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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Equal access to social privileges for all men is a right that has been overtly defended in America, but a right which has not always been fully maintained in practice. The urgency felt by many students of human relations to provide a better understanding of the phenomena of intergroup relations is emphasized by the desire to implement this right. The challenging question before us, according to Allport, "is whether progress toward tolerance will continue, or whether, as in many regions of the world, a fatal retrogression will set in." The viability of the democratic ideal in human relationships is on trial before the whole world. "Can citizens learn to seek their own welfare and growth not at the expense of their fellow men, but in concert with them? The human family does not yet know the answer, but hopes it will be affirmative." ¹

Ethnicity has provided obstacles to harmonious intergroup relations when associated with prejudice. The emotional "pre-judgment" of individuals of other ethnic groups is in essence an attitude related to social, situational, and personality factors which impinge upon the person in modern society. Attempts to explain the source of attitudes of

antipathy in the bigoted person has been presented in theoretical propositions, but consensus has not been reached. There is also considerable dispute about the relative effectiveness of formal education programs, contact and acquaintance programs, group retraining, information through mass media, and exhortation. Yet there is still great hope that education for tolerance will attack overgeneralized belief and moderate prejudices toward ethnic groups.

The church and the school have been expected to take the lead in combating intolerance, but investigations of the role of religiosity among prejudiced and tolerant subjects have raised a question as to the effectiveness of religious training. Allport depicts clearly the confusion left by studies of religiosity and prejudice.

The role of religion is paradoxical. It makes prejudice and it unmakes prejudice. While the creeds of the great religions are universalistic, all stressing brotherhood, the practice of these creeds is frequently divisive and brutal. . . . Some say the only cure is to abolish religion. Churchgoers are more prejudiced than the average; they also are less prejudiced than the average.2

One possible hypothesis is that it may be the use that churchgoers make of their religion which is responsible for their prejudicial attitudes. Those churchgoers, who use their religion as a protection for their ethnocentric personalities and are primarily interested in the benefits gained from the institutional aspects of church life, can twist the teachings of religion to justify protection for their own in-group and serve nurture for their personal prejudices.

2 Ibid., p. 444.
On the other hand, those who internalize religious tenets with humility tend to serve their religion and actively support the move toward brotherhood.3

If the use made of religious belief is determined by the individual's psychological needs, it may be that personality characteristics are the intervening variables which have clouded the picture of the association between religion and prejudice. Because religious doctrine is authoritarian in nature, it is suggested that religious people may tend to develop the authoritarian syndrome which has been shown to be related to prejudice.4 It may be that the contribution of religion to prejudicial attitudes will be clarified only after the effect of varying personality has been negated.

A study of the kind of belief religious people hold found orthodoxy to be related to devotion to religion, fantasy, and prejudice.5 The authors suggested that some distinction may have to be made between the devoutly religious, nonprejudiced person and the devoutly religious, prejudiced person to gain the key to this relationship.6

Other studies describe various dimensions of religiosity such as


6 In personal letter from Middleton.
frequency of attendance, use of religion, and the degree of orthodox belief. These variables seemed to be associated with prejudicial attitudes in earlier studies. The first goal of this research is to study the relationship between these three dimensions of religiosity and prejudice.

Although the relationship of education to prejudice has shown in a majority of studies a negative correlation, there is evidence that this may be a spurious relationship. High school students with superior personality adjustment are more likely than the average to go on to college. It may be formal education is related to those aspects of personality which are negatively related to prejudice. Thus, the role of formal education in relation to prejudice can also be clarified when the effect of personality is controlled.

Personality factors which have been found related to prejudicial attitudes are numerous. These personality correlates also tend to be related to the "authoritarian" dimension. It may be that dimensions such as anomia, conservatism, and status-concern, are part of the authoritarian syndrome, and their relationship to prejudice may also be

---


spurious. The true nature of the relationship of each of these personality traits with prejudice can be examined if the effect of the remaining personality variables is controlled.

This study has centered around these problems:

1. What is the initial relationship of religiosity, education, and personality variables with prejudicial attitudes?

2. Which of these simple relationships remain significant when the effect of other related variables is controlled?

While no causal inferences can be made from this ex post facto study where no time order can be established except through deduction, it is hoped that the findings may reinforce tenable conclusions reached in past studies focused on the variables listed above as final causes in the phenomenon of prejudice.10

Basic Assumptions

This exploration of prejudicial attitudes among church participants is based upon four assumptions.

First, it has been assumed that attitudes toward ethnic groups are reflected in the answers of respondents, and that these attitudes

10 Final causes as classified by Paul H. Furfey in the Scope and Method of Sociology (pp. 68-73, Harper and Brothers: New York, N. Y., 1953) where he applies Aristotle's four types of causes—material, the physical aspects from which the phenomenon originates; formal, determinants of the shape and configuration of the phenomenon; efficient, the agency through which the change is brought about; final, the end of motive which gives reason for its occurrence—to the sociological approach.
can be measured and quantified.

Secondly, it has been assumed that the number assignment given each response represents the same attitude of each respondent. For example, respondent A expresses a certain level of prejudice when he circles "3" to indicate his willingness to accept the Japanese to his street as neighbors.\(^{11}\) It is assumed that respondent B expresses the same level of prejudice when he marks his questionnaire in the same manner.

Thirdly, it has been assumed that the distance between the numbers assigned to each response for a particular item is equal. Although there is much dispute as to whether this assumption can be made when ordinal scales are employed, the error involved is not significantly larger than the error acquired in dichotomizing samples into "high" and "low" categories. This assumption was necessarily made in order to employ zero-order correlation analysis—the only statistical technique available for controlling more than two or three variables simultaneously. The problem undertaken involved controlling nine variables simultaneously. Because no comparison has been made with the findings of this sample and the findings of other populations, the assumption seemed valid in spite of error incurred.

Fourthly, it has been assumed that the direction of causality\(^{12}\)

\(^{11}\) See page 5 of questionnaire, Appendix B.

is from the independent variables to the dependent variable. While this assumption is necessary in any investigation of this kind it must be remembered that this direction is by no means established at this point.

Simpson and Yinger warn:

One must be careful not to assume too quickly that a certain tendency—rigidity of mind, for example—that is correlated with prejudice necessarily causes that prejudice. . . . The sequence may be the other way around. . . . It is more likely that both are related to more basic factors. 13

These basic assumptions parallel closely the assumptions made in studies similar to the one undertaken.

12 (Cont'd from page 6) that the multiplicity of factors—economic, technological, and political—affecting social phenomena makes causal investigation literally an impossible test. Furfey (Paul H. Furfey, The Scope and Method of Sociology, pp. 68-73, Harper and Brothers: New York, N. Y., 1953) points out that knowledge has no scientific basis without causal inference. Furfey goes on to point out that, while the social scientist may lack precise tools for measurement, he is, on the other hand, in a more advantageous position than the natural scientist because he is of the very nature of that which he is trying to explain. He, himself, is the material cause; he has keen insights into the formal causes through his daily contact with the elements of social structure; he functions as an efficient cause of social change; and he knows only too well the mechanisms of motivation or final causes. Although studies to isolate single causal factors may be impaired by the multiplicity of factors influencing a single effect, testable causal hypothesis must be evolved by the social scientist if he is to organize present and new knowledge into scientific order—the end goal of all science.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The study of ethnic groupings—racial, nationality, and religious—received its first impetus not from sociologists but from anthropologists and psychologists. Early studies of cultural and/or racial groups laid the foundation for the sociological literature focused on adjustment and assimilation of European immigrant groups. Simpson and Yinger have divided the past study of ethnic relations into three stages:

1. The first stage which engulfed numerous assertions in the name of social science leaning heavily on racist notions and colored by value declarations;

2. The second stage which produced masses of empirical data, objectively recorded, describing various minority groups, but unrelated to any larger body of theory;

3. The third stage which promises the integration of empirical data into general theory of human behavior through analysis of intergroup relations, a growing interest in research, and the beginnings of some experimental work.14

It is from this third stage that literature relevant to this study has been drawn, with particular focus on studies centering on situational and personality correlates of prejudice in recent publications.

The term prejudice has many connotations—all of them negative. Berry points out that it is difficult to examine such a concept objec-

tively, and discusses several definitions in an attempt to bring together the meanings attributed to prejudice by sociologists. The literal meaning of prejudice hardly spells out its meaning, for prejudice cannot be classed as a judgment when its common basis is emotion rather than logical consideration of facts involved.\(^{15}\) Powdermaker asserts, "Prejudice means jumping to a conclusion before considering the facts."\(^{16}\) Along the same line Frazier states: "Prejudice is a prejudgment in the sense that it is a judgment concerning objects and persons not based upon knowledge or experience."\(^{17}\)

Wirth takes prejudice out of the judgment class when he defines it as "an attitude with an emotional basis."\(^{18}\) Defining prejudice as an attitude seems more apt than as a judgment, for prejudices reflect an emotional set—"from love to hatred, from esteem to contempt, from devotion to indifference"—which the individual acquires through socialization toward many elements of the environment. Marden joins this approach by defining prejudice as "an attitude unfavorable or disparaging of a whole group... based upon some elements of irrationality."\(^{19}\)

---


Simpson and Yinger describe prejudice as "an emotional, rigid attitude toward a group of people." Allport's definition of prejudice includes some of the best elements of the other definitions: "Ethnic prejudice is an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole, or toward an individual because he is a member of that group."  

A number of investigations have been made to determine the role of religion in prejudicial attitudes. The results of these studies are inconsistent with one another. In an early study conducted by Allport and Kramer with 437 college undergraduates taking courses in psychology, they found that religious training in itself did not effect tolerant attitudes. If the students felt that their religious background had emphasized tolerance, their attitudes tended to be more tolerant. If, however, the students felt that their religious background had an unfavorable, neutral or mixed effect on them, their attitudes tended to be more prejudiced. Those students who reported no influence of religious training were in the less prejudiced half.  

In replication of the Allport study Rosenblith found similar relationships between the type of religious training and level of preju-

---

20 Simpson and Yinger, loc. cit.


Lindzey discovered that a group of Harvard undergraduates who were high in prejudice attended church more frequently than those low in prejudice. Religious variables—expressed preferences, intensity of belief, and frequency of church attendance—were inversely related to tolerant attitudes in Nehnevajsa's study of University of Colorado students. Martin and Westie reported that the "tolerant" half of a sample randomly drawn from the population of Indianapolis tended to reject the fundamentalistic, doctrinaire, and conservative outlook in favor of a more humanistic orientation. However, they found no significant relationship between tolerance or prejudice and frequency of church attendance, praying, Bible reading, and percentage of income contributed to one's religious group.

On the other hand no relationship was apparent between church attitudes and attitudes toward two ethnic groups when Prothro and Miles tested 380 white, middle class, Christian adults from 16 Louisiana municipalities.

---


24 Lindzey, loc. cit.


Other studies have shown both positive and negative relationships between religiosity and prejudice. When comparing Southern and Northern white respondents, Pettigrew found no significant differences among the Northerners who had attended church within the week, and those who had not attended church within the month. When age and education were controlled, the Northern Protestant attenders were significantly more tolerant than the non-attenders. Among the Southern respondents, however, church attenders were significantly more anti-Negro than non-attenders. In a later study which he conducted at the English-speaking University of Natal, Pettigrew found that church attenders were significantly more tolerant toward non-whites.

College and university students from different regions of the country were discovered to differ in attitudes. While religious orthodoxy was significantly positively related in the southeast area, it was not related significantly in the northeast area. As stated before, Middleton feels the answer may lie in the differences found between the "devoutly religious nonprejudiced person" and the "devoutly religious prejudiced person." He has summarized his position as follows:

This matter of measuring religiosity will be your greatest problem. . . Most studies show that prejudice is highly related to orthodoxy of religious belief, but our study shows that orthodoxy is closely related to the importance of religious belief to the individual and also is closely related to fanaticism. Thus,

the general picture is that the more conservative or orthodox an individual is, the more likely he is to be devout, fanatic, and prejudiced.30

After reviewing the inconsistent conclusions regarding the relationships between religion and prejudice, Allport hypothesized that it may not be as much the type of belief the individual has, nor the frequency of attending church functions, as it is the use which the individual makes of his belief that effects prejudice. The individual who uses his religion as a shield from the "perils" of a threatening world lacks tolerance for his fellowman. This is the prejudiced person, primarily interested in the institutional aspects of his religion, who expects his religion to serve him. Allport labels this use of religion extrinsic belief.

The intrinsic believer, conversely, internalizes his religious dogma, but recognizes the fact that others have convictions which are equally as important to them. He does not use his religion as a talisman but seems dedicated to serve his religion and his fellowman. Furthermore, Allport suggests that no individual is either entirely "extrinsic" or "intrinsic" in his religious outlook. At any moment an individual probably falls at some point on a continuum ranging from extreme extrinsic belief to extreme intrinsic belief.31

Education has proved to be another important correlate of prejudice. For the most part studies have shown a negative relationship be-

31 Allport, "Religion and Prejudice", loc. cit.
tween prejudice and the years of formal education. The Allport and Kramer study indicated that children of college trained parents tended to be more tolerant of ethnic groups than children of non-college parents,\textsuperscript{32} and Rosenblith's follow-up study in South Dakota tended to confirm these findings.\textsuperscript{33} Nehnevajsa reported a positive relationship between the number of years of formal education and tolerance.\textsuperscript{34} In his study of differences between northern and southern adults, Pettigrew found education to be negatively related to prejudice and authoritarianism in both areas of the nation. He states further that in the south it seems to play an even more essential part in tolerant attitudes.\textsuperscript{35} The Martin and Westie study also concluded that the "tolerant" subjects were significantly higher in the number of years of education completed.\textsuperscript{36} After stratifying his sample by occupational level, Lipset found that educational attainment was associated with democratic attitudes at each level.\textsuperscript{37} Putney and Middleton found no significant relationship between the fathers' education and prejudice in either the northeast or the southeast.\textsuperscript{38}

\textsuperscript{32} Allport and Kramer, \textit{loc. cit.}
\textsuperscript{33} Rosenblith, \textit{loc. cit.}
\textsuperscript{34} Nehnevajsa, \textit{loc. cit.}
\textsuperscript{35} Pettigrew, "Regional Differences in Anti-Negro Prejudice", \textit{loc. cit.}
\textsuperscript{36} Martin and Westie, \textit{loc. cit.}
\textsuperscript{38} Putney and Middleton, \textit{loc. cit.}
The psychologists' contribution to characterizing the intolerant personality has been especially fruitful in the last fifteen years. Summarizing the findings of the relation of personality to prejudice, Williams writes:

From many sources there has arisen an influential current of research based upon the idea that prejudice is not a set of isolated attitudes but rather a functional part of a total personality system. By all odds the most influential study in this field has been The Authoritarian Personality. The bold hypotheses of the original study stimulated many partial replications, and invited critical analysis... The net result is an impressive increment of both new ideas and empirical findings.39

The Authoritarian Personality was based on a study of urban and suburban population on the West Coast of the United States. The main differences in personality structure between the "highs" and "lows" in ethnic prejudice were examined by the authors. Characteristics attributed to the "highs" were: repression, unwillingness to face unacceptable tendencies and impulses, and failure to integrate these tendencies satisfactorily with his conscious image; externalization, mechanism of projecting to others those repressed tendencies such as fear, weakness, passivity, sex impulses, and aggressive feeling against authoritative figures--especially parents--thus making the exterior world the threat rather than the individual, himself; conventionalism, the adoption of and conformity to conventional values and rules due to the need for external support; power, the admiration of and striving for power, a ten-

dency to utilize everything and everybody as means to an end; rigidity. rigid defenses maintained to prevent repressed tendencies from breaking through to the conscious level, with no place for ambivalence or ambiguity.  

In examining the background of the highly prejudiced subjects, the authors found that these individuals grew up in homes where parents tended toward rigid discipline and where affection depended upon approved behavior of the child. Family roles tended to be dominant for the parents and submissive for the child. They hypothesized that the child growing up in this type of home, appearing submissive on the surface, repressed his hostilities and aggressions toward his parents, and through externalization, channeled these feelings toward the out-group. Parents of prejudiced subjects also tended toward preoccupation with problems of status, and as a result the child seemed unduly concerned with status, and with a set of rigid and externalized rules to protect that status.  

Williams proposes two important limitations to these findings:  

1. The responses tend to be such as would be expected on the basis of social realities, e.g., for poor and uneducated persons in our present society, the world often is a threatening "jungle";  

2. ... For some items, at any rate, it appears that variations in responses so closely follow levels of education and social class as to throw serious doubt upon whether personality or culture is being indexed.  

---  

40 Frenkel-Brunswik, loc. cit.  
41 Ibid.  
42 Williams, loc. cit.
Other studies relating personality characteristics to prejudice reported: (1) In Lindzey's study the highly prejudiced students tended to favor conformity to conservative nationalistic statements.\(^4^3\) (2) In McClosky's study conservatism was related to prejudicial attitudes.\(^4^4\) (3) In Martin and Westie's study a significant difference in authoritarianism was apparent between the tolerant and intolerant subjects.\(^4^5\) (4) In Srole's study both anomie and authoritarianism were related positively to prejudice; anomie more strongly related than authoritarianism.\(^4^6\) Roberts and Rokeach found anomie and authoritarianism had equal relationships to prejudice in their replication of Srole's work.\(^4^7\) In a second replication, McDill also found anomie and authoritarianism equally related to prejudice.\(^4^8\) (5) Comparing the strength of the relationships in anti-Semitic prejudice, Kaufman reported a larger correlation between status-concern and prejudice than between authoritarianism and prejudice.\(^4^9\) (6) In the northeast section of their sample,

---

\(^{43}\) Lindzey, loc. cit.


\(^{45}\) Martin and Westie, loc. cit.


\(^{47}\) Ibid.

\(^{48}\) Ibid.

Putney and Middleton discovered a relationship between conservatism, anomia, authoritarianism, and status-concern with prejudice; in addition to these, in the southeast sample they found a relationship between orthodoxy of religion and prejudice.\(^5^0\)

A review of current literature centering around factors affecting prejudicial attitudes yields few generalizations which contribute to comprehensive theoretical explanations of prejudice. Religiosity, whether gauged by orthodoxy or by participation in church activities, has been found positively related, not related, and negatively related to prejudice. The level of educational attainment, rather consistently, was negatively related to prejudice. Both theoretical and empirical studies have shown several personality attributes—authoritarianism, anomia, conservative outlook, and status-concern—to be associated with prejudice.

**BASIC HYPOTHESES**

The inconsistent results obtained in past studies of the relationship between religiosity and prejudice point to the presence of intervening variables which affect the conclusions. Some of these variables, which may be highly related to prejudicial attitudes, are education and personality variables—authoritarianism, anomia, conservatism, and status-concern. To test the relationships of these variables, two sets of hypotheses were drawn up. The first set (Hypotheses I, II, and

---

\(^5^0\) Putney and Middleton, *loc. cit.*
III) has to do with establishing the relationship of each of three dimensions of religiosity, formal education, and each of six personality dimensions with social distance.

Hypothesis I: Religiosity is related to social distance. To support this hypothesis the following sub-hypotheses are proposed:

A. The more orthodox the belief, the more the social distance.

B. The more extrinsic the use of belief, the more the social distance.

C. The more the participation in church activities, the less the social distance.

Hypothesis II: Education is related to social distance. To support this hypothesis the following sub-hypothesis is proposed:

A. The more years of formal education, the less the social distance.

Hypothesis III: Selected personality dimensions are related to social distance. To support this hypothesis the following sub-hypotheses are proposed:

A. The more the anomia, the more the social distance.

B. The more the status-concern, the more the social distance.

C. The more the conservatism, the more the social distance.

D. The more the authoritarianism, the more the social distance.

E. The more the tendency for withdrawal, the more the social distance.

F. The more the anti-social tendency, the more the social distance.

The second set of hypotheses (IV and V) was designed to test the
presence of intervening variables. It was necessary to determine if the separate relationships would remain significant when the effect of each of the remaining variables was controlled; first, when each variable was controlled one at a time, and second, when all remaining variables were controlled simultaneously.

Hypothesis IV: Certain variables are related to social distance when the effect of each of the remaining variables is controlled, one at a time. To support this hypothesis the following sub-hypotheses are proposed:

A. Orthodoxy is related to social distance when the effect of each of the remaining variables is held constant.

B. Extrinsic belief is related to social distance when the effect of each of the remaining variables is held constant.

C. Participation is related to social distance when the effect of each of the remaining variables is held constant.

D. Education is related to social distance when the effect of the remaining variables is held constant (one at a time).

Hypothesis V: Each variable tested is related to social distance when the effect of all remaining variables is controlled simultaneously. To support this hypothesis the following sub-hypotheses are proposed:

A. Orthodox belief is related to social distance when the effect of all the remaining variables is controlled.

B. Extrinsic belief is related to social distance when the effect of all the remaining variables is controlled.

C. Participation is related to social distance when the effect of all the remaining variables is controlled.

D. Education is related to social distance when the effect of all the remaining variables is controlled.
E. Anomia is related to social distance when the effect of all the remaining variables is controlled.

F. Status-concern is related to social distance when the effect of all the remaining variables is controlled.

G. Conservatism is related to social distance when the effect of all the remaining variables is controlled.

H. Authoritarianism is related to social distance when the effect of all the remaining variables is controlled.

I. Withdrawal tendency is related to social distance when the effect of all the remaining variables is controlled.

J. Anti-social tendency is related to social distance when the effect of all the remaining variables is controlled.

With these hypotheses in mind, a conceptual framework was sought within which these basic variables could be studied, and operational definitions were drawn up in order that these variables could be measured and quantified.
CHAPTER III

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

The hypotheses listed above center around one dependent variable --prejudice as social distance--and ten independent variables--orthodoxy, extrinsic, participation, education, conservatism, anomia, status-concern, authoritarianism, withdrawal, and anti-social tendencies.

In order to manipulate these concepts on an empirical level, the following abstract and operational definitions are offered to clarify the instrument employed to measure these variables.

Using Allport's definition as a guide, prejudice has been regarded as antipathy felt toward any ethnic group or any member of an ethnic group. This antipathy was reflected in attitudes held toward ethnic groups. A measure of such attitudes of acceptance or rejection of ethnic groups would show then the degree of prejudicial antipathy held by the respondent.

Walter explains the phenomenon of prejudice on the basis of ethnocentrism and in-group and out-group theory:

What has been said gives support to the consideration of race prejudice as one of many aspects which may be found in the more nearly universal characteristic of ethnocentrism. Basically, ethnocentrism is loyalty to one's group, reinforced by a corollary disdain or hostility toward other groups... The important thing in ethnocentrism is the intensification of one's feeling of attachment to his group.51

It is the individual's loyalty to his in-group which fosters his protective attitude toward that group. These ethnocentric feelings are intensified at any threat from an out-group, and it is in defense of his in-group that the individual assumes the fanciful feelings of superiority toward his own kind. This is the circumstance under which prejudicial attitudes reign supreme, and ultimately conflict can occur between groups.

On the other hand, when ethnocentric feelings are at a minimum, that is, when members of the in-group feel little or no threat from members of the out-group, prejudicial attitudes decline and tolerance may predominate. This conception of prejudicial attitudes has been labeled "social distance" by social psychologists, and various scales have been devised to measure the degree of social distance a respondent may hold toward an out-group member.

The concept of social distance refers to a continuum described by Robert E. Park as the "grades and degrees of understanding and intimacy which characterize presocial and social relations generally." Thus described the continuum ranges from close, warm, and intimate contact on the one hand, through indifference, to active dislike, hostility, and rejection on the other hand.

The measure of social distance used in this study was the Bogardus Scale where acceptance of out-groups, in this case ethnic groups, ranges from marriage to exclusion from the nation.

The review of literature revealed that religiosity is a rather


53 See Appendix B.
ambiguous term used to represent many dimensions of religion and church activity from type of belief, amount of time spent reading the Bible, frequency of church attendance, to denomination where membership was held. Furthermore, the results of past studies, testing any one of these dimensions, have proved inconsistent. For example, one study found a positive relationship between prejudice and church attendance, a second found a negative relationship, and a third found no relationship.\textsuperscript{54}

The main objective of this study, as stated in the problem section, is to examine the relationships of religiosity with social distance both before and after the effects of related personality factors are controlled. Three dimensions of religiosity—orthodoxy, extrinsic, and participation—were chosen because of the associations shown with prejudice in previous investigations.

The first dimension, orthodoxy, describes the kind of belief held. Orthodox belief is fundamentalistic in nature, and closely related to the original Catholic dogma, calling for belief in physical Hell, the Devil, life after death, and a Divine plan and purpose for all earthly things.\textsuperscript{55} A six-item scale was used to measure the degree of orthodoxy of the respondent.\textsuperscript{56}

The second, extrinsic, describes the use made of the belief by

\textsuperscript{54} Studies referred to are Lindzey's, Nehnevajs'a's, and Martin and Westie's, respectively. See Chapter II.

\textsuperscript{55} Putney and Middleton, loc. cit.

\textsuperscript{56} Taken from questionnaire used by Putney and Middleton's study.
the individual in which the religious outlook serves to protect him from a threatening world. The individual's main concern is with the institutional aspects of the church and how his religion can serve him.\(^{57}\) An eight-item scale was used to measure the degree of extrinsic belief of the respondent.\(^{58}\)

The third, participation, describes the intensity of contact with church activities. After conferring with two Protestant ministers, it was decided that attendance at Sunday morning services did not give a true picture of participation in church life. Full participation also involves membership, attendance, and service in other church organizations such as choir, men's and women's associations, and church government. Participation then, was measured on the basis of a combination of present and past activity in the total church program.

Along with these three dimensions of religiosity, education and personality variables were tested. Education was measured by the actual number of years of formal education completed by each respondent. McClosky describes conservatism as the tendency to preserve the status quo, the desire to identify with what "has been", and a resistance to change.\(^{59}\) A nine-item scale was used to measure the degree of conserva-

\(^{57}\) Allport, "Religion and Prejudice", loc. cit.

\(^{58}\) Two items were taken from scale derived by Cody Wilson, loc. cit. Dr. John Photiadis, Rev. Howard Osborne, and author drew up nine items and pretested them on 100 college students for discriminating power. After eliminating three items from the eleven, the Coefficient of Scalability approached 90 per cent.

\(^{59}\) McClosky, loc. cit.
This personality tendency also coincides with the in-group theory of prejudice in that preservation of the status-quo sparks the prejudicial attitudes donned to protect in-group security.

In an effort to clarify the authoritarian syndrome of personality, Kaufman hypothesizes that status-concern is related to prejudice. This is the personality tendency of individuals to value "symbols of status and attainment of higher status." His ten-item scale was used to measure the degree of concern with status by the respondents.

Srole's anomia has been shown to be related to prejudice in several studies. This personality attribute is "the individual's generalized, pervasive sense of ... 'self-to-others distance or alienation', or 'lack of interpersonal integration'." Five items were taken from Srole's original scale to measure the degree of anomia felt by the respondents.

Authoritarianism has been explained as the personality orientation that the way to live and be supported in this threatening world is through obedience to authority figures and through conventionalism or a rigid acceptance of the status-quo, along with a punitive attitude toward violators of obedience and conventionalism. A five-item version

60 Taken from the Putney and Middleton questionnaire.
61 Kaufman, loc. cit.
63 McDill, op. cit., p. 245.
of the California F-Scale was used to measure the degree of authoritarianism harbored by the respondent.64

The personality inclination to reject the social group whether in-group or out-group, and to find greater pleasure in solitary activities or associations with only a few close friends has been labeled withdrawal tendency. Ten items were taken from the 1953 Revision of the California Test of Personality to measure the tendency for withdrawal.65

The personality dimension which not only excludes the social group but casts suspicion on its motives and places the individual in a defensive position where he must protect himself from the encroachment of this threatening society has been termed anti-social tendency. Ten items were taken from the same California test to measure the degree of anti-social tendency of the respondent.66

Within this conceptual framework and these operational definitions the design of this study was conceived, the population was selected, the questionnaire was drawn up, and the mode of analysis was determined.

64 Developed by the Department of Scientific Research of the Jewish Committee, and taken from the Putney and Middleton questionnaire.

65 Ernest Tieg, Willis Clark, and Louis Thorpe, 1953 Revision of the California Test of Personality, Adult Form AA, California Test Bureau: Los Angeles, California. Items in Withdrawal and Anti-Social Tendency Scales were chosen because of their high correlation with the Rorschach Test when comparison made by Glenn Blair and Donald Clark, "Personality Adjustment of 9th Grade Pupils as Measured by the Multiple-Choice Rorschach Test and the California Test of Personality", Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 37, No. 1, 13-20, 1946.

66 Ibid.
CHAPTER IV

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The Sample

Because "church attenders" were the respondents selected for study, the local Ministerial Association was contacted and presented with the problem to be investigated. Several of the ministers showed considerable interest in the project, and permission was obtained from five churches to present a questionnaire to be completed by the members of the congregation either during or immediately following a regular Sunday morning church service during January of 1961.

The population for this study was defined as persons in attendance at the Sunday, January 22, 1961, service of the Baptist, Church of God, Episcopalian, and Roman Catholic churches, and the Sunday, January 29, 1961, service of the Presbyterian church. The elementary sampling unit was any individual, 18 years or older, attending church at the above times and places. A total of 468 questionnaires were completed.

The population was stratified on the basis of orthodoxy and participation. A sample of 300 respondents was selected from this population in order to provide a wide distribution in orthodoxy and participation in church activities.67

67 Tables V, VI, VII, and VIII in Appendix A show both similarities and differences found in sample and total population for social distance, age, years of school completed, and socio-economic status, respectively.
Table I shows the distribution of scores of respondents from Churches A, B, and C (from which most of the sample was drawn) along with average scores for each church and each ethnic group by church. It is interesting to note that Church B, although the average score for all groups lies between Church A and Church C, shows extreme average scores for four of the five ethnic groupings. The average score for Japanese, Greeks, and Indians are the lowest of the three churches. On the other hand, the average score for the Negroes is the highest of any of the three churches. Apparently the three low average scores cannot be accounted for on the basis of a generally lower level of social distance. Church B has had several families of these three ethnic groups as active participants in the church activities. Homan suggests, "The greater the interaction between two persons, the greater the sentiments of affection they feel for one another." If the interaction between the respondents of Church B with Japanese, Greek, and Indian members of this congregation has been favorable, the lower level of social distance displayed here can be explained by the increased sentiment of affection they feel for these families.

The Questionnaire

Because of the tendency of some respondents to answer attitude questions asked by an interviewer on the basis of what they believe to

### Table I: Distribution of Scores on Rogardus Social Distance and Average Scores of Church A, Church B, and Church C for Five Ethnic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score by Church</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>(1) To close kinship by marriage</th>
<th>(2) To personal friends</th>
<th>(3) To neighbors</th>
<th>(4) To employment</th>
<th>(5) To citizenship</th>
<th>(6) As visitors only to my country</th>
<th>(7) Would exclude from my country</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church A Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negros</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church B Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negros</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church C Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negros</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of Churches A, B, C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>425</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be socially accepted attitudes rather than their own personal attitudes, an anonymous, self-administered instrument was drawn up. It was hoped that this type of questionnaire would give a clearer picture of the respondent's attitudes toward ethnic groups, a more accurate description of his beliefs on the orthodoxy and extrinsic scales and of his feelings on the personality scales.69

This questionnaire was designed to be completed by the respondents in less than thirty minutes. When a pretest was run on 200 college students, the average completion time was around twenty minutes. After the questionnaire had been distributed to each congregation, instructions for completion were read.70 Respondents were reminded not to indicate their church denomination, were assured of the anonymity of their responses, and were asked to drop the completed questionnaire in a box at the door of the church as they left.

Method of Analysis

Because the primary goal of this study, as described in the second set of hypotheses, was to test for the existence of a relationship between the variables when the effect of the remaining variables was controlled, partial correlation was selected as the appropriate statistical technique. In spite of the controversy among sociologists as to

69 The questionnaire is found in Appendix B. Explanation and sources of the items follow.

70 Instruction sheet follows questionnaire in Appendix B.
whether or not ordinal scales can be used for this type of analysis, this technique was the only one currently available to control more than three variables simultaneously. The error which is incurred by inferring that the difference between the responses of "four" and "six" is the same as the difference between "five" and "seven" when using a Likert-type ordinal scale, is negated considerably by using a number of items rather than one item, and by using a sizeable sample.

Responses were scored as indicated on the questionnaire as:

7 Strong Agreement 3 Slight Disagreement
6 Moderate Agreement 2 Moderate Disagreement
5 Slight Agreement 1 Strong Disagreement

for the orthodoxy, extrinsic, anomia, conservatism, status-concern, and authoritarianism scales.

Responses were scored as indicated on the questionnaire as:

4 Unquestionably Yes 2 No
3 Yes 1 Unquestionably No

for the withdrawal and anti-social tendency scales.

Responses were scored as indicated on the questionnaire as:

1 To close kinship by marriage
2 To my club as personal friends
3 To my street as neighbors
4 To employment in my occupation
5 To citizenship in my country
6 As visitors only to my country
7 Would exclude from my country

for the social distance scale.

Responses were scored as answered for the number of years of

71 Scores for item six were reversed to adjust for the opposite direction of the statement.
formal education completed.

Responses for participation in church activities were scored as follows:

**Item 81:** How often do you attend church services?

1. Not at all
2. Once a year
3. Twice a year
4. Four or five times a year
5. About once a month
6. About every-other Sunday
7. Almost every Sunday
8. Every Sunday (barring illness)

Items 84 through 91, columns a through e were given a score of ½ to all column entries based on either present or past activity. Column a was omitted in this scoring because Sunday School is not part of all participating churches' activities.\(^{72}\)

When scoring was completed, total scores were obtained for each scale used in measuring the variables tested in this study. Mean total scores were calculated for each variable, and deviations from this mean were recorded for each respondent for the variables.

As required by the first set of hypotheses, zero-order correlations were computed to show the relationship existing between pairs of the eleven variables, according to the following formula:

\[
r_{xy} = \frac{\sum xy}{\sqrt{\left(\sum x^2\right)\left(\sum y^2\right)}}
\]

\(^{72}\) Scores for items 81 and 84 through 91 were combined. Scores assigned to various levels on the basis of judgment of two Protestant ministers, Dr. John Photiadis, and author.

\(^{73}\) Where \(r_{xy}\) is the coefficient of correlation; \(x\) is the deviation of each total score from the mean total score of variable \(x\); \(y\) is the deviation of each total score from the mean total score of \(y\).
As required by the second set of hypotheses, partial correlations from the first-order through the ninth-order were calculated to find the relationship of each independent variable with the dependent variable when the effect of the remaining variables was held constant one at a time, and simultaneously, according to the following formula:

\[
\hat{r}_{ij \cdot k \ldots n} = \frac{r_{ij \cdot k \ldots n} - (r_{in \cdot k \ldots (n-1)}) (r_{jn \cdot k \ldots (n-1)})}{\sqrt{1 - r_{in \cdot k \ldots (n-1)}^2}} \sqrt{1 - r_{jn \cdot k \ldots (n-1)}^2}
\]

The F-test was employed to test level of significance for each of the zero-order and partial correlations.

---

74 Where \( r_{ij \cdot k \ldots n} \) is the \( n - 2 \) (th)-order partial correlation for dependent variable \( i \) and independent variable \( j \) while the effect of \( n - 2 \) variables is controlled, \( k \) being the first controlled variable and \( n \) being the last controlled variable.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

The results of testing the first set of hypotheses by zero-order correlations is presented in the first line of the matrix, Table II.

Hypothesis I: Religiosity is related to social distance. Middleton's and Allport's research has suggested that several dimensions are involved in the relationship between religiosity and prejudice. The following sub-hypotheses were tested to find the relationship of three dimensions of religiosity and social distance:

Sub-hypothesis A: The more orthodox the belief, the more the social distance. The zero-order correlation showed the relationship between these variables was not significant so this sub-hypothesis was not supported. Results here agree with Middleton's findings for college students in the Northeast.

Sub-hypothesis B: The more extrinsic the belief, the more the social distance. The zero-order correlation showed a significant positive relationship between these variables, supporting the sub-hypothesis and Allport's thesis.

Sub-hypothesis C: The more the participation in church activities, the less the social distance. The zero-order correlation showed a significant negative relationship between these variables, supporting the sub-hypothesis and findings of Pettigrew concerning northern protestant church attenders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$X_1$</th>
<th>$X_2$</th>
<th>$X_3$</th>
<th>$X_4$</th>
<th>$X_5$</th>
<th>$X_6$</th>
<th>$X_7$</th>
<th>$X_8$</th>
<th>$X_9$</th>
<th>$X_0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_a$</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.198**</td>
<td>-.159**</td>
<td>-.300**</td>
<td>.156**</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>.308**</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.151**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.205**</td>
<td>-.243**</td>
<td>.173**</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.175**</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.124*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.246**</td>
<td>.251**</td>
<td>.391**</td>
<td>.444**</td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>.129*</td>
<td>.282**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.119*</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.165**</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_4$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.178**</td>
<td>-.266**</td>
<td>-.180**</td>
<td>-.227**</td>
<td>-.202**</td>
<td>-.153**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>.414**</td>
<td>.348**</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>.235**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_6$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.572**</td>
<td>.509**</td>
<td>.125*</td>
<td>.283**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_7$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>.216**</td>
<td>.253**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_8$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.115*</td>
<td>.337**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_9$</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.467**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 5 percent level; ** Significant at the 1 percent level.

$X_a$ = social distance; $X_1$ = orthodoxy; $X_2$ = extrinsic belief; $X_3$ = participation; $X_4$ = education; $X_5$ = anomia; $X_6$ = status concern; $X_7$ = conservatism; $X_8$ = authoritarianism; $X_9$ = withdrawal tendencies; $X_0$ = anti-social tendencies.
The findings from testing the above sub-hypotheses lend support to Hypothesis I, religiosity is related to social distance, only when religiosity is measured by the extrinsic and participation dimensions. For this sample of rural church-goers the degree of prejudicial attitude is not associated with the degree of orthodoxy, belief in the original fundamental doctrine of the early Catholic Church, but rather with the use of that belief in daily relations with fellowmen, and with the frequency of participation in church activities.

Hypothesis II: Education is related to social distance. The findings of Nehnevajsa, Allport and Kramer, Rosenblith, Pettigrew, Martin and Westie, and Lipset showed that education was significantly negatively related to prejudicial attitudes.

Sub-hypothesis A: The more years of formal education, the less the social distance. Ther zero-order correlation showed a significant negative relationship between these variables, supporting this sub-hypothesis and the results of the above studies.

The findings from testing the above sub-hypothesis lend support to Hypothesis II, education is related to social distance. The degree of social distance felt by this sample then is inversely dependent upon the number of years of formal education completed.

Hypothesis III: Selected personality dimensions are related to social distance. Williams' summary of personality attributes found to correlate with prejudice suggested the following sub-hypotheses for testing.

Sub-hypothesis A: The more the anomia, the more the social distance. The zero-order correlation showed a significant positive rela-
tionship between these variables, supporting this sub-hypothesis and the results obtained by Srole, Roberts and Rokeach, McDill, and Middleton.

Sub-hypothesis B: The more the status-concern, the more the social distance. The zero-order correlation showed a significant positive relationship between these variables, supporting this sub-hypothesis and the findings of Kaufman and Middleton.

Sub-hypothesis C: The more the conservatism, the more the social distance. The zero-order correlation showed a significant positive relationship between these variables, supporting this sub-hypothesis and the findings of McClosky and Middleton.

Sub-hypothesis D: The more the authoritarianism, the more the social distance. The zero-order correlation showed a significant positive relationship between these variables, supporting this sub-hypothesis and the findings of Frenkel-Brunswick, Martin and Westie, Srole, Roberts and Rokeach, McDill, and Middleton.

Sub-hypothesis E: The more the withdrawal tendency, the more the social distance. The zero-order correlation failed to show a significant relationship between these variables, thus failing to support this sub-hypothesis.

Sub-hypothesis F: The more the anti-social tendency, the more the social distance. The zero-order correlation showed a significant positive relationship between these variables, supporting this sub-hypothesis.

The findings resulting from the testing of sub-hypotheses A, B, C, D, and F support Hypothesis III, selected personality factors—anomia,
status-concern, conservatism, authoritarianism, and anti-social tendency—are related to social distance. The degree of social distance felt by this sample tended to change as the degree of anomia, status-concern, conservatism, authoritarianism, and anti-social tendency present in personality structure changed. It appears that the tendency for withdrawal from social groupings and the preference for solitary activities or social relations with only close friends has little influence on social distance.

Zero-order correlations showing the relationships between each of the independent variables provided a valid basis for proceeding to test the second set of hypotheses since each independent variable correlated significantly with most of the remaining independent variables. The results of testing the second set of hypotheses by partial correlation are presented in Table III and Table IV.

Hypothesis IV: Certain variables are related to social distance when the remaining variables are controlled one at a time.

Sub-hypothesis A: Orthodoxy is related to social distance when each of the remaining variables is controlled one at a time. As seen in Table III the relationship between orthodoxy and social distance is not significant when extrinsic, education, anomia, status-concern, conservatism, authoritarianism, withdrawal tendencies, or anti-social tendency are controlled. The relationship between orthodoxy and social distance becomes significantly positive, however, when participation is con-

72 See Table II.
### Table III. Relationship Between Social Distance and Orthodoxy, Extrinsic Belief, Participation, and Education When Each Remaining Variable is Held Constant

<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>Orthodoxy</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .082 **</td>
<td>- .128 **</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>- .181 10.000**</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>- .289 26.996**</td>
<td>1.15 26.524**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- .153 7.155**</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>- .264 22.276**</td>
<td>1.15 26.524**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>4.426 **</td>
<td>.193 11.540 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- .286 26.524**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Education</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.134 5.446 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .130 5.105**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>.166 8.391 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .149 6.776**</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .280 25.185**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status-Concern</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>1.519</td>
<td>.085 2.151</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .115 4.010**</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .238 17.833**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatism</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.072 1.530</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .140 5.930**</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .261 21.704**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.063 1.175</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .147 6.548**</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .234 17.244**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Social Tendency</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>1.343</td>
<td>.164 8.158 **</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .158 7.602**</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .282 25.743**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The numbers in the parenthesis indicate the initial relationship between the independent variables and social distance.

* Significant at the 5 percent level; ** Significant at the 1 percent level.
trolled, indicating that when orthodoxy is high and participation is low, there is a positive relationship with social distance.

Sub-hypothesis B: Extrinsic belief is related to social distance when each of the remaining variables is controlled one at a time. First-order correlations show that when orthodoxy, participation, education, anomia, withdrawal tendency, or anti-social tendency are controlled, the relationship between extrinsic belief and social distance remains significantly positive. However, when status-concern, conservatism, or authoritarianism is controlled the initial relationship becomes insignificant. Because of the high relationship between these variables indicated in Table I, a factor analysis might reveal a single dimension which these variables have in common.

Sub-hypothesis C: Participation is related to social distance when each of the remaining variables is controlled one at a time. The partial correlations support this sub-hypothesis for each of the independent variables. The relationship between participation and social distance remains significantly negative when each variable is controlled.

Sub-hypothesis D: Education is related to social distance when each of the remaining variables is controlled one at a time. This sub-hypothesis is supported because the relationship remains significantly negative when each variable is controlled.

The findings from the testing of the above sub-hypotheses do not completely support Hypothesis IV. Orthodoxy is only significantly related to social distance in a positive direction when participation
is controlled. Extrinsic belief maintains its significant relationship only when orthodoxy, participation, education, anomia, withdrawal, or anti-social tendencies are controlled. Education and participation are the only two variables which maintain their significant negative relationships with social distance when the remaining variables are controlled one at a time.

Hypothesis V: Each variable tested is related to social distance when the remaining variables are controlled simultaneously.

Ninth-order correlations for the following sub-hypotheses are listed in Table IV.

Sub-hypothesis A: Orthodoxy is related to social distance when all other variables are controlled simultaneously. The correlation for orthodoxy indicates that although the initial relationship between orthodoxy and social distance moved from positive to negative, it still does not reach a level of significance where the sub-hypothesis is supported.

Sub-hypothesis B: Extrinsic belief is related to social distance when all other variables are controlled simultaneously. The initial positive relationship between extrinsic belief and social distance is diminished to almost zero when the effect of all remaining variables is controlled. This sub-hypothesis is not supported by the partial correlation test.

Sub-hypothesis C: Participation is related to social distance when all remaining variables are controlled. The ninth-order correlation retains the negative relationship approaching the required level
### TABLE IV. NINTH-ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATIONS AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partial Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>F Test*</th>
<th>Conclusion when effect of all remaining variables is controlled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r_{a1.234567890} = -0.42$</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>Orthodox belief is not related significantly to social distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{a2.134567890} = -0.005$</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>Extrinsic belief is not related significantly to social distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{a3.124567890} = -0.101$</td>
<td>2.980</td>
<td>Church participation is related to social distance negatively.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{a4.123567890} = -0.209$</td>
<td>13.271</td>
<td>Formal education is related to social distance negatively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{a5.123467890} = -0.001$</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Anomia is not related significantly to social distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{a6.123457890} = 0.022$</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>Status-concern is not related significantly to social distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{a7.123456890} = -0.038$</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>Conservatism is not related significantly to social distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{a8.123456790} = 0.253$</td>
<td>19.812</td>
<td>Authoritarianism is related to social distance positively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{a9.123456780} = 0.009$</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>Withdrawal tendency is not related significantly to social distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{a0.123456789} = -0.015$</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>Anti-social tendency is not related significantly to social distance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* F values greater than 3.84 and 6.64 are required for significance at the 5 and 1 percent levels respectively.

** Approaches the required level of significance.
of significance between participation and social distance, supporting this sub-hypothesis.

Sub-hypothesis D: Education is related to social distance when all remaining variables are controlled. A significant negative relationship remains between education and social distance in the ninth-order correlation, supporting this sub-hypothesis.

Sub-hypothesis E: Anomia is related to social distance when all remaining variables are controlled. The initial significant positive relationship is lost in the ninth-order correlation and this sub-hypothesis is not supported.

Sub-hypothesis F: Status-concern is related to social distance when all remaining variables are controlled. The ninth-order correlation shows no significant relationship despite the fact that a positive relationship was found in the zero-order calculations, thus failing to support this sub-hypothesis.

Sub-hypothesis G: Conservatism is related to social distance when all remaining variables are controlled. No significant relationship was found in the ninth-order, and this sub-hypothesis is not supported.

Sub-hypothesis H: Authoritarianism is related to social distance when all remaining variables are controlled. A significant positive relationship remains after all other variables are controlled, supporting this sub-hypothesis.

Sub-hypothesis I: Withdrawal tendency is related to social distance when all remaining variables are controlled. No significant rela-
tionship was found in the ninth-order correlation, thus failing to sup­port this sub-hypothesis.

Sub-hypothesis J: Anti-social tendency is related to social dis­tance when all remaining variables are controlled. The initial positive relationship of the zero-order was lost in the ninth-order correlation, and this sub-hypothesis is not supported.

The above sub-hypotheses support Hypothesis V (each variable tested is related to social distance when the remaining variables are controlled simultaneously) for only three of these variables—participation, education, and authoritarianism. What conclusions can be drawn from the changes in these mathematical relationships will be discussed in the following section.

Summary, Limitations, and Conclusions For Each Variable

Former studies have established relationships of religiosity, ed­ucation, and personality with prejudice, although with varying results. The nature of these relationships, that is, whether direct or spurious, has not been probed, however, except through theoretical deducation. This study was designed to explore these relationships in a sample, stratified to provide a distribution for orthodoxy and participation, of church-attenders in this midwestern community. The study has cen­tered around these two problems:

1. What is the initial relationship of religiosity, education, and personality variables with prejudicial attitudes?

2. Which of these initial relationships remain significant when
the effect of other related variables is controlled?

These questions shall be answered by interpreting the above mathematical findings for each variable.

Religiosity

For this sample of midwestern church-goers, the type of belief held, orthodoxy, was not significantly associated with the degree of social distance felt for ethnic groups. When the degree of participation in church activities is negated, orthodoxy was related positively. This can be interpreted to mean that with strong orthodox belief, low participants tend to be more prejudiced. Before making such a conclusion, however, it must be kept in mind that the effects of education, and personality are at work in this relationship. As can be seen in the matrix, Table II, orthodoxy is highly related to authoritarianism. Orthodox belief is in itself authoritarian in nature. The significant relationship between orthodoxy and social distance when only participation is controlled may actually be a reflection of the association which exists between orthodox belief and authoritarianism. When, in the ninth-order, the effects of all other independent variables were controlled, no significant relationship existed between orthodoxy and social distance. Therefore, this population at least gives little basis for assuming any relationship between these two variables.

Although the initial relationship between the extrinsic use of belief and social distance indicated a direct relationship, the relationship approached zero when all remaining variables were controlled.
Examination of the first-order correlations, Table III, showed that this initial relationship was negated when status-concern, conservatism, or authoritarianism was controlled. Allport's extrinsic belief is used by the individual with just such personality characteristics, and the findings here indicate that this dimension of religiosity may be related to these personality factors rather than to social distance, itself. This in no way detracts from his thesis, however, for it provides further connection between the relationship of the use made of belief, and the personality of the user. For this population at least, this study shows extrinsic belief only indirectly related to social distance through the personality factors listed above.

Of the three religiosity variables tested here, the degree of participation of the respondents seems the most reliable indicator of the level of social distance held. The relationship between these variables not only remained significantly negative when the remaining variables were controlled one at a time, but also when the remaining variables were controlled simultaneously. Therefore, it can be concluded that as participation in church activities increases, the social distance felt for other ethnic groups decreases, regardless of the type of belief held, the use made of this belief, and regardless of the personality characteristics of the respondents. This relationship verifies the fact that the education job of the church can indeed be effective, and that the church can make a real contribution in the education for tolerance toward other ethnic groups.
Education

The picture for education is much the same as for participation, a negative relationship even after the effects of the remaining variables have been controlled. This means that personality does not intervene between education and social distance, and that the less prejudiced attitudes of the highly educated are not necessarily due to the personality adjustment of those who enter college. The school can be a second agency for the creation of more tolerant attitudes even among those students with a more authoritarian orientation.

Personality Variables

Of the personality variables tested, only Adorno's authoritarianism seems directly related to social distance. While anomia, status-concern, conservatism, and anti-social tendency were all related to social distance initially, when the effect of the remaining variables was controlled, these relationships lost significance. Examination of the matrix, Table II, shows that each of these variables is highly related to authoritarianism. A factor analysis may show that these variables have a dimension common to authoritarianism. In fact, the definition of authoritarianism includes aspects of these variables. Whatever dimensions Adorno's concept may include, this study found authoritarianism positively related to social distance regardless of religiosity, education, or the remaining personality variables, for the church-attenders of this community.

These conclusions must be viewed in light of certain limitations.
First, the attributes of this stratified sample cannot be compared with samples of other populations. Because the main goal was to study the relationships of basic variables within a church-attending population rather than description of a particular population, no attempt was made to simulate randomness. A replication of this study on a larger population randomly drawn would add a great deal to the meaning of findings here. Second, only ten of the many factors found related to prejudice have been dealt with here. This does not assume that there are other, and perhaps equally important, variables related to this phenomenon. Age of respondent, socio-economic status, church denomination, amount of contact, type of contact—equal-status or non-equal-status—are suggested variables for further research. Third, direction of causality has only been assumed, and no inference of causality can be taken from this ex post facto study. Fourth, accuracy and comprehensiveness of attitude scales used here still have much to be desired. Bogardus' Scale of Social Distance has been challenged on several occasions, particularly on the lowest level of admittance to close kinship by marriage. Realizing its limitations, this scale was used because directions for answering are easily understood and because less time is taken than with other social distance scales. Future research could increase accuracy of results by employing scales more closely resembling the interval type. Fifth, the use of ordinal scales in the absence of validated interval scales for zero-order correlations introduces some error which must be considered in viewing the mathematical findings.

73 Highly correlated with level of education.
With these limitations in mind, Allport's question is again asked: "Can citizens learn to seek their own welfare and growth not at the expense of their fellow men, but in concert with them?"\textsuperscript{74}

While this exploratory study cannot directly answer this question, it can lend support to some of the answers given in past studies. By isolating from the effect of intervening variables, the relationships of religiosity, education and personality factors with social distance, it was found that the more the participation in church activities, the more the education, the less the authoritarianism, the less the social distance. It seems plausible then, that tolerance for other ethnic groups can be fostered through the educational role of both the church and the school.

\textsuperscript{74} Allport, \textit{The Nature of Prejudice}, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 518.
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TABLE V. SOCIAL DISTANCE MARGINALS AND PERCENTAGES FOR SAMPLE STUDIED AND TOTAL POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Social Distance Score: M = 10.74 M = 11.22

Comparison of the mean social distance scores for the sample and the population indicates that on the average the population was slightly more prejudiced than the sample. Although this difference was not submitted to a test of significance, the difference seems negligible.
### TABLE VI. AGE MARGINALS AND PERCENTAGES FOR SAMPLE STUDIED AND TOTAL POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age In Years</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Age:**

- **Sample:** \( M = 38.3 \)
- **Population:** \( M = 39.6 \)

Comparison of the mean ages for the sample and the total population shows an average difference of less than one year. Although this difference was not submitted to a test of significance, the difference seems negligible.
TABLE VII. EDUCATION MARGINALS AND PERCENTAGES FOR SAMPLE STUDIED AND TOTAL POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of School Years Completed</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean number of school years completed

M = 15.04  
M = 14.25
Comparison of the mean number of years of education completed for the sample and the total population shows an average difference of less than a year. Although this difference was not submitted to a test of significance, the difference seems negligible. It is interesting to note, however, that there is a consistently higher percentage of respondents at each level below fourteen years of school in the total population. The reverse is true for over thirteen years of school completed.

**TABLE VIII. SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS MARGINALS AND PERCENTAGES FOR SAMPLE STUDIED AND TOTAL POPULATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-28</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-32</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 300 100.0 396 100.0

Mean Total Socio-Economic Status Score

Sample  $M = 24.38$

Population  $M = 20.83$
Comparison of the mean total socio-economic status scores (score obtained by combining education, occupational level, and income level) shows the members of the sample to be of a slightly higher status than the members of the population. There are consistently higher percentages in the lower four levels in the total population.
APPENDIX B
OPINION SURVEY

This is an Anonymous Questionnaire

DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME

DO NOT INDICATE YOUR DENOMINATION

This anonymous questionnaire is designed for all congregations from all churches in our community. Its purpose is to get some idea of what people think about some basic issues. It is hoped that the answers found here will help civic and church leaders to establish a more realistic approach to our modern society. The information needed is information which only you can give. What is wanted is your frank opinions. Please answer all of the questions.

Some of the information asked for is confidential, and it will be treated as confidential.

After you have completed the questionnaire, you will be asked to drop it in a collection box.

PLEASE BE SURE THAT YOU ANSWER EACH QUESTION
The statements listed below are those with which some people agree and others disagree. Please mark each one in the left margin, according to the amount of your agreement or disagreement, by using the following scale:

7 Strong Agreement  3 Slight Disagreement
6 Moderate Agreement  2 Moderate Disagreement
5 Slight Agreement  1 Strong Disagreement

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.

7. The church should not concern itself with government programs for economic or social welfare.

8. If a man is satisfied with his religious ideas he should not allow his belief to be changed by people with other religious ideas.

9. The principal reason people join a church is to gain a deep feeling of security in this troubled world.

10. Prayer is, above all else, a means of obtaining needed benefits, protection, and safety in a dangerous world.

11. One’s belief cannot be enriched by discussion with non-believers.

12. Prayer puts the power of God at our disposal.

13. God acts so as to reward those who express respect and adoration toward Him.

14. In God’s eyes, the Christian is superior to the non-Christian.
15. The church should give more help to those who give the most time, talent, and money to it.

16. The church should avoid the controversial issues surrounding civil rights.

17. If one's belief is firmly based, it should serve as a buffer to the outside world.

18. In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse.

19. It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.

20. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.

21. These days a person doesn't really know what he can count on.

22. There's little use writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man.

23. If you start trying to change things very much, you usually make them worse.

24. No matter how we like to talk about it, political authority really comes not from us, but from some higher power.

25. It's better to stick by what you have than to be trying new things you don't really know about.

26. A man doesn't really get to have much wisdom until he's well along in years.

27. I prefer the practical man anytime to the man of ideas.

28. If something grows up over a long time, there will always be much wisdom in it.

29. I'd want to know something would really work before I'd be willing to take a chance on it.

30. All groups can live in harmony in this country, without changing the system in any way.
We must respect the work of our forefathers and not think that we know better than they did.

The extent of a man's ambition to better himself is a pretty good indicator of his character.

In order to merit the respect of others, a person should show the desire to better himself.

One of the things you should consider in choosing your friends is whether they can help you make your way in the world.

Ambition is the most important factor in determining success in life.

One should always try to live in a highly respectable residential area even though it entails sacrifices.

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.

Possession of proper social etiquette is usually the mark of a desirable person.

The raising of one's social position is one of the more important goals in life.

It is worth considerable effort to assure one's self of a good name with the right kind of people.

An ambitious person can almost always achieve his goals.

The most important thing to teach children is absolute obedience to their parents.

Any good leader should be strict with people under him in order to gain their respect.

There are two kinds of people in the world: the weak and the strong.

Prison is too good for sex criminals. They should be publicly whipped or worse.

No decent man can respect a woman who has had sex relations before marriage.
The following questions are designed to show what you usually think, how you usually feel, or what you usually do about things. Use the following scale to show the degree of positiveness or negativeness you wish to express:

4 Unquestionably Yes  2 No
3 Yes  1 Unquestionably No

47. Are certain people so unreasonable that you hate them?

48. Do you find it more pleasant to think about desired successes than to work for them?

49. Do you find that many people seem perfectly willing to take advantage of you?

50. Do you find many financial problems that cause you a great deal of worry?

51. Are your responsibilities and problems often such that you cannot help but get discouraged?

52. Do you often feel lonesome even when you are with people?

53. Are conditions frequently so bad that you find it hard to keep from feeling depressed?

54. Do you prefer to be alone rather than to have close friendships with many of the people around you?

55. Do you find it difficult to overcome the feeling that you are inferior to others in many respects?

56. Do you generally go out of your way to avoid meeting someone you dislike?

57. Do you often feel depressed because you are not popular socially?

58. Are you often forced to show some temper in order to get what is coming to you?

59. Are many of your acquaintances so conceited that you find it necessary to insult them?

60. Do you often have to insist that your friends do things that they don't care to do?

61. Do you find it easy to get out of trouble by telling "white lies"?
62. Do you have to assert yourself more than others in order to get recognition?

63. Are your friends and associates often so unfair that you do not respect them?

64. Do people who leave their houses or cars unlocked deserve to have things stolen?

65. Does someone at home disturb you so much that you find it necessary to "squelch" them?

66. Have you found that getting even is better than "taking it" too much of the time?

67. Have many people treated you so unjustly that you are warranted in having a grudge against them?

Directions: According to my first feeling reactions I would willingly admit members of each race or nationality (as a class and not the best I have known, nor the worst members I have known) to one or more of the classifications which I have circled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To close kinship by marriage</th>
<th>To my club as personal friends</th>
<th>To my Street as neighbors</th>
<th>To employment in my occupation</th>
<th>To citizenship in my country</th>
<th>As visitors only to my country</th>
<th>Would exclude from my country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68. Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Jews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Greeks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Negroes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Scandinavian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Indians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D

75. Please state your present age: __

E

76. Circle the number of years of school you completed: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 or more.

F

77. Write X beside the item which represents your present family income.

Under $2,000 $6,000 - $6,999
$2,000 - $3,999 $7,000 - $8,999
$4,000 - $4,999 $9,000 - $11,999
$5,000 - $5,999 $12,000 and over

G

78. Write X beside the item which best fits your main occupation, that is, the one from which you make most of your income (or husband's income).

___ Farmer
___ Farm laborer
___ Professional worker, doctor, lawyer, teacher, social worker
___ Business man, owner, or manager
___ Clerk, clerical worker, or salesman
___ Unskilled laborer other than farm laborer
___ Skilled tradesman: carpenter, plumber, mechanic, etc.
___ Student
___ Retired - what former occupation ___________________
___ Other. What? ____________________________________
79. Are you presently a member of any church? __ 

80. How long ago did you join this or any other church through a formal ceremony (confirmation, or confession of faith, or declaration, or admission to membership)? ____ yrs.

81. How often do you attend church services:
   ____ Not at all
   ____ Once a year
   ____ Twice a year
   ____ Four or five times a year
   ____ About once a month
   ____ About every-other Sunday
   ____ Almost every Sunday
   ____ Every Sunday (barring illness)

82. Do you contribute to the finances of this or any church by tithe or definite pledge -
   ____ tithe regular contribution monthly ___
   ____ tithe regular contribution weekly ___
   ____ tithe occasional contribution ___
   ____ not at all ___

83. Write X to indicate: Male ____; Female ___. 
In the table below: Write X in the blank boxes to indicate in which church organizations you are presently participating or have participated.

**NAME OF CHURCH ORGANIZATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Men's or Women's School</th>
<th>Men's or Prayer Study</th>
<th>Local or State Governing Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84. Member now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Past Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Attend Occasionally now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Attended Occasionally in the past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Now Attend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Regularly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Have Attended Regularly in the Past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Use Number rather than X)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Present Committee Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Office held in the Past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Presently Holding Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Instruction sheet to be used by administrators:

This is an opinion survey. Its form is anonymous questionnaire.

PLEASE DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME

PLEASE DO NOT INDICATE YOUR DENOMINATION

After you have completed the questionnaire, please place it in the collection box (then tell where the box is located).

On pages 1 through 3, you will find listed statements with which some people agree and others disagree. The instructions ask you to indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement by:

7 Strong Agreement; 6 Moderate Agreement; 5 Slight Agreement;
3 Slight Disagreement; 2 Moderate Disagreement;
1 Strong Disagreement

Every time you answer a question please look at this scale.

On the middle of page 3, you will find listed questions designed to show what you usually think, how you usually feel, or what you usually do about things. The directions ask you to indicate the degree of positiveness or negativeness you feel by:

4 Unquestionably yes; 3 Yes; 2 No; 1 Unquestionably no

On page 5, you are asked to indicate the kind of relationship you would favor with the nationality groups and racial groups listed in the table. The directions ask that you draw a circle only around the number representing the relationship which you approve with each group listed.

The remainder of the blanks are self-explanatory.

Are there any questions?

May we remind you again: Express your frank opinion.

Do not sign your name.

Do not indicate your denomination.

Please be sure that you answer each question.
Sources of Items in Questionnaire

Cover Page: This instruction sheet was drawn up to explain the purpose of the survey, to assure anonymity, and to urge all respondents to answer each question.

Pages one through four: At the top of these pages instructions are given to respondents to answer with numbers corresponding to a seven-point Likert response scale. Items one through six were taken from Putney and Middleton Orthodox Religious Belief Scale. Items seven through seventeen were drawn up to measure extrinsic belief. Items nine and ten were taken from Wilson's Extrinsic Scale. Items eighteen through twenty-two were taken from Srole's Anemia Scale. Items twenty-three through thirty-one were taken from McClasky's Conservatism Scale. Items thirty-two through forty-one were taken from Kaufman's Status-concern Scale. Items forty-two through forty-six were taken from the five-item version of the California F-Scale. Items forty-seven through fifty-two were taken from Tieg, Clark, and

74 Putney and Middleton, loc. cit.
75 As stated earlier, Dr. John Photiadis, Rev. Howard Osborne, and author drew up extrinsic items and pretested them on 100 college students for discriminating power.
76 Wilson, loc. cit.
77 Srole, loc. cit.
78 Kaufman, loc. cit.
79 Developed by the Department of Scientific Research of the Jewish Committee.
80 McClasky, loc. cit.
Thorpe's Withdrawal Tendency Scale. Items fifty-three through sixty-seven were taken from Tieg, Clark, and Thorpe's Anti-social Tendency Scale.

Pages five through seven: Items sixty-eight through seventy-four were taken from the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. Item seventy-five was chronological age in years. Item seventy-six was number of years of formal education completed. Item seventy-eight was to show occupation of family head. Items seventy-nine through eighty-two indicate membership, length of membership, frequency of attendance, and regularity of contribution to the church. Item eighty-three indicated "male" or "female". Items eighty-four through ninety-three indicated degree of participation, past and present, in various church organizations—Sunday School, choir, men's and women's associations, prayer and study groups, and governing boards.

---

81 Tieg, Clark, and Thorpe, _loc. cit._
82 Ibid.