Being-in-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>becoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lineality</td>
<td>Collaterality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individualism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These notions have been developed and revised in several papers of Florence Kluckhohn.

Twenty-two items were selected to assess the ordering of solutions to four orientations; time and financial limitations obviated examination of the human nature orientation. Each item was expected to be a familiar type of life situation. Respondents chose among alternatives which were based on theoretical notions of what the three variations for each orientation would be.
Sample

Limitations of time, financial resources, and other difficulties also necessitated a small sample. (1) A Spanish-American community. The total population of this community was selected, since there were only 25 adult members. Two men did not complete the schedule; thus the number interviewed was 23 (12 women and 11 men). (2) A Mormon group. Eleven men and nine women were randomly selected. The procedure involved dividing the names of all people over the age of 20 according to sex and using random numbers to select 10 names from each of the two groups. An error in interpretation caused the sample to be composed of 11 men and 9 women. The (3) Texan group and the (4) Navaho group were sampled in the same way as the Mormon group, resulting in a sample of 10 men and 10 women in each group. In addition, a full alternate Navaho sample was drawn because the need for substitutions was anticipated. Twenty-two respondents were used in the final analysis. (5) Zuni community. A random sample was not drawn. The 11 men and 10 women interviewed were a close network of adults who shared frequent face-to-face interaction and close kinship ties.

Reliability

There is no report of reliability. The authors note, "concerning that aspect of reliability which means consistency of response over time, we expected the 'general question' method to produce more reliable results than a method which depended upon the use of situationally specific questions. But we were not able to put this expectation to the empirical test of repeated questioning."

Validity

The authors suggest that the simultaneous testing of the same items in the various cultural samples constitutes some measure of validity. Thus a lack of pattern in the responses of only one or two groups may be attributed to true cultural inconsistency, rather than to the poor quality of the question. Extensive ethnographic data tended to support the findings of the schedule and many of the predicted relationships.

Location


Administration

The amount of time necessary for this interview will probably vary greatly. The sentences among which a respondent must choose are often long and complex and may need repetition for some subjects, thus extending the length of the interview.

Results and Comments

This study is based on several interesting assumptions: there are a limited number of common human problems; all peoples at all times must find some solution to these problems; a limited range of different solutions is possible; and all solutions are not only present at all times in all societies but also differentially preferred. Each of these assumptions needs further refinement and empirical verification. It is not clear that the five problems suggested are exhaustive; for example, might not conceptions of space be another common human problem? Furthermore, a more precise specification both of which solutions become preferred by which groups or subgroups and of why change in these preferences occurs is necessary.
Significant within-culture regularities and significant between culture differences were found. Unfortunately the data were insufficient for an analysis of the variation within each of the cultures. This is particularly unfortunate because one of the most important contributions of this book is to point to the existence of permitted and required variant orientations, thus recognizing the heterogeneity of values. Some between culture results are troublesome: Is the consistency found among the Zuni a statement about their values or about the measures used? How can the Texas and Mormon groups have similar profiles when the ethnographic data shows great differences? (The answer to this question seems to be that the interview does not ask for the intensity of degree to which a value is held.) Furthermore, as the authors recognize, items seem to have more than one orientation present. Items 16 and 17 to test relational values have elements of time and activity orientations too. Of interest is the graphic method analysis employed to show levels of significance among the alternative solutions to a particular orientation. The problem of lack of reliability data is particularly serious, both because of the usual problems of translating the same concept into several languages, and because the items are long and complex, and may have been troublesome to many respondents. Despite all the above criticisms, the specification of these value orientations has great potential utility for assessing the values of individuals in different groups or subgroups. Psychologists may well wish to modify the interview in a variety of ways, perhaps developing a questionnaire, perhaps by adding items, perhaps by finding ways to assess degree of valuation, but the comprehensiveness and generality suggested by the five value orientations and the possible variations is attractive indeed.
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1. Job Choice

A man needed a job and had a chance to work for two men. The two bosses were different. Listen to what they were like and say which you think would be the best one to work for.

A (Doing) One boss was a fair enough man, and he gave somewhat higher pay than most men, but he was the kind of boss who insisted that men work hard, stick on the job. He did not like it at all when a worker sometimes just knocked off work for a while to go on a trip or to have a day or so of fun, and he thought it was right not to take such a worker back on the job.

B (Being) The other paid just average wages but he was not so firm. He understood that a worker would sometimes just not turn up—would be off on a trip or having a little fun for a day or two. When his men did this he would take them back without saying too much.

(Part one)

Which of these men do you believe that it would be better to work for in most cases?

Which of these men would most other ______ think it better to work for?

(Part two)

Which kind of boss do you believe that it is better to be in most cases?

Which kind of boss would most other ______ think it better to be?

2. Well Arrangements

When a community has to make arrangements for water, such as drill a well, there are three different ways they can decide to arrange things like location, and who is going to do the work.

A (Lin) There are some communities where it is mainly the older or recognized leaders of the important families who decide the plans. Everyone usually accepts what they say without much discussion since they are the ones who are used to deciding such things and are the ones who have had the most experience.
B (Coll) There are some communities where most people in the group have a part in making the plans. Lots of different people talk, but nothing is done until almost everyone comes to agree as to what is best to be done.

C (Ind) There are some communities where everyone holds to his own opinion, and they decide the matter by vote. They do what the largest number want even though there are still a very great many people who disagree and object to the action.

Which way do you think is usually best in such cases?

Which of the other two ways do you think is better?

Which way of all three ways do you think most other persons in _______ would usually think is best?

3. Child Training time: Item T1

Some people were talking about the way children should be brought up. Here are three different ideas.

A (Past) Some people say that children should be taught well the traditions of the past (the ways of the old people). They believe the old ways are best, and that it is when children do not follow them too much that things go wrong.

B (Pres) Some people say that children should be taught some of the old traditions (ways of the old people), but it is wrong to insist that they stick to these ways. These people believe that it is necessary for children always to learn about and take on whatever of the new ways will best help them get along in the world of today.

C (Fut) Some people do not believe children should be taught much about past traditions (the ways of the old people) at all except as an interesting story of what has gone before. These people believe that the world goes along best when children are taught the things that will make them want to find out for themselves new ways of doing things to replace the old.

Which of these people had the best idea about how children should be taught?

Which of the other two people had the better idea?

Considering again all three ideas, which would most other persons in _______ say had the better idea?
4. Livestock Dying

One time a man had a lot of livestock. Most of them died off in different ways. People talked about this and said different things.

A Some people said you just can't blame a man when things like this happen. There are so many things that can and do happen, and a man can do almost nothing to prevent such losses when they come. We all have to learn to take the bad with the good.

B Some people said that it was probably the man's own fault that he lost so many. He probably didn't use his head to prevent the losses. They said that it is usually the case that men who keep up on new ways of doing things, and really set themselves to it, almost always find a way to keep out of such trouble.

C Some people said that it was probably because the man had not lived his life right—had not done things in the right way to keep harmony between himself and the forces of nature (i.e., the ways of nature like the rain, winds, snow, etc.).

Which of these reasons do you think is most usually true?

Which of the other two reasons do you think is more true?

Which of all three reasons would most other persons in _______ think is usually true?

5. Expectations about Change

Three young people were talking about what they thought their families would have one day as compared with their fathers and mothers. They each said different things.

C The first said: I expect my family to be better off in the future than the family of my father and mother or relatives if we work hard and plan right. Things in this country usually get better for people who really try.

B The second one said: I don't know whether my family will be better off, the same, or worse off than the family of my father and mother or relatives. Things always go up and down even if people do work hard. So one can never really tell how things will be.

A The third one said: I expect my family to be about the same as the family of my father and mother or relatives. The best way is to work hard and plan ways to keep up things as they have been in the past.
Which of these people do you think had the best idea?

Which of the other two persons had the better idea?

Which of these three people would most other ______ your age think had the best idea?

(b. 40-up Age Group)

Three older people were talking about what they thought their children would have when they were grown. Here is what each one said.

C (Fut) One said: I really expect my children to have more than I have had if they work hard and plan right. There are always good chances for people who try.

B (Pres) The second one said: I don't know whether my children will be better off, worse off, or just the same. Things always go up and down even if one works hard, so we can't really tell.

A (Past) The third one said: I expect my children to have just about the same as I have had or bring things back as they once were. It is their job to work hard and find ways to keep things going as they have been in the past.

Which of these people do you think had the best idea?

Which of the other two persons had the better idea?

Which of these three people would most other ______ your age think had the best idea?

6. Facing Conditions man-nature: Item MN2

There are different ways of thinking about how God (the gods) is (are) related to man and to weather and all other natural conditions which make the crops and animals live or die. Here are three possible ways.

C (With) God (the gods) and people all work together all the time; whether the conditions which make the crops and animals grow are good or bad depends upon whether people themselves do all the proper things to keep themselves in harmony with their God (gods) and with the forces of nature.

B (Over) God (the gods) does (do) not directly use his (their) power to control all the conditions which affect the growth of crops or animals. It is up to the people themselves to figure out the ways conditions change and to try hard to find the ways of controlling them.
A Just how God (the gods) will use his (their) power over all
(Subj) the conditions which affect the growth of crops and animals
cannot be known by man. But it is useless for people to
think they can change conditions very much for very long.
The best way is to take conditions as they come and do as
well as one can.

Which of these ways of looking at things do you think is best?

Which of the other two ways do you think is better?

Which of the three ways of looking at things would most other people
in _______ think is best?

7. Help in Misfortune

A man had a crop failure, or, let us say, had lost most of his
sheep or cattle. He and his family had to have help from someone if
they were going to get through the winter. There are different ways
of getting help. Which of these three ways would be best?

B Would it be best if he depended mostly on his brothers and
(Coll) sisters or other relatives all to help him out as much as
each one could?

C Would it be best for him to try to raise the money on his
(Ind) own outside the community (his own people) from people
who are neither relatives nor employers?

A Would it be best for him to go to a boss or to an older
(Lin) important relative who is used to managing things in his
group, and ask him to help out until things get better?

Which way of getting the help do you think would usually be best?

Which way of getting the help do you think is next best?

Which way do you think you yourself would really follow?

Which way do you think most other people in _______ would think best?

8. Family Work Relations

I'm going to tell you about three different ways families can ar-
range work. These families are related and they live close together.

C In some groups (or communities) it is usually expected that
(Ind) each of the separate families (by which we mean just hus-
band, wife, and children) will look after its own business
separate from all others and not be responsible for the others.
In some groups (or communities) it is usually expected that the close relatives in the families will work together and talk over among themselves the way to take care of whatever problems come up. When a boss is needed they usually choose (get) one person, not necessarily the oldest able person, to manage things.

In some groups (or communities) it is usually expected that the families which are closely related to each other will work together and have the oldest able person (hermano mayor or father) be responsible for and take charge of most important things.

Which of these ways do you think is usually best in most cases?

Which of the other two ways do you think is better?

Which of all the ways do you think most other persons in _______ would think is usually best?

9. Choice of Delegate

A group like yours (community like yours) is to send a delegate—a representative—to a meeting away from here (this can be any sort of meeting). How will this delegate be chosen?

B (Coll) Is it best that a meeting be called and everyone discuss things until almost everyone agrees so that when a vote is taken almost all people would be agreed on the same person?

A (Lin) Is it best that the older, important, leaders take the main responsibility for deciding who should represent the people since they are the ones who have had the long experience in such matters?

C (Ind) Is it best that a meeting be called, names be put up, a vote be taken, then send the man who gets the majority of votes even if there are many people who are still against this man?

Which of these ways of choosing is usually best in cases like this?

Which of the other two ways is usually better?

Which would most other persons in ______ say is usually best?

10. Use of Fields

There were three men who had fields with crops (were farmers). The three men had quite different ways of planting and taking care of crops.
One man put in his crops, worked hard, and also set himself to living in right and proper ways. He felt that it is the way a man works and tries to keep himself in harmony with the forces of nature that has the most effect on conditions and the way crops turn out.

One man put in his crops. Afterwards he worked on them sufficiently but did not do more than was necessary to keep them going along. He felt that it mainly depended on weather conditions how they would turn out, and that nothing extra that people do could change things much.

One man put in his crops and then worked on them a lot of time and made use of all the new scientific ideas he could find out about. He felt that by doing this he would in most years prevent many of the effects of bad conditions.

Which of these ways do you believe is usually best?

Which of the other two ways do you believe is better?

Which of the three ways would most other persons in ___ think is best?

II. Philosophy of Life

People often have very different ideas about what has gone before and what we can expect in life. Here are three ways of thinking about these things.

Some people believe it best to give most attention to what is happening now in the present. They say that the past has gone and the future is much too uncertain to count on. Things do change, but it is sometimes for the better and sometimes for the worse, so in the long run it is about the same. These people believe the best way to live is to keep those of the old ways that one can—or that one likes—but to be ready to accept the new ways which will help to make life easier and better as we live from year to year.

Some people think that the ways of the past (ways of the old people or traditional ways) were the most right and the best, and as changes come things get worse. These people think the best way to live is to work hard to keep up the old ways and try to bring them back when they are lost.

Some people believe that it is almost always the ways of the future--the ways which are still to come--which will be best, and they say that even though there are sometimes small setbacks, change brings improvements in the long run. These people think the best way to live is to look a long time ahead, work hard, and give up many things now so that the future will be better.
Which of these ways of looking at life do you think is best?

Which of the other two ways do you think is better?

Which of the three ways of looking at life do you think most other persons in _______ would think is best?

12. Wage Work

There are three ways in which men who do not themselves hire others may work.

C (Ind) One way is working on one's own as an individual. In this case a man is pretty much his own boss. He decides most things himself, and how he gets along is his own business. He only has to take care of himself and he doesn't expect others to look out for him.

B (Coll) One way is working in a group of men where all the men work together without there being one main boss. Every man has something to say in the decisions that are made, and all the men can count on each other.

A (Lin) One way is working for an owner, a big boss, or a man who has been running things for a long time (a parrón). In this case, the men do not take part in deciding how the business will be run, but they know they can depend on the boss to help them out in many ways.

Which of these ways is usually best for a man who does not hire others?

Which of the other two ways is better for a man who does not hire others?

Which of the three ways do you think most other persons in _______ would think is best?

13. Belief In Control

Three men from different areas were talking about the things that control the weather and other conditions. Here is what they each said.

A (Subj) One man said: My people have never controlled the rain, wind, and other natural conditions and probably never will. There have always been good years and bad years. That is the way it is, and if you are wise you will take it as it comes and do the best you can.

B (Over) The second man said: My people believe that it is man's job to find ways to overcome weather and other conditions
just as they have overcome so many things. They believe they will one day succeed in doing this and may even overcome drought and floods.

C (With) The third man said: My people help conditions and keep things going by working to keep in close touch with all the forces which make the rain, the snow, and other conditions. It is when we do the right things--live in the proper way--and keep all that we have--the land, the stock, and the water--in good condition, that all goes along well.

Which of these men do you think had the best idea?

Which of the other two men do you think had the better idea?

Which of the three men do you think most other persons in _______ would think had the best idea?

14. Ceremonial Innovation time: Item T4

Some people in a community like your own saw that the religious ceremonies (the church services) were changing from what they used to be.

C (Fut) Some people were really pleased because of the changes in religious ceremonies. They felt that new ways are usually better than old ones, and they like to keep everything--even ceremonies--moving ahead.

A (Past) Some people were unhappy because of the change. They felt that religious ceremonies should be kept exactly--in every way--as they had been in the past.

B (Pres) Some people felt that the old ways for religious ceremonies were best but you just can't hang on to them. It makes life easier just to accept some changes as they come along.

Which of these three said most nearly what you would believe is right?

Which of the other two do you think is more right?

Which of the three would most other _______ say was most right?

15. Ways of Living activity: Item A3

There were two people talking about how they liked to live. They had different ideas.

A (Doing) One said: What I care about most is accomplishing things--getting things done just as well or better than other people do them. I like to see results and think they are worth working for.
The other said: What I care most about is to be left alone to think and act in the ways that best suit the way I really am. If I don't always get much done but can enjoy life as I go along, that is the best way.

Which of these two persons do you think has the better way of thinking?

Which of the two do you think you are more like?

Which do you think most other ______ would say had the better way of living?

16. Livestock Inheritance  

Some sons and daughters have been left some livestock (sheep or cattle) by a father or mother who has died. All these sons and daughters are grown up, and they live near each other. There are three different ways they can run the livestock.

A  
In some groups of people it is usually expected that the oldest able person (son or daughter, hermano mayor) will take charge of, or manage, all the stock held by himself and the other sons and daughters.

B  
In some groups of people it is usually expected that all the sons and daughters will keep all their cattle and sheep together and work together and decide among themselves who is best able to take charge of things, not necessarily the oldest, when a boss is needed.

C  
In some groups of people it is usually expected that each of the sons and daughters will prefer to take his or her own share of the stock and run his or her own business completely separate from all the others.

Which way do you think is usually best in most cases?

Which of the other two ways do you think is better?

Which of all three ways do you think most other persons in ______ would think is usually best?

17. Land Inheritance  

Now I want to ask a similar question concerning farm and grazing land instead of livestock.

Some sons and daughters have been left some farm and grazing land by a father or mother who has died. All these sons and daughters are grown and live near each other. There are three ways they can handle the property.
A In some groups of people it is usually expected that the oldest able person (hermano mayor) will take charge of or manage the land for himself and all the other sons and daughters, even if they all share it.

C In some groups of people it is usually expected that each son and daughter will take his own share of the land and do with it what he wants—separate from all the others.

B In some groups of people it is usually expected that all the sons and daughters will make use of the land together. When a boss is needed, they all get together and agree to choose someone of the group, not necessarily the oldest, to take charge of things.

Which of these ways do you think is usually best in most cases?
Which of the other two ways do you think is better?
Which of all three ways do you think most other persons in _______ would think is usually best?

18. Care of Fields

There were two men, both farmers (men with fields). They lived differently.

B One man kept the crops growing all right but didn't work on them more than he had to. He wanted to have extra time to visit with friends, go on trips, and enjoy life. This was the way he liked best.

A One man liked to work with his fields and was always putting in extra time keeping them clean of weeds and in fine condition. Because he did this extra work, he did not have much time left to be with friends, to go on trips, or to enjoy himself in other ways. But this was the way he really liked best.

Which kind of man do you believe it is better to be?

(For men only): Which kind of man are you really most like?
Which kind of man would most other _______ think it better to be?

19. Length of Life

Three men were talking about whether people themselves can do anything to make the lives of men and women longer. Here is what each said.
B One said: It is already true that people like doctors and others are finding the way to add many years to the lives of most men by discovering (finding) new medicines, by studying foods, and doing other such things as vaccinations. If people will pay attention to all these new things they will almost always live longer.

A The second one said: I really do not believe that there is much human beings themselves can do to make the lives of men and women longer. It is my belief that every person has a set time to live, and when that time comes it just comes.

C The third one said: I believe that there is a plan to life which works to keep all living things moving together, and if a man will learn to live his whole life in accord with that plan, he will live longer than other men.

Which of these three said most nearly what you would think is right?

Which of the other two ways is more right?

Which of the three would most other persons in ______ say was most right?

20. Water Allocation

The government is going to help a community like yours to get more water by redrilling and cleaning out a community well. The government officials suggest that the community should have a plan for dividing the extra water, but don't say what kind of plan. Since the amount of extra water that may come in is not known, people feel differently about planning.

A Some say that whatever water comes in should be divided just about like water in the past was always divided.

C Others want to work out a really good plan ahead of time for dividing whatever water comes in.

B Still others want to just wait until the water comes in before deciding on how it will be divided.

Which of these ways do you think is usually best in cases like this?

Which of the other two ways do you think is better?

Which of the three ways do you think most other persons in ______ would think best?
21. Housework activity: Item A5

There were two women talking about the way they liked to live.

B One said that she was willing to work as hard as the average, but that she didn't like to spend a lot of time doing the kind of extra things in her house or taking up extra things outside like ______. Instead she liked to have time free to enjoy visiting with people—to go on trips—or to just talk with whoever was around.

A The other woman said she liked best of all to find extra things to work on which would interest her—for example, ______. She said she was happiest when kept busy and was getting lots done.

Which of these ways do you think it is usually better for women to live?

(For women only): Which woman are you really more like?

Which way of life would most other ______ think is best?

22. Nonworking Time activity: Item A6

Two men spend their time in different ways when they have no work to do. (This means when they are not actually on the job.)

A One man spends most of this time learning or trying out things which will help him in his work.

B One man spends most of this time talking, telling stories, singing, and so on with his friends.

Which of these men has the better way of living?

Which of these men do you think you are more like?

Which of these men would most other ______ think had the better way of living?
Perloe designed the SVQ to study the impact of varying kinds of college environments on students' orientations relevant to participation in a democratic society. Two orientations were of major interest: social responsibility and participation in secondary groups.

Several steps were involved in developing the SVQ. First, a large number of Likert-type items were devised and administered to male college freshmen (N = 120) at the beginning and end of their first year in college. A factor analysis was performed using pooled ratings from the two administrations. Ambiguous items and items with low communalities were then eliminated. Separate factor analyses were performed using the remaining item pool and several other college samples (listed under "Sample" below). In these analyses considerable redundancy appeared; this was overcome by moving from factor analysis of individual items to analysis of parcels of items.

To avoid capitalizing on chance, parcels were assembled on the basis of only one sample and were cross-validated on the other samples. Intra-parcel correlations ranged from .11 to .67, with 88% falling between .20 and .55. The median was .38. Parcel scores were obtained by summing individual item scores within the parcel. After several separate factor analyses of parcel scores, it was found that a consistent four-factor structure could be obtained by omitting two parcels. The four factors accounted for 58% of the total variance and seemed to Perloe "to provide a fairly concise description of the major dimensions of variation present in response to the SVQ."

The parcels yielding loadings of .30 or greater on each of the four oblique factors comprise the final questionnaire, and these are presented below. Each item is rated on a six step scale running from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." A table of regression weights for computing factor scores is also presented. Although Perloe recommends its use, he says that scores computed in this way are well approximated by simply summing item ratings.

Short descriptions given by Perloe of the four factor dimensions are as follows:

1) The first runs from the acceptance of a moral obligation to protect and promote the welfare of others outside one's primary groups to the denial of this obligation. The individualist pole of this factor does not devalue being concerned with the welfare of others as much as it emphasizes that this concern is a matter of individual choice or preference rather than moral obligation. (Accounts for 24.8% of total variance.)
2) The second is concerned with cooperation and conformity in secondary groups. One pole expresses a positive evaluation of group norms and sanctions as mechanisms to help groups accomplish their purposes. The other rejects the creation and application of group norms. (Accounts for 13.7% of variance.)

3) One end of the third factor stresses the value and necessity, for proper personal development, of becoming deeply involved and identified with some group. The other end expresses man's natural separateness and devalues participation in groups. (Accounts for 16.4% of variance.)

4) The fourth factor taps the extent to which an individual should be concerned with another person's morals (as defined in the introduction to the questionnaire given below). One end values activity designed to increase the conformity of others to general moral standards. The other rejects this view and advocates minding one's business as far as others' morals are concerned. (Accounts for 9.2% of variance.)

In Perlo's samples the first three factors intercorrelated in the low or middle twenties, while the fourth correlated with the other three from .11 to .16.

Sample

Eight separate administrations of the SVQ provided the data for the studies just described.

1) Freshmen class of 1968 from a small, highly selective men's college—tested approximately three weeks before the start of classes (N = 120).

2) Same population as 1), tested approximately six weeks before the end of the second semester of their freshman year (N = 111).

3) Same as 1) and 2), tested at the start of the first semester of their junior year (N = 71).

4) Freshmen from the class of 1969, about three weeks before the start of classes (N = 117).

5) Same as 4) tested four to six weeks before the end of the second semester of their freshman year (N = 124).

6) Undergraduates at all levels in a small men's university which places strong emphasis on engineering and science. The sample was taken from an introductory social relations course required of all students (N = 58).

7) and 8) Two groups of Peace Corps Volunteers of both sexes tested during their initial training periods (N = 56; 58).
Since the author grouped items into parcels before proceeding with his correlational and factor analyses, it is difficult to assess the homogeneity figures of these scales (given above) against the usual standards. The factor loadings do indicate fairly high homogeneity however. No concrete figures are given, but the author indicates considerable stability in factor scores over a nine month period.

Two sources of evidence were reported. A sample of 50 students from the class of 1969 was given a two hour interview by a female psychiatric social worker. Responses were coded into categories based on questionnaire items, and these were then used to estimate factor scores. (Inter-observer correlations ranged from .87 to .90.) Correlations were computed between scores on the SVQ and on the interviews; these were .46, .25, .47, and .49 for the respective factors. All were significant at the .05 level.

As a measure of discriminant validity the sample of Peace Corps Volunteers was compared to the students from the science and engineering college. These groups differed on all four factors, the Volunteers being more social welfare oriented, less conforming and cooperative, more affiliative, and more moral support oriented.

Several interesting relationships were found between SVQ factor scores and MMPI, F scale, and other questionnaire item scores in a longitudinal study of the men's college samples, thus lending further support to the validity of the SVQ.

So far the SVQ has not been published, but the following documents are available:

Perloe, S.I. The factorial structure of the social values questionnaire. Dittoed manuscript dated October, 1967.

Final report to the Office of Education on Project S-308, Bureau No. 5-8210, 1967.

Social responsibility and individualism in college students: a preliminary report. Dittoed manuscript dated April, 1968.

The SVQ is self-administered and the total instrument would take an estimated 40 to 60 minutes to complete.

The SVQ seems to tap at least two important value orientations related to political beliefs and actions. Because it has received relatively little use since its recent construction, more study is required to map out its relation to other measures of values, personality, political attitudes, etc. In the process it will probably undergo revision.

Researchers interested in longitudinal studies of value change in college students would be interested in the results of Perloe's research employing the SVQ with several other standard measures. These required too much space to be discussed here.
SOCIAL VALUES QUESTIONNAIRE SCALE

The following questionnaire asks you to rate your agreement or disagreement with a number of general statements about individuals, groups, and their interrelationships. In order to make the meanings clear, the definitions assigned to some of the terms used in the statements are given below. Please read the definitions carefully because they may be slightly different than the ones you would spontaneously give. In all cases please respond to the words in terms of the definitions given here.

**Group** - An association or organization such as the P.T.A., a local civic or political club, a student government organization, a professional association, a committee functioning within such an organization.

**Community** - The town, city, or neighborhood in which a person resides. Although a community does not always have exact boundaries, it is generally thought of as a relatively coherent unit by those who live in and near it.

**Inconvenient** - Annoying, awkward, causing mild to moderate displeasure or discomfort, usually of a temporary nature.

**Preference** - The state of desiring some alternative more than others. As used in the questionnaire, the term connotes a small to medium difference between the desired and rejected alternatives.

**Moral** - Just, good, ethical. Although the synonyms listed here vary somewhat in strength, all refer to judgments of right and wrong with respect to some important principles commanding a moderately high degree of agreement by the members of our society, although there is disagreement on the source of the principles and on the range of situations to which they apply. There are moral principles for most areas of human conduct, particularly ones involving interactions among people. When you are asked to judge whether something is moral, right, etc. in the following questionnaire, you should respond in terms of what you personally believe the relevant moral principles are, even if you think that some other people would disagree.

Some of the following statements contain combinations of assertions which might evoke different reactions from you if they were responded to separately. Such combinations are often necessary in order to present complex ideas. In such cases your response to the total statement should be based on some combination of your reactions to each part, with the part which is more important to you being given greater weight. It is important that you assign only a single rating to the combined statement, and that you rate all the statements. Think of the six steps in the rating scale as being evenly spaced.
Social Values Questionnaire *

First Factor - Social Welfare

+ Individuals should be ready to inhibit their own pleasures if these inconvenience others.

+ People who try but are unable to provide for their own welfare have a right to expect help from others.

+ People should give up activities which bring them pleasure if these activities cause serious discomfort to others.

- Whether an individual acts to protect the welfare of persons beyond his circle of friends and relatives is a matter of personal preference, not moral obligation.

- The mere fact that one group or nation is prosperous and another is not places no moral obligation on the "have" group to improve the lot of the "have not" group.

+ Not only does everyone have an inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, he also has an equally inalienable moral obligation to protect others from having these rights taken from them.

- An individual who has not caused another person's misfortune has no moral obligation to help the other person.

+ It is wrong for a person to choose to pay little or no attention to the welfare of persons with whom he has no personal connection.

+ Acting to protect the rights and interests of other members of one's community is a major obligation for all persons.

- An individual's responsibility for the welfare of others extends no further than the boundaries of his immediate circle of friends and relatives.

+ A man should not be respected for his achievements if they were obtained by interfering with the welfare and development of others.

+ Although others may equal it in importance, there is no value more important than compassion for others.

+ It is sympathetic love among persons which alone gives significance to life.

- Although altruism and feelings of responsibility for the welfare of others are generally thought to be admirable qualities, a person should not be required to have them in order to be respected by himself or others.

*The various "parcels" within each factor are separated by horizontal lines.
- Except for one's immediate family and closest friends, people have a perfect right to pursue their own goals without regard to the convenience or comfort of others.

- People cannot be considered moral if they are indifferent to the welfare of the members of the community in which they live and work.

+ All men have an obligation to promote not only the welfare of their immediate circle of relatives but also to work for the well being of all the members of the community in which they live.

- Things work best when people concern themselves with their own welfare and let others take care of themselves.

- One's major obligation to other men is to let them alone so that they may sink or swim by their own efforts.

+ Minor conflicts between one's own comfort and convenience and that of a neighbor should be resolved in favor of the neighbor more often than not.

+ An individual most deserves the feeling of satisfaction with himself after he has done something to help someone else.

+ The typical law abiding person who avoids situations in which transgressions occur rather than acting in such situations to protect those who are being injured, does not deserve the respect of his fellow citizens.

+ A person who witnesses an unlawful or immoral act, such as physical assault or sadistic taunting and teasing, and who does not try to do what he can to stop its occurrence shares part of the guilt with the transgressor.

- The only people guilty of immoral acts are those who commit them or directly cause them to be committed; others who might have prevented the acts, but did not, should bear no blame.

+ Individuals should feel responsible for fostering the improvement of moral as well as the physical well being of others.

+ Every person should be his brother’s keeper in the physical and moral sense.

- People should leave the prevention of immoral acts up to those whose jobs are specifically concerned with such prevention.

- One should avoid trying to make people more moral and considerate than they generally are.

- It is better for a person to ignore the larger social concerns of the community in which he lives than to force himself to take part in these concerns merely from a sense of moral obligation.
- It is better to ignore a person in need when one feels no personal compassion for him than to act compassionately out of a sense of obligation or guilt.

+ People cannot rely solely upon ministers, policemen and judges to insure moral behavior among the citizens of a community; they must each act to dissuade others from anti-social acts.

- When one individual behaves unjustly toward another, it is wrong for a third person to intervene to correct the injustice unless he has been asked to do so.

- We intrude unjustifiably into the privacy of other persons when we try to get them to abide more closely to a moral code which they accept as a vague ideal, but which they do not follow in their behavior.

Second Factor - Cooperation toward Group Goals

+ There is nothing wrong in the members of a group trying to persuade indifferent or mildly dissenting members to go along with the group.

+ A person should be willing to cooperate with democratically selected group leaders, even though they are not the ones he personally preferred.

- Conformity to the policies of your group when you are not wholeheartedly in agreement with them is wrong, even when the policies are the result of a democratic process in which you were free to participate.

- A person should not feel bound to follow the decisions of the groups to which he belongs if these decisions are not in accord with his private preferences.

+ Groups and communities which refuse to regulate the behaviors of their members encourage the exploitation of the weak by the powerful.

+ It is proper for a group to decide to mete out some kind of punishment to group members who act without regard to the goals and rules of the group.

+ A person is right in feeling annoyed or angry when other members of his group ignore justifiable group demands.

+ A democratically organized group has the right to determine what should be considered proper behavior in areas relevant to the group.

- Group members should not be criticized when they refuse to do something in which they have no interest even when the action in question is necessary for their group to reach its goals.
- People damage themselves as individuals when they inhibit or in some other way modify their behaviors as a result of the rules of the groups to which they belong.

- Regardless of how democratically a group sets up its rules, it ceases to be a democratic group once it begins to pressure its members to conform to these rules.

- When democratically organized groups begin to influence and regulate the behaviors of their members, they either disintegrate or become transformed into undemocratic, autocratic groups.

- In the long run, people are best off if left to regulate their own behavior rather than setting up group norms and sanctions.

+ It is often better for a group to agree upon specific rules to regulate behaviors of importance to the group than to leave the regulation to the individual judgments of the group members.

+ Individual consciences need the support of laws and social codes in order to function effectively in producing moral behavior.

Third Factor - Identification with Groups

+ It is important for an individual to be closely identified with at least one group.

+ Individuals do not really fulfill their human potentials unless they involve themselves deeply in some group.

- In life an individual should for the most part "go it alone" assuring himself of privacy, having much time to himself, attempting to resist being influenced by others.

- People who identify strongly with some group usually do so at the expense of their development and individual self-fulfillment.

+ Man is a social animal; he cannot flourish and grow without identifying himself with some group.

- Men are first and foremost individual beings; the identifications they may have with groups never really alters their essential separateness from one another.

- Man's natural state is as an independent, unattached individual; he acts in conflict with his essential qualities when he acts with others as a member of a highly unified group.

+ Individuals and groups exist in a symbiotic relationship; neither can flourish without satisfying the needs of the other.
An individual truly finds himself when he merges with a social group and joins with others in resolute and determined activity for the realization of social goals.

Only a person who remains aloof from social organizations and group allegiances can fully develop his potential as an individual.

Man's natural state is as a member of a group; the individual who holds himself aloof from active participation in a community is acting against his natural inclinations.

It is wrong if an individual refuses to participate actively in at least some of the group activities of the community in which he lives.

A man's self-fulfillment through his work and his life with family and friends should almost always transcend his obligation to participate in the civic activities of his community, e.g., being active in a local civic, political, cultural or charitable organization.

Individuals should feel no obligation to participate in the group activities of the communities in which they happen to live or work.

Some of life's greatest satisfactions are found in working cooperatively with others.

It is often more gratifying to work for the accomplishment of a goal held by a group to which one belongs than to work for the attainment of a purely personal goal.

It is just as important to work toward group goals and adhere to the established rules of the group as it is to gratify one's individual desires.

Fourth Factor - Moral Pressure

Everyone has an obligation to criticize other members of his community when they act in an immoral, antisocial manner.

A person should be willing to openly criticize individuals who break the rules agreed upon by the group.

Encouraging others to behave in accord with generally accepted moral standards is as important as one's own living up to these standards.

A community in which people were very concerned with each others' morality as well as their own would be an intolerable one in which to live.

It is wrong for a man to point out other people's moral shortcomings.

People cannot rely solely upon ministers, policemen and judges to insure moral behavior among the citizens of a community; they must act to dissuade others from antisocial acts.
- When one individual behaves unjustly toward another it is wrong for a third person to intervene to correct the injustice unless he has been asked to do so.

- We intrude unjustifiably into the privacy of other persons when we try to get them to abide more closely to a moral code which they accept as a vague ideal, but which they do not follow in their behavior.

+ Individuals should feel responsible for fostering the improvement of morals as well as the physical well being of others.

+ Every person should be his brother's keeper in the physical and moral sense.

- People should leave the prevention of immoral acts up to those whose jobs are specifically concerned with such prevention.

- One should avoid trying to make people more moral and considerate than they generally are.

+ Minor conflicts between one's own comfort and convenience and that of a neighbor should be resolved in favor of the neighbor more often than not.

+ An individual most deserves the feeling of satisfaction with himself after he has done something to help someone else.
The measures in this chapter show considerable underuse in relation to the number of phenomena that can be related to them. Orientations toward other people (or human nature) appear to be one attitude area in which people have well-structured and concrete attitudes that are built up and used in everyday experience. In one of the most comprehensive studies of racial attitudes in the literature, Wrightsman and Cook (1965) found that two of the scales in this chapter were practically the only ones (out of 78 examined) to predict a change toward more favorable attitudes toward Negroes. A total of seven scales are reviewed in this section:

1. Machiavellianism (Christie and others 1969)
2. Philosophy of Human Nature (Wrightsman 1964)
3. Faith in People Scale (Rosenberg 1957)
4. Trust in People (Survey Research Center 1969)
5. People in General (Banta 1961)
6. Misanthropy (Sullivan and Adelson 1954)
7. Acceptance of Others (Fey 1955)

Christie's Machiavellianism (or Mach) scale has the most interesting theoretical rationale and has been used in the widest variety of research settings. The strongest component of the scale taps a respondent's feelings about whether other people can be manipulated so as to achieve (usually the respondent's) desired ends. The scale has relatively high internal consistency, although factor analyses reveal that there are at least three dimensions of item content. While not all experiments using the scale have yielded positive results, most of the studies with negative results failed to optimize the conditions under which high 'Machs' can operate. Very interesting results have been obtained in field studies using the Mach scale. The scale is available in three different formats in order to control for response sets, although Mach responses are still judged as quite socially undesirable so that to score as a "high Mach" one must be relatively insensitive to social desirability.
Wrightsman's philosophy of human nature instrument is also well-conceived and has been applied in a variety of research settings. Although there are six subscales of human nature, the instrument appears to be two dimensional in nature—the major dimension being favorability toward human nature. The instruments evidence quite satisfactory internal consistency and test-retest stability, and are worded in both positive and negative format to control for agreement response set. The author also presents considerable evidence of the scale's essential validity, although more extensive validity checks might be desirable.

Rosenberg's faith in people scale was one of the earliest scales to focus on this attitudinal area. The scale contains only five items and evidence for reliability is not impressive for the data that Rosenberg collected. However, validity of the scale was well reflected by predictable differences in respondents' occupational choice and a wide variety of related political attitudes. However, all of this research was conducted with college students.

The Survey Research Center has more recently applied three of Rosenberg's items to nationwide samples of adults. Here inter-item correlations are very impressive and hold when controlled for educational level. The scale in national samples is associated as expected with optimistic and efficacious political attitudes, with feelings of personal efficacy, and with feelings of life satisfaction. Interesting differences in trust in people are also found by religious affiliation and for those with varying political views (e.g., supporters of George Wallace, respondents who want to pull out of Vietnam).

The items in Banta's scale are drawn from Christie's early work into Machiavellianism and hence represent little new in the way of item content. Furthermore, they have been applied to a very small sample
of college students. The scale is included because it is one of the few attitude scales to employ the unfolding technique. It is interesting to see that scale values derived via this technique are practically identical to those obtained using Thurstone's more detailed procedure.

The misanthropy scale of Sullivan and Adelson is derived directly from an ethnocentrism scale, by replacing references to ethnic minorities with terms such as "most people" in the scale items. The main value of the scale is the significant relation it shows to the original ethnocentrism scale indicating (but not completely demonstrating) that misanthropy is a strong component in ethnocentrism. The items need further refinement (and at least some items need to be written in the reversed direction to counter response set) and tests for validity need to be carried out.

Fey's acceptance of others scale is also mainly distinguished by the interesting results generated from its application—the findings that acceptance of others is associated with acceptance of self and estimated acceptance by others. The scale shows relatively high reliability but needs to be applied in a more comprehensive study than the one on which it was developed. Readers may find some interest in the short "estimated acceptance by others" scale which we have appended to this scale.

Reference
MACHIAVELLIANISM (Christie and others 1969)

Variable

This measure attempts to tap a person's general strategy for dealing with people, especially the degree to which he feels other people are manipulable in interpersonal situations.

Description

Seventy-one items were drawn from the writings of Machiavelli (The Prince and The Discourses). These were conceived as falling into three substantive areas: 1) the nature of interpersonal tactics (32 items), 2) views of human nature (28 items), and 3) abstract or generalized morality (11 items). An item analysis revealed that about 60 of these correlated at the .05 level with a total "Mach" score based on the sum of all items (the items about human nature being most highly related, the ones about morality least highly related). The ten highest related items of those worded in the Machiavellian direction were selected into the final scale (Mach IV) along with the ten highest related items worded in the opposite direction. An attempt was made to introduce as much content variety as possible. The counterbalancing was designed to minimize the effects of indiscriminant agreement or disagreement.

Items are given in standard 6-category Likert format (agree strongly being scored 7, no answer 4, and disagree strongly 1). A constant score of 20 was added to make the neutral score 100, the lowest possible Machiavellian score 40, and the highest 160.

A forced-choice version of this scale (Mach V) was developed to offset a significant negative correlation (r's around -.40) observed between Mach IV scores and Edward's social desirability scale. Scores on Mach V also range between 40 and 160.

A "Kiddie Mach" scale (20 Likert format items) was also developed for use with children or low education adults.

Sample

The items in the initial Mach scale were given to samples of 1,196 college students in Iowa, North Carolina, and New York. A total of 1,700 college students gave responses to the Mach scale, F-scale, and anomie scale which formed the basis for the factor analysis reported below. The items have also been used to select students for 34 separate experiments to test hypotheses about the Mach scale. The items have also been applied to a national cross-section sample of Americans, but no results on this sample have been published. The scale has also been applied in a number of other research settings.

Reliability/Homogeneity

The average item-test correlation for the items in Mach IV was .38, with little difference in this value across the three content categories of items or positive vs. negative item wording. Split-half reliabilities determined on subsequent samples averaged .79. (The values for comparable F-scale items were .33 and .68 respectively.)
Reliabilities for the forced-choice Mach V scale were somewhat lower (in the .60's) but this might be expected to occur with most sets of items in which social desirability is as strictly controlled as it was in this scale.

A factor analysis of Mach items, F-scale items, and anomie items resulted in four factors: one Mach factor, one F-factor, one factor combining F and Mach and one factor combining Mach and anomie. In terms of the items from Mach IV which loaded over .25 on each factor with Mach items, we have the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor:</th>
<th>Duplicity</th>
<th>Negativism</th>
<th>Distrust of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(plus 4 anomie items)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(plus 8 F items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity

It would be impossible to summarize here the results of all relevant experiments. In some experiments, hypotheses were not confirmed but

"...in 12 or 13 instances in which face-to-face contact, latitude for improvisation, and irrelevant affect were all judged present, the high Machs won more, were persuaded less, persuaded others more, or behaved as predicted significantly compared to low Machs. ...in seven of the nine cases in which two of the variables were present, high Machs did better."

Some field study results bearing indirectly on validity are reported below (see Results and Comments)

Location


Administration

Each of the three forms of the scale contains 20 items; and each has been normed so that the score 100 is the neutral point. The Kiddie Mach would seem to be the most rapidly administered, with Mach IV taking slightly more time to complete. Mach V would undoubtedly take the most time to complete. Moreover it would appear that attempts to control social desirability (the raison-d'etre for Mach V) were not successful, as scores on Mach V still correlated -.40 with social desirability. The author notes that he has used Mach IV and Mach V in conjunction in experimental work, selecting for high Machs only people who score high on both scales.

The author has also had the scales translated into a number of foreign languages (e.g., Chinese, Swedish).

This correlation is based on an internal measure of social desirability. Subsequent research has shown that Mach V does not correlate significantly with either the Crowne-Marlowe or Edwards social desirability scales (described in Chapter 10).
Results and Comments

The author cautions against the usual perjorative implications that surround the term "Machiavellian." None of his research evidence substantiates the view that high Mach's are more hostile, vicious, or vindictive than low Machs. Rather it appears that they have a "cool detachment," which makes them less emotionally involved with other people, with sensitive issues, or with saving face in embarrassing situations.

Generational differences in Mach scores indicate that Americans are becoming more manipulative and impersonal in the Machiavellian sense. No differences have been found by intelligence, social status, or even social mobility. It is hypothesized that high Machs are less likely to arise from traditional societies because they operate most effectively in unstructured situations.

Field studies at medical schools have revealed the counter-intuitive but plausible finding that psychiatrists score highest on the Mach scale and surgeons lowest (it is argued that the psychiatrists' role involves manipulation per se vs. the surgeon who has as little personal contact with patients as possible). In two further separate studies, the Mach scale predicted aspects of lobbyist behavior in Washington and differences in acculturation of certain Hungarian immigrants into American life.
Listed below are a number of statements. Each represents a commonly
held opinion and there are no right or wrong answers. You will probably
disagree with some items and agree with others. We are interested in
the extent to which you agree or disagree with such matters of opinion.

Read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you
agree or disagree by circling the number in front of each statement.
The numbers and their meaning are indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Score)</th>
<th>(Original Reversed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you agree strongly, circle +3</td>
<td>7 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you agree somewhat, circle +2</td>
<td>6 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you agree slightly, circle +1</td>
<td>5 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you disagree slightly, circle -1</td>
<td>3 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you disagree somewhat, circle -2</td>
<td>2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you disagree strongly, circle -3</td>
<td>1 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First impressions are usually best in such matters. Read each statement,
decide if you agree or disagree and the strength of your opinion, and
then circle the appropriate number in front of the statement. Give your
opinion on every statement.

If you find that the numbers to be used in answering do not adequately
indicate your own opinion, use the one which is closest to the way you
feel.

---

1. Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it
   is useful to do so. .41
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3
2. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want
   to hear. .47

*3. One should take action only when sure it is morally right. .41

*4. Most people are basically good and kind. .35

5. It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak and
   it will come out when they are given a chance. .41

* Reversed item.
6. Honesty is the best policy in all cases. \hspace{1cm} .42
7. There is no excuse for lying to someone else. \hspace{1cm} .35
8. Generally speaking, men won't work hard unless they're forced to do so. \hspace{1cm} .31
9. All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than to be important and dishonest. \hspace{1cm} .38
10. When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reasons for wanting it rather than giving reasons which carry more weight. \hspace{1cm} .45
11. Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives. \hspace{1cm} .33
12. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble. \hspace{1cm} .42
13. The biggest difference between most criminals and other people is that the criminals are stupid enough to get caught. \hspace{1cm} .31
14. Most men are brave. \hspace{1cm} .29
15. It is wise to flatter important people. \hspace{1cm} .40
16. It is possible to be good in all respects. \hspace{1cm} .37
17. Barnum was wrong when he said that there's a sucker born every minute. \hspace{1cm} .37
18. It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there. \hspace{1cm} .42
19. People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death. \hspace{1cm} .37
20. Most men forget more easily the death of their father than the loss of their property. \hspace{1cm} .35
Mach V Attitude Inventory

You will find 20 groups of statements listed below. Each group is composed of three statements. Each statement refers to a way of thinking about people or things in general. They reflect opinions and not matters of fact -- there are no "right" or "wrong" answers and different people have been found to agree with different statements.

Please read each of the three statements in each group. Then decide first which of the statements is most true or comes the closest to describing your own beliefs. Circle a plus (+) in the space provided on the answer sheet.

Just decide which of the remaining two statements is most false or is the farthest from your own beliefs. Circle the minus (-) in the space provided on the answer sheet.

Here is an example:

A. It is easy to persuade people but hard to keep them persuaded. +
B. Theories that run counter to common sense are a waste of time. 
C. It is only common sense to go along with what other people are doing and not be too different. ±

In this case, statement B would be the one you believe in most strongly and A and C would be ones that are not as characteristic of your opinion. Statement C would be the one you believe in least strongly and is least characteristic of your beliefs.

You will find some of the choices easy to make; others will be quite difficult. Do not fail to make a choice no matter how hard it may be. You will mark two statements in each group of three -- the one that comes the closest to your own beliefs with a + and the one farthest from your beliefs with a -. The remaining statement should be left unmarked.

Do not omit any groups of statements.
## SCORING KEY FOR MACH V (1968)

### Points per Item by Response Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sum for all 20 items and add constant of 20. Range: 40 - 160.**
1. A. It takes more imagination to be a successful criminal than a successful business man.
B. The phrase "the road to hell is paved with good intentions" contains a lot of truth.
C. Most men forget more easily the death of their father than the loss of their property.

2. A. Men are more concerned with the car they drive than with the clothes their wives wear.
B. It is very important that imagination and creativity in children be cultivated.
C. People suffering from incurable diseases should have the choice of being put painlessly to death.

3. A. Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so.
B. The well-being of the individual is the goal that should be worked for before anything else.
C. Once a truly intelligent person makes up his mind about the answer to a problem he rarely continues to think about it.

4. A. People are getting so lazy and self-indulgent that it is bad for our country.
B. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.
C. It would be a good thing if people were kinder to others less fortunate than themselves.

5. A. Most people are basically good and kind.
B. The best criteria for a wife or husband is compatibility--other characteristics are nice but not essential.
C. Only after a man has gotten what he wants from life should he concern himself with the injustices in the world.

6. A. Most people who get ahead in the world lead clean, moral lives.
B. Any man worth his salt shouldn't be blamed for putting his career above his family.
C. People would be better off if they were concerned less with how to do things and more with what to do.

7. A. A good teacher is one who points out unanswered questions rather than gives explicit answers.
B. When you ask someone to do something for you, it is best to give the real reasons for wanting it rather than giving reasons which might carry more weight.
C. A person's job is the best single guide as to the sort of person he is.

8. A. The construction of such monumental works as the Egyptian pyramids was worth the enslavement of the workers who built them.
B. Once a way of handling problems has been worked out it is best to stick to it.
C. One should take action only when sure that it is morally right.
9. A. The world would be a much better place to live in if people would let the future take care of itself and concern themselves only with enjoying the present.  
B. It is wise to flatter important people.  
C. Once a decision has been made, it is best to keep changing it as new circumstances arise.

10. A. It is a good policy to act as if you are doing the things you do because you have no other choice.  
B. The biggest difference between most criminals and other people is that criminals are stupid enough to get caught.  
C. Even the most hardened and vicious criminal has a spark of decency somewhere within him.

11. A. All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than to be important and dishonest.  
B. A man who is able and willing to work hard has a good chance of succeeding in whatever he wants to do.  
C. If a thing does not help us in our daily lives, it isn't very important.

12. A. A person shouldn't be punished for breaking a law which he thinks is unreasonable.  
B. Too many criminals are not punished for their crime.  
C. There is no excuse for lying to someone else.

13. A. Generally speaking, men won't work hard unless they're forced to do so.  
B. Every person is entitled to a second chance, even after he commits a serious mistake.  
C. People who can't make up their minds aren't worth bothering about.

14. A. A man's first responsibility is to his wife, not his mother.  
B. Most men are brave.  
C. It's best to pick friends that are intellectually stimulating rather than ones it is comfortable to be around.

15. A. There are very few people in the world worth concerning oneself about.  
B. It is hard to get ahead without cutting corners here and there.  
C. A capable person motivated for his own gain is more useful to society than a well-meaning but ineffective one.

16. A. It is best to give others the impression that you can change your mind easily.  
B. It is a good working policy to keep on good terms with everyone.  
C. Honesty is the best policy in all cases.

17. A. It is possible to be good in all respects.  
B. To help oneself is good; to help others even better.  
C. War and threats of war are unchangeable facts of human life.
18. A. Barnum was probably right when he said that there's at least one sucker born every minute.
B. Life is pretty dull unless one deliberately stirs up some excitement.
C. Most people would be better off if they controlled their emotions.

19. A. Sensitivity to the feelings of others is worth more than poise in social situations.
B. The ideal society is one where everybody knows his place and accepts it.
C. It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak and it will come out when they are given a chance.

20. A. People who talk about abstract problems usually don't know what they are talking about.
B. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.
C. It is essential for the functioning of a democracy that everyone votes.
KIDDIE MACH

On the next two pages are some sentences. Each sentence says something about the world or about people. There are no right or wrong answers. You will probably agree with some of the sentences and disagree with others. We want to know how much you agree or disagree. You can show how much you agree or disagree with each sentence by circling one of the answers next to each sentence.

Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>item</th>
<th>+ item</th>
<th>- item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree very much</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree a little</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree a little</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree very much</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Read each sentence, decide whether you agree or disagree and how much. Then you will put a circle around the answer that best tells how you feel about the sentence.

+ 1. Never tell anyone why you did something unless it will help you.
    Agree very much    Agree a little    Disagree a little    Disagree very much

- 2. Most people are good and kind.

+ 3. The best way to get along with people is to tell them things that make them happy.

- 4. You should do something only when you are sure it is right.

+ 5. It is smartest to believe that all people will be mean if they have a chance.

- 6. You should always be honest, no matter what.

+ 7. Sometimes you have to hurt other people to get what you want.

+ 8. Most people won't work hard unless you make them do it.
9. It is better to be ordinary and honest than famous and dishonest.

10. It's better to tell someone why you want him to help you than to make up a good story to get him to do it.

11. Successful people are mostly honest and good.

12. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.

13. A criminal is just like other people except that he is stupid enough to get caught.

14. Most people are brave.

15. It is smart to be nice to important people even if you don't really like them.

16. It is possible to be good in every way.

17. Most people can not be easily fooled.

18. Sometimes you have to cheat a little to get what you want.

19. It is never right to tell a lie.

20. It hurts more to lose money than to lose a friend.
Variable

The instrument attempts to assess philosophy of human nature, conceived of as the expectancies that people have about the ways in which other people generally behave.

Description

Unlike other investigations into how people perceive human nature, Wrightsman's attempts to break the construct into six different components:

1) Trustworthiness - the extent to which people are seen as moral, honest, and reliable
2) Altruism - the extent of unselfishness, sincere sympathy, and concern for others
3) Independence - the extent to which a person can maintain his convictions in the face of society's pressures toward conformity
4) Strength of Will and Rationality - the extent to which people understand the motives behind their behavior and the extent to which they have control over their outcomes
5) Complexity of Human Nature - the extent to which people are complex and hard to understand vs. simple and easy to understand
6) Variability in Human Nature - the extent of individual differences in basic nature and the basic changeability in human nature

The first four dimensions are conceived of as essentially independent of the last two, a presupposition borne out empirically (see Reliability below). An overall favorability toward human nature score was therefore calculated from these first four subscales. A total of 120 items (20 for each of the six components--10 stated positively, 10 negatively) were constructed and given to 177 undergraduate students. After an item analysis, the 24 least discriminating items were discarded. A further item analysis resulted in the discarding of an additional 12 items. The final form of the scale consists of six subscales of 14 items each, 7 worded positively and 7 negatively.

Samples

In addition to the samples used for item analyses and ascertaining reliability, the scale was administered to 530 undergraduates (253 males and 377 females) at six colleges in the South, East, and Midwest. Data on self-concepts was obtained from 100 of these females.
Reliability/ Homogeneity

The following split-half reliabilities (corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula), test-retest reliabilities, and inter-subscale correlations were obtained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Altruism</th>
<th>Indep.</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Complex.</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Split-half (average)</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test-retest (3 month)</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test-retest correlation for the total favorability toward human nature scale (i.e., the 56 items from the first four subscales) was .90.

Validity

A number of predictions about hypothesized differences in favorableness in human nature were confirmed.

1) Females had more favorable views toward human nature than men at each school tested.

2) Students at a Fundamentalist college revealed themselves as feeling quite negative about human nature.

3) In two classroom studies, favorably oriented students rated their instructors more favorably than negatively oriented students.

4) A strong correlation (r = .65) was found between negative views and dissatisfaction with one's self-concept.

5) Substantial correlations were found between favorableness towards human nature and other attitudes in the same conceptual area: Agger et al.'s political cynicism scale (r = -.61), Rosenberg's faith-in-people scale (r = .77), and Christie's Machiavellianism scale (r = -.68).

Location

Administration Each item is presented in standard 6-point Likert format from +3 (agree strongly) through -3 (disagree strongly). Scores on each subscale can vary between -42 (extremely negative view of human nature) to +42 (positive view). Average scores on the six-subscals for 500 college students were as follows:

- Trustworthiness: +2.5
- Altruism: -3.7
- Independence: -2.2
- Strength of will: +7.2
- Complexity: +13.0
- Variability: +17.2

Total scores for the favorableness toward human nature scale can vary between -118 and +118. Although no average scores for this total scale are given, the above information would work out to a value of +3.8.

Results and Comments Despite the impressive and interesting set of correlations that Wrightsman has presented (under Validity), only one—the finding about differences in colleges with varying religious views—can really be said to bear directly on validity (if one insists on some sort of behavioral criterion, such as contributing money to a charity, to establish validity). The differences in ratings of college instructors, while statistically significant, result from differences of less than one point in overall favorableness.

Although the author dismisses as insignificant the correlations between the first four subscales vs. complexity and variability, the fact that they are consistently negative leads to the interesting conclusion that there is a tendency for people having a negative view of human nature to see human nature as simple and unchangeable. However, as the average scores above indicate, there is much higher agreement among the college students tested that human nature is more complex and variable than it is trustworthy or altruistic.
Here is a series of attitude statements. Each represents a commonly held opinion and there are no right or wrong answers. You will probably disagree with some items and agree with others. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with such matters of opinion.

Read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by circling the number in front of each statement. The numbers and their meaning are indicated below:

If you agree strongly - circle +3
If you agree somewhat - circle +2
If you agree slightly - circle +1
If you disagree slightly - circle -1
If you disagree somewhat - circle -2
If you disagree strongly - circle -3

First impressions are usually best in such matters. Read each statement, decide if you agree or disagree and the strength of your opinion, and then circle the appropriate number in front of the statement. Give your opinion on every statement.

If you find that the numbers to be used in answering do not adequately indicate your own opinion use the one which is closest to the way you feel.

**Trustworthiness (Positive items)**

2. Most students will tell the instructor when he has made a mistake in adding up their score, even if he had given them more points than they deserved.
   +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

8. If you give the average person a job to do and leave him to do it, he will finish it successfully.

14. People usually tell the truth, even when they know they would be better off by lying.
20. Most students do not cheat when taking an exam.

26. Most people are basically honest.

62. If you act in good faith with people, almost all of them will reciprocate with fairness toward you.

86. Most people lead clean, decent lives.

Trustworthiness (Negative items)

32. People claim they have ethical standards regarding honesty and morality, but few people stick to them when the chips are down.

38. If you want people to do a job right, you should explain things to them in great detail and supervise them closely.

44. If most people could get into a movie without paying and be sure they were not seen, they would do it.

50. Most people are not really honest for a desirable reason; they're afraid of getting caught.

56. Most people would tell a lie if they could gain by it.

74. Most people would cheat on their income tax, if they had a chance.

92. Nowadays people commit a lot of crimes and sins that no one else ever hears about.

Altruism (Positive items)

4. Most people try to apply the Golden Rule even in today's complex society.

10. Most people do not hesitate to go out of their way to help someone in trouble.

16. Most people will act as "Good Samaritans" if given the opportunity.

22. "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" is a motto most people follow.

64. The typical person is sincerely concerned about the problems of others.

70. Most people with a fallout shelter would let their neighbors stay in it during a nuclear attack.

88. Most people would stop and help a person whose car is disabled.
Altruism (Negative items)

34. The average person is conceited.

40. It's only a rare person who would risk his own life and limb to help someone else.

46. It's pathetic to see an unselfish person in today's world because so many people take advantage of him.

52. People pretend to care more about one another than they really do.

58. Most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people.

76. Most people exaggerate their troubles in order to get sympathy.

94. People are usually out for their own good.

Independence (Positive items)

33. Most people have the courage of their convictions.

39. Most people can make their own decisions, uninfluenced by public opinion.

45. It is achievement, rather than popularity with others, that gets you ahead nowadays.

51. The average person will stick to his opinion if he thinks he's right, even if others disagree.

57. If a student does not believe in cheating, he will avoid it even if he sees many others doing it.

75. The person with novel ideas is respected in our society.

93. Most people will speak out for what they believe in.

Independence (Negative items)

3. Most people will change the opinion they express as a result of an onslaught of criticism, even though they really don't change the way they feel.

9. Nowadays many people won't make a move until they find out what other people think.
15. The important thing in being successful nowadays is not how hard you work, but how well you fit in with the crowd.

27. The typical student will cheat on a test when everybody else does, even though he has a set of ethical standards.

63. It's a rare person who will go against the crowd.

69. Most people have to rely on someone else to make their important decisions for them.

87. The average person will rarely express his opinion in a group when he sees the others disagree with him.

Strength of Will and Rationality (Positive items)

31. If a person tries hard enough, he will usually reach his goals in life.

37. The average person has an accurate understanding of the reasons for his behavior.

43. If people try hard enough, wars can be prevented in the future.

49. The average person is largely the master of his own fate.

55. In a local or national election, most people select a candidate rationally and logically.

73. Most persons have a lot of control over what happens to them in life.

79. Most people have a good idea of what their strengths and weaknesses are.

Strength of Will and Rationality (Negative items)

1. Great successes in life, like great artists and inventors, are usually motivated by forces they are unaware of.

7. Our success in life is pretty much determined by forces outside our own control.

19. Attempts to understand ourselves are usually futile.

25. There's little one can do to alter his fate in life.

61. Most people have little influence over the things that happen to them.
67. Most people have an unrealistically favorable view of their own capabilities.

85. Most people vote for a political candidate on the basis of unimportant characteristics such as his appearance or name, rather than because of his stand on the issues.

Complexity of Human Nature (Positive items)

36. I find that my first impressions of people are frequently wrong.
42. Some people are too complicated for me to figure out.
48. I think you can never really understand the feeling of other people.
54. You can't accurately describe a person in just a few words.
60. You can't classify everyone as good or bad.
78. People are too complex to ever be understood fully.
90. People are so complex it is hard to know what "makes them tick."

Complexity of Human Nature (Negative items)

6. I find that my first impression of a person is usually correct.
12. People can be described accurately by one term, such as "introverted," or "moral," or "sociable."
18. It's not hard to understand what really is important to a person.
24. I think I get a good idea of a person's basic nature after a brief conversation with him.
30. If I could ask a person three questions about himself (and assuming he would answer them honestly), I would know a great deal about him.
72. When I meet a person, I look for one basic characteristic through which I try to understand him.
96. Give me a few facts about a person and I'll have a good idea of whether I'll like him or not.
Variability in Human Nature (Positive items)

11. A person's reaction to things differs from one situation to another.

17. Different people react to the same situation in different ways.

23. Each person's personality is different from the personality of every other person.

29. People are quite different in their basic interests.

65. People are pretty different from one another in what "makes them tick."

83. Often a person's basic personality is altered by such things as a religious conversion, psycho-therapy, or a charm course.

89. People are unpredictable in how they'll act from one situation to another.

Variability in Human Nature (Negative items)

35. People are pretty much alike in their basic interests.

41. People are basically similar in their personalities.

47. If you have a good idea about how several people will react to a certain situation, you can expect most other people to react the same way.

53. Most people are consistent from situation to situation in the way they react to things.

59. A child who is popular will be popular as an adult, too.

77. If I can see how a person reacts to one situation, I have a good idea of how he will react to other situations.

95. When you get right down to it, people are quite alike in their emotional makeup.
FAITH IN PEOPLE SCALE (Rosenberg 1957)

Variable

This scale attempts to assess one's degree of confidence in the trustworthiness, honesty, goodness, generosity, and brotherliness of people in general. It is alternately called the "misanthropy scale."

Description

The instrument consists of a Guttman-type scale of two forced-choice and three agree-disagree statements, which was formed from nine related items culled by judges (five sociologists at Cornell) from an original group of 36 items. Positive responses are those indicating absence of faith in people. Range of scores is 1 (high faith on all 5 items) to 6 (low faith on all 5 items).

Rosenberg intended the dimension covered by this scale to be relevant to occupational choice, under the assumption that inter-personal attitudes could influence the individual's perception of his career.

The following distribution along the scale was found for Cornell students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | 100% |

Sample

The sample used was a nationwide sample of 4,585 college students in 1952. The instrument was first administered to a sample of 2,758 Cornell students in 1950, and to 1,571 Cornell students in 1952.

Reliability/ Homogeneity

The coefficient of reproducibility for the five item scale was .92. The author notes that while the fifth item did not meet the Guttman 80-20 positive-negative marginal standard, it was included because the other four items produced a coefficient of over .90.

Validity

Evidence of validity may be found in the fact that the group of respondents whose occupational choices were social work, personnel work, and teaching had the largest proportion of high scores on the scale, while the group choosing sales-promotion, business-finance, and advertising had the greatest proportion of low scores. This relationship remained even when sex differences were controlled. Consistent with these findings, students with a high faith-in-people were more likely to select people-oriented occupational values while those with low faith-in-people were more likely to choose extrinsic values. (The value statements are presented in Robinson et al., 1969.)
In correlating scores on the scale with single-question indices, it was found that high scorers were less willing to use unscrupulous means to get ahead, less likely to believe in the superior efficiency of "contacts" over ability, and less likely to believe it very important to get ahead in life.

In a separate analysis of data from the Cornell University students, Rosenberg (1956) found that students scoring low in faith-in-people were far more likely (than those showing high faith) to profess political attitudes that would be congruent with these general attitudes toward other people. These misanthropic students were more likely to agree with the statements: the general public was "not qualified to vote on today's complex issues" (68% of those scoring 6 on the scale agreed vs. 32% of those scoring 1); "There's little use writing to public officials..." (45% vs. 12%); "political candidates are run by machines" (92% vs. 66%); "people who talk politics without knowing what they are talking about should be kept quiet" (40% vs. 21%); "unrestricted freedom of speech leads to mass hysteria" (32% vs. 16%); "people should be kept from spreading dangerous ideas because they might influence others to adopt them" (51% vs. 32%); "religions which preach unwholesome ideas should be suppressed" (32% vs. 16%); and "it's unwise to give people with dangerous social and economic viewpoints a chance to be elected" (46% vs. 25%). These results held up when controlled for political party affiliation.
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Faith in People Scale

(one point scored for each response noted with an *)

1. Some people say that most people can be trusted. Others say you can't be too careful in your dealings with people. How do you feel about it?

_______ Most people can be trusted.

_______* You can't be too careful.

2. Would you say that most people are more inclined to help others, or more inclined to look out for themselves?

_______ To help others.

_______* To look out for themselves.

3. If you don't watch yourself, people will take advantage of you.

Agree* Disagree

4. No one is going to care much what happens to you, when you get right down to it.

Agree* Disagree

5. Human nature is fundamentally cooperative.

Agree Disagree*
TRUST IN PEOPLE (Survey Research Center 1969)

Variable

This scale consists of slight rephrasings of the first three items in Rosenberg's faith in people scale (see previous scale).

Description

The three items are presented in forced-choice format, a person being given a score of 1 for each trustworthy response. Scores therefore range from 0 (low trust) to 3 (high trust).

The distributions along this scale for a cross-section of Americans in 1964 and 1968 were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1968</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(low) 0</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(high) 3</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average score: 1.78, 1.87

Sample

The items were included in the 1964 post-election study of electoral behavior by the Survey Research Center. A national cross-section of 1,450 people answered these questions. The items were similarly applied to a cross-section of 1,330 post-election respondents in the 1968 election study.

Reliability/Homogeneity

The following inter-item correlations were obtained in the two studies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1968</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People trusted</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People helpful</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take advantage</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These impressive inter-item correlations held at about the same magnitude for people with just a grade school education.

Validity

No test-retest data are currently available.

Validity

Data collected in this study do not bear directly on validity. Validity is directly assessed in the previous scale description.

Location

When formed into a scale in the 1964 election study, the trust in people items correlated .24 with a short scale measuring trust in government, .23 with a scale tapping respondents feelings that the government paid attention to the will of the people, and .25 with the SRC political efficacy scale. (These items and correlations appear in Robinson, et al., 1968.) Thus there seems to be a reasonable degree of carry-over from trust of other people onto feelings toward government and the likelihood that one can influence the government.

The correlation of .28 between trust in people and the SRC measure of personal competence (see Chapter 3) indicates that feelings of self-worth are accompanied by an active trust of people. As noted in Chapter 2 of this volume, in 1968 trust in people correlated moderately with life satisfaction.

Trust of people in 1964 was higher among the better-educated (r = .28), among whites (in 1968 the average score for Negroes was 1.12), and among residents of rural (vs. urban) areas. The relation with age was unusual in that highest trust was found in the 30-49 age group (average score = 1.97) and the lowest in the 20-29 age group (1.64). Differences in 1968 however were in the same direction but nowhere near as dramatic (1.82 for those under 30 vs. 1.88 for those aged 30-59). Women were only slightly more (about .10 points) trusting than men in both studies.

Differences by religion were definitely in the expected direction, but were not as dramatic as one might anticipate in view of the general finding (see Wrightsman's scale results) that people belonging to Fundamentalist religions share a pessimistic credo about their fellow men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Average score 1964</th>
<th>Average score 1968</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformation (e.g., Lutheran, Presbyterian)</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietistic (e.g., Baptist, Methodist)</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-Fundamentalist (e.g., Church of Christ)</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Traditional (e.g., Quakers)</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No denominational preference</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious preference</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SAMPLE</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are of course further differences within the gross categories of Protestants in the above tabulation. For example, in 1968 Episcopalians (2.52) scored higher than Lutherans and Presbyterians within the category "Reformation" and Baptists (1.47 for both South and non-South) scored lowest in the Pietistic category. Whether any of the differences within Protestant religions
cannot largely be attributed to differences in educational attainment (since members of religions whose members are better-educated, e.g., Episcopalians have highest faith in people) has not been thoroughly investigated in these data. However, the most interesting differences are between the high faith in people of Jewish persons vs. the low trust in people demonstrated by Neo-Fundamentalists and persons with no religious preference.

The following differences by region, observed in the 1964 data, show surprisingly low trust in people for respondents living in the West. This did not hold true in the 1968 data, however, the lowest ratings being noted in the South (as would be expected on the basis of lower education and higher prevalence of people with Fundamentalist religion).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1968</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trust in people scale related in the following ways to various political orientations in the 1968 data:

i) People who voted for Wallace showed slightly less trust in people.

ii) People who wanted to pull our troops out of Vietnam (vs. those who wanted to stay there and those who wanted to invade North Vietnam) showed less trust in people.

iii) People who thought the police used too much force with demonstrators in Chicago were no more trusting of people than people who thought the police used the right amount of force or not enough force.
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TRUST IN PEOPLE
(* indicates trusting response)

1. Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1968 (low education)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Most people can be trusted</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56% (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't be too careful</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44% (60%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Would you say that most of the time, people try to be helpful, or that they are mostly just looking out for themselves?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1968 (low education)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Try to be helpful</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>60% (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look out for themselves</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40% (52%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Do you think that most people would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance or would they try to be fair?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1968 (low education)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take advantage</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31% (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Try to be fair</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>69% (58%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PEOPLE IN GENERAL (Banta 1961)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>This scale attempts to measure the extent to which people are disposed to act in an exploitative or manipulative manner toward other people.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The scale consists of 20 items in five-category Likert format (but not employing the usual strongly agree-agree, etc. response categories). The items were selected from a pool of 72 items constructed by Christie (see his scales reviewed earlier in this chapter). The individual's score can be determined in any one of three ways, the simplest (and apparently most reliable) being his average score for those items which the respondent checks as expressing his own feelings on the issue (i.e., if he answers &quot;0&quot; only to items 1 and 2, his score is 3.0). Total scores apparently vary between 1.0 (very exploitative) and 5.0 (very non-exploitative), with 3.0 marking the neutral point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>The sample consisted of 28 students in introductory psychology classes at Columbia University in summer, 1958.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability/ Homogeneity</td>
<td>The students responded to the same items on three different occasions using three different formats: standard Likert format, Thurstone format, and the format as presented here. The score for the scale as presented here correlated .71 with the items in Likert and .72 with the items in Thurstone format (these test-retest correlations are undoubtedly low considering the change in response format).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>No data bearing on validity are reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results and Comments</td>
<td>The intent of this study was mainly methodological, so that substantive results were minimal. This is one of the few extant examples of the application of the unfolding technique to attitude measurement. It is interesting to see that the scale values for items derived by Banta's technique correlated .96 with scores derived from Thurstone's more cumbersome methods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People in General

Some of the following statements may reflect your own views, while others may not. Of these statements that do not reflect your own views, there are likely to be some that are too favorable toward the issue; on the other hand, there are also likely to be some that are too unfavorable toward the issue to represent your own views.

Please read each statement carefully and indicate your reaction to it in accordance with the following rules:

Circle:

- If the statement expresses your own feelings regarding the issue.
- If the statement is somewhat too favorable toward the issue in question to represent your own views.
- If the statement is much too favorable to represent your own views.
- If the statement is too unfavorable to represent your own views.
- If the statement is very definitely too unfavorable to represent your own views.
- If the statement is not one that expresses your own feelings but you can't determine whether it is too favorable or too unfavorable toward the issue in question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPRO Scale Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Most men will fight back when insulted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Generally speaking, most people do not truly believe in anything new until they have experienced it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anyone who completely trusts anyone else is asking for trouble.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Generally speaking, men won't work hard unless they're forced to do so. 1.8

5. Even the most hardened and vicious criminal has a spark of decency somewhere within him. 3.3

6. Any normal person will stand up for what he thinks is right even if it costs him his job. 4.0

7. Most people really don't know what is best for them. 2.7

8. Some of the best people have some of the worst vices. 2.7

9. Most men forget more easily the death of their father than the loss of their property. 2.1

10. Men are quicker to praise than they are to blame. 3.4

11. Most men like to tackle new and difficult problems. 3.8

12. Most men are brave. 3.8

13. Nature has so created men that they desire everything but are unable to attain it. 2.4

14. The biggest difference between most criminals and other people is that criminals are stupid enough to get caught. 2.0

15. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear. 2.8

16. It is safest to assume that all people have a vicious streak and it will come out when they are given the chance. 2.1

17. Most people are basically good and kind. 3.5

18. Barnum was very wrong when he said that there's a sucker born every minute. 2.6

19. When you come right down to it, it's human nature never to do anything without an eye to one's own advantage. 2.3

20. The great majority of men are more satisfied with what seems true than with the truth. 2.9
MISANTHROPY (Sullivan and Adelson 1954)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>This instrument attempts to measure misanthropy as a variant of ethnocentrism.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>A total of 29 items taken from the ethnocentrism scale (used by the University of California Public Opinion Study) were modified by replacing references to minorities with more general terms such as &quot;most people&quot;, etc. Six response categories are provided from complete agreement (+3) to complete disagreement (-3). In scoring, four was added to all the scores to produce a range from 1 to 7. Omitted responses were given the score of four.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>The sample consisted of 221 students enrolled in an elementary psychology course at a midwestern university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Odd-even reliability for the scale was found to be .79. The authors maintain that although the instrument is fairly adequate it could easily be refined through item analysis and other means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>No validity data are reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results and Comments</td>
<td>The product-moment correlation between the original ethnocentrism scale and misanthropy was determined to be .43 which is highly significant statistically. The authors concluded that although misanthropy and ethnocentrism are not interchangeable they are definitely related. Ethnocentrism may be partly a manifestation of an ingroup-outgroup situation in which the only ingroup is the self.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Misanthropy

1. People seem to prefer the most luxurious, extravagant, and sensual way of living.

   Completely agree +3  +2  +1  0  -1  -2  -3  Completely disagree

2. In order to maintain a nice residential neighborhood it is best to prevent most people from living in it.

3. A major fault of most people is their conceit.

4. Colleges should adopt a quota system by which they may limit the number of people in fields which have too many now.

5. A step toward solving social problems would be to prevent people from getting into superior, profitable positions in society, for a while at least.

6. One trouble with most people is that they stick together and connive, so that others don't have a fair chance in competition.

7. Our social problems are so general and deep that one often doubts that democratic methods can ever solve them.

8. Most people tend to lower the general standard of living by their willingness to do the most menial work and to live under standards that are far below average.

9. Most people should not pry so much into others' activities and organizations nor seek so much recognition and prestige.

10. Much resentment against most people stems from their tendency to keep apart and to exclude others from their social life.

11. One big trouble with people is that they are never contented, but always try for the best jobs and the most money.

12. People go too far in hiding their backgrounds, especially such extremes as changing their names and imitating others' manner and customs.

13. People should make sincere efforts to rid themselves of their conspicuous and irritating faults, if they really want to prevent themselves from being condemned.

14. War shows up the fact that most people are not patriotic or willing to make sacrifices for their country.

15. There is something different and strange about most people; one never knows what they are thinking or planning, nor what makes them tick.
16. People may have moral standards that they apply in their dealings with their friends, but with others most of them are unscrupulous, ruthless, and undependable.

17. Most peoples' first loyalty is to themselves rather than to their country.

18. In order to handle social problems, one must meet fire with fire and use the same ruthless tactics with others that they use.

19. Most people seem to have an aversion to plain hard work; they tend to be parasites on society by finding easy, nonproductive jobs.

20. One general fault of people is their overaggressiveness, a strange tendency always to display their looks, manner, and breeding.

21. There seems to be some revolutionary streak in the human makeup as shown by the fact that there are so many communists and agitators.

22. People should be more concerned with their personal appearance, and not be so dirty and smelly and unkempt.

23. There is little hope of correcting human defects, since these defects are simply in the blood.

24. People keep too much to themselves, instead of taking the proper interest in community problems and good government.

25. When people create large funds for educational or scientific research it is mainly due to a desire for fame and public notice rather than a really sincere scientific interest.

26. People would solve many of their social problems by not being so irresponsible, lazy, and ignorant.

27. It would be best to limit most people to grammar and trade school education since more schooling just gives them ambition and desires which they are unable to fulfill in competition.

28. There is something inherently primitive and uncivilized in most people, as shown in their musical tastes and extreme aggressiveness.

29. There will always be wars because, for one thing, there will always be people who ruthlessly try to grab for more than their share.
**ACCEPTANCE OF OTHERS (Fey 1955)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Validity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Results and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| This scale was devised to test the relationship between three separate variables: feelings of self acceptance, acceptance of others, and feelings of acceptability to others. | The sample consisted of 58 third year medical students.                          | Split-half reliability for the acceptance of others scale was .90 (and for estimated acceptability to others .89). | No validity data are reported.                                                          | Fey, W.F. Acceptance by others and its relation to acceptance of self and others: a revaluation. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1955, 50 (2), 274-276. | The author summarizes his results as follows: "Analysis of the data indicated that individuals with high self-acceptance scores tend also to accept others, to feel accepted by others, but actually to be neither more nor less accepted by others than those with low self-acceptance scores. Individuals with high acceptance-of-others scores tend in turn to feel accepted by others, and tend toward being accepted by them. Persons who think relatively much better of themselves than they do of others tend to feel accepted by others, whereas actually they are significantly less well liked by them; this group significantly overestimates its acceptability to others. Estimated acceptability, in this study, is independent of actual acceptability. Comparison of most and least accepted groups shows only that the latter have a significantly larger gap between self acceptance and their acceptance of others."

The five items in the "estimated acceptance by others" scale are also reproduced below.
Acceptance of Others

1. People are too easily led.
   Almost always 1 2 3 4 5 Very rarely

*2. I like people I get to know.

3. People these days have pretty low moral standards.

4. Most people are pretty smug about themselves, never really facing their bad points.

*5. I can be comfortable with nearly all kinds of people.

6. All people can talk about these days, it seems, is movies, TV, and foolishness like that.

7. People get ahead by using 'pull,' and not because of what they know.

8. If you once start doing favors for people, they'll just walk all over you.

9. People are too self-centered.

10. People are always dissatisfied and hunting for something new.

11. With many people you don't know how you stand.

12. You've probably got to hurt someone if you're going to make something out of yourself.

13. People really need a strong, smart leader.

14. I enjoy myself most when I am alone, away from people.

15. I wish people would be more honest with you.

*16. I enjoy going with a crowd.

17. In my experience, people are pretty stubborn and unreasonable.

*18. I can enjoy being with people whose values are very different from mine.

*19. Everybody tries to be nice.

20. The average person is not very well satisfied with himself.

(* Reversed item)
Acceptability to Others

1. People are quite critical of me.
2. I feel 'left out,' as if people don't want me around.
3. People seem to respect my opinion about things.  (* Reversed item)
4. People seem to like me.
5. Most people seem to understand how I feel about things.

(* Reversed item)
CHAPTER 9: RELIGIOUS ATTITUDES

For many years the sociology and psychology of religion barely overlapped (Swanborn, 1968). Sociologists were interested either in large-scale historical developments, as in Weber's classic study of Protestantism and the Spirit of Capitalism, or in empirical studies of church attendance and related facets of organizational membership. Psychologists were much more concerned with the religious experiences of individuals—their feelings, attitudes, and beliefs about the supernatural. Naturally, then, sociologists tended to employ attendance statistics or interviews with people regarding participation in church activities, while psychologists most often used attitude scales or depth interviews, and sometimes even introspection. As the research tools of each discipline developed—most notably attitude scaling in psychology—the newer techniques were applied to the study of religion, but little theory and little joining of sociological and psychological approaches emerged.

Fortunately, this pattern has changed considerably during the last several years. New journals have arisen to report developing theory and research—e.g., Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Review of Religious Research, and the International Yearbook for the Sociology of Religion. These have encouraged joint contributions from social scientists of varying persuasions. Most investigators are now aware that the organizational character of the church as well as the beliefs, attitudes, and behavior of its members must somehow be combined in order to obtain a coherent and complete scientific account of religion.
Perhaps the most outstanding example of this "total approach" can be seen in the work of Glock, Stark, and their colleagues in the Program for the Study of Religion and Society—a subdivision of the Survey Research Center at the University of California, Berkeley. They have contributed substantially to the development of sound theory in the area of religious research (e.g., Glock and Stark, 1965) and to the empirical literature as well (e.g., Glock and Stark, 1966).

Although there already exists a vast amount of information about religious attitudes and beliefs, and too many measuring instruments to be exhaustively covered in this volume, it is fairly easy to reduce the topics commonly investigated to a few central themes. One of these is the problem of representing religious phenomena on some reasonably limited set of theoretical dimensions. Everyone now admits that religious experience is complex, usually involving at least an ideology, ritual practices, organizational maintenance activities, and feelings of transcendence or contact with the supernatural. A serious attempt to study religion empirically, then, must eventually face the difficulty of specifying and measuring the important dimensions of religiosity (Brown, 1966; Fukuyama, 1961; Glock and Stark, 1965).

Another central task for the scientific study of religion is to characterize important dimensions of organizational variation among churches. This is, of course, primarily a sociological issue, but we shall see that it has implications also for the particular way in which members of various religious bodies feel and behave.

Specifying the relationships between religious attitudes and the multitude of potentially associated social attitudes and personality characteristics has been the focus of a third area of religious research.
One of the most intensively studied relationships—still a source of heated controversy—is that between religiosity and racial bigotry.

Measuring instruments employed in all three areas of research are presented in this chapter, along with a few scales devoted to attitudes concerning more specific religious objects, such as the Bible, the Church, and one's "image of God." A brief account of the rationale for the development of these measures will be presented for each research area.

**Dimensions of Religiosity**

Several attempts have been made to explore the multi-dimensionality of religious commitment; these are represented in the present chapter by the following instruments:

1. Dimensions of Religious Commitment (Glock and Stark 1966)
2. Religiosity Scales (Faulkner and DeJong 1965)
3. Dimensions of Religiosity (King 1967)
5. Religious Orientation and Involvement (Lenski 1963)
6. Religious Attitude Inventory (Broen 1956)

For complete coverage of the religious attitude domain the first two scales are probably the most sophisticated developed to date. They are based on a careful theoretical analysis by Glock and Stark of all the conceivable ways in which an individual can be religious. This is of fundamental importance because in the past it has been quite common for religious apologists, and social scientists as well, to criticize empirical research on the grounds that what was being studied was not "really" religion. By attempting seriously
to give exhaustive coverage to the various components of religiosity, Glock and Stark hope to avoid criticism on these grounds.

They propose five basic dimensions: the **experiential**, which refers to the basic assumption in all religions that a religious person will at one time or another experience special feelings or direct knowledge of ultimate reality (e.g., the "presence" or "nearness of God"); the **ideological** dimension, which reflects the assumption in all formal religions that adherence to a core of beliefs is essential to the religious life; the **ritualistic**, encompassing the specifically religious activities prescribed by all formal religions, such as prayer and fasting; the **intellectual**, reflecting the expectation that a religious person will be knowledgeable about the tenets of his faith; and the **consequential** dimension, different from the other four in that it refers to the effects of religiosity in an individual's life--e.g., doing of "good works" and displaying "love of neighbor." Within each of these categories one can make many other distinctions--kinds of belief, types of consequences, etc.--but according to Glock and Stark these five dimensions are basic.

The scales designed by Glock and Stark and by Faulkner and DeJong represent independent attempts to measure these basic dimensions of religiosity. Glock and Stark have omitted a measure of the consequential dimension for the moment, while Faulkner and DeJong have built indices for all five. Independently both teams of researchers have found the dimensions to be nearly uncorrelated; both agree that ideology (or belief) is the most important.

Whereas Glock and Stark built their indices in correspondence with a prior analytic scheme, King explored the multi-dimensionality of religiosity empirically using factor analytic techniques. Following an unusually comprehensive literature review, King reduced a large battery of
items to a relatively small number of factors which, to his mind, repre-
sent the entire range of religious beliefs and attitudes. This approach
is quite helpful, but because it depends to such a large extent on item
selection and sample biases (all of King's respondents were Methodists),
much further work is needed before King's dimensions can be well under-
stood or accepted as basic.

The Putney and Middleton instrument appears to be a good, intensive
measure of what we have been calling the belief component of religiosity.
Similarly, a factor analysis of the Broen Inventory revealed two dimensions,
one of which (fundamentalism) seems to be based primarily on differences
in belief. The other factor, "nearness to God," can be considered one
element of the Glock-Stark experiential component.

Finally, this list contains measures of two dimensions found to
be important in Lenski's classic study, The Religious Factor. One of
these, "involvement," was classified either as associational--having the
characteristics of staid formal organizations--or as communal, with em-
phasis on emotional primary group ties among members and heavy time and
resource commitments to group activities. The second dimension, "reli-
gious orientation," was characterized either by doctrinal orthodoxy
(strict adherence to dogma and ritual prescriptions) or devotionalism
(emphasis on private acts of worship). The significance of these cate-
gories for other attitudes and actions is discussed more fully in the
following section.

The reader will find additional aspects of religious attitudes
in the questionnaire listed in the appendix of Glock and Stark (1966).
A further heterogeneous listing of interesting attitude questions on reli-
gion appears in the appendix to Thomas (1963), whose questionnaire was
applied to a national sample of American adults.
Orthodoxy, Fundamentalism, and Sectness

Most of the religious literature on ideal church organization contains an image of the church as a primary group: the believers know and love each other as they live a life of worship together. However, anyone with a bit of experience in modern American Sunday society has seen blatant contradictions of this image—large masses, many of whom know only a small minority of the others present and who have been absent from services for weeks, listening to a sermon delivered over a public address system. Some Americans even fulfill what they feel is a "Sunday obligation" by listening to services broadcast on the radio or television.

Yet there are also in America some intensely emotional congregations whose members devote extensive time and energy to the group effort. These people sometimes limit social contacts exclusively to fellows within their own religious community.

The church-sect typology proposed by sociologists, beginning with Weber and Troeltsch (Weber, 1946) and continuing down to the present (Dynes, 1957; Johnson, 1963), is an attempt to describe and analyze the deviation and development of churches away from the sect form. What is now called "church-sect theory" has developed to explain a rather general form of evolution: emotional, evangelical, communal, and spiritualistic sects gradually become (or lose members to) more formal, quiet, and less "other-worldly" churches. As Glock and Stark put it, religious communities become religious audiences. Very often the sects attract lower status, somewhat alienated members, while the churches tend to be filled with the more comfortable, better established members of an area or society. (For further discussion see Johnson, 1963; Glock and Stark, 1965; Gustafson, 1967; Goode, 1967; Demerath, 1967; Eister, 1967; and the articles
by Dynes discussed later in the present chapter.) The scales listed below measure attitudes that seem to accompany membership in a sectarian, as opposed to a church-like, religious organization:

7. Church-Sect Scale (Dynes 1957)
8. Religious Fundamentalism (Martin and Westie 1959)
9. Certainty in Religious Belief Scale (Thouless 1935)
10. Religiosity Questionnaire (Brown 1962)
11. Inventory of Religious Belief (Brown and Lowe 1951)
12. Religious Attitude Scale (Poppleton and Pilkington 1963)

For the most part these instruments tap what to Glock and Stark is the belief dimension of religiosity, but they do so in a special way. Usually scores run from orthodox, conservative, superstitious, and emotional, on one hand, to skeptical, liberal, and scientific on the other. A number of studies (not necessarily using these particular scales) have discovered reliable correlates of this orthodoxy dimension: lower class status, relatively low educational level, ethnic prejudice, hostility to other nations, and the like. Many of these correlates are discussed in Chapter 5 (on authoritarianism) in this volume.

Such findings reveal an intriguing paradox. Whereas religious doctrine nearly always emphasizes universal love and brotherhood, social psychological research consistently discloses a negative relationship between religiosity (when defined as orthodoxy) and tolerance. Beginning in 1946, for example, Allport and Kramer demonstrated that churchgoers were more intolerant than non-churchgoers. Kirkpatrick (1949) found religious people to be less humanitarian than non-religious people (attitudinally more punitive toward criminals, homosexuals, and other deviants). Stouffer (1955) obtained similar findings even after controlling for education, which might have been thought to account for both intolerance and religiosity. Rokeach (1960) found non-believers to be less dogmatic and less
ethnocentric than believers. The list could be greatly extended. The paradox led to the development of the scales discussed in the next section.

**Intrinsic versus Extrinsic Religiosity**

Gordon Allport (1954) offered an explanation for the association between religiosity and prejudice. He reasoned that people who come to church for social support and for relief from personal problems might also be insecure enough to blame outgroups for their troubles, to feel threatened by social change, and so on. If so, they would not be the most frequent attenders, the ones who seek most seriously to expend all their energies on a truly religious life. There should be, he thought, a subset of churchgoers who attend very frequently, attempt to "apply" religion in all their social dealings, and thus exhibit great tolerance for others.

Allport reviewed several studies that indeed found a U-shaped curve relating prejudice scores to frequency of church attendance. In general, people who attend only a few times a month express the most prejudice, while non-attenders and persons who attend two or more times a week are about equally low (summarized in Allport and Ross, 1967).

Following theoretical discussions inspired by Allport's analysis, these two scales were constructed:


The first tapped only the extrinsic end of the proposed dimension; yet using this scale Wilson obtained a median correlation of .65 in 10
religious groups between extrinsic orientation and anti-Semitism. The second instrument was developed to measure both intrinsic and extrinsic ends of the theoretical continuum. In at least two studies (Feagin 1964; Allport and Ross 1967) results indicated that the intrinsic and extrinsic subscales were nearly independent, although each was related to bigotry in the expected way. People with an extrinsic orientation were significantly more prejudiced than people with an intrinsic orientation.

However, there were also a number of people who agreed with both sets of items, and they were the most prejudiced of all! Allport and Ross labelled them "indiscriminately proreligious." Since their sample was drawn from church-attenders, they did not have a chance to observe the fourth possible type of person, the "indiscriminately anti-religious (or non-religious)." Recent unpublished research with college students, however (Robert Brannon, personal communication), indicates that in liberal environments such people abound. It remains to be seen how they would actually score on prejudice measures, however.

To summarize, then, Allport agrees that the majority of religious people are intolerant—and this accounts for the usual correlation. Nevertheless, there is a minority of people who express religiosity of a different, intrinsic sort, and they are generally as tolerant as their beliefs would indicate they should be.

**Attitudes Concerning the Church, the Bible, and God**

The remaining scales are fairly straightforward. Each was developed to measure attitudes or beliefs about a specific religious "object."

15. Attitude toward the Church Scale (Thurstone and Chave 1929)
16. Attitudes about the Bible (Survey Research Center 1969)
17. Adjective Ratings of God (Gorsuch 1968)
The Thurstone-Chave scale has been used in countless studies as a measure of religiosity and religious change (say, over several years in college). It contains some items that could be considered indices of orthodox beliefs, but primarily it taps attitudes about the church as a social institution.

The Survey Research Center's Bible attitudes measure is simply one item that indicates belief or relative skepticism about the truth of the Bible taken literally. It is probably a good measure of fundamentalism for use in studies requiring a very short index.

Gorsuch's instrument assesses one's conception of God. Though it had not been used in relational studies at the time he published his factor-analytic results, this measure may reveal interesting inter-denominational and cross-cultural differences.

Problems in the Scientific Study of Religion

Considering that empirical research on religion is a relatively recent phenomenon, and that religious people maintain that the most significant component of religious experience--namely direct contact with God--is not subject to scientific scrutiny, it is not surprising that immense difficulties await the social scientist, expert or novice, who decides to measure religiosity.

Even when this obstacle is assumed away--the most common tack being to admit that one's investigations are limited to whatever is potentially measurable--there are still great problems. Religious experiences are not confined to participants in formal organizations; yet social scientists almost always study churches and church members rather than isolated individual mystics. If these were guaranteed to occupy no
significant social positions, or were only a tiny minority of the whole society, then little would be missed by ignoring them. But if, as much contemporary research indicates, there is a continuing movement of individuals from the lower classes into and through sects, then into and through churches, finally to emerge non-members, we ought to be concerned with where these people end up. Of course, the process just grossly summarized and oversimplified often requires several generations; and even granting its existence; it is too early to tell what the results will be. But if the rising interest in mysticism, astrology, and related endeavors among students (who rarely attend church) is a portent of the future, religious research will have to take a new direction.

Even in the event this particular trend does not materialize (recent Gallup poll data show the United States to be the only Western country not to show a significant decline in the acceptance of traditional Christian credos over the last 20 years), there are still limitations on the existing approaches. Most studies employ measures of traditional Christian ideologies. Little appears to be known about non-Christian religious beliefs and prejudices, for example. Surely more comparative research is needed. How would Glock and Stark's dimensions be operationalized for Buddhists, for example?

In spite of these and other problems, the scientific study of religion has advanced tremendously in recent years (Argyle, 1958; Knudten, 1967; Swanborn, 1968; see also the recent issues of the journals mentioned earlier), and it will continue to do so. The simultaneous development of theory and research methods indicated of late is quite promising.
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DIMENSIONS OF RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT (Glock and Stark 1966)

Variable

As discussed in the introduction to this chapter, Glock and Stark (1965) on theoretical grounds proposed five dimensions of religiosity: Belief, Ritual, Experience, Knowledge, and Consequences. They went on to design measures for four of these -- all but "Consequences" -- for a study of Christian beliefs which will eventually be completely reported in several volumes. The first of these appeared in 1966; the others are still being prepared.

Description

Two survey studies, one involving northern California church members and another national in scope, were conducted. From item analysis and hypotheses based on the theoretical viewpoint elaborated in Glock and Stark (1965), the authors constructed indices of four general dimensions of religious commitment. Most of these indices were built simply by summing points assigned to each item which was answered in a certain direction. The authors state in an appendix (1966, Appendix B) that more elaborate attempts at scale construction were not considered appropriate in this early phase of their research.

Scoring procedures for each index are reported with the items listed below. The rationale for each of the indices is indicated by their labels in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Dimensions of Religious Commitment</th>
<th>Primary Measures</th>
<th>Secondary Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Belief</td>
<td>Orthodoxy Index</td>
<td>Particularism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(central religious beliefs)</td>
<td>Index (beliefs about what Ethicalism leads to salvation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Practice</td>
<td>Ritual involvement Index (public worship)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devotionalism Index (private worship)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Experience</td>
<td>Religious Experience Index (contact with the supernatural)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Knowledge</td>
<td>Religious Knowledge Index (knowledge of the Bible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample

The most detailed indices were developed from a questionnaire study of 3000 persons randomly selected from membership lists of 97 Protestant congregations and 21 Roman Catholic parishes. These particular churches had earlier been drawn randomly from all churches in four northern California counties. Of these people, 72% of the Protestants and 53% of the Catholics completed and returned the questionnaire by mail. Phone calls to 300 Protest-
ant and 200 Catholic nonresponders indicated no substantial bias created by selective responding.

Eighteen months later (October, 1964) some of the most important items from the questionnaire were included in an NORC survey of the nation, in which 1,976 people were intensively interviewed. Findings from this survey, in most every case, replicated the results from the California study.

Reliability No direct evidence reported.

Validity Each index was correlated with the answers to other items designed to measure the same dimension, and invariably substantial associations were found. Also, patterns of denominational differences were checked to see whether they "made sense." For example, the orthodoxy score was expected to increase from a low for Unitarians and Congregationalists to a high for Southern Baptists and small sects, and this pattern was indeed observed.

Location Glock, C. and Stark, R., Christian beliefs and anti-Semitism. New York: Harper and Row, 1965. (This book contains the full questionnaire and several of the indices. However, some of our information also came from an as yet unpublished manuscript: R. Stark and C. Glock, American piety: The nature of religious commitment.)

Administration Something less than a minute can be estimated for each item. Using this as a guide, the reader can compute approximate completion times for each of the indices listed.

Results and Comments The analysis presented in Glock and Stark's 1965 book was an important contribution because it represented a careful attempt to specify, in advance of empirical efforts, what the significant dimensions of religious thought and behavior might be. Results in the 1966 book (and in more recent unpublished reports) indicate that the four measured dimensions are in fact essentially uncorrelated, and that other attitudes and behavior can be predicted from positions on these dimensions. In an independent operation- ization of this analytic scheme, Faulkner and DeJong (1966; see also the following scale in this chapter) got very similar results with different items and college student rather than non-student adult respondents.

In both investigations orthodoxy was found to be the best predictor of all other aspects of religiosity. This is quite important because, as Glock and Stark point out, it implies that belief is the most significant component of religiosity. When belief wanes, as it is currently among members of the more liberal churches, other indications of religiosity will eventually decline -- e.g., church contributions and attendance. Moreover, much of the research reviewed
in this chapter suggests that orthodoxy is associated with bigotry, so we must conclude that the most central component of religious commitment (orthodox belief) is somehow linked with intolerance (a finding borne out in Glock and Stark's research on anti-Semitism).

The entire Glock and Stark questionnaire contained over 500 items. The interested reader will want to consult the published analyses of these for details on denominational differences and patterns of inter-item correlation.
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Dimensions of Religious Commitment

I. Belief Dimension

A. Orthodoxy Index

1. Which of the following statements comes closest to expressing what you believe about God? (Please check only one answer.)
   a) I know God really exists and I have no doubts about it.
   b) While I have doubts, I feel that I do believe in God.
   c) I find myself believing in God some of the time, but not at other times.
   d) I don't believe in a personal God, but I do believe in a higher power of some kind.
   e) I don't know whether there is a God and I don't believe there is any way to find out.
   f) I don't believe in God.
   g) None of the above represents what I believe. What I believe about God is __________________________.

2. Which of the following statements comes closest to expressing what you believe about Jesus? (Check only one answer.)
   a) Jesus is the Divine Son of God and I have no doubts about it.
   b) While I have some doubts, I feel basically that Jesus is Divine.
   c) I feel that Jesus was a great man and very holy, but I don't feel Him to be the Son of God any more than all of us are children of God.
   d) I think that Jesus was only a man although an extraordinary one.
   e) Frankly, I'm not entirely sure there was such a person as Jesus.
   f) None of the above represents what I believe. What I believe about Jesus is __________________________.

3. The Bible tells of many miracles, some credited to Christ and some to other prophets and apostles. Generally speaking, which of the following statements comes closest to what you believe about Biblical miracles? (Check only one answer.)
   a) I'm not sure whether these miracles really happened or not.
   b) I believe miracles are stories and never really happened.
   c) I believe the miracles happened, but can be explained by natural causes.
   d) I believe the miracles actually happened just as the Bible says they did.

4. The Devil actually exists. (Check how certain you are this is true.)
   a) Completely true
   b) Probably true
   c) Probably not true
   d) Definitely not true

Scoring: Glock and Stark gave one point for each of these four questions on which a respondent expressed his certainty of the truth of the orthodox Christian position (1a, 2a, 3d, and 4a); other answers were scored zero. Scores thus ranged from 0 to 4.
B. **Particularism Index** (measuring the importance of holding one's own particular beliefs.)

1. Do you think belief in Jesus Christ as Saviour is ...
   a) absolutely necessary for salvation
   b) would probably help
   c) probably has no influence

2. Do you think being a member of your particular religious faith is ...
   a) absolutely necessary for salvation
   b) would probably help
   c) probably has no influence

3. Do you think being completely ignorant of Jesus, as might be the case for people living in other countries, will ...
   a) definitely prevent salvation
   b) may possibly prevent salvation
   c) probably has no influence on salvation

**Scoring:** For each item score a = 2, b = 1, and c = 0. Thus the index ranges from 6 (highest particularism) to 0 (lowest).

C. **Ethicalism** (concern for others)

1. Do you think doing good for others is ...
   a) absolutely necessary for salvation
   b) would probably help
   c) probably has no influence

2. Do you think loving thy neighbor is ...
   a) absolutely necessary for salvation
   b) would probably help
   c) probably has no influence

**Scoring:** For each item score a = 2, b = 1, and c = 0. Thus the index ranges from 4 (holding both to be absolutely necessary) to 0 (rejecting both).

II. **Ritual Dimension**

A. **Ritual Involvement Index**

1. How often do you attend Sunday worship services? (Check the answer which comes closest to describing what you do.)
   a) Every week
   b) Nearly every week
   c) About three times a month
   d) About twice a month
   e) About once a month
   f) About every six weeks
   g) About every three months
   h) About once or twice a year
   i) Less than once a year
   j) Never
2. How often, if at all, are table prayers or grace said before or after meals in your home?
   a) We say grace at all meals
   b) We say grace at least once a day
   c) We say grace at least once a week
   d) We say grace, but only on special occasions
   e) We never, or hardly ever, say grace

**Scoring:** Persons who both attended church every, or nearly every, week and said grace at least once a week were classified as **high** on the index. Those who reported performing either of these ritual obligations this often were scored **medium**. And persons who fell short of these levels on both were classified as **low**.

B. **Devotionalism Index**

1. How often do you pray privately? (Check the answer which comes closest to what you do.)
   a) I never pray, or only do so at church services.
   b) I pray only on very special occasions.
   c) I pray once in a while, but not at regular intervals.
   d) I pray quite often, but not at regular times.
   e) I pray regularly once a day or more.
   f) I pray regularly several times a week.
   g) I pray regularly once a week.

2. How important is prayer in your life?
   a) Extremely important
   b) Fairly important
   c) Not too important
   d) Not important

**Scoring:** Respondents were classified as high if they felt prayer was "extremely" important and they prayed privately once a week or oftener; medium if they were devotional in either sense; low if they met neither of these standards.

III. **Experiential Dimension: Religious Experience Index**

Listed below are a number of experiences of a religious nature which people have reported having. Since you have been an adult have you ever had any of these experiences, and how sure are you that you had it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Yes, I'm sure</th>
<th>Yes, I think</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A feeling that you were somehow in the presence of God...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sense of being saved in Christ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A feeling of being afraid of God...

*A feeling of being punished by God for something you had done...

A feeling of being tempted by the Devil...

Scoring: Only the starred (*) items were used in the final index. Respondents were labelled high if they at least answered "Yes, I think that I have" to all three questions; medium if they thought they might have had one or two of these experiences; low if they reported having no such experience. (It may be worth noting that Protestants more than Catholics tend to feel saved, while the reverse holds for "being punished." )

IV. Religious Knowledge: Religious Knowledge Index

A. Scripture Quotations. Please read each of the following statements and do two things: first, decide whether the statement is from the Bible or not; and second, indicate whether or not you agree with the statement. (Please do this even if you think the statement is not from the Bible.)

1. For it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.
   From the Bible? Yes (x) No
   Do you agree? Yes ___ No ___

2. Blessed are the strong: for they shall be the sword of God.
   From the Bible? Yes ___ No (x)
   Do you agree? Yes ___ No ___

3. Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live.
   From the Bible? Yes (x) No
   Do you agree? Yes ___ No ___

4. Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak.
   From the Bible? Yes (x) No
   Do you agree? Yes ___ No ___

5. For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me.
   From the Bible? Yes (x) No
   Do you agree? Yes ___ No ___
Scoring: Persons who got 4 of 5 correct were called high; 3, medium; and 2 or less, low. (Each answer is marked with a parenthesized x.)

B. Prophets

Which of the following were Old Testament prophets? (Check as many answers as you think are correct.)

- (x) Elijah
- Deuteronomy
- (x) Jeremiah
- Paul
- Levitus
- (x) Ezekiel
- None of these

Scoring: High was assigned to persons with all 6 correct; medium for 4 or 5; low for 3 or less.

A combined Religious Knowledge Index was formed by assigning points as follows and then adding:

Identification of Bible Quotations --
High = 2
Medium = 1
Low = 0

Identification of Old Testament Prophets --
High = 2
Medium = 1
Low = 0
RELIGIOSITY SCALES (Faulkner and DeJong 1965)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>This scale is the result of an attempt to measure the five dimensions of religiosity proposed by Glock and Stark (1965) using the Guttman technique.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Using items from previous attitude measures and some devised especially for this scale, the authors sought to measure several dimensions of traditional Judeo-Christian beliefs. A random sample of 89 Pennsylvania State University students pretested the instrument; items found to be ambiguous were reworded or eliminated. Items not meeting the Guttman criterion of unidimensionality were also eliminated. The final version contains the following; a five-item ideological subscale; a four-item intellectual subscale; a five-item ritualistic subscale; a five-item experiential subscale; and a four-item consequential subscale. Each subscale was scored separately; the exact procedure has not been reported, but apparently one point was given for each item endorsed. After analysis of the total twenty-three item instrument, an eight-item composite scale of religiosity was constructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>The sample contained 372 students in introductory sociology at Pennsylvania State University. Twenty-five percent were Freshmen, 38% Sophomores, 25% Juniors, and 12% Seniors. One hundred ninety-six were male and 166 female.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability/</td>
<td>The coefficient of reproducibility for the eight-item composite scale was .92. For the various subscales the following reproducibility coefficients were reported: ideological .94, intellectual .93, ritualistic .92, experiential .92, and consequential .90. No test-retest data are reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneity</td>
<td>No evidence for validity was cited, except for the construct validity claimed for the Guttman procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>This scale is self-administered. It should take approximately fifteen minutes to complete the longer form and five to ten minutes for the short form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results and</td>
<td>This scale appears to be a relatively good measure of general religiosity. Since it was based on Glock and Stark's (1965) dimensional analysis, it covers several components of religious commitment commonly ignored by other researchers. The subscales designed to measure each of the five dimensions might be used separately in research concerned with a more detailed view of religious commitment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the dimensions were all moderately correlated with each other (to a statistically significant degree), there was evidence that no two dimensions are the same. Also, it was clear that the belief or ideological dimension was the most highly correlated with the others, suggesting that belief is the central component of religiosity. The least central component was "consequences" of religion, indicating that ethical views are fairly independent of religious beliefs.

Information about the test-retest reliability and construct validity of this scale is now needed. One would like to know how the various subscales differentiate between denominations and between people of different personality types within denominations, and so on.

In short, these dimensional subscales seem to offer a promising approach to the study of religion, but additional work is required before we can have great confidence in this particular set of items as the best representatives of the Glock and Stark dimensions.

Reference
The exact wording of items included in the religiosity scales are listed below with an asterisk (*) marking the response defined as indicating a traditional religious response. Items which were included in the total religiosity scale are marked with a plus sign (+).

**Ideological Scale**

1. Do you believe that the world will come to an end according to the will of God?
   *1. Yes, I believe this.
   2. I am uncertain about this.
   3. No, I do not believe this.

2. Which of the following statements most clearly describes your idea about the Deity?
   *1. I believe in a Divine God, Creator of the Universe, Who knows my innermost thoughts and feelings, and to Whom one day I shall be accountable.
   2. I believe in a power greater than myself, which some people call God and some people call Nature.
   3. I believe in the worth of humanity but not in a God or a Supreme Being.
   4. The so-called universal mysteries are ultimately knowable according to the scientific method based on natural laws.
   5. I am not quite sure what I believe.
   6. I am an atheist.

3. Do you believe that it is necessary for a person to repent before God will forgive his sins?
   *1. Yes, God's forgiveness comes only after repentance.
   2. No, God does not demand repentance.
   3. I am not in need of repentance.

4. Which one of the following best expresses your opinion of God acting in history?
   *1. God has and continues to act in the history of mankind.
   2. God acted in previous periods but is not active at the present time.
   3. God does not act in human history.

5. Which of the following best expresses your view of the Bible?
   *1. The Bible is God's word and all it says is true.
   *2. The Bible was written by men inspired by God, and its basic moral and religious teachings are true, but because writers were men, it contains some human errors.
   3. The Bible is a valuable book because it was written by wise and good men, but God had nothing to do with it.
   4. The Bible was written by men who lived so long ago that it is of little value today.
**Intellectual Scale**

1. How do you personally view the story of creation as recorded in Genesis?
   *1. Literally true history.
   2. A symbolic account which is no better or worse than any other account of the beginning.
   3. Not a valid account of creation.

+2. Which of the following best expresses your opinion concerning miracles?
   *1. I believe the report of the miracles in the Bible; that is, they occurred through a setting aside of natural laws by a higher power.
   2. I do not believe in the so-called miracles of the Bible. Either such events did not occur at all, or if they did, the report is inaccurate, and they could be explained upon scientific grounds if we had the actual facts.
   3. I neither believe nor disbelieve the so-called miracles of the Bible. No evidence which I have considered seems to prove conclusively that they did or did not happen as recorded.

+3. What is your view of the following statement: Religious truth is higher than any other form of truth.
   *1. Strongly agree
   *2. Agree
   3. Disagree
   4. Strongly disagree

4. Would you write the names of the four Gospels?
   (What are the first five books of the Old Testament?--used for Jewish respondents.)
   * Three or more books correctly identified.

**Ritualistic Scale**

+1. Do you feel it is possible for an individual to develop a well-rounded religious life apart from the institutional church?
   *1. No
   2. Uncertain
   3. Yes

2. How much time during a week would you say you spend reading the Bible and other religious literature?
   *1. One hour or more
   *2. One-half hour
   3. None
3. How many of the past four Sabbath worship services have you attended?
   *1. Three or more
   *2. Two
   3. One
   4. None

4. Which of the following best describes your participation in the act of prayer?
   *1. Prayer is a regular part of my behavior.
   *2. I pray primarily in times of stress and/or need, but not much otherwise.
   3. Prayer is restricted pretty much to formal worship services.
   4. Prayer is only incidental to my life.
   5. I never pray.

5. Do you believe that for your marriage the ceremony should be performed by:
   *1. A religious official.
   2. Either a religious official or a civil authority.
   3. A civil authority.

Experiential Scale

1. Would you say that one's religious commitment gives life a certain purpose which it could not otherwise have?
   *1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree
   3. Disagree

2. All religions stress that belief normally includes some experience of "union" with the divine. Are there particular moments when you feel "close" to the divine?
   *1. Frequently
   *2. Occasionally
   3. Rarely
   4. Never

3. Would you say that religion offers a sense of security in the face of death which is not otherwise possible?
   *1. Agree
   2. Uncertain
   3. Disagree

4. How would you respond to the statement: "Religion provides the individual with an interpretation of his existence which could not be discovered by reason alone."
   *1. Strongly agree
   *2. Agree
   3. Disagree
5. Faith, meaning putting full confidence in the things we hope for and being certain of things we cannot see, is essential to one's religious life.
   *1. Agree
   2. Uncertain
   3. Disagree

Consequential Scale

1. What is your feeling about the operation of non-essential businesses on the Sabbath?
   *1. They should not be open.
   2. I am uncertain about this.
   3. They have a legitimate right to be open.

2. A boy and a girl, both of whom attend church frequently, regularly date one another and have entered into sexual relations with each other. Do you feel that people who give at least partial support to the church by attending its worship services should behave in this manner? Which of the following statements expresses your opinion concerning this matter?
   *1. People who identify themselves with the church to the extent that they participate in its worship services should uphold its moral teachings as well.
   2. Sexual intercourse prior to marriage is a matter of individual responsibility.

3. Two candidates are seeking the same political office. One is a member and a strong participant in a church. The other candidate is indifferent, but not hostile, to religious organizations. Other factors being equal, do you think the candidate identified with the church would be a better public servant than the one who has no interest in religion?
   *1. He definitely would.
   *2. He probably would.
   3. Uncertain.
   4. He probably would not.
   5. He definitely would not.

4. Suppose you are living next door to a person who confides in you that each year he puts down on his income tax a $50.00 contribution to the church in "loose change," even though he knows that while he does contribute some money to the church in "loose change" each year, the total sum is far below that amount. Do you feel that a person's religious orientation should be reflected in all phases of his life so that such behavior is morally wrong—that it is a form of lying?
   *1. Yes
   2. Uncertain
   3. No
Variable

King's purpose was to consider a wide variety of items in a factor analytic study to test the null hypothesis that the "religious variable" is unidimensional. On the basis of successive factor and cluster analyses he rejected the hypothesis of unidimensionality and proposed nine dimensions for further study. Although his work was in its early stages at the time of this report, it seems worthy of consideration because of the great breadth of his item pool.

Description

Items were chosen from the literature (following an extensive review) or devised to cover eleven potentially important areas of religious life: 1) assent to credal propositions; 2) religious knowledge; 3) theological perspective (e.g., on self, society, church); 4) dogmatism vs. openness to growth and change; 5) extrinsic vs. intrinsic orientation; 6) participation in and understanding of public and private worship; 7) involvement with friends in the social activities of the congregation; 8) participation in organizational activities; 9) financial support and attitudes toward it; 10) loyalty to the institutional church; 11) attitudes toward ethical questions. Seven to seventeen items were included for each of the eleven dimensions, yielding 121 in all. Each had four response alternatives arranged in Likert fashion along a continuum. About 25 other questions, mostly demographic except for a measure of ethnic tolerance, were added.

Questionnaires were returned by 575 Methodists in Dallas, from which a 131 X 131 matrix was obtained (121 religion items plus 10 ethnic tolerance items). On the basis of a preliminary factor analysis irrelevant items (31 in all) were eliminated, and a second factor analysis was run on the new 100 X 100 matrix. Finally a cluster analysis was performed.

After these analyses were completed, King proposed the nine dimensions listed below as being most consistently revealed in the three analyses. The items are roughly ordered within each dimension according to their salience for that dimension. The order was determined according to four considerations: "1. degree of agreement between the three analyses; 2. rank of items within factors and clusters; 3. size of the factor loadings and average inter-item correlations; 4. my judgment regarding germaneness of item content."

Sample

All subjects were members of Methodist congregations in Dallas, Texas or its suburbs. The congregations were purposely chosen to vary widely in size, demographic characteristics of members, and religious emphasis (e.g., pietistic, liturgical, "liberal"). Questionnaires were mailed to 50% of each congregation chosen "over the signature of its pastor." Even after follow-up letters
and phone calls, only 48% were returned, amounting to 575 persons. Undoubtedly these include a disproportionate number of active and literate members. Still, King reports that the respondents were "heterogeneous on such relevant indices as age, self-rating of activity, education, and income."

Reliability
No test-retest data are available, but the dimensions were constructed on the basis of factor homogeneity, thus assuring reasonable internal consistency at least for this sample.

Validity
No validation evidence was reported.

Location

Administration
The items are all self-administered and the total instrument would take about an hour to complete.

Results and Comments
Obviously much more work is required before these scales can be recommended for wide use. Nevertheless, they provide a foundation for future research. As King points out, several of his dimensions correspond well with others proposed by different investigators (e.g., Glock, Fukuyama, Lenski), and the thorough literature review which proceeded his analyses guarantees inclusion of most items considered relevant to assessing religiosity. King's sample was quite limited in representativeness, yet it is appropriate to use such a group for preliminary explorations. And the items were deliberately chosen to apply to a much wider range of beliefs than were represented. It remains for others to obtain comparative data based on these items.
NINE PROPOSED DIMENSIONS

Item Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Analysis</th>
<th>2nd Factor Analysis</th>
<th>AIC Cluster Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. CREEDAL ASSENT AND PERSONAL COMMITMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Response Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>I believe in God as a Heavenly Father who watches over me and to whom I am accountable. (accurate-inaccurate)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>I know that I need God's continual love and care. (accurate-inaccurate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>I believe in eternal life. (accurate-inaccurate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>I believe that Christ is a living reality. (accurate-inaccurate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>I believe in salvation as release from sin and freedom for new life. (accurate-inaccurate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>I believe that God revealed himself to man in Jesus Christ. (accurate-inaccurate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>I believe that the Word of God is revealed through the Scriptures. (accurate-inaccurate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>I believe in the Church as God's agent of salvation in the world. (accurate-inaccurate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>I know that God answers my prayers. (accurate-inaccurate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>I believe that the Bible provides basic moral principles to guide every decision of my daily life: with family and neighbors, in business and financial transactions, and as a citizen of the nation and the world. (accurate-inaccurate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>I think of the Church as a place where I can hear God's Word for me. (accurate-inaccurate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>I believe that lay men and women, as well as clergy, are called by God to a ministry of witness and service in the world. (accurate-inaccurate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>The purpose of worship and prayer is to find out what God wants us to do. (agree-disagree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>The main purpose of the Church is to reconcile men to God and each other, thus establishing the conditions for &quot;newness of life.&quot; (agree-disagree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>Property (house, automobile, money, investments, etc.) belong to God; we only hold it in trust for Him. (agree-disagree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ All items within a dimension are positively intercorrelated, except those preceded by a minus sign (-).

² As administered, all items were followed by four response alternatives, along the continua indicated here.
II. Participation in Congregational Activities

How would you rate your activity in this congregation? (very active-inactive)

(-) During the last year, how many Sundays per month on the average have you gone to a worship service? (None-three or more)

(-) How many Sundays out of the last four have you attended worship services? (None-three or more)

How often do you spend evenings at church meetings or in church work? (regularly-never)

How often have you taken Communion during the past year? (regularly-never)

(-) How many times during the last month have you attended Sunday School or some equivalent educational activity? (none-three or more)

I keep pretty well informed about my congregation and have some influence on its decisions. (accurate-inaccurate)

(-) List the offices, special jobs, committees, etc. of either the congregation or denomination in which you served during the last church year. (none-three or more)

Church activities (meetings, committee work, etc.) are a major source of satisfaction in my life. (accurate-inaccurate)

I enjoy working in the activities of the Church. (accurate-inaccurate)

I try to cooperate with the pastor in his program for the congregation. (accurate-inaccurate)

All in all, how well do you think you fit in with the group of people who make up your church congregation? (very well-rather poorly)

When church activities conflict with your community responsibilities, how do you handle the situation?
(a. I usually choose the church activities.
  b. I choose church activities over half the time.
  c. I choose church activities less than half the time.
  d. I am usually faithful to my civic responsibilities.)

III. Personal Religious Experience

I know what it feels like to repent and experience forgiveness of sin. (accurate-inaccurate)

How often do you pray privately in places other than at church? (regularly-never)

How often do you ask God to forgive your sins? (regularly-never)

(-) The idea of God often seems vague to me and distant from my everyday experiences. (accurate-inaccurate)

(-) The idea of sin means very little to me. (accurate-inaccurate)

When you have decisions to make in your everyday life, how often do you try to find out what God wants you to do? (regularly-never)
Life has no meaning apart from a relationship to God. (agree-disagree)

To what extent has God influenced your life? (very much-not at all)

(-) I find myself believing in God some of the time, but not at other times. (accurate-inaccurate)

Private prayer is one of the most important and satisfying aspects of my religious experience. (accurate-inaccurate)

I frequently feel very close to God in prayer, during public worship, or at important moments in my daily life. (accurate-inaccurate)

The truly religious person has the joy and peace which come from recognizing that he is a forgiven sinner. (agree-disagree)

IV. Personal Ties in the Congregation

Think of your five closest friends. How many of them are members of your church congregation? (none-three or more)

Of all your closest friends, how many are also members of your local congregation? (none-many)

How long have you been a member of this congregation? (under 1 year-over 5 years)

List the church organizations to which you belong. (for example: SS Class, Women's Society, MYF, etc.) (none-three or more)

(-) Church membership has helped me to meet the right kind of people. (accurate-inaccurate)

V. Commitment to Intellectual Search Despite Doubt

My understanding of the central doctrines of the Church has changed considerably since I first joined. (accurate-inaccurate)

How often do you read religious non-fiction books, other than the Bible? (regularly-never)

The truly religious person is likely to have sincere and searching questions about the nature of a life of faith in God. (agree-disagree)

I enjoy the intellectual stimulation of learning about the Bible and about the history and doctrines of the Church. (accurate-inaccurate)

Usually the Communion Service does not mean very much to me. (accurate-inaccurate)

This item is intercorrelated with the 4th and 5th items in a separate subcluster.

Four of the 21 intercorrelations do not fit the pattern. Most of the correlations are low. Therefore, this dimension should be used cautiously, while better items are sought. The last item is the least useful.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>The truly religious person is sure that his beliefs are correct. (agree-disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>My interest in and real commitment to religion is greater now than when I first joined the Church. (accurate-inaccurate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Openness to Religious Growth

| .478  | The truly religious person steadily strives to grow in knowledge and understanding of what it means to live as a child of God. (agree-disagree) |
| .518  | The truly religious person feels compelled to continue growing in understanding of his faith. (agree-disagree)                               |
| .665  | The truly religious person is so secure in his faith that his mind is always open to explore new religious ideas. (agree-disagree)           |
| .624  | The truly religious person strives to be moral in all aspects of everyday life. (agree-disagree)                                           |
| .336  | The truly religious person is likely to have sincere and searching questions about the nature of a life of faith in God. (agree-disagree)   |

VIIa. Dogmatism

| .462  | The truly religious person is sure that his beliefs are correct. (agree-disagree)                                                               |
| .313  | The truly religious person is sure that he is living in right relationship to God and men. (agree-disagree)                                   |
| .331  | The truly religious person believes honestly and wholeheartedly in the doctrines of his church. (agree-disagree)                             |
| .356  | When a congregation or its pastor are frequently criticized by respectable citizens of the community, that church is probably not preaching the true Gospel of Jesus Christ. (agree-disagree) |
| .355  | Being confident that I am saved, I do not need to change or increase my religious knowledge and belief. (accurate-inaccurate)               |

VIIb. Extrinsic Orientation

| .640  | The purpose of worship and prayer is to gain personal security and happiness. (agree-disagree)                                                 |
| .473  | Religion helps to keep my life balanced and steady in the same way as my citizenship, friendships, and other memberships do. (accurate-inaccurate) |
| .493  | The Church is most important as a place to formulate good social relationships. (agree-disagree)                                              |
| .537  | The purpose of worship and prayer is to ask God to help us. (agree-disagree)                                                                     |
| .365  | The main reason I attend Church is to help me live a better life during the week. (accurate-inaccurate)                                             |
Church is important as a place to go for comfort and refuge from the trials and problems of life. (agree-disagree)
The main reason I attend Church is to learn more about religion. (accurate-inaccurate)
Church membership has helped me to meet the right kind of people. (accurate-inaccurate)
The Church is important to me as a place where I get the understanding and courage for dealing with the trials and problems of life. (agree-disagree)

VIIA. Financial Behavior

(-) During the last year, what was the average monthly contribution of your family to your local congregation? (under $5-$50 and up)
(-) Last year, approximately what percent of your total family income was contributed to the Church? (1% or less-10% or more)
In proportion to your income, do you consider that your contributions to the Church are: (generous-small)
Are your financial contributions to the Church: a) a planned amount (per week, month, etc.), b) irregularly, but fairly often, c) irregularly several times a year, d) seldom or never?
During the last year, how often have you made contributions to the Church in addition to the general budget and Sunday school? (regularly-never)

VIIIB. Financial Attitude

I enjoy giving money to the Church. (accurate-inaccurate)
(-) Churches talk too much about money and not enough about what it means to be a Christian. (agree-disagree)
The more liberally I support the Church financially, the closer I feel to it and to God. (accurate-inaccurate)

IX. Talking and Reading about Religion

How often do you talk about religion with your friends, neighbors, or fellow workers? (regularly-never)
How often have you personally tried to convert someone to faith in God? (regularly-never)
When faced by decisions regarding social problems and issues, how often do you seek guidance from statements and publications by the Church? (regularly-never)
In talking with members of your family how often do you yourself mention religion or religious activities? (regularly-never)
How often in the last year have you invited someone to join or visit your church? (regularly-never)
How often do you read religious non-fiction books, other than the Bible? (regularly-never)
How often do you read the Bible? (regularly-never)
DIMENSIONS OF RELIGIOUS IDEOLOGY
(Putney and Middleton 1961)

Variable
This scale is based on the assumption that religious ideology is composed of four dimensions: orthodoxy, fanaticism, importance, and ambivalence. Each is measured by a subscale of the Ideology instrument.

Description
The combined scales comprise 19 statements—six each for orthodoxy, fanaticism, and importance; one for ambivalence. These 19 were culled from a larger group on the basis of a pretest. Respondents rate each statement on the following Likert-type response scale: 7, strong agreement; 6, moderate agreement; 5, slight agreement; 4, no answer or don't know; 3, slight disagreement; 2, moderate disagreement; 1, strong disagreement. (Asterisks in front of items below indicate reverse scoring.) Scores on each subscale are obtained by summing item scores. In the study reported by the authors no total score was computed.

A check list was also administered, which allowed classification of the respondents as "skeptics," "modernists," or "conservatives," along with measures of authoritarianism, status concern, anomia, and conservatism.

Sample
Questionnaires were distributed to 1200 students in social science courses at 13 colleges and universities in the following states: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Florida, Georgia, and Alabama. About half were in the Northeastern universities, and half in the Southeastern. Non-Christians were eliminated from the sample, leaving 1,126 questionnaires for analysis.

Reliability
No measure reported.

Validity
There was a close correspondence between responses on the check list and the orthodoxy subscale. "Only 7.7 percent of the skeptics as compared with 91.9 percent of the conservatives scored relatively high on the orthodoxy scale." No evidence for the validity of the other subscales was reported.

Location

Administration
The total instrument should take about fifteen minutes to self-administer.

Results and Comments
The findings of the study are difficult to present briefly; the authors' summary may suffice.

Four potentially independent dimensions of religious ideology are investigated: the orthodoxy of the belief,
the fanaticism which it inspires, its importance to the self-conception, and the consciousness of ambivalence concerning the belief. Measured independently of each other, the first three are found to be directly related to each other, and the fourth inversely related to the other three. These dimensions are found to be related—but in different degree—to personality characteristics such as authoritarianism, status concern, and conservatism, and social characteristics such as region of residence, size of community, and sex.

The orthodoxy subscale has since been used successfully by several investigators. All the subscales appear to be potentially useful, although perhaps the ambivalence scale should be lengthened to increase reliability. Further information must be gathered before either validity or reliability of this instrument is assured. Investigators looking for a general measure of "religiosity" should recall that the Putney-Middleton scale is designed to measure only the ideological (as distinct from, for example, the ritualistic) dimension of religious attitudes; nevertheless, as indicated in the introduction to this chapter, the belief or ideological dimension does appear to be the best single index of religiosity.
DIMENSIONS OF RELIGIOUS IDEOLOGY

Each question was scored according to the following response scale: 7, strong agreement; 6, moderate agreement; 5, slight agreement; 4, no answer or don't know; 3, slight disagreement; 2, moderate disagreement; 1, strong disagreement. Reverse scoring items are indicated by an asterisk.

Orthodoxy Scale

1. I believe that there is a physical Hell where men are punished after death for the sins of their lives.
2. I believe there is a supernatural being, the Devil, who continually tries to lead men into sin.
3. To me the most important work of the church is the saving of souls.
4. I believe that there is a life after death.
5. I believe there is a Divine plan and purpose for every living person and thing.
*6. The only benefit one receives from prayer is psychological.

Fanaticism Scale

1. I have a duty to help those who are confused about religion.
2. Even though it may create some unpleasant situations, it is important to help people become enlightened about religion.
*3. There is no point in arguing about religion, because there is little chance of changing other people's minds.
*4. It doesn't really matter what an individual believes about religion as long as he is happy with it.
5. I believe the world would really be a better place if more people held the views about religion which I hold.
6. I believe the world's problems are seriously aggravated by the fact that so many people are misguided about religion.

Importance Scale

1. My ideas about religion are one of the most important parts of my philosophy of life.
2. I find that my ideas on religion have a considerable influence on my views in other areas.
3. Believing as I do about religion is very important to being the kind of person I want to be.

4. If my ideas about religion were different, I believe that my way of life would be very different.

*5. Religion is a subject in which I am not particularly interested.

6. I very often think about matters relating to religion.

Ambivalence Scale

The fourth dimension, ambivalence, called for a Likert-type rating of the statement: "Although one is stronger than the other, there is part of me which believes in religion and part of me which does not."
RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION AND INVOLVEMENT (Lenski 1963)

Variable
Two variables from Lenski's classic *The Religious Factor* are considered: 1) involvement as "associational" or "communal" and 2) orientation as one of "doctrinal orthodoxy" or "devotionalism." Associational involvement refers to participation in corporate worship, whereas communal involvement refers to the degree to which a person's primary group is restricted to members of his own religion. Doctrinal orthodoxy involves adherence to church dogma; devotionalism involves emphasis on private, or personal, communion with God.

Description
Under the auspices of the Detroit Area Study, Lenski and his co-workers interviewed 656 lay Detroiters in 1958. Also interviewed were 127 clergymen. The interview schedule was quite long (see Appendix II in Lenski, 1963), and all we shall consider here are questions included in the various indices named above. Most of the questions called for simple "yes-no" responses, or the choice of some alternative, such as frequency of prayer. Other investigators could, however, use Likert-type agree-disagree answer scales if this seemed desirable. Scoring for each index is described with the lists of questions below.

Sample
Of 750 Detroiters representatively sampled for the study, 656 (87%) completed the interview. They were categorized by social grouping and religion as follows: White Protestants (41%), White Catholics (35%), Negro Protestants (15%), Jews (4%). The remaining 5% had no religious preference or were Eastern Orthodox, Negro Catholics, Moslems, or Buddhists. In terms of the usual SES variables, the group was representative of the population of Detroit (by comparison with Census data and earlier Detroit Area Studies).

Reliability
No information given.

Validity
Only face validity is claimed, and since the indices are generally quite simple the reader will find it fairly easy to assess this for himself. Also, the findings reported by Lenski suggest some construct validity, although many of his interpretations are post hoc and thus require further study.

Location

Administration
The items would each require something less than a minute to complete if presented in a "self-administered" format. Thus each measure would take less than five minutes.

Results and Comments
Overall, the associational and communal dimensions were essentially uncorrelated. The four "socio-religious" groups were characterized by the following patterns of religious involvement:
**Socio-religious Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Strength of bonds:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Associational</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Catholics</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Protestants</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro Protestants</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Associational involvement was found to be correlated with upward social mobility among White Protestants; with a capitalist ideology for White and Negro Protestants; with voting Republican for Whites, Democratic for Negroes; with voting rates for all groups. Communal involvement was inversely related to mobility, especially for Catholics, and was related to voting Democratic among Catholics.

Regarding religious orientation, Lenski summarizes as follows:

Repeatedly throughout this study we found that the orthodox and the devotional orientations are linked with differing and even opposing behavior patterns. In general, the orthodox orientation is associated with a compartmentalized outlook which separates and segregates religion from daily life. By contrast, the devotional orientation is linked with a unified Weltanschauung, or view of life, with religious beliefs and practices being integrated with other major aspects of daily life. In particular, the devotional orientation is linked with a humanitarian orientation (1963, p. 323).

(Notice the similarity between this distinction and Allport's extrinsic-intrinsic dichotomy.)

There are several problems with Lenski's scales. For example, they are dichotomous rather than continuous -- often, as in the case of orthodoxy, seeming arbitrarily divided. They are based only on a few questions, and though appropriate for inclusion in long interview schedules, need to be elaborated for intricate psychological studies of religiosity. Nevertheless, through their use Lenski demonstrated the importance of these dimensions of religiosity in explaining social attitudes and behavior; he concluded that religion is as important a variable as class, and thus increased interest in the study of religion within sociology.

These scales could be easily expanded, where appropriate, for use in future research.
Religious Orientation and Involvement

I. Types of Involvement:

A. Associational

1. About how often, if ever, have you attended religious services in the last year?
   a) Once a week or more
   b) Two or three times a month
   c) Once a month
   d) A few times a year or less
   e) Never

2. Do you take part in any of the activities or organizations of your church (synagogue, temple) other than attending services? (IF YES)
   How often have you done these things in the last year? (Use same responses categories as for #1 above.)

Scoring: Lenski labelled "actively involved" all those who attended worship services every week, plus those who attended services two or three times a month and also some church related group at least once a month. All the others he called "marginal members."

B. Communal

1. What is (was) your husband's (wife's) religious preference?

2. Of those relatives you really feel close to, what proportion are (same religion as respondent)?
   a) All of them
   b) Nearly all of them
   c) More than half of them
   d) Less than half of them
   e) None of them

3. Thinking of your closest friends, what proportion are (same religion as respondent)? (Use same response categories as for previous question.)

Scoring: High communal involvement was inferred for all those who were married to someone of the same socio-religious group, and who also reported that all or nearly all of their close friends and relatives were of the same group. Low communal involvement was attributed to all the others.

II. Types of Religious Orientation

A. Doctrinal Orthodoxy

1. Do you believe there is a God, or not?
2. Do you think God is like a Heavenly Father who watches over you, or do you have some other belief?
3. Do you believe that God answers people's prayers, or not?

4. Do you believe in a life after death, or not? If so, do you also believe that in the next life some people will be punished and others rewarded by God, or not?

5. Do you believe that, when they are able, God expects people to worship Him in their churches and synagogues every week, or not?

6. Do you believe that Jesus was God's only Son sent into the world by God to save sinful men, or do you believe that he was simply a very good man and teacher, or do you have some other belief?

Scoring: (It should be noted that Jews were not classified according to this scale.) Christians were classified as unorthodox unless they held all six beliefs.

B. Devotionalism

1. How often do you pray?

2. When you have decisions to make in your everyday life, do you ask yourself what God would want you to do -- often, sometimes, or never?

Scoring: Respondents were ranked high in devotionalism if (a) they reported praying more than once a day, plus asking what God would have them do either often or sometimes; or if (b) they reported praying once a day, but often asked what God would have them do.
RELIGIOUS ATTITUDE INVENTORY (Broen 1956)

Variable

Broen was interested in discovering whether there are important factors within the concept "religiosity." He found two such factors: "nearness to God" and "fundamentalism-humanitarianism." The Inventory to be described purportedly measures these two dimensions, as well as "general religiosity" and differential religious emphasis.

Description

The Inventory contains 58 agree-disagree statements to be Q-sorted. Thirty-two of the statements are scored for Factor I ("nearness to God") and 34 for Factor II ("fundamentalism-humanitarianism"). The 58 items were obtained from a factor analysis of 133 statements which had been Q-sorted into nine categories along an agree-disagree continuum. Some of these had been taken from earlier attitude scales (Romkin, 1938; Stone, 1933), some were devised by the author, and some were suggested by various religious persons. A pretest of 193 statements was made on six people holding different religious views, and 60 items placed by all six sorters in the same category were eliminated before the factor analysis since these were not expected to discriminate well in larger groups.

The final 58-item inventory was cross-validated on four religious groups having different belief systems. For this study, scores were determined by the number of statements under each factor with which the respondent agreed. The sum of scores for Factors I and II was used as an index of general religiosity and the difference as a measure of differential emphasis.

Sample

For performing the initial Q-sort, prior to factor analysis, Broen hypothesized five religious types and then obtained four persons from each of five religious groups "who were seen as being rather strong and 'pure' representatives of the desired religious orientations." A sixth group of four was made up of two Catholics and two Lutherans. All subjects were Christians. There were 16 females and eight males with an average age of 32.1 and an "above average" amount of education.

For the cross-validation study Broen used four groups: "27 persons from a Unitarian group with a largely humanistic attitudinal base; 17 persons from a more theistically oriented Unitarian church; 22 members of a Disciples of Christ Church choir; and 47 students from a strict, fundamentalistic, Lutheran academy."

Reliability

Ten to fourteen days after initial testing a second Q-sort was performed by a randomly sampled quarter of the original group of sorters. The test-retest correlation coefficient was .81.
Validity
Nothing beyond the procedure for elimination of items is offered as evidence for validity.

Location

Administration
The Q-sort took 70 minutes on the average to complete, so it is estimated that the final inventory would take about 30 minutes. Scoring is accomplished by summing the number of endorsed statements within each factor. The key for Factor I is indicated by the circled answers given below. For Factor II the key is as follows:


Results and Comments
The factor-analysis of the original Q-sorting yielded two major factors, a unipolar "nearness to God" factor and a bipolar "fundamentalism-humanitarianism" factor, which correlated .32 with each other. Using scores on Factors I and II, plus their sum (a measure of general religiosity) and their difference (a measure of "positive"—worship, communion, guidance—versus "negative"—sin and punishment—emphasis of the person's beliefs), Broen tested thirteen hypotheses concerning scores on these measures for his four cross-validation groups. All were statistically significant (using the t-test), thus indicating the discriminatory power of the instrument.

It remains to be seen how scores on this measure relate to other personality and social variables. Further validation is called for. Nevertheless, the items and factor scores appear to be useful at least for the particular Christian groups studies by Broen.

References

RELIGIOUS ATTITUDE INVENTORY

Directions: Circle the A if you agree with a statement; circle the D if you disagree with the statement. Make a choice for each statement. (We have found that people are able to answer all the items.) Do not spend too much time on any one statement.

A D 1. God is constantly with us.
A D 2. Christ died for sinners.
A D 3. The Ten Commandments were good for people of olden times but are really not applicable to modern life.
A D 4. There is really no such a place as Hell.
A D 5. Miracles are performed by the power of God even today.
A D 6. It is through the righteousness of Jesus Christ and not because of our own works that we are made righteous before God.
A D 7. Dancing is a sin.
A D 8. Christ's simple message of concern for your fellow man has been twisted by the superstitious mysticism of such men as Paul.
A D 9. God can be approached directly by all believers.
A D 10. The death of Christ on the cross was necessary to blot out man's sin and make him acceptable in the eyes of God.
A D 11. It was too bad that Christ died so young or He could have been a greater power for good.
A D 12. "God" is an abstract concept roughly equivalent to the concept "nature."
A D 13. God exists in all of us.
A D 14. Man is born in sin.
A D 15. The wearing of fashionable dress and worldly adornment should be discontinued because it tends to gratify and encourage pride.
A D 16. Man's essential nature is good.
A D 17. I am sometimes very conscious of the presence of God.
A D 18. Man is by nature sinful and unclean.
A D 19. All public places of amusement should be closed on Sunday.
A D 20. The stories of miracles in the Bible are like the parables in that they have some deeper meaning or moral but are not to be taken literally.
A D 21. God is very real to me.
A D 22. The Bible is the word of God and must be believed in its entirety.
A D 23. I believe in God but I am not sure what I believe about Him.
A D 24. Man has a spark of the divine in him which must be made to blossom more fully.
A D 25. When in doubt it's best to stop and ask God what to do.
A D 26. Sin brings forth the wrath of God.
A D 27. A person should follow his own conscience in deciding right and wrong.
A D 28. The most important idea in religion is the golden rule.
A D 29. God should be asked about all important matters.
A D 30. The wrath of God is a terrible thing.
31. It is more important to love your neighbor than to keep the Ten Commandments.
32. The scriptures should be interpreted with the constant exercise of reason.
33. Because of His presence we can know that God exists.
34. Everyone will be called before God at the judgment day to answer for his sins.
35. Man's idea of God is quite vague.
36. Reason is not depraved and untrustworthy for then the natural foundations of religion which rest upon it, would fall.
37. Miracles are sometimes performed by persons in close communion with God.
38. Everyone has sinned and deserves punishment for his sins.
39. The church is important because it is an effective agency for organizing the social life of a community.
40. My faith in God is complete for "though He slay me yet will I trust Him."
41. No one should question the authority of the Bible.
42. The content of various doctrines is unimportant. What really matters is that they help those who believe in them to lead better lives.
43. When the scriptures are interpreted with reason they will be found to be consistent with themselves and with nature.
44. Because of his terrible sinfulness, man has been eternally damned unless he accepts Christ as his savior.
45. Religion is a search for understanding, truth, love and beauty in human life.
46. True love of God is shown in obedience to His moral laws.
47. Every person born into this world deserves God's wrath and damnation.
48. If we live as pure lives as we can, God will forgive our sins.
49. The world is full of condemned sinners.
50. Persons who are in close contact with the Holy Spirit can, and do at times speak in unknown tongues.
51. The Devil can enter a man's body and take control.
52. The people of the world must repent before it is too late and they find themselves in Hell.
53. No one who has experienced God like I have could doubt His existence.
54. The Christian must lead a strict life, away from worldly amusements.
55. In his natural state of sin, man is too evil to communicate with God.
56. Christ was not divine but his teachings and the example set by his life are invaluable.
57. The question of Christ's divinity is unimportant; it is his teachings that matter.
58. God is the final judge of our behavior but I do not believe that He is as punishing as some seem to say He is.

Answers for Factor I are circled; answers for Factor II are listed above (see Administration).
This scale was designed to operationalize the distinction, introduced by Max Weber and elaborated by Ernst Troeltsch, between Church and Sect. As defined by Dynes: "The construct of the Church has generally signified a type of religious organization which accepts the social order and integrates existing cultural definitions into its religious ideology. The Sect, as a contrasting type, rejects integration with the social order and develops a separate subculture, stressing rather rigid behavioral requirements for its members."

A pool of 35 Likert-type items was pretested on 55 members of a large Protestant church in Columbus, Ohio. An item analysis was performed in which only items that discriminated significantly between upper and lower quartiles were retained. There were 24 of these, which comprise the final scale. Each is rated on a five-point, agree-disagree scale. A score of 1 is assigned for a Sect response, and a 5 for a Church response. Total score is simply the sum of these numbers over all 24 items; low totals indicate acceptance of the Sect form of religious organization and high totals indicate acceptance of the Church form.

Two samples were obtained. The pretest sample included 55 members of a large, urban Protestant church (mentioned above). A second sample included 360 Protestants from the same city (Columbus, Ohio)—an estimated 53% of the number contacted by mail after drawing names randomly from the City Directory.

A corrected split-half coefficient of .92 was obtained for the first sample, and of .82 for the second sample.

Ten sociologists of varying religious backgrounds judged the items according to the Church-Sect distinction. There was a mean agreement of 98%.

Dynes also offered evidence for the scale's ability to distinguish validly between groups. Episcopalians and Presbyterians ("Church" organizations) were compared with members of several Sectarian groups: Holiness, Pentecostal, Church of God, Church of the Nazarene and Baptist. Mean scale scores for these two sets of respondents were significantly different in the expected direction:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Church&quot; members</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Sect&quot; members</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This scale is self-administered and would take about 15 minutes to complete.

Using three different measures of socio-economic status, Dynes found that "Churchness" is associated with high status and "Sectness" with low status. The relationship was almost perfectly monotonic in all cases. One of the SES indicators was education, so it can also be said that "Churchness" is correlated with level of education. This is not just a matter of denominational doctrine, because the relationship holds even when denomination is held constant.

In a later article, Dynes (1957) reported further results from the same research showing that for Sectarians religious groups supplied their most meaningful associations and sources of friendship. "This was indicated by the fact that he attends church more often, belongs to more subgroups within an undifferentiated organization, states almost unanimously that he derives more satisfaction from these religious associations as contrasted with 'secular' groups, and draws most of his close friends from within his religious groups."

Further discussion of the Church-Sect distinction can be found in several articles (by Gustafson, Goode, Demerath, and Eister, respectively) appearing in the Spring 1967 issue of the *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*; see the section entitled "Reappraisal of the Church-Sect Typology."


"Reappraisal of the Church-Sect Typology":


Demerath, N., III. Comment: In a sow's ear. Pp. 77-84.


All in *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 1967, 6, 64-90.
CHURCH - SECT SCALE

In the scale, when an item stated a Sectarian trait, Strongly Agree was scored as one. When the item stated a Church trait, the scoring was reversed and Strongly Agree was scored as five. The items representing a Church trait are indicated by an asterisk.

1. I think a minister should preach without expecting to get paid for it. Strongly agree Agree ? Disagree Strongly disagree

2. I think it is more important to live a good life now than to bother about life after death.*

3. I think a person who is not willing to follow all the rules of the church should not be allowed to belong.

4. Testifying about one's religious experience should be a part of regular church services.

5. I feel that a congregation should encourage the minister during his sermon by saying amen.

6. I think that we should emphasize education in religion and not conversion.*

7. I think that there is practically no difference between what the different Protestant churches believe.*

8. I think a person should make a testimony about his religion before he joins a church.

9. In church, I would rather sing the hymns myself than hear the choir sing.

10. I think being a success in one's job is one mark of a good Christian.*

11. A minister who is "called" is better than one who is "trained."

12. I like the "old-time" religion.

13. I think churches should have more revivals.

14. I think it would be wrong for a church member to have a job as a bartender.

15. I think a person should feel his religion before he joins a church.

16. I like to sing the old gospel songs rather than the new hymns.

17. I don't believe churches do enough about saving souls.
18. Heaven and Hell are very real to me.

19. All the miracles in the Bible are true.

20. Children should not become members of the church until they are old enough to understand about it.*

21. I think it is more important to go to church than to be active in politics.

22. I wish ministers would preach more on the Bible and less on politics.

23. I think it is more serious to break God's law than to break man's law.

24. I think every family should have family prayers or say grace before meals.
RELIGIOUS FUNDAMENTALISM SCALE (Martin and Westie 1959)

This scale measures religious fundamentalism among Christians -- a construct similar to "orthodoxy" as conceived by other researchers discussed in this chapter.

In a study of prejudice toward Negroes, Martin and Westie (1959) attempted to characterize the "tolerant personality" -- one who is neither extremely negative nor extremely positive in his attitudes. Tolerance was assessed with Westie's (1953) Summated Difference Scales; two groups were selected from 429 initial respondents -- 41 who were relatively neutral (tolerant) and 59 who were conspicuously prejudiced against Negroes. These groups were then compared on several other dimensions, including religious fundamentalism.

The scale used to measure fundamentalism contained nine items, each scored along a five-point agree-disagree continuum of the Likert sort. Scoring was accomplished simply by summing item scores across the nine items.

The sampling universe for this study was all "white adults (21 years of age or older) residing within the city limits of Indianapolis in blocks containing no Negro residents." From 429 initial respondents who completed a short prognostic scale (used to avoid detailed interviews of too many prejudiced respondents), 41 qualified as "tolerant" and 59 were chosen who had high prejudice scores.

Scores on the fundamentalism measure differentiated significantly (p < .005) between the tolerant and prejudiced respondents. Moreover, fundamentalism correlated .56 with authoritarianism, .32 with intolerance of ambiguity, and .41 with nationalism (all significant at the .05 level) among the tolerant respondents.


This scale would require only about six minutes to complete.

In line with other findings in studies relating orthodoxy with intolerance, Martin and Westie found a strong relationship between Christian fundamentalism and bigotry. It should also be noted, however, that no such relationship was found between intolerance and frequency of church attendance, praying, Bible reading, and percentage of income contributed to one's religious group -- all usually associated with sect membership. This pattern of results suggests a cognitive style interpretation, one
in which cognitive rigidity, intolerance of ambiguity, strict adherence to church dogma, and separation between in-group and out-group members are all dynamically related.

The Religious Fundamentalism Scale seems to be a good short measure of religious conservatism, but it warrants careful investigation of content. Some of the items -- e.g., "If more people in this country would turn to Christ we would have a lot less crime and corruption" -- may be linked to other conservative attitudes because of specific content. Items using phrases such as "crime and punishment," "simply a myth," or "are fictitious and mythical" may reflect dogmatism.

Reference

FUNDAMENTALISM SCALE

1. SA A U D SD The Bible is the inspired word of God.
2. SA A U D SD The religious idea of heaven is not much more than superstition.
3. SA A U D SD Christ was a mortal, historical person, but not a supernatural or divine being.
4. SA A U D SD Christ is a divine being, the Son of God.
5. SA A U D SD The stories in the Bible about Christ healing sick and lame persons by His touch are fictitious and mythical.
6. SA A U D SD Someday Christ will return.
7. SA A U D SD The idea of life after death is simply a myth.
8. SA A U D SD If more of the people in this country would turn to Christ we would have a lot less crime and corruption.
9. SA A U D SD Since Christ brought the dead to life, He gave eternal life to all who have faith.

NOTE: Items 1, 4, 6, 8 and 9 are "positive" for scoring purposes, whereas 2, 3, 5, and 7 are "negative" items. Suggested scoring procedure: +2, +1, 0, -1, -2.
CERTAINTY IN RELIGIOUS BELIEF SCALE (Thouless 1935)

Variable
This scale was designed to determine the certainty with which various religious beliefs are held.

Description
The scale includes forty statements, twenty-five of which are religious, eight are neutral, non-religious factual statements and the remaining are political and vague statements condensed from complex propositional wholes. The respondents were asked to answer on a six point Likert-type scale from "complete certainty" to "complete uncertainty" with scores from +3 to -3. The average degree of certainty was determined by summing the scores on the items (disregarding signs) and dividing by the number of items. The possible range was therefore from 0 to 3.

The respondents were asked to read each statement carefully and to mark the degree of certainty with which they hold the belief (on the continuum: complete certainty, strong conviction of certainty, low degree of conviction of certainty, low degree of conviction of uncertainty, strong conviction of uncertainty, complete uncertainty.)

Sample
The sample was made up of 93 men and 45 women students at the University of Glasgow.

Reliability
No measure of reliability was given.

Validity
No measure of validity was given.

Location

Administration
The scale is self-administered and should take about twenty minutes to complete.

Results and Comments
The absence of reliability and validity information, while not of great importance for the author's immediate work, hampers the further use of the scale. Also, the non-religious questions would have to be changed for a non-British population. While the question of certainty of belief is important, it represents only one aspect of religiosity, and other measures would have to be constructed to tap other dimensions. The Brown questionnaire (the next scale in this chapter) contains further information on reliability and for dimensions related to scores on a modified Thouless scale.
THE 'BELIEFS' TEST

1. There is a personal God.
2. Jesus Christ was God the Son.
3. There are spiritual realities of some kind.
4. The world was created by God.
5. There is a personal Devil.
6. Matter is the sole reality.
7. There is a God who is all-powerful.
8. There is a God who is altogether good.
9. There are such spiritual beings as angels.
10. Jonah was swallowed by a great fish and afterwards emerged alive.
11. Man has been evolved from lower forms of life.
12. There is an impersonal God.
13. Evil is a reality.
14. The spirits of human beings continue to exist after the death of their bodies.
15. Religion is the opium of the people.
16. There is no God (personal or impersonal).
17. The universe is expanding.
18. Attendance at church is a better way of spending Sunday than taking a walk in the country.
19. Moses was the author of the first five books of the Bible.
20. Christianity is a better religion than Buddhism.
21. The Bible is literally true in all its parts.
22. Man is, in some degree, responsible for his actions.
23. There is a Hell in which the wicked will be everlastingly punished.
24. The spirits of persons who have died can sometimes communicate with the living.
25. Right will triumph.
26. Belief in evolution is compatible with belief in a Creator.
27. Hardship strengthens character.
28. Mary, Queen of Scots, was beheaded between 1580 and 1590.
29. Everything is relative.
30. Tigers are found in parts of China.
31. Hornets live in nests under the ground.
32. Sex is evil.
33. Light travels to us from the sun in less than one minute.
34. Bacon was the author of the plays attributed to Shakespeare.
35. Green is a primary colour.
36. Sunlight is good for human health.
37. Members of the leisured class are supported by the 'surplus value' created by the workers.
38. Tariffs improve trade.
39. India has, on the whole, benefited from British rule.
40. The total national debt of Great Britain is more than a thousand million pounds.
Variable
This questionnaire was designed to study functional relationships between religious beliefs and other psychological variables.

Description
The questionnaire comprised several parts. The heart of the religiosity measure was a modified version of the Thouless scale for studying certainty of religious beliefs (the previous scale in the present chapter). Eight new items were added, and the whole set of items was then broken into categories by ten judges. Eighty percent agreement was required. The resulting categories were beliefs about Christ and God, other orthodox Christian beliefs, general religious beliefs, opinions, facts, and miscellaneous items. Respondents judged these items on a six-point Likert scale of certainty: from "complete certainty that the belief is true" (scored +3) to "complete certainty that the belief is false" (scored -3).

The scoring categories were later renumbered 1 to 8 and the score for each subpart of the scale was determined by computing the mean of the score values for that area.

Several other attitude and personality measures were also included in the Brown study, including a scale to measure attitudes toward the institutional church (Jeeves, 1959), Eysenck's (1958) neuroticism and extraversion scales, the Taylor (1953) manifest anxiety scale, a ten-item F scale, a modified version of previous humanitarianism scales, and the MMPI Lie Scale. Only the religion items used are reproduced below.

Sample
The sample included 203 first year psychology students from the University of Adelaide, having a mean age of 22 years. Nineteen were Roman Catholics, 56 were members of the Church of England, 40 were Methodists; 45 were classed as members of "non-conformist" groups (e.g., Presbyterian and Baptist), 18 as "miscellaneous," and 25 labelled themselves atheists or "nothing."

Reliability
Test-retest measures of reliability were obtained from 40 subjects over an eight month interval. For each of the separate categories these were as follows: orthodox beliefs .85, general religious beliefs .92, opinions .35, facts .30, miscellaneous .50, institutionalization .53, and individualism .60.

Validity
No evidence for validity was reported.

Location

Administration
The questionnaire is self-administered and should take about half an hour to complete.
A factor analysis was performed on all scores from the personality and religious belief scales, yielding two major factors: a religious belief factor (accounting for 43% of the variance) and a neuroticism or anxiety factor (accounting for 15% of the variance). The principal loadings were as follows:

**Religious belief:**
- Orthodox Christian belief + .894
- General religious belief + .812
- Institutionalization + .656
- Authoritarianism + .598
- Individualism - .278
- Age - .365
- Denomination - .581

**Neuroticism or anxiety:**
- Manifest Anxiety + .725
- Neuroticism + .704
- Opinion Strength + .500
- Factual certainty + .399
- Miscellaneous items + .285
- Individualism + .376
- Lie Score - .312
- Age - .337

The results indicated that religious certainty is independent of certainty about factual and opinionative matters (at least for those included), and that anxiety is associated with certainty only on matters of opinion. It was found that untestable religious statements, e.g., regarding the existence of "such spiritual beings as angels," were held more strongly than factual ones.

It is doubtful whether the religious certainty scale used here is a great improvement over Thouless' original scale. However, because of its promising reliability and interesting association with other variables included in Brown's study, it is considered worth further exploration, especially directed toward ascertaining its validity.

**References**


For a later study with similar conclusions, using a wider variety of personality measures, see

Institutionalization

1. The Church is necessary to establish and preserve concepts of right and wrong.
2. Every person needs to have the feeling of security given by a church.
3. For the vast majority of people, in order to live a truly religious life the Church or some other organized religious body is an essential.
4. The aim of missionaries should be to establish church buildings where religious services and ceremonies can be conducted.

Individualism

1. A man ought to be guided by what his own experience tells him is right rather than by what any institution, such as the Church, tells him to do.
2. It is more important for an individual to understand the principles of his personal faith than to have a detailed knowledge of his own denomination.
3. Private devotions are more important in the religious life of a person than is attendance at public church services.
4. True Christianity is seen in the lives of individual men and women rather than in the activities of the Church.

Beliefs about Christ

1. (2)* Jesus Christ was God the Son.
2. Jesus changed water into wine.
3. Jesus Christ was born of a Virgin.
4. Jesus walked upon the water while his disciples waited for him in their boat.

Beliefs about God

1. (1) There is a personal God.
2. (4) The world was created by God.
3. (7) There is a God who is all-powerful.
4. (8) There is a God who is altogether good.
5. God made man out of dust and breathed life into him.
6. (16) There is no God (personal or impersonal), (with scoring reversed)

Other Orthodox Christian Beliefs

1. (3) There are spiritual realities of some kind.
2. (5) There is a personal Devil.
3. (13) Evil is a reality.
4. (14) The spirits of human beings continue to exist after the death of their bodies.
5. (18) Attendance at church is a better way of spending Sunday than taking a walk in the country.
General Religious Belief

1. (6) Matter is the sole reality. (with scoring reversed)
2. (9) There are such spiritual beings as angels.
3. (10) Jonah was swallowed by a great fish and afterwards emerged alive.
4. (20) Christianity is a better religion than Buddhism.
5. (21) The Bible is literally true in all its parts.
6. (23) There is a Hell in which the wicked will be everlastingly punished.
7. (25) Right will triumph.
8. There is no life after death. (with scoring reversed)

* Item number in the original Thouless scale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>This scale was designed to measure the degree of acceptance or rejection of Christian dogma.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The scale is made up of fifteen statements which are answered on a five point Likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Eight of the statements (2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, and 15) were positively scored and seven (1, 4, 5, 8, 10, 13, and 14) had reverse scoring (a high score for disagreement rather than agreement). The total score was obtained by summing the item weights and had a possible range of 15 (strongest non-belief) to 75 (strongest belief). An original list of 25 statements was evaluated by 60 undergraduates at the University of Denver and the dean of a Bible college. Ten items were eliminated because they were ambiguous or overlapping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>The questionnaire was administered to 887 male and female students enrolled in lower division liberal arts courses at the University of Denver, spring quarter 1948. There were 622 Protestant, 166 Catholic, 68 Jewish, 9 Moslem, and 22 unclassified respondents. The sample was approximately 21% female and 79% male, representative of that college's population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>A split-half measure of reliability obtained from a random sample of 100 of the first three hundred to take the questionnaire yielded a value of .77±.04. Applying the Spearman-Brown formula this yielded a value of .87 for the total scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>As a measure of concurrent validity the scale was given to 35 Bible college students and 21 students at a liberal theological seminary. As predicted, the Bible college students scored much higher (mean 73.77) than the liberal theological school students (mean 48.60).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>The scale is self-administered and would take approximately ten minutes to complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results and Comments</td>
<td>The authors confirmed a number of predicted relationships. Conservatism decreased as years in college increased, etc. They also found that the less conservative students were in general more intelligent than the more conservative group. Correlations with other personality scales were also reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This scale seems to be a fairly valid and reliable measure to determine the attitude of a person toward Christian dogma. The</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sample is obviously biased but the questions are worded simply enough that the scale could be administered to persons with much less education. The reliability and validity measures are encouraging, as are its differentiating powers across religious denominations (as reported in the article). All in all this seems to be a promising scale although limited in its scope since it does not evaluate attitudes toward the church as an institution or tap other dimensions of religiosity.
Inventory of Religious Belief

This is a study of religious belief. Below are fifteen items which are to be answered in the following manner:

Place a line under **Strongly agree** if you agree strongly with the statement.
Place a line under **Agree** if you agree with the statement.
Place a line under **Not sure** if you are in doubt as to whether you agree or disagree with the statement.
Place a line under **Disagree** if you disagree with the statement.
Place a line under **Strongly disagree** if you disagree strongly with the statement.

Remember to read each statement carefully, and mark only one answer for each item.

People differ widely in their beliefs: please indicate your own in the manner described.

1. It makes no difference whether one is a Christian or not as long as one has good will for others.
   Strongly agree    Agree    Not sure    Disagree    Strongly disagree

2. I believe the Bible is the inspired Word of God.

3. God created man separate and distinct from animals.

4. The idea of God is unnecessary in our enlightened age.

5. There is no life after death.

6. I believe Jesus was born of a Virgin.

7. God exists as: Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

8. The Bible is full of errors, misconceptions and contradictions.

9. The Gospel of Christ is the only way for mankind to be saved.

10. I think there have been many men in history just as great as Jesus.

11. I believe there is a heaven and a hell.

12. Eternal life is the gift of God only to those who believe in Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord.
13. I think a person can be happy and enjoy life without believing in God.

14. In many ways the Bible has held back and retarded human progress.

15. I believe in the personal, visible return of Christ to the earth.
RELIGIOUS ATTITUDE SCALE (Poppleton and Pilkington 1963)

Variable
This scale was designed to measure the "religious attitudes" of British college students. The authors were motivated in part by the results of American studies in the 1930's using Thurstone scales.

Description
A sample of 156 statements concerning religious beliefs was collected from students and faculty at the University of Sheffield. Using the Thurstone method, two parallel forms of a scale were developed, each containing 22 statements. These two forms were then administered to a sample of 121 students and staff members of the university; half received form A first, half received B first. Each group received the alternate form three weeks later.

Responses were made according to a five-point Likert scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree). An item analysis suggested by Likert resulted in the elimination of 23 items. Response category weights were determined using a method proposed by Guilford. The final scale therefore contained 21 items, each with appropriate category weights. (These are given with the scale items below.) Scores range from 40 (anti-religious) to 136 (pro-religious).

Sample
For their final study, the authors chose a proportionate, stratified random sample of the entire student body of the University of Sheffield. This yielded a mailing sample of 500; 463 completed questionnaires were returned (92.6%).

Reliability/ Homogeneity
The scale was split into three equal parts and intercorrelations were computed. Corrected for length, these were $r_{12} = .95$, $r_{13} = .96$, and $r_{23} = .97$. Using Cronbach's formula for the coefficient alpha, a value of $\alpha = .97$ was obtained.

Validity
In order to determine concurrent validity, the sample was divided into three groups as follows: 1) a low religious group, made up of those claiming to be atheists or agnostics on a background data questionnaire; 2) a highly participative religious group - those people who attended church frequently, prayed at least weekly, and were active church members (again assessed by questionnaire); 3) the remainder of the sample - those who failed to meet either set of criteria. The high and low groups differed significantly, with the pro-religious group (N = 107) obtaining a median score of 116, and the anti-religious group (N = 109) a score of 60. There was no overlap between the two groups.

Location

Administration
The scale is self-administered and should require approximately fifteen minutes to complete.
Results and Comments

In general the results are quite similar to those usually found in the United States. For example, there is a significant decline in religious belief among students in the Arts and Pure Science during early years at the University, but the decline continues only for the scientists (especially for those later engaging in research); women tended to be more religious than men; Catholics and members of small sects scored higher than members of other denominations.

The scale appears to be an adequate measure of general religious beliefs, yielding acceptable reliability indexes and appropriate discrimination between groups. The items are simply worded and could probably be understood by everyone beyond the high school educational level. As with most scales of religiosity, this one taps only what Glock and Stark call the ideological or belief dimension; it does not ask about religious experiences or the consequences of faith in the respondent's everyday life.
Below are 21 statements which concern religious beliefs. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of them. On the right-hand side of the page you will find five alternative answers. Place a cross opposite each statement in the column which best represents your opinion. For example:

More time in broadcasting should be allotted to agnostic speakers.

Please do not leave out any statements even if you find it difficult to make up your mind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To lead a good life it is necessary to have some religious belief. (3.15)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Jesus Christ was an important and interesting historical figure, but in no way divine. (9.84)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I genuinely do not know whether or not God exists. (5.59)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People without religious beliefs can lead just as moral and useful lives as people with religious beliefs. (5.90)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Religious faith is merely another name for belief which is contrary to reason. (10.05)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The existence of disease, famine and strife in the world makes one doubt some religious doctrines. (7.43)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The miracles recorded in the Bible really happened.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It makes no difference to me whether religious beliefs are true or false. (6.20)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Christ atoned for our sins by His sacrifice on the cross. (0.62)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The truth of the Bible diminishes with the advance of science. (9.00)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Without belief in God life is meaningless. (0.73)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The more scientific discoveries are made the more the glory of God is revealed. (1.47)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Religious education is essential to preserve the morals of our society. (2.64)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The proof that Christ was the Son of God lies in the record of the Gospels. (1.53)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The best explanation of miracles is as an exaggeration of ordinary events into myths and legends. (8.71)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. International peace depends on the worldwide adoption of religion. (2.06)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If you lead a good and decent life it is not necessary to go to church. (7.33)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Parents have a duty to teach elementary Christian truths to their children. (2.70)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. There is no survival of any kind after death. (10.37)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The psychiatrist rather than the theologian can best explain the phenomena of religious experience. (8.88)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. On the whole, religious beliefs make for better and happier living. (3.32)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers in parentheses after each statement refer to the Thurstone scale values of the items. Values range from 0-11. Low values indicate pro-religious and high values antireligious attitudes.

Weights are indicated by the numbers in the ruled columns.
Extrinsic Religious Values Scale (Wilson 1960)

Variable

This scale was designed to measure the motivation of an individual for affiliating with a religious institution; in particular, to tap what Allport (1954) has called extrinsic motivation. According to Allport, the usual finding of a relationship between religiosity and prejudice is attributable to persons with extrinsic religious values.

Description

The instrument contains a total of 15 dichotomous items which may be classified in two groups:

a) statements reflecting "an allegiance to, and dependence upon, the external or institutional structure of a church", and

b) statements reflecting "a utilitarian orientation toward religion, i.e., acceptance of religion as a means."

(These two categories come from Allport's conception of extrinsic motivation.) For each item one response alternative reflects an "extrinsic" religious orientation, the other reflects "absence of extrinsic religious value." Total score is simply the sum of extrinsic responses (those with asterisks in the listing below).

Wilson administered his scale (ERV), along with Levinson's Religious Conventionalism Scale (RC), a 12-item version of the California Anti-Semitism Scale (AS), and several filler items, to the several small, homogeneous groups (N=207 in all), described under "sample" below. The results are presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Scale Reliability</th>
<th>ERV Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>RC Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>AS Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>ERV-AS Correlation</th>
<th>RC-AS Correlation</th>
<th>ERV-RC Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>-b</td>
<td>-b</td>
<td>-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>-b</td>
<td>-b</td>
<td>-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>-b</td>
<td>-b</td>
<td>-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.57**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The following abbreviations are used in the column headings: ERV, Extrinsic Religious Values Scale; RC, Religious Conventionalism Scale; AS, Anti-Semitism Scale.

a Corrected equivalent halves.
b The Religious Conventionalism Scale was not administered to this sample.
c All correlations are by rank-difference method

* P < .05; ** P < .01; *** P < .001
Sample

Numbered to correspond with the above table, the groups were as follows:

1., 2., 3., 4. Adult members of four different Congregational Christian churches in the metropolitan Boston area (N = 15, 22, 22, and 35 respectively);

5. Members of a young adult organization in a Methodist church in the Boston area (N = 10);

6. Harvard-Radcliffe students of various Christian denominations who reported attending services regularly (N = 26);

7. Adult members of a Disciples of Christ church in North Carolina (N = 11);

8. Adult members of the choir of a Negro Baptist church in the Boston area (N = 15);

9. Sophomore students in a Catholic girls college in the Boston area (N = 23);

10. Catholic graduate students in the Boston area (N = 28).

Reliability

Corrected split-half reliability coefficients are given in the table. These are low for Catholics because approximately one-fourth of the items, which refer to matters on which the church has a doctrinal position, did not differentiate among Catholics.

Validity

The face validity of the scale was presumably boosted by the contribution of Allport to its formulation (acknowledged in a footnote). Concurrent validity and an indication of construct validity are reported in the table. Correlations between Wilson's ERV and anti-Semitism (AS) ranged from .41 to .72, adding support to the prediction that extrinsically religious people are more prejudiced. Correlations with Levinson's Religious Conventionalism Scale (RC) were much lower on the average, suggesting that conventionalism and extrinsic motivation—although both correlates of prejudice—are not identical. In Wilson's study, the ERV scale accounted for about twice as much of the variance in prejudice (AS) as did the RC scale for the five Protestant groups that responded to all three scales.

Location


Administration

The ERV scale is self-administered and, since it took about half an hour to complete Wilson's entire 50 item questionnaire in this study, it should require about 10 minutes to complete the ERV.

Results and Comments

The ERV scale is interesting not only because it has promising reliability and validity, but also because it represents an attempt to operationalize part of Allport's frequently cited explanation of the contradictory findings relating religiosity and prejudice. But the scale needs further work, especially before it can be used fruitfully for Catholic samples. See the following scale in this chapter for one attempt to improve Wilson's measure.
References:


For a more recent validation study employing the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule as a measure of personality, see the following:

Below are some statements about religion. Each has two possible endings. Will you please read each of these statements and mark an X beside the ending which best fits your feelings about the statement. It may be hard to decide which ending to choose for some of the statements and you may want to mark both, but please mark only one ending for each statement, selecting the one that you most nearly agree with. There are no "right" or "wrong" choices and there will be many religious people who will select each possible ending to the statements.

1. When saying the Lord's Prayer in unison at church my mind is more likely to be on
   - * the fact that many of us are saying the same prayer.
   - ___ the meaning of the prayer for me personally.

2. Religion helps to keep my life balanced and steady in much the same way as my citizenship, friendships and other memberships do.
   - ___ I agree.
   - ___ I disagree.

3. A person who does not belong to some church must at heart feel very insecure.
   - ___ I think this is almost certainly a true statement.
   - ___ I think this statement is not necessarily true.

4. The principal reason I am a member of the church is that it gives me a deep feeling of security in this troubled world.
   - ___ Yes, this is true.
   - ___ No, I do not agree.

5. Without the church mankind would have no concepts of right and wrong.
   - ___ I agree.
   - ___ I disagree.

6. While the church serves me in a good many ways, on the whole it seems especially important to me personally because:
   - ___ it gives me an opportunity to find myself and express my aspirations.
   - ___ it teaches, guides and protects me.

7. The religious concept of "Brotherhood of Man" probably refers to:
   - ___ a unity of all people regardless of who they are or what they believe
   - ___ a unity of believers in the faith.
8. One reason for my being a church member is that such a membership helps to establish a person firmly in the community.

* Yes, this is one reason.
* This reason does not apply to me.

9. Prayer is, above all else, a means of obtaining needed benefits, protection, and safety in a dangerous world.

* On the whole, I agree.
* On the whole, I disagree.

10. Some people say that they can be genuinely religious without being a member of any church.

* Yes, I agree that they can.
* I do not believe this.

11. When I enter a cathedral or large beautiful church I am more likely to feel:

* respect for the majesty and greatness it represents.
* some other personal religious emotions of my own.

12. Imagine yourself in the two following situations. In which would you feel your religious life to be most strengthened?

* As a member of a small struggling church.
* As a member of a big and influential church.

13. In one respect my church is like a lodge or fraternity: I feel more comfortable and congenial with fellow-members than I do with non-members.

* Yes, I agree with this statement.
* No, I cannot agree with it.

14. I have received specific benefits for myself and my family as a result of prayer.

* Yes, I can agree with this statement.
* No, I cannot agree with it.

15. When visiting friends in another city who never go to church, I would nonetheless make a definite effort myself to attend church on Sunday.

* Probably yes.
* Probably no.

Note: The asterisk (*) indicates the alternative for each item that is considered to reflect the extrinsic religious value. The total score for the scale is simply the number of items on which the extrinsic religious value alternative is chosen.
INTRINSIC-EXTRINSIC RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION (Feagin 1964; Allport and Ross 1967)

Variable
Whereas Wilson's (1960) scale measures the extrinsic orientation toward religion, according to Allport's (1954) theory, the scale described here contains separate intrinsic and extrinsic items which seem to form empirically distinct subscales.

Description
This scale was developed jointly by members of a seminar at Harvard, apparently under Allport's leadership, and has been reported both by Feagin (1964) and by Allport and Ross (1967). The Feagin version has one additional extrinsic item; otherwise the two scales are identical.

Items are scored from 1 to 5, as shown below, with 4 or 5 indicating an extrinsic orientation, 1 and 2 indicating an intrinsic orientation, and 3 being assigned to any items omitted by a respondent.

Total score is simply the sum of the 20 or 21 item scores. Although one can obtain a single total score, it is wise to score the intrinsic and extrinsic subscales separately, because for many respondents they appear to be independent (as discussed below).

Sample
Feagin. In the spring of 1963 Feagin had friends distribute "about" 420 questionnaires to members of five churches in four cities in Texas and Oklahoma. He received 286 (68%) by return mail and these constituted his sample. Ages of respondents ranged from 18 to "over 50;" there were 122 males and 163 females distributed widely across occupational, educational, and income categories. Each questionnaire included the Intrinsic-Extrinsic Scale along with measures of fundamentalism, anti-Negro prejudice, conformity, and "jungle ideology."

Allport and Ross. Graduate students in the Harvard seminar distributed questionnaires to six church groups, including Catholics, Lutherans, Nazarenes, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists. In all there were 309 cases. All respondents were contacted as members of these groups, so some "proreligious" bias may have been introduced. The authors caution that no generalizations about denominations should be drawn from their small, non-random samples. The questionnaires included the Intrinsic-Extrinsic Scale and several direct and indirect measures of racial prejudice.

Reliability
Feagin. Item-to-scale correlations ranged from .22 to .54 when the whole scale (21 items) was given one score. Feagin noticed that some items were intercorrelating well while others were not, and so performed a factor analysis. Two orthogonal factors emerged, representing intrinsic (18% of variance) and extrinsic (11% of variance) dimensions. When these are considered as subscales, the following item-to-subscale correlations were obtained for the top six items on each factor (item numbers refer to list below):
Allport and Ross. Item-to-subscale correlations ranged from .18 to .58; these are listed in parentheses after the items in the list below.

Validity

In both studies respondents showing an extrinsic religious orientation were found to be more racially prejudiced than the intrinsically religious respondents. Allport and Ross also discovered that some people, labelled "indiscriminately proreligious," tended to endorse both extrinsic and intrinsic items, and that these were the most prejudiced of all. (The "indiscriminately proreligious" include those who on the intrinsic subscale score at least 12 points less than on the extrinsic subscale.) In more liberal groups, such as university students, one might also expect to find people who are "indiscriminately antireligious or nonreligious," and in fact unpublished research has borne out this expectation.

In the studies by Feagin and by Allport and Ross, as well as in unpublished research available to us, the Intrinsic-Extrinsic Scale appears consistently to demonstrate its construct validity.

Location


Administration

This scale is self-administered and should take about 10-15 minutes to complete.

Results and Comments

As discussed in the introduction to this chapter, Allport explains the repeatedly demonstrated correlation between church attendance and bigotry by postulating two types of church-goers. The extrinsically motivated, who make up the majority, are racially prejudiced. But a minority of church members, the intrinsically motivated, are actually less prejudiced than nonreligious persons. Research with the Intrinsic-Extrinsic Scale appears to support Allport's claim. Furthermore, it has uncovered two other types of people, the indiscriminately proreligious and the indiscriminately antireligious. These people appear to contradict themselves by expressing blanket support or condemnation for all religious statements.
The items employed in the research of Feagin and of Allport and Ross are listed separately for the extrinsic subscale and for the intrinsic. In actual use, of course, they are interspersed (to avoid agreement response-set). The twelfth extrinsic item, for some unspecified reason, was used only by Feagin.

In both subscales the items are scored in such a way that scores of 4 or 5 indicate an extrinsic orientation, while scores of 1 and 2 indicate an intrinsic orientation. If an item is omitted it receives a score of 3.

While the scores of the 20 items (or 21 including Feagin's #12) may be summed (with high totals indicating an extrinsic orientation), it is probably well, as the reported research demonstrates, to obtain separate scores for the two subscales in order to distinguish cases that are "indiscriminately pro-religious" from those that are consistently extrinsic or intrinsic.

In parentheses following the statement of each item the reader finds the correlation of the item with the total subscale score in Allport and Ross's study, with the contribution of the item to the scale excluded.

The following "cover-up" title and instructions were used by the authors:

**Inquiry Concerning Social and Religious Views**

The following items deal with various types of religious ideas and social opinions. We should like to find out how common they are.

Please indicate the response you prefer, or most closely agree with, by writing the letter corresponding to your choice in the right margin.

If none of the choices expresses exactly how you feel, then indicate the one which is closest to your own views. If no choice is possible you may omit the item.

There are no "right" or "wrong" choices. There will be many religious people who will agree with all the possible alternative answers.

Reference


Extrinsic Subscale

1. What religion offers me most is comfort when sorrows and misfortune strike. (.49)
   a. I definitely disagree 1
   b. I tend to disagree 2
   c. I tend to agree 4
   d. I definitely agree 5

2. One reason for my being a church member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community. (.47)
   a. Definitely not true 1
   b. Tends not to be true 2
   c. Tends to be true 4
   d. Definitely true 5

3. The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life. (.51)
   a. I definitely disagree 1
   b. I tend to disagree 2
   c. I tend to agree 4
   d. I definitely agree 5

4. It doesn't matter so much what I believe so long as I lead a moral life. (.39)
   a. I definitely disagree 1
   b. I tend to disagree 2
   c. I tend to agree 4
   d. I definitely agree 5

5. Although I am a religious person I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs. (.31)
   a. Definitely not true of me 1
   b. Tends not to be true 2
   c. Tends to be true 4
   d. Clearly true in my case 5

6. The church is most important as a place to formulate good social relationships. (.44)
   a. I definitely disagree 1
   b. I tend to disagree 2
   c. I tend to agree 4
   d. I definitely agree 5
7. Although I believe in my religion, I feel there are many more important things in my life. (.32)
   a. I definitely disagree 1
   b. I tend to disagree 2
   c. I tend to agree 4
   d. I definitely agree 5

8. I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray. (.31)
   a. Definitely true of me 5
   b. Tends to be true 4
   c. Tends not to be true 2
   d. Definitely not true of me 1

9. A primary reason for my interest in religion is that my church is a congenial social activity. (.33)
   a. Definitely not true of me 1
   b. Tends not to be true 2
   c. Tends to be true 4
   d. Definitely true of me 5

10. Occasionally I find it necessary to compromise my religious beliefs in order to protect my social and economic well-being. (.18)
    a. Definitely disagree 1
    b. Tend to disagree 2
    c. Tend to agree 4
    d. Definitely agree 5

11. The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection. (.50)
    a. I definitely agree 5
    b. I tend to agree 4
    c. I tend to disagree 2
    d. I definitely disagree 1

12. Religion helps to keep my life balanced and steady in exactly the same way as my citizenship, friendships, and other memberships do. (This item not used by Allport and Ross.)
    a. I definitely agree 5
    b. I tend to agree 4
    c. I tend to disagree 2
    d. I definitely disagree 1
Intrinsic Subscale

1. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life. (.39)
   a. I definitely disagree
   b. I tend to disagree
   c. I tend to agree
   d. I definitely agree

2. Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of God or the Divine Being. (.44)
   a. Definitely not true
   b. Tends not to be true
   c. Tends to be true
   d. Definitely true

3. My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life. (.50)
   a. This is definitely not so
   b. Probably not so
   c. Probably so
   d. Definitely so

4. The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotion as those said by me during services. (.30)
   a. Almost never
   b. Sometimes
   c. Usually
   d. Almost always

5. If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend church: (.47)
   a. more than once a week
   b. about once a week
   c. two or three times a month
   d. less than once a month

6. If I were to join a church group I would prefer to join (1) a Bible Study group, or (2) a social fellowship. (.49)
   a. I would prefer to join (1)
   b. I probably would prefer (1)
   c. I probably would prefer (2)
   d. I would prefer to join (2)
7. Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life. (.28)
   a. Definitely disagree 5
   b. Tend to disagree 4
   c. Tend to agree 2
   d. Definitely agree 1

8. I read literature about my faith (or church). (.41)
   a. Frequently 1
   b. Occasionally 2
   c. Rarely 4
   d. Never 5

9. It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation. (.58)
   a. Frequently true 1
   b. Occasionally true 2
   c. Rarely true 4
   d. Never true 5
**ATTITUDE TOWARD CHURCH SCALE (Thurstone and Chave 1929)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>The scale purportedly measures a respondent's position on a continuum ranging from strong depreciation to strong appreciation of &quot;the&quot; (his) &quot;church.&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>A list of 130 statements about the church was compiled from various people and from a search of the literature. These statements were then sorted into eleven piles by 300 subjects according to Thurstone's method. By eliminating ambiguous and irrelevant items a final scale of 45 statements was obtained. An individual's score on this scale is obtained by averaging the values associated with items he endorses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>In the studies initially reported the scale was administered to students at the University of Chicago (548 freshmen, 127 sophomores, 107 juniors, 107 seniors, and 210 graduate students), 103 Divinity students and 181 members of the Chicago Forum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>A split-half measure of .848 was obtained. Corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula this became .92. In another study mentioned, using 100 subjects, the split-half measure was .89, corrected to .94.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>As a measure of discriminant validity and a rough indicant of construct validity the subjects were classified by religion and, as expected, the Catholic group obtained the highest mean score. Another classification, according to church attendance rate, showed that frequent attenders were more favorable to the church. Similar results were obtained for a split between active and inactive church members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Thurstone, L. and Chave, E. <em>The measurement of attitude</em>, Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1929.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Approximately thirty minutes would be needed for self-administration of the scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results and Comments</td>
<td>This instrument has been fairly widely used even in recent years. It has adequate reliability and has been shown to relate reasonably to other variables. It is general enough to be used with any of the major religious groups. However, it is directed almost entirely toward institutional and ritual concerns and does not tap individual religious beliefs or notions about God, doctrine, etc. Perhaps some of its better items could be used in conjunction with scales designed to measure other dimensions of religiosity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For an interesting study of religious attitude change over more than a decade using the Thurstone-Chave scale, see Nelson (1956).

Reference
Nelson, E. Patterns of religious attitude shifts from college to fourteen years later. *Psychological Monographs*, 1956, 70, Whole No. 424.
ATTITUDE TOWARD CHURCH SCALE

Check (✓) every statement below that expresses your sentiment toward the church. Interpret the statements in accordance with your own experience with churches.

(8.3)* 1. I think the teaching of the church is altogether too superficial to have much social significance.

(1.7) 2. I feel the church services give me inspiration and help me to live up to my best during the following week.

(2.6) 3. I think the church keeps business and politics up to a higher standard than they would otherwise tend to maintain.

(2.3) 4. I find the services of the church both restful and inspiring.

(4.0) 5. When I go to church I enjoy a fine ritual service with good music.

(4.5) 6. I believe in what the church teaches but with mental reservations.

(5.7) 7. I do not receive any benefit from attending church services but I think it helps some people.

(5.4) 8. I believe in religion but I seldom go to church.

(4.7) 9. I am careless about religion and church relationships but I would not like to see my attitude become general.

(10.5) 10. I regard the church as a static, crystallized institution and as such it is unwholesome and detrimental to society and the individual.

(1.5) 11. I believe church membership is almost essential to living life at its best.

(3.1) 12. I do not understand the dogmas or creeds of the church but I find that the church helps me to be more honest and creditable.

(8.2) 13. The paternal and benevolent attitude of the church is quite distasteful to me.

* Scale value
14. I feel that church attendance is a fair index of the nation's morality.

15. Sometimes I feel that the church and religion are necessary and sometimes I doubt it.

16. I believe the church is fundamentally sound but some of its adherents have given it a bad name.

17. I think the church is a parasite on society.

18. I feel the need for religion but do not find what I want in any one church.

19. I think too much money is being spent on the church for the benefit that is being derived.

20. I believe in the church and its teachings because I have been accustomed to them since I was a child.

21. I think the church is hundreds of years behind the times and cannot make a dent on modern life.

22. I believe the church has grown up with the primary purpose of perpetuating the spirit and teachings of Jesus and deserves loyal support.

23. I feel the church perpetuates the values which man puts highest in his philosophy of life.

24. I feel I can worship God better out of doors than in the church and I get more inspiration there.

25. My experience is that the church is hopelessly out of date.

26. I feel the church is petty, always quarreling over matters that have no interest or importance.

27. I do not believe in any brand of religion or in any particular church but I have never given the subject serious thought.

28. I respect any church-member's beliefs but I think it is all "bunk."

29. I enjoy my church because there is a spirit of friendliness there.

30. I think the country would be better off if the churches were closed and the ministers set to some useful work.

31. I believe the church is the greatest institution in America today.

32. I believe in sincerity and goodness without any church ceremonies.
33. I believe the church is the greatest influence for good government and right living.

34. I think the organized church is an enemy of science and truth.

35. I believe the church is losing ground as education advances.

36. The churches may be doing good and useful work but they do not interest me.

37. I think the church is a hindrance to religion for it still depends upon magic, superstition, and myth.

38. The church is needed to develop religion, which has always been concerned with man's deepest feelings and greatest values.

39. I believe the churches are too much divided by factions and denominations to be a strong force for righteousness.

40. The church represents shallowness, hypocrisy, and prejudice.

41. I think the church seeks to impose a lot of worn-out dogmas and medieval superstitions.

42. I think the church allows denominational differences to appear larger than true religion.

43. I like the ceremonies of my church but do not miss them much when I stay away.

44. I believe the church is a powerful agency for promoting both individual and social righteousness.

45. I like to go to church for I get something worth while to think about and it keeps my mind filled with right thoughts.
ATTITUDES ABOUT THE BIBLE (Survey Research Center 1969)

Variable
This question inquires into whether a person takes a literal view of
the Bible or takes a less literal view.

Description
The question has four choices and the respondent is asked to make
but one choice. (The item is used in the Faulkner and DeJong scale
described previously in this chapter.)
The following distributions of response for those who choose one of
the alternatives (only 3% cannot make a choice) have been obtained
in the 1964 and 1968 pre-election samples of the Survey Research
Center:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1968</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bible is all true.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bible has human errors.</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bible is just a good book.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bible is worth little.</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample
The samples consisted of a nationwide probability sample of 1,571
adults interviewed in September and October 1964 and 1,558 adults
interviewed in the same months in 1968.

Reliability/
Homogeneity
No test-retest reliability data are available.

Validity
No data bearing directly on validity are available.

Location
1964 Election Study. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Survey Research Center
(ICPR) (in press)

Results and
Comments
Attitudes about the Bible are strongly related to education (tau-
beta = .30) and religion (especially for those of Jewish faith) as
shown by the following results from the 1968 data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All true</th>
<th>Some errors</th>
<th>Good book</th>
<th>Worth little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade school or less</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school incomplete</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school grad</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College grad</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are large variations within the Protestant category that cannot be
detailed here; e.g., from 42% of Reformation Protestants (e.g., Lutheran,
Presbyterian) to 80% of Neo-Fundamentalists choosing the most literal
interpretation. Within the Pietistic religions the percent taking the most literal view varies between 57% for Methodists (72% in the South) and 73% for Baptists (78% in the South).

Any "generation-gap" that exists in views about the Bible is certainly confined to the college graduate segment of those under 30. Percentages saying the Bible is all true according to age and education are as follows for the 1968 data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total sample</th>
<th>People under 30</th>
<th>People over 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No high school</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school grad</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College grad</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This college graduate under 30 segment still takes the Bible more seriously than classroom samples at the University of Michigan that the major author of this volume has studied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All true</th>
<th>Some errors</th>
<th>Good book</th>
<th>Worth little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan undergrads</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collected from a haphazard sample at Adrian College, a small college in southeastern Michigan show quite a different pattern:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian college undergrads</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results are consistent with the following differentials in Bible views in the 1964 study among graduates of colleges which have various AAUP ratings of quality:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (A and B rating)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium and Low (C through F rating)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally the major author of this volume has found the following pattern of correlations (tau-beta for total sample = -.16) between liberal views of the Bible and the opinion that the police used too much force with the demonstrators at the 1968 Chicago convention:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school education</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In all groups then individuals with literal views of the Bible were most likely to feel that the police did not use enough force with the demonstrators. However, the correspondence between the two "hard-line" responses was hardly noticeable for those of less education and became quite pronounced for persons who had been to college.
ATTITUDES ABOUT THE BIBLE

Here are four statements about the Bible (HAND CARD TO R), and I'd like you to tell me which is closest to your own view.

1. The Bible is God's Word and all it says is true.

2. The Bible was written by men inspired by God but it contains some human errors.

3. The Bible is a good book because it was written by wise men but God had nothing to do with it.

4. The Bible was written by men who lived so long ago that it is worth very little today.

8. Don't know
ADJECTIVE RATINGS OF GOD (Gorsuch 1968)

Variable

Previous research had identified several dimensions used in people's conception of God, and Semantic Differential research had revealed three adjectival factors (evaluation, potency, and activity) which apply to numerous concepts. Gorsuch sought to combine these approaches in discovering replicable factors underlying conceptions of God.

Description

Sixty-three adjectives were taken from a previous study by Spilka, Armatas, and Nussbaum (1964) and another 28 were selected to represent the three major factors usually found in Semantic Differential studies (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957). Subjects rated each adjective on a three-point scale: 1) "the word does not describe 'God';" 2) "the word describes 'God';" 3) "the word describes 'God' particularly well." To these 91 adjectives, eight random variables and sex were added.

For 500 respondents the 100 variables were correlated and hierarchically factored. Three orders of factors were obtained. In the list below all "salient" adjectives (those with loadings above .30) are listed for each factor. Gorsuch states: "Each loading can be interpreted as the correlation of the adjective with the factor when the influence of any factor at a higher order than the one under consideration has been removed." The relationship between factors is indicated in the following outline:

I. Traditional Christian
   A. Companionable
      1. Evaluation
      2. Kindness
      3. Relevancy
   B. Benevolent Deity
      1. Lack of deisticness
      2. Sternality
      3. Kindness
II. Wrathfulness
III. Omni-ness
IV. Potently passive

Gorsuch attempted to find at least three salient adjectives to form a scale for each factor. Variables were selected from a Schmidt-Leiman (1957) analysis which met three conditions: 1) each variable loaded at least .40 on the factor, 2) each had no stronger loading on another factor, and 3) each had no loading on another factor within .10 of its major loading. Only five factors met these conditions; the adjectives chosen for these five are asterisked in the list below. For a sample of 85 males alpha coefficients were computed to determine the internal consistency reliability of each factor scale.
A total of 585 undergraduates taking general psychology courses at Vanderbilt completed the adjective ratings; 234 were females. Eighty-five males were randomly selected from the sample for the reliability study, the remaining 500 were included in the factor analyses. Only the composition of the entire group is specified: Methodists (21%), Presbyterians (21%), Episcopalians (14%), Baptists (11%), Catholics (8%), no preference (7%), Jewish (4%), Church of Christ (3%), Lutheran (3%), Congregational (2%), Disciples of Christ (2%), and other bodies (4%). Twenty-nine percent reported attending religious services at least once a week; 27% said "several times a year or less."

The alpha coefficients for the five satisfactory scales were as follows:

- Traditional Christian (15 adjectives) .94
- Wrathfulness (11 adjectives) .83
- Deisticness (3 adjectives) .71
- Omni-ness (4 adjectives) .89
- Irrelevancy (4 adjectives) .49

The last reliability coefficient is low in part because 77 of the 85 respondents received the lowest possible score.

No direct evidence for validity was offered, but the close correspondence between several of the factors and factors obtained earlier by Spilka, et al. (1964) was discussed.


The adjective scales are self-administered and take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

This instrument has not as yet been used in published studies, but it is worth consideration because it offers a differentiated approach to the conceptualization of God which has at least some validation in previous work. After further development such an instrument might be useful for comparing the conception of the deity held by various groups (liberal, fundamentalist, etc.) or different cultures. Gorsuch intends to alter and refine the scales and to undertake such comparative studies, and he explicitly suggests that interested researchers contact him for up-to-date information. (Department of Psychology, Vanderbilt University)


ADJECTIVE RATINGS OF GOD

Third Order Factor

Factor 1: Traditional Christian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-wise</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blessed*</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comforting</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative*</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divine</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eternal</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everlasting</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faithful</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatherly</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm*</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glorious</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gracious*</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important*</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinite</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingly*</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majestic*</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matchless*</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merciful</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnipotent</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omniscient</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient*</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real*</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redeeming</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovereign*</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steadfast*</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong*</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True*</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigorous</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Order Factors

Factor 2: Benevolent Deity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All-wise</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comforting</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divine</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccessible</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccessible</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merciful</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omnipresent</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 3: Companionable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faithful</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary Factors

Factor 4: Kindliness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charitable</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comforting</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerate</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentle</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gracious</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loving</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merciful</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 5: Wrathfulness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avenging*</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt*</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical*</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruel*</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damning*</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard*</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealous</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishing*</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe*</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp*</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern*</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrathful*</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor 6: Deisticness

Distant* 54  Inaccessible* 57  Mythical 35  Passive 34
Impersonal* 55

Factor 7: Omni-ness

Infinite* 46  Omnipotent* 58  Omnipresent* 66  Omniscient* 64

Factor 8: Evaluation

Important 38  Timely 40  Valuable 51  Vigorous 39
Meaningful 36

Factor 9: Irrelevancy

False* 62  Feeble* 70  Weak* 65  Worthless* 60

Factor 10: Eternality

Divine 49  Eternal 58  Everlasting 59  Holy 37

Factor 11: Potently Passive

Slow 53  Still 57  Tough 35

---

Each adjective was rated on a three point scale:

1. The word does not describe "God."
2. The word describes "God."
3. The word describes "God" particularly well.

The following were omitted from the above listing:

a. decimal points
b. non-salient loadings (i.e., less than .30)
c. loadings less than .35 on factors with 6 or more salient loadings
d. factors without at least 3 salient loadings
In this final chapter, we examine three sets of attitudinal instruments that are primarily of methodological relevance. The three are intended to control for the response set tendencies of social desirability and acquiescence (Wiggins, 1968, p. 308, lists references to four scales which measure, as distinct from controlling for, acquiescence.) The scales reviewed are:

1. Social Desirability Scale (Crowne and Marlowe 1964)
2. Social Desirability (or SD) Scale (Edwards 1957)
3. Various Social Attitude Scales (Campbell 1966)

The Crowne-Marlowe scale, while initially constructed as a control for response set, gradually developed into a springboard for a complex series of studies of motivation (a measurement area we are unfortunately not able to cover in this volume). We shall point out some problems that arise in this connection as well as the relatively low inter-item homogeneity that the scale seems to possess. Nevertheless there are few scales in the literature that have their validity as well established through experimentation as this one. The amount of normative data (e.g., average scores for various groups) that the authors provide is also a laudable feature of this scale.

The Edwards scale is taken directly from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, a copyrighted instrument that we cannot reproduce here. A main disadvantage of these items, compared to those of Crowne-Marlowe, is that their content is heavily laden with references to psychologically abnormal behavior. In other words, scores on the Edwards scale should be higher relative to the number of items employed because it is so difficult to admit many of the abnormal behaviors employed.
This in fact is reflected in the average number of items endorsed in the socially desirable direction for the two scales, Crowne and Marlowe generally reporting their subjects answer in the desirable direction to less then half of their items, in comparison to the two-thirds rate for the Edwards items.

The final scales by Campbell have yet to be used in any reported research, so that we are unable to evaluate them psychometrically. However, it is the way in which the items are formatted that draws our attention to these scales. In order to control for acquiescence, each item has two alternatives which define opposite ends of the continuum of interest. After picking one alternative the respondent is then asked to indicate the strength of his preference of one end of the continuum over the other. This item format thus allows all respondents to gauge their attitudes on an item in terms of the same concrete alternatives.

At the present time, a good deal of controversy surrounds the importance of response sets in attitude and personality research. Research up to the mid-1960s generally took the position that response sets were so strong that perhaps that was all that most personality inventories were measuring (see the review of Christie and Lindauer, 1963). With the writings of Rorer (1965) and Block (1965), the pendulum swung to the opposite extreme. More recent articles (Campbell et al., 1967; Bock et al., 1969) suggest a more modified position—response sets seldom obliterate item content but in some content areas their effects can seriously confound the interpretation of scale scores. Wiggins (1968) provides a readable overview of the state-of-the-art through mid-1967. This research, however, has been conducted with college-students and therefore leaves unanswered the importance of the operation of such response sets among less-educated persons in sample surveys (Campbell et al., 1960; Lenski and Leggett, 1960).
References:


SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE (Crowne and Marlowe 1964)

Variable
This scale attempts to locate individuals who describe themselves in favorable, socially desirable terms in order to achieve the approval of others.

Description
The items in the scale were modelled so as to achieve a balance of two types of statements: half culturally acceptable but probably untrue, the other half true but undesirable. Current personality inventories were consulted to find items of this type which had minimal abnormal implications. A set of 50 such items were selected and reduced to 33 by ratings of experienced judges and by item analyses with psychology students. Of these 18 are keyed in the true direction, 15 in the false direction. One point is scored for each response in the socially desirable direction with scores therefore varying between 0 (no social desirability) to 33 (highest social desirability). The following data on scale norms were drawn from 1,400 students in introductory psychology students at Ohio State University. The mean for males was 15.1 (s.d. = 5.6), for females 16.8 (s.d. = 5.5) with the following distribution of scale scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average scores for other samples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Univ.</td>
<td>11.7 (N = 100)</td>
<td>13.5 (N = 86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>10.1 (N = 32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Washington</td>
<td>14.4 (N = 110)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of North Dakota</td>
<td>13.9 (N = 49)</td>
<td>16.0 (N = 59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley College</td>
<td>13.7 (N = 41)</td>
<td>14.2 (N = 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial school</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.3 (N = 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance company</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.4 (N = 88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizophrenic in-patients</td>
<td>16.5 (N = 60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric out-patients</td>
<td>12.2 (N = 40)</td>
<td>11.5 (N = 46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California prisoners</td>
<td>16.7 (N = 80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts prisoners</td>
<td>21.4 (N = 17 prostitutes)</td>
<td>19.1 (N = 26 prostitutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.3 (N = 19 non-prostitutes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample

The various samples are described above. For the most part these appear to be captive samples, with no attempt made at selective or probability sampling procedures.

Reliability/Homogeneity

The items retained in the scale were those that had originally correlated at the .05 level with total scale scores. Internal consistency (Kuder-Richardson 20) came out at .88.

A test-retest correlation over a one-month interval with 57 college students also was .88. Less encouraging data on the homogeneity of scale items is reported under "Results and Comments" below.

Validity

The validity of the scale was supported by the confirmation of several hypotheses in experimental settings. These experiments are too complex to detail here except for the authors' conclusion:

"The greater amenability to social influence of persons who characterize themselves in very desirable terms is seen in (a) the favorability of their attitudes toward an extremely dull and boring task; (b) their greater verbal conditionability, both directly and vicariously; (c) social conformity; (d) a tendency to give popular word associations; (e) the cautious setting of goals in a risk-taking situation; (f) their greater reactivity, depending on their expectancies about the evaluative consequences of their behavior, in a "dirty word" perceptual-defense task; and (g) susceptibility to persuasion."

Location


Results and Comments

One essential element in the need for approval that experiments in this study brought to light was the way in which this need was dependent on an idealized version of the self that had to be maintained and defended. "Many of the behaviors which are associated with defensive self-evaluation appear to follow from and to support the approval-dependent person's self-esteem....more is involved than a contrived and deliberate presentation of self."

Scores on this scale generally correlate considerably lower with scales of the MMPI that do Edward's (1957) items, as the authors had intended. No correlation between the two social desirability scales is reported however.

Application of these items to a national probability sample of tenth-grade boys (Bachman et al., 1967) produced relatively low inter-item correlations.

Out of a total of 465 inter-item correlations, only 15 exceeded .20 (for a random subset of 778 boys), and about half of all inter-item correlations were not significant at the .01 level (.10 being the point at which significance would be attained). Consider the following four items, for example:
1. I am always a good listener.  
2. I have doubts about my ability to succeed in life.  
3. I almost never have the urge to tell somebody off.  
4. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. 

X
- .06  X  
.06  -.03  X  
-.10  .08  .02  X

For this sample, Arscott (1968) reports data which calculate out to an average score of 14.8, with a standard deviation of 5.3. The percentages giving the socially desirable response to each question in this study are included with the presentation of items. (Two inapplicable items were not included in the Bachman et al. study.)

Further research with this scale in the Mental Health in Industry Program at the Institute for Social Research has raised certain questions about the theoretical foundations of this scale. Jack French (personal communication) has noted that motivational theory and previous research would indicate that the items could be fruitfully divided under three headings:

Approach:  Items 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21

General avoidance:  Items 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 22, 24

Avoid aggression:  Items 4, 6, 12, 19, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33

The items might also be divided according to whether they refer to intrinsic or extrinsic content. Factor analyses of the items in the scale suggest further that the items need to be distinguished on the grounds of positive vs. negative wording.

John Lillibridge (personal communication) comments:

"Preliminary analyses support the idea that the basic dimension measured by the M-C scale is denial rather than need for social approval. That is, culturally undesirable but common attributes are true of the self rather than measuring the need to conform to social norms about good and bad behavior.

A factor analysis of 778 adolescents in a current study (Youth-in-Transition data) indicates that the scale may comprise at least two subscales: Deny Bad Qualities and Claim Good Qualities. In a second study of men aged 35 to 60 (Employment Termination data) it appears that the Deny Bad Qualities subscale contributes most of the variance in correlations between the M-C total score and several other variables especially measures of negative affect. Work is continuing to assess the role of this denial dimension in response set phenomena."
A comprehensive review of mainly positive results using the Crowne-Marlowe Scale through mid-1967 is provided by Wiggins (1968, pp. 305-308). A specific application of the Crowne-Marlowe scale to the control of a response set tendencies in the survey setting is provided by Smith (1967).
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SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have never intensely disliked anyone.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am always careful about my manner of dress.</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If I could get into a movie without paying for it and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I like to gossip at times.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I can remember &quot;playing sick&quot; to get out of something.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I always try to practice what I preach.</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent of a nationwide sample of tenth grade boys answering the item in the keyed direction.
(F) 19. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget. 33

(T) 20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it. 71

(T) 21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. 54

(F) 22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way. 19

(F) 23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things. 35

(T) 24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings. 75

(T) 25. I never resent being asked to return a favor. 82

(T) 26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. 55

(T) 27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car. Not asked

(F) 28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. 34

(T) 29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off. 24

(F) 30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. 55

(T) 31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause. 41

(F) 32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved. 50

(T) 33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. 45
SOCIAL DESIRABILITY (SD) SCALE (Edwards 1957)

Variable
The items in this scale are intended to tap a tendency to endorse statements on the basis of their implicit social desirability rather than their actual explicit content.

Description
All items are drawn from the MMPI. The present 39 item scale consists of a subset of an original 79 item scale devised earlier from judgments about the desirability of MMPI items. The 39 items were those that proved to show the greatest differentiation on total SD scores from the 79 item scale.

One point is scored for each item answered in the keyed direction, therefore yielding a range from 0 (lowest SD) to 39 (highest desirability). A sample of 84 male students had a mean of 28.6 (s.d. = 6.5) on this scale while 108 female students had a mean 27.1 (s.d. = 6.5).

Sample
A number of college student samples were employed in this research.

Reliability/ Homogeneity
A corrected split-half reliability of .83 is reported for 192 students.

No test-retest data are reported.

Validity
No data bearing directly on validity are reported, except that the author presents evidence to suggest that results with his scale could not have been obtained as a result of acquiescence.

Location
Edwards, A. The social desirability variable in personality assessment and research. New York: Dryden, 1957. (The actual items in this scale are part of the copyrighted MMPI, which is available from the Psychological Corporation in New York City.)

Results and Comments
The following high correlations between SD scores and various personality scales led Edwards to hypothesize that these scales were measuring little more than social desirability:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other MMPI Scales</th>
<th>Other Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Cooperativeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Introversion</td>
<td>Objectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manifest Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values: .49, .52, .61, -.90, -.84, -.50, -.75, -.73, -.85, .63, .53, .71
### Social Desirability Scale

**MMPI Booklet Numbers and Scoring Key for the 39-Item SD Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VARIOUS SOCIAL ATTITUDE SCALES (Campbell 1966)

Variable

The variables included in these scales cover the following areas: self-esteem (self-assessment), values (individualism, materialism, trust in people), and political attitudes (local-cosmopolitan, foreign policy).

Description

The items in these scales were derived primarily to illustrate a method of item construction that has advantages over traditional item format, mainly in controlling for acquiescence response set and defining the attitude continuum for respondents. Even though these items have not been used extensively, we feel that they are well-constructed enough to deserve exposure, if for no other reason than to illustrate a promising method of item construction.

Sample

The items have been used in classroom studies at Northwestern University.

Reliability/Homogeneity

No data on reliability have been published.

Validity

No data on validity have been published.

Location

Campbell, D. Unpublished papers, Department of Psychology, Northwestern University.

Administration

Items would be scored in Likert style, depending on the keying of the items. Thus scores for self-assessment would cover the range 8 (all replies in the non-asterisk direction and use capital letters) through 40 (all asterisk replies and use capital letters).

Results and Comments

These scales represent only a few of the many attitude areas for which the author has constructed scales. An inner-directedness scale using this method has been published (Kassargian 1962).

Variations on the technique can be found in the Berkowitz-Wolkon and Schuman-Harding scales reviewed in Chapter 5.
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VARIOUS SOCIAL ATTITUDE SCALES

This is a survey of attitudes and opinions on a variety of topics.

Each item consists of two alternatives, A and B, between which you are asked to choose by circling one of these indicators:

A = Statement A is entirely preferred to Statement B as an expression of my opinion.
a = Statement A is somewhat preferred over Statement B.
? = I cannot choose between A and B.
b = Statement B is somewhat preferred to Statement A.
B = Statement B is entirely preferred to Statement A as an expression of my opinion.

Please show your attitude leanings on each item, even though you do not feel strongly on the topic or do not feel well informed. Please choose between the alternatives, even though both may seem acceptable to you, or both unacceptable.

Items in the Assessment of Self

(* indicates high self-assessment)

A a ? b B 1. A. My progress toward the goals of success I set for myself has been disappointing.
   *B. I feel that I have made significant progress toward the goals of success I set for myself.

A a ? b B 2.*A. The conception I now have of myself is more complimentary than the conception I have had in the past.
   B. I now have a less complimentary conception of myself than I have had in the past.

A a ? b B 3. A. In determining how others feel about me, I am not confident in my ability to do so.
   *B. I am confident of my ability to ascertain how others feel about me.
4. A. Knowing the evaluations of myself by others is important for the way I see myself.
   *B. The way I see myself does not depend upon my knowing the evaluations of me by others.

5. A. In a given situation, I am inadequate in telling how others perceive me.
   *B. It is my feeling that I am able adequately to tell how others perceive me in a given situation.

6. A. I tend to identify myself in terms of the reactions of others toward me.
   *B. The way others react toward me does not influence the way I tend to react toward those others.

7. *A. The way I play my role in a given social situation is dependent upon how I conceive myself.
   B. In a given social situation, the way I play my role is dependent upon how others conceive me.

8. *A. My self conception is not shaped by factors external to the given social situation in which I am playing a role.
   B. The conception I have of myself is shaped by the way I play my role in a given social situation.

**Individuality**

(* indicates individualistic response)

1. A. Schools and colleges should teach their students to accept their morals of society and to adjust themselves to community life.
   *B. The primary purpose of education is to make the student independent and to help him develop his own conceptions of life, morals and values.

2. A. Since man is basically evil he must be taught to accept society and his innate spontaneity must be constrained by regulations.
   *B. Man is fundamentally good and will always develop his good faculties under positive environmental conditions.

3. A. Good and evil are values which are determined by society or religious concepts.
   *B. Man should consider all moral values in relation to himself; he alone is the standard (of judgment) of good and evil.

4. A. The U.S.A. places great emphasis on developing people who are well-adjusted to society and who take an active responsible role in social life.
   *B. The U.S.A. encourages a self-dependent, and individualistic attitude towards life.
5. *A. The integrated person is capable of getting along by himself and avoids unnecessary social contacts.
   B. A well-adjusted and mature person seeks and enjoys social contacts and likes to affiliate with others.

   B. The only way to attain appropriate self-evaluation is by comparing one's self with the community in which one lives.

7. *A. Fraternity life is too dominant because it does not give students a chance to stand entirely on their own feet, to get a real estimation of themselves and to develop their own social relations.
   B. Fraternities and sororities are very positive because they help students who are away from home for the first time to get adjusted to the new form of life.

8. *A. There are no basic values worth striving for except those which come from the individual himself.
   B. Man should strive to meet fundamental values which are pointed out by society and religion.

---

**Materialism**

(* indicates materialist response)

1. A. "A loaf of bread, a jug of wine..." this epitomizes all the material requirements for personal happiness.
   *B. "A loaf of bread and a jug of wine" may have been alright for someone who hasn't known anything else, but let's face it; in twentieth century America we approach happiness as the carpet gets thicker and the steaks less "rare."

2. *A. My philosophy is: to have or to have not is the question, and if I'm lucky enough to have, I'm going to enjoy it.
   B. To have wealth and material goods is not more conducive to happiness than to have debts and cancer.

3. *A. An orderly, uncluttered house and a well-kept lawn will be important features of my future home.
   B. I'm frankly not really interested in how my physical surroundings will be disposed in my future home.
4. A. The joys which wealth and material possessions bring are superficial and short-term as compared to the real joys in life.
   *B. The only people who can say "money can't buy happiness" are those who never had a chance to try.

5. A. A society that worships such extravagances as "golfmobiles" and all electric kitchens is indeed a "sick" society.
   *B. If things were such that everybody in the world had stereophonic record players and champagne, wars would probably be obsolete.

6. *A. To conjecture upon the size of one's starting salary when leaving college is a natural tendency on the part of a modern college student.
   B. A person with a "healthy" value system rarely if ever reflects on his future salary.

7. A. Neatness and physical appearance of my like-sexed friends are entirely accidental in terms of my associations.
   *B. Important determinants in my choice of like-sexed friends in my living group at college are physical attractiveness and stylishness of dress.

8. *A. A place for everything and everything in its place is a good maxim to abide by.
   B. Although cleanliness is important in material things, order, per se, bores me.

Social Attitudes

(* indicates positive views of others)

1. *A. Confidence in others is seldom misplaced.
   B. If you leave yourself open to being hurt, you probably will be.

2. *A. People would rather help than hurt one another.
   B. In this dog-eat-dog world, you can't trust anyone.

3. A. Working for others is a situation of basic insecurity.
   *B. Friends and co-workers are the best security that a person can have.

4. *A. Faith in others is essential for survival these days.
   B. Having faith in others is just asking for trouble.

5. A. If an acquaintance asks to borrow money, it is better to try to avoid lending it.
   *B. Being able to help those in need is part of the joy of living.

6. *A. The golden rule is still the best rule to live by.
   B. Nice guys finish last.
7. A. You can't beat city hall.  
   *B. Where there's a will there's a way.

8. A. There's no place for friendship in business.  
   *B. Business' first function is to meet a social need.

---

(* cosmopolitan response)

1. A. It's a good idea to look around for a place to settle but there's nothing like setting one's roots in one spot.  
   *B. When it comes to what I do in my spare time I don't pay much attention to what people might think.

2. *A. I don't care to know people unless there is something to the person.  
   B. I judge a man by who he is more than I do by what kind of person he is.

3. A. It's best to join clubs where there are people most like yourself.  
   *B. It's best to know a few selected people than a lot of them.

4. A. News from home seems more meaningful than other news found in the newspaper.  
   *B. In order to better himself and his family, a man sometimes has to give up some of his friends.

5. A. In general, it is preferable reading daily newspapers than magazines.  
   *B. If a person gets tired of people he's known for years he should stop seeing them.

6. A. Joining such clubs as the Elks and Kiwanis is preferable over such clubs as debate and cultural ones.  
   *B. One of the best ways to judge a man is by his success in his job or career.

7. *A. The findings of science may someday show that many of our most deeply-held beliefs are wrong.  
   B. If given a choice between an American good or item and a foreign one, I would select the American good even if the foreign good was slightly cheaper.

8. *A. People ought to pay more attention to new ideas, even if they seem to go against the American way of life.  
   B. It is best to borrow needed funds from close friends or one's family than from a bank or loan firm.
Foreign Policy
(* internationalist response)

1. *A. The important thing for the U.S. foreign aid program is to see to it that poor countries benefit.
   B. The important thing for the U.S. foreign aid program is to see to it that the U.S. gains a political advantage.

2. A. If the U.S. policy of regional blocs of countries protects the member states, it is a good policy.
   *B. If the U.S. policy of regional blocs of countries creates difficult world conditions for small neutral countries, it is a bad policy.

3. A. The laws of the United States should be used as a model for developing international laws.
   *B. International laws should be developed out of the laws of all nations.

4. *A. U.S. foreign trade is desirable if it raises the standard of living of all countries involved in the trades.
   B. U.S. foreign trade is desirable if it raises the U.S. standard of living.

5. A. A U.S. citizen must remember his duty to his country whatever the international issue.
   *B. The position a U.S. citizen takes on an international issue should depend on how much good it does for how many people in the world, regardless of their nation.

6. *A. The United States should abide by United Nations decisions, whether it agrees with them or not.
   B. The United States should abide by United Nations decisions only if it agrees with them.

7. *A. It will be all right if Communism replaces capitalism if it means a better life for most people in the world.
   B. Capitalism must be defended against attack.

8. A. Countries needing our agricultural surpluses should pay for them instead of getting something for nothing.
   *B. Countries needing our agricultural surpluses should get them free if we cannot use them.
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