

A STUDY OF PREJUDICE IN RELATION TO PERSONALITY,
EDUCATION, AND RELIGION

by

EUNICE NIELSON BRUCE

B. A., University of Kansas, 1941

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree


MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Economics and Sociology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1963

Approved by:


Major Professor

LD
266B
R4
1963
8887
6.2
Docu-
ments

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	111
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	v
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND DERIVATIVE HYPOTHESIS	5
The Literature	5
Derivative Hypotheses	12
III. METHODOLOGY	13
Operational Definitions	13
Procedure	15
IV. RESULTS, SUMMARY, AND CONCLUSIONS	19
Results	19
Summary	20
Conclusions	23
V. APPENDIX	26
VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY	41

PREFACE

The research reported here is part of a team effort in the investigation of prejudice at the South Dakota State College in the Department of Rural Sociology. The idea was first discussed in a "Methods of Research" class of five graduate students, three of whom later undertook responsibility for a definite part of the prejudice project, under the direction of the teacher. The writer of this report, a Kansas State University graduate student, who was taking the Methods of Social Research course for transfer, also took part in the study.

The study was planned in advance to include a number of independent variables with prejudice as a dependent variable so that several sets of hypotheses concerning prejudice relationships could be tested.

One graduate student, whose thesis concerned attitude measurement scales, was responsible for the questionnaire and also selected the sample from which data were used.

The writer was responsible for distributing and collecting the questionnaires at one of the churches where data were obtained. This included meeting with the minister to make advance arrangements, answering questions from the congregation while questionnaires were being completed, etc.

The writer also worked with others on the team in scoring the questionnaires.

Finally, the writer assumed responsibility for calculating zero order correlations for all the nine variables with prejudice, and testing their significance.

Another graduate student, using these same data, then continued the investigation by calculating ninth order partial correlations for these same relationships. Her table of findings will also be included here.

The teacher plans a future study, using these data, on the relationship between church participation and orthodox belief as affected by selected personality variables.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer expresses sincere appreciation to Dr. Ralph E. Dakin for the counsel and guidance which made this report possible and to Professor Glenn Long for helpful suggestions.

Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. John D. Photiadis of the South Dakota State College Rural Sociology Department for his supervision, and to the entire staff at the South Dakota State Sociology Department for their cooperation and the use of their facilities.

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Zero Order Correlations and Their Significance . .	21
2. Ninth Order Partial Correlations and Their Significance	22
3. Relationship Between Prejudice and Orthodoxy, Extrinsic Belief, Church Participation, and Education When Remaining Variables are Held Constant	27

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Research in the field of inter-cultural relations becomes increasingly important today as the earth's peoples move into closer contact. This research takes many directions - including sociological, psychological, anthropological, and historical. One problem which has received much attention from both sociologists and psychologists in the past decade is ethnic prejudice. Further understanding of the causes and correlates of prejudice is the first step toward easing cultural conflicts and tension. Also, further exploration of prejudice can contribute to a theoretical background in the fields of personality development and social organization.

Most of these studies indicate that ethnic prejudice is not an independent attitude, but a function of the total personality system. It appears to be only potential in children¹ but developed along with other personality traits during the socialization process. Two influential elements of the socialization process, education and religion, will be considered in this study along with some personality traits suspected of coexisting with prejudice.

¹Gordon W. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice (Boston: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1955).

Generally, recent studies have found prejudice correlated positively with certain personality factors (anomia, authoritarianism, etc.) and negatively with education. The relation of prejudice to religion is less clear; some studies have found a positive relationship and others a negative one. The present study attempts to provide new information by re-exploring these relationships. It is unique in three ways: 1. The population was a group of church-goers in a small mid-western community. 2. Partial correlation was used to measure separately the relationships between each pair of variables when the effects of other related variables have been eliminated. 3. A new dimension has been added to religion to help disentangle the effects of its various components on prejudice.

Religion will be considered in three dimensions: Church participation (which has not been treated before), orthodoxy, and extrinsic religious beliefs.

Extrinsic religious values, which emphasize the external manifestations of religion, have already been found by W. Cody Wilson² and others to be positively connected with prejudice. Yet Bettelheim and Janowitz,³ in their study among veterans, found religious motivation underlying and strengthening tolerant attitudes. To fully understand the influence of religion, it must be necessary to break it down further in search of the

²W. Cody Wilson, "Extrinsic Religious Values and Prejudice," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LX (March, 1960), p. 286.

³B. Bettelheim and M. Janowitz, The Dynamics of Prejudice (New York: Harper & Bros., 1950).

elements which apparently have opposing effects.

Church participation, which implies regular exposure to "Love Thy Neighbor" teachings, could be expected to affect prejudice negatively. This counter influence could be one of the dimensions responsible for the uncertain balance in religion-prejudice relationships. It is popularly supposed that the church is one institution we can count on to help develop tolerance. Yet the present evidence is conflicting.

Orthodoxy, also, has already been found positively related to prejudice by some investigators.⁴ Perhaps the "authoritarian personality" is inclined toward both prejudice and orthodoxy. We can learn more about this when we control the personality variables by partial correlation and see what relationship remains between orthodoxy and prejudice.

Education has been repeatedly found in negative correlation with prejudice. References to this can be found in Allport,⁵ Adorno,⁶ Roberts and Rokeach,⁷ and Kaufman,⁸ among others. This part of our study is replication.

⁴T. C. Keedy, Jr., "Anomie and Religious Orthodoxy," Sociology and Social Research, XLIII (Sept.-Oct., 1958), p. 34.

⁵Allport, loc. cit.

⁶T. W. Adorno, et al., The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper and Bros., 1950), p. 281.

⁷Alan H. Roberts and Milton Rokeach, "Anomie, Authoritarianism, and Prejudice, A Replication," American Journal of Sociology, LXI (Jan., 1956), p. 355.

⁸Walter C. Kaufman, "Status, Authoritarianism, and Anti-Semitism," American Journal of Sociology, LXII (Jan., 1957), p. 379.

The personality traits investigated are: anomia, authoritarianism, status concern, conservatism, withdrawal tendencies, and anti-social tendencies. Each of these has been studied previously and found by someone to be in positive correlation with prejudice. However, these traits also correlate with each other to some extent. Thus their relative importance in relation to prejudice has remained uncertain. Use of partial correlation techniques should enable clarification of these relationships.

So we are attacking a familiar problem from a slightly different angle. We hope to learn more about personality traits as they relate to prejudice, more about the relations of various religious dimensions to prejudice, and more about the effects of two of the socializing institutions which may help reduce prejudice and foster tolerance.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND DERIVATIVE HYPOTHESES

The Literature

Outstanding among many studies concerning personality traits in their relation to prejudice are those published in 1950 by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, Sanford, and others.¹ This book was part of a social studies series sponsored by the American Jewish Committee. The primary concern was to discover whether the "potentially fascistic" individual really exists, and what he is like. The major finding was that certain individuals do show more susceptibility to the fascist propaganda, and these individuals have numerous characteristics in common.

Group, as well as individual studies were performed in the search for "patterns of dynamically related factors." First, anonymous questionnaires were administered to a large group of people. Facts about each subject's past and present life were elicited, together with their opinions on various social issues. Individuals whose scores on the questionnaire placed them at the extreme ends of the resulting continuum (and a few from the center) were selected for further study by members of the team. Interviews, and various special clinical techniques such as the

¹Adorno, loc. cit.

thematic apperception test, were used to reveal the patterns of attitudes and values, and the underlying wishes, fears, and defenses of these subjects.

Personality was defined by Adorno et al. as "essentially an organization of needs." These researchers concluded that personality was a determinant of ideological preferences in politics, economics, religion, race relations, etc.

Conventionality, rigidity, repressive denial, and the ensuing break-through of one's weakness, fear, and dependency, are but aspects of the same fundamental personality pattern, and they can be observed in personal life as well as in attitudes toward religion and social issues.²

The personality syndrome described in the above quotation was termed "the Authoritarian Personality" by Adorno and his colleagues. One of the variables in our study will be authoritarianism as measured by the same scale developed by the Adorno group.

The research and publications of Gordon Allport³ have an important influence on recent prejudice literature. His well-known assertion that four-fifths of Americans are prejudiced is a challenge to those of us who would study individual-group adjustments. He published a detailed description of the nature of prejudice together with his theory of its multiple causation, and suggested remedial programs.

Allport's own research and many subsequent studies, including this one, draw at least some of their hypotheses from two

²Ibid., p. 971.

³Allport, loc. cit.

theories which he contributed--the multiple causation theory of the nature of prejudice, and the extrinsic-intrinsic religious values concept. According to this theory, the personality structure of the prejudiced is rooted in one or more of the following: insecurity, early traumatic experience, unfavorable parental influence, misshapen philosophy, and religion or its lack. Personality traits growing from these same roots include: rigidity, authoritarianism, ambivalence, dichotomization, externalization (lack of insight), conservatism, conventionalism, stereotypy, egocentrism, humorlessness, and immaturity. His general conclusion in the area of personality-prejudice relationships was summed up in his statement, "The development of mature and tolerant personalities is largely a matter of building inner security."⁴

At the time of Allport's writings, the relationship between religion and prejudice was hopelessly confused. Empirical evidence could be cited to show that the religious are more prejudiced than the non-religious. Other empirical evidence supported the opposite theory, that the religious are more tolerant. It was Allport who suggested that there are two kinds of religion, depending upon the individual motivation for church affiliation. He coined the terms "extrinsic" and "intrinsic" to represent two different approaches to religion. Those individuals whose religious values are extrinsic seek in the church the comfort and security of an ethnocentric and self-exalting "in-group," with a

⁴Ibid., p. 441.

power structure and conventional acceptance pattern. These people can be expected to have higher levels of prejudice. On the other hand, the individual whose religious values are intrinsic, emphasizes the content rather than the form of his religion; the universalistic teachings appeal to him. This is the type of religion which apparently correlates with lower levels of prejudice.

For our present research we have borrowed Allport's idea and constructed an "Extrinsic Religious Values Scale." Also, at least three of our other variables were explored earlier by Gordon Allport: Education, Conservatism, and Authoritarianism.

Leo Srole, of the Psychiatry Department at Cornell, was one of the first to test several dimensions simultaneously in their relation to prejudice.⁵ Srole, who set out to test Durkheim's anomia concept, studied three variables: anomia, authoritarianism, and prejudice. The hypothesis for Srole's study was: "Anomie in individuals is associated with a rejective orientation towards outgroups in general, and toward minority groups in particular."⁶ He found each of these significantly related to each of the others. His Springfield study, published in 1956, inspired several replications. All found these relationships significant, but disagreed on the "most important." Srole considered anomia to be the most important

⁵Leo Srole, "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries, An Exploratory Study," American Sociological Review, XXI (Dec., 1956), p. 709.

⁶Ibid., p. 712.

correlate of prejudice because of the higher correlation figure. Roberts and Rokeach,⁷ however, found anomia and authoritarianism equally high in their correlation with prejudice, but authoritarianism higher when the other was held constant. Part of this study is a replication of Srole's work. It utilizes the anomia scale which he developed and the authoritarian scale he employed (the California F).⁸ The prejudice scale, used in this study, however, is one developed by Bogardus.

Walter C. Kaufman, believing there should be a more satisfactory explanation of anti-Semitism than "the ill-defined aspects of personality," devised a Status Concern Scale.⁹ He administered this "SC" scale to 213 non-Jewish undergraduates along with the California F (authoritarianism) and the AS (anti-Semitism). His conclusions as a result of this testing were:

Concern with status is more closely related to Anti-Semitism than is Authoritarianism; and the relationship between authoritarianism and anti-Semitism may be largely explained by their mutual relationship to status concern.¹⁰

Roberts and Rokeach, however, reported from their research that status concern had a negligible relation to prejudice.¹¹ Mr. Kaufman's SC scale has been used in this research to determine

⁷Roberts and Rokeach, loc. cit.

⁸Ernest Tieg, Willis Clark, and Louis Thorpe, "1953 Revision of the California Test of Personality, Adult Form AA," California Test Bureau, Los Angeles, California, 1953.

⁹Kaufman, loc. cit.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 382.

¹¹Roberts and Rokeach, loc. cit.

which point of view is supported by these data.

A later investigation of the anomie-authoritarianism-prejudice syndrome was done by Edward McDill of Vanderbilt University and published in 1960.¹² His questionnaire used the same five anomie items and five authoritarian items used by Srole in the original study and by Roberts and Rokeach in their replication. He also collected data on education and socio-economic status. McDill's results were strikingly similar to those of Roberts and Rokeach, except that he found the correlation between authoritarianism and prejudice with anomie controlled almost identical with the correlation between anomie and prejudice when authoritarianism was controlled. McDill concluded that there must be a common psychological dimension underlying the three scales. He proceeded with a factor analysis of the items comprising the three measurement scales. This produced, "a general factor accounting for 45% of the total variance and 75% of the common variance of the items composing the three scales." McDill labeled this factor "negative Weltanschauung" and described it as "a feeling of self-to-others alienation, a lack of interpersonal integration."¹³

Although conservatism has been mentioned in connection with prejudice by both Adorno and Allport, Herbert McCloskey, at the University of Minnesota, was the first to develop a scale

¹²Edward McDill, "Anomie, Authoritarianism, Prejudice, and Socio-Economic Status, an Attempt at Clarification," Social Forces, XXXIX (March, 1961), p. 239.

¹³Ibid., p. 244.

for measuring conservative attitudes.¹⁴ Starting with 1200 responses to a pool of 43 items, McCloskey later reduced this to a nine-item scale, published in 1957. This scale was used in this study to measure conservatism. McCloskey did not include prejudice in his research, but he sought to show a relationship between personality type and conservatism. He concluded that conservatives rate higher in "less desirable" characteristics including hostility, suspicion, and rigidity. This is definitely part of the problem we are attacking, particularly his statement: "Persons who feel inadequate are quickest to aggress against others."¹⁵

T. C. Keedy, Jr., of the University of Maryland, studied anomia, authoritarianism, prejudice, and religious orthodoxy of middle class undergraduates in a small southern denominational school.¹⁶ Keedy developed his own ten-item religious orthodoxy scale to use along with the usual Srole anomia and authoritarianism scales and a ten-item version of the Adorno ethnocentrism scale. His conclusions, published in 1958, were that authoritarianism and religious orthodoxy are two important independent correlates of ethnocentrism.

W. Cody Wilson, of Harvard, developed an Extrinsic Religious Values Scale (the ERV, published in 1960),¹⁷ to measure

¹⁴Herbert McCloskey, "Conservatism and Personality," American Political Science Review, LII (March, 1958), p. 27.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 43.

¹⁶Keedy, op. cit.

¹⁷W. Cody Wilson, op. cit.

the "self-serving" aspect of religion. He found a positive and significant correlation between this and a twelve-item version of the California Anti-Semitism Scale. This study includes a group of items aimed at measuring Extrinsic Religious Values which differ somewhat from Wilson's ERV. Only two items are identical with Wilson's. All are inspired by insights developed in both Adorno's and Allport's books.

Derivative Hypotheses

Although these studies do not agree completely, there is a common theme. Along with many others, they approach the study of social problems from the angle of personality adjustment. In the study of prejudice, in particular, the findings have been fairly similar. Prejudice has been found to exist more often along with certain types of personality adjustments, certain types of religious orientation, and a lack of formal education. Using these findings as a basis, the following hypotheses have been tested in our prejudice investigation:

1. Certain personality traits (authoritarianism, anomia, conservatism, status concern, withdrawal tendencies, and anti-social tendencies) are positively related to prejudice.
2. Education is negatively related to prejudice.
3. Two dimensions of religiosity--orthodoxy and extrinsic religious values--are positively related to prejudice, but church participation is negatively related to prejudice.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Operational Definitions

Prejudice. Prejudice, the term, evolved from "pre-judgment." Today it has the connotation of "unfavorable pre-judgment." Webster puts it "An opinion adverse to anything before sufficient knowledge." Ben Hecht calls it "our ruse to dislike others rather than ourselves." For this study we use the term in its ethnocentric sense, as categorical pre-judgments favoring one's own racial group over others.

Authoritarianism. Authoritarianism is a personality orientation toward acceptance of authority figures, with punitive reaction toward disobedience to authority, and toward violators of the established power system.

Anomia. The anomia concept came originally from Durkheim. It has been described by both Leo Srole¹ and Edward McDill² as "a feeling of self-to-others alienation."

Status concern. Walter C. Kaufman³ has stated that his Status Concern Scale, which has been used in this research, was designed to measure "the tendency to put a high value on symbols

¹Srole, op. cit.

²McDill, op. cit.

³Kaufman, op. cit.

of status, and on attainment of higher status."

Conservatism. Herbert McCloskey's⁴ conservatism scale, one part of the schedule in the Appendix, purports to measure "the tendency to resist change and try to preserve the status quo."

Withdrawal tendency. Withdrawal tendency in this study is meant to express an inclination to reject the social group and associate with only a few persons on an individual basis.

Anti-social. Anti-social tendency is a defensive reaction. It involves rejection of the social group and a feeling of need for protection from it.

Education. Education, as measured in this study, is the number of years of regular formal schooling an individual has completed.

Orthodoxy. Orthodoxy is the fundamentalist kind of religious belief which includes belief in physical Hell, the Devil, life after death, and a Divine plan for all things.

Extrinsic religious values. Extrinsic religious values refer to the use an individual makes of his belief. To the extent that a person uses his religion as a defense against the world rather than as a way to live in it, to that extent, his religious values are "extrinsic" rather than "intrinsic."

Church participation. Church participation has been measured in this study as the intensity of contact with church teachings and activities. A combination of past and present activity in the total church program were included.

⁴McClaskey, op. cit.

Procedure

An anonymous questionnaire was administered to test the hypotheses. It was designed to ascertain personal attitudes with the least pressure for socially acceptable responses. This instrument included the Bogardus Social Distance Scale⁵ as the measure of prejudice best adapted to the questionnaire form. Nationalities included were German, Scandinavian, Japanese, Jewish, Greek, Negro, and Indian. Scales used for measuring the personality variables include Srole's anomia scale,⁶ the California F Scale for Authoritarianism,⁷ McCloskey's measure for conservatism,⁸ and Kaufman's Status Concern attitude scale.⁹ The Withdrawal and Anti-social divisions of the questionnaire are taken from the California Test of Personality. These two of the twelve California test components were found by Blair and Clark of Illinois¹⁰ to correlate highly with the Multiple Choice Rorschach Test.

The three dimensions of religion in our schedule are measured by: Middleton and Putney's Orthodoxy scale,¹¹ an Extrinsic

⁵E. S. Bogardus, "A Social Distance Scale," Sociology and Social Research, XVII (Jan.-Feb., 1944), p. 265.

⁶Srole, op. cit.

⁷Tieg, Clarke, and Thorpe, op. cit.

⁸McCloskey, op. cit.

⁹Kaufman, op. cit.

¹⁰Glenn Blair and Ronald Clark, "Correlations of Rorschach and California Test," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXVII (Jan., 1946), p. 13.

¹¹Snell Putney and Russell Middleton, "Dimensions and Correlates of Religious Ideologies," paper read at Southern Sociological Society, April, 1960.

religious values scale suggested by Allport's articles, and a 15-item check list for church attendance and participation.

The eight items used in our extrinsic religious values scale were composed by members of the South Dakota State College Sociology Department with the help of two members of the local Ministerial Alliance. Only two items are identical with those used by Cody Wilson in his Extrinsic Religious Values Scale. A graduate student in the Department did her thesis research on this scale. She pre-tested an 11-item scale (Wilson's two plus nine from the Sociology Department-Ministerial Alliance Collaboration) on 100 college students. Three items were dropped and the eight we used in the questionnaires formed a scale which approached 90% in Coefficient of Reproducibility.

The local Ministerial Alliance also made suggestions for the 15-item check list designed for measuring church participation. Five ministers arranged time for the questionnaires to be completed by their congregations during a regular Sunday morning worship service.

Churches participating were Church of God, Baptist, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, and Episcopalian. We received 466 completed questionnaires from members of these five congregations who were 18 or more years of age. Respondents placed the completed forms in a designated box when leaving the church.

From a total population of 466 church goers, a sample of 300 schedules was selected for total scoring. This was done by scoring the entire group for orthodoxy and church participation; then excluding the middle range and retaining the high and low

scorers in these two variables. The purpose of this was to balance the distribution of these two religiosity variables and to make the figures more manageable without losing the "extreme" cases which are more dramatic in fact, and in the influence on mathematical totals.

The retained sample was about evenly divided between the sexes. The mean age and number of years of education for the sample deviated less than a year from the means for the entire group of 466.

Since most of the measurement scales are Likert type, allowing five or seven degrees of agreement-disagreement, scoring was mostly simple addition (see Appendix). Thus having translated the variables into quantitative data, an appropriate tool for discovering relationships between variables--correlation--was applied. The formula measuring the degree of relationship or correlation (r) between two variables is:¹²

$$r = \frac{N\sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[N\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2][N\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

where X and Y are the variables being tested, N the number of cases, and \sum is the symbol for "the sum of."

Before working through this formula it is necessary to find the total score for each variable, calculate the mean, and then calculate and square the deviation from the mean for each. The resulting r value expresses numerically the relationship

¹²Frederick Croxton and Dudley Cowden, Applied General Statistics (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1941), p. 672.

between the two variables, X and Y.

Although this associational relationship is precisely what we have been seeking in our experiment, there remains one more statistical procedure before we can interpret our findings. Since probability is involved, we need to use one of the mathematical techniques for discovering to what extent our relationships might be due to chance alone. F is the symbol for the ratio between the two mean squares, or variances. Most statistics books have tables where values of F are already computed for various combinations of degrees of freedom.¹³ Levels of significance are customarily given at the 5 per cent value of F. All of our relationships were checked on this F table for statistical significance.

After the questionnaire was arranged, it was pre-tested on 200 college students and adjusted to require about 20 minutes completion time.

¹³Ibid., p. 878.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS, SUMMARY, AND CONCLUSIONS

Results

Results showed (along with Srole, McDill, and Roberts and Rokeach) a positive and significant relationship between prejudice, anomia, and authoritarianism. Like Kaufman, there was also a positive relationship between prejudice and status concern. In addition, prejudice was correlated positively with conservatism and anti-social tendencies. The sixth personality variable, withdrawal tendency, also correlated positively with prejudice, but not to a significant degree. Education showed a significant negative correlation to prejudice, as expected.

Among the three religious variables, extrinsic belief showed a positive, significant relationship to prejudice; participation a significant negative relation; and the relationship between orthodoxy and prejudice was slightly positive.

Five of the six hypothesized personality trait-prejudice relationships were supported by our findings. The education-prejudice hypothesis was likewise supported; so were two of the three hypothesized relationships between religious dimensions and prejudice. Only two of the relationships were not supported. The positive relationships of prejudice to withdrawal tendencies and to religious orthodoxy were not strong enough to be

considered significant statistically (see Table 1).

Dr. Photiadis and other members of the South Dakota State College Sociology Department have carried out further tests on these same data.¹ They used partial correlation techniques to find what relationships remained between various pairs of these variables when the effect of all the other variables was controlled. According to their findings, the only relationships still strong enough to be significant "on their own" were prejudice-authoritarianism (positive), prejudice-education (negative), and prejudice-church participation (negative as shown in Table 2). In other words, according to the findings of this portion of the study, neither orthodoxy nor extrinsic belief are positively related to prejudice when the other variables are controlled. The three variables whose removal was found to have the most effect on the change from positive to negative were authoritarianism, conservatism, and status concern. Church participation was found to be the only variable which, when controlled, makes the relationship between orthodoxy and prejudice strongly positive.

Summary

The personality function of prejudice has been re-explored in this study, using 300 92-item questionnaires for a group of church attendants in a midwestern college town. This group represented a sample stratified to provide a distribution for

¹John D. Photiadis and Jeanne Biggar, "Religiosity, Education, and Ethnic Distance," The American Journal of Sociology, LXVII (May, 1962), p. 666.

TABLE 1
ZERO ORDER CORRELATIONS AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

Variable	X ₁	X ₂	X ₃	X ₄	X ₅	X ₆	X ₇	X ₈	X ₉	X ₀
X _a	.085	.198**	-.159**	-.300**	.156**	.305**	.508**	.396**	.103	.151**
X ₁	---	.322**	.205**	-.243**	.173**	.055	.175**	.293**	.114	.124*
X ₂	---	---	-.043	-.246**	.251**	.391**	.444**	.355**	.129*	.262**
X ₃	---	---	---	.119*	-.074	-.165**	-.085	-.061	-.048	-.017
X ₄	---	---	---	---	-.178**	-.266**	-.180**	-.227**	-.202**	-.159**
X ₅	---	---	---	---	---	.303**	.414**	.348**	.246**	.235**
X ₆	---	---	---	---	---	---	.572**	.509**	.125*	.283**
X ₇	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.497**	.216**	.253**
X ₈	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.115*	.337**
X ₉	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.467**

*Significant at the 5 per cent level. **Significant at the 1 per cent level.

X_a = prejudice, X₁ = orthodoxy, X₂ = extrinsic belief, X₃ = participation,

X₄ = education, X₅ = anomia, X₆ = status concern, X₇ = conservatism,

X₈ = authoritarianism, X₉ = withdrawal tendencies, X₀ = anti-social tendencies.

TABLE 2
NINTH ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATIONS AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

Partial correlation coefficient	F. Test*	Conclusion when effect of all remaining variables is controlled
$r_{a1.234567890} = -.402$.508	Orthodox belief is not related significantly to prejudice
$r_{a2.134567890} = -.005$.006	Extrinsic belief is not related significantly to prejudice
$r_{a3.124567890} = -.101$	2.980	Church participation is related to prejudice negatively**
$r_{a4.123567890} = -.209$	13.271	Formal education is related to prejudice negatively
- - - - -		
$r_{a5.123467890} = -.001$.001	Anomia is not related significantly to prejudice
$r_{a6.123457890} = .022$.140	Status concern is not related significantly to prejudice
$r_{a7.123456890} = .038$.435	Conservatism is not related significantly to prejudice
$r_{a8.123456790} = .253$	19.812	Authoritarianism is related to prejudice positively
$r_{a9.123456780} = .009$.021	Withdrawal tendencies are not related significantly to prejudice
$r_{a0.123456789} = -.015$.065	Anti-social tendencies are not related significantly to prejudice

*F values greater than 3.84 and 6.64 are required for significance at the 5 and 1 per cent levels consecutively.

**Approaches the required level of significance.

orthodoxy and participation. Hypotheses suggested by other such studies were included in the expectation of again finding anomia, authoritarianism, conservatism, status concern, withdrawal tendencies, and anti-social tendencies positively related to prejudice. It was further hypothesized that religious orthodoxy and extrinsic religious beliefs would coexist with prejudice, while education and church participation (a new variable) would stand in reverse relationships.

The aim was to contribute new understanding of prejudice by adding a new setting, a new variable, and a new statistical technique.

At the present stage of development of our studies, we have not reached the point at which we can clearly isolate cause and effect. Techniques in this study are, therefore, restricted to simple demonstration of relationships. Findings were that prejudice is positively associated with authoritarianism, anomia, status concern, anti-social tendencies, conservatism, and extrinsic religious values; and that prejudice is negatively associated with education and church participation. The relationship we found between prejudice and withdrawal tendencies, and prejudice and orthodoxy, were weak enough that they may be chance relationships rather than associational.

Conclusions

Much has been said and done about prejudice, and a great deal more must be learned as we progress toward less friction among various peoples of the earth. This study contributes some

additional knowledge of the correlates of prejudice. We cannot, however, presently presume to say why it is there or what we can do about it.

The findings add further evidence in support of the case for the hostile personality theory of prejudice. Further analyzed, they select authoritarianism as the personality trait most strongly correlating with prejudice. This seems to suggest that the home is the first socializing institution which can be used to foster tolerance.

The findings suggest, once again, the beneficial influence of general formal education in promoting tolerance regardless of personality type or religious belief.

An attempt has been made to disentangle the various aspects of religion as they relate to prejudice. Orthodoxy was found to be unrelated to prejudice, and this remained true when the effect of all the other variables was removed simultaneously. Apparently orthodoxy need not imply prejudice as some students have suggested, but neither does it appear to inculcate tolerance as others insist that it must. When church participation was held constant, the relation of orthodoxy to prejudice did become positive. This indicated that among those individuals who do adhere to a strongly orthodox doctrine, participation in religious services lessens prejudice.

In regard to Extrinsic Religious Values, the findings from this writer's part of the study seem to bear out Allport's belief that the "religious" often are prejudiced because many of them are using religion as a protection from a threatening world

more than as a guide for their way of life. This is further borne out by the findings of others working on the project who applied partial correlation to these data and discovered that extrinsic religious values were unrelated to prejudice when the effect of the personality variables was removed.

Church participation, a previously untested variable, is one religious dimension which does have a significant negative relationship to prejudice, with or without intervening variables.

APPENDIX

TABLE 3

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PREJUDICE AND ORTHODOXY, EXTRINSIC BELIEF,
CHURCH PARTICIPATION, AND EDUCATION WHEN REMAINING
VARIABLES ARE HELD CONSTANT INDIVIDUALLY

Variable held constant	Orthodoxy		Extrinsic belief		Church participation		Formal education	
	Partial corr.	F test	Partial corr.	F test	Partial corr.	F test	Partial corr.	F test
Orthodoxy	---	---	.181	10.002**	-.181	10.004**	-.289	26.996**
Extrinsic belief	.023	.152	---	---	-.153	7.155**	-.264	22.276**
Participation	.121	4.426*	.193	11.546**	---	---	-.286	26.524**
Formal education	.013	.049	.134	5.446*	-.130	5.105*	---	---
Anomia	.059	1.042	.166	8.391**	-.149	6.776**	-.280	25.185**
Status concern	.071	1.519	.085	2.151	-.115	4.010*	-.238	17.833**
Conservatism	.033	.318	.072	1.534	-.140	5.930*	-.261	21.704**
Authoritarianism	-.036	.387	.063	1.175	-.147	6.548*	-.234	17.244**
Withdrawal tendencies	.074	1.620	.187	10.750**	-.155	7.290**	-.288	26.841**
Anti-social tendencies	.067	1.343	.164	8.156**	-.158	7.602**	-.282	25.743**

* Significant at the 5 per cent level. ** Significant at the 1 per cent level.

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

A

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.
- ___ 31. We must respect the work of our forefathers and not think that we know better than they did.

- ___ 32. The extent of a man's ambition to better himself is a pretty good indicator of his character.
- ___ 33. In order to merit the respect of others, a person should show the desire to better himself.
- ___ 34. One of the things you should consider in choosing your friends is whether they can help you make your way in the world.
- ___ 35. Ambition is the most important factor in determining success in life.
- ___ 36. One should always try to live in a highly respectable residential area even though it entails sacrifices.
- ___ 37. 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.
- ___ 38. Possession of proper social etiquette is usually the mark of a desirable person.
- ___ 39. The raising of one's social position is one of the more important goals in life.
- ___ 40. It is worth considerable effort to assure one's self of a good name with the right kind of people.
- ___ 41. An ambitious person can almost always achieve his goals.
- ___ 42. The most important thing to teach children is absolute obedience to their parents.
- ___ 43. Any good leader should be strict with people under him in order to gain their respect.
- ___ 44. There are two kinds of people in the world: the weak and the strong.
- ___ 45. Prison is too good for sex criminals. They should be publicly whipped or worse.
- ___ 46. No decent man can respect a woman who has had sex relations before marriage.

B

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 negativness 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?

C

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.

	To close kin- ship by mar- riage	To my club as per- sonal friends	To my street as neigh- bors	To em- ploy- ment in my occu- pation	To citi- zen- ship in my coun- try	As visi- tors only to my coun- try	Would ex- clude from my coun- try
68. Japanese	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
69. German	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
70. Jews	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
71. Greeks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
72. Negroes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
73. Scandi- navian	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
74. Indians	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

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? _____

H

79. Are you presently a member of any church? _____

I

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.

J

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)

K

82. Do you contribute to the finances of this or any church by tithe or definite pledge _____; regular contribution monthly _____, or weekly _____; occasionally _____; not at all _____.

L

83. Write X to indicate: Male _____; Female _____.

M

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

Participation	: <u>Sunday School</u> :	: <u>Choir</u> :	: <u>Men's</u> : <u>Prayer</u> :	: <u>or</u> : <u>or</u> :	: <u>Women's</u> : <u>Study</u> :	: <u>Group</u> :	: <u>Local or</u>
							: <u>State</u>
							: <u>Governing</u>
							: <u>Board</u>
							: (Trustees,
							: Vestry,
							: Deacons,
							: Session,
							: etc.
84. Member now	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
85. Past member	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
86. Attend occasionally now	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
87. Attended occasionally in the past	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
88. Now attend regularly	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
89. Have attended regularly in the past	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
(Use number rather than X)	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
90. Approximate number of committees served on, in the past	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
91. Present committee member	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
92. Office held in the past	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
93. Presently holding an office	:	:	:	:	:	:	:

a

b

c

d

e

Scoring of Opinion Survey Questionnaire

A. Orthodoxy

1 through 5 scores as answered = 7, 6, 5, 3, 2, 1
 6 scored in reverse 7 = 1, 6 = 2, 5 = 3, 3 = 5, 2 = 6,
 1 = 7

Range: 6 to 42.

B. Extrinsic Belief

7 through 17 scored as answered = 7, 6, 5, 3, 2, 1

Range 11 to 77.

C. Anomia

18 through 22 scored as answered = 7, 6, 5, 3, 2, 1

Range: 5 to 35.

D. Conservatism

23 through 31 scored as answered = 7, 6, 5, 3, 2, 1

Range 9 to 63.

E. Status - Concern

32 through 41 scored as answered = 7, 6, 5, 3, 2, 1

Range 10 to 70.

F. Authoritarianism scored as answered = 7, 6, 5, 3, 2, 1

42 through 46

Range 5 to 35.

G. Withdrawal

47 through 57 scored as answered = 4, 3, 2, 1

Range 11 to 77.

H. Anti-Social

58 through 67 scored as answered = 4, 3, 2, 1

Range 10 to 70.

I. Bogardus Prejudice

Scored only 68, 70, 71, 72, 74 by using furthest left number circled.

Range 5 to 35.

J. Age

75 scored as # for decade. 1 = 18-19; 2 = 20-24; 3 = 25-34; 4 = 35-44; 5 = 45-54; 6 = 55-64; 7 = 65 and over.

Range 1 through 7 (Questionnaires from those 17 years of age and younger not used).

K. School completed

76 scored:	8 yrs. or less	1
	9 and 10	2
	11 and 12	3
	13 and 14	4
	15 and 16	5
	17 and 18	6
	19 or more	7

Range 1 through 7.

L. Income

77 scored:	\$3,999 or less	1	\$ 7,000 - \$ 8,999	5
	4,000 - \$4,999	2	9,000 - 11,999	6
	5,000 - 5,999	3	12,000 and over	7
	6,000 - 6,999	4		

Range 1 through 7.

M. Occupation

Scored:	3	Farmer	
	1	Farm laborer	
	7	Professional	
	6	Business man, women	
	4	Clerk	
	2	Unskilled laborer	
	5	Skilled tradesman	
	5	College student	
		Retired (under proper past category)	
	4	If no category	
Housewife:	7	= income of over \$9,000	
	6	= 7 - 8,999	3 = 4,000 - 4,999
	5	= 6 - 6,999	2 = under 4,000
	4	= 5 - 5,999	

Other into proper category

Range 1 to 7.

N. Socio-Economic Status Total

$$K \div L + M = N$$

Range 3 - 21.

O. Membership in Church

Scored - "yes" - 1; "no" - 2.

P. Length of Membership (make sure answer here is at least 12 years less than total age).

Scored:	5 yrs. and less = 1	30 - 39 yrs. = 5
	6 - 10 yrs. = 2	40 - 49 yrs. = 6
	11 - 20 yrs. = 3	50 yrs. and over = 7
	20 - 29 yrs. = 4	

Range 1 - 7.

Q. Church Sunday Attendance

Scored:	1 = Not at all	5 = Once a month
	2 = Once a year	6 = Twice a month
	3 = Twice a year	7 = Almost every Sunday
	4 = Four or five times a yr.	8 = Every Sunday

Range 1 - 8.

R. Contribution

Score 5 for check in any one or all of first 3 blanks

Score 2 for occasionally

Range 0 - 5.

S. Sex

Score: 1 = Male
2 = Female

Total made of males
Total made of females.

T. Participation (do not tabulate Sunday School scores)

For partials

84)
85) Score $\frac{1}{2}$ for check in either level of last 4 groups

85) Score $\frac{1}{2}$ for check in either level of last 4 groups
 86)

88) Score $\frac{1}{2}$ for check in either level of last 4 groups
 89)

90) Score $\frac{1}{2}$ for number written in either level of last
 91) 4 groups

(Do not give score of more than $\frac{1}{2}$ to each of paired level
 per group)

Range 0 - 8.

U. Total Participation Score

Add score from Q
 to score from T
 total participation

Range 2 through 16.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Adorno, T. W., et al. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper and Bros., 1950.
- Allport, Gordon W. The Nature of Prejudice. Boston: Addison-Wesley, 1955.
- Bettelheim, B., and Janowitz, M. The Dynamics of Prejudice. New York: Harper and Bros., 1950.
- Blalock, Hubert. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.
- Croxtan, Frederick, and Cowden, Dudley. Applied General Statistics. New York: Prentice Hall, 1941.
- Williams, Robin. Review of Sociology, Analysis of a Decade. Edited by Joseph B. Gittler. ("Racial and Cultural Relations.") New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1957.

Articles

- Allport, Gordon W., and Kramer, Bernard M. "Some Roots of Prejudice," Journal of Psychology, XXI (January, 1946), 9-39.
- Blair, Glenn, and Clark, Ronald W. "Correlations of Rorschach and California Test," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXVII (January, 1946), 13-20.
- Bogardus, E. S., "A Social Distance Scale," Sociology and Social Research, XVII (January, 1933), 265-271.
- Kaufman, Walter C. "Status, Authoritarianism, and Anti-Semitism," American Journal of Sociology, LXII (January, 1957), 379-383.
- Keedy, T. C., Jr. "Anomie and Religious Orthodoxy," Sociology and Social Research, XLIII (September, 1958), 34-37.
- McCloskey, Herbert. "Conservatism and Personality," American Political Science Review, LII (March, 1958), 27-45.

- McDill, Edward. "Anomie, Authoritarianism, Prejudice, and Socio-Economic Status, An Attempt at Clarification," Social Forces, XXXIX (March, 1961), 239-245.
- Meier, Dorothy L., and Bell, Wendell. "Anomia and Differential Access to the Achievement of Life Goals," American Sociological Review, XXIV (April, 1959), 189-202.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. "Regional Differences in Anti-Negro Prejudice," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIX (July, 1959), 28-36.
- Photiadis, John, and Biggar, Jeanne. "Religiosity, Education, and Ethnic Distance," The American Journal of Sociology, LXVII (May, 1962), 666-672.
- Roberts, Alan H., and Rokeach, Milton. "Anomie, Authoritarianism, and Prejudice, a Replication," American Journal of Sociology, LXI (January, 1956), 355-358.
- Rosenblith, Judy Frances. "A Replication of 'Some Roots of Prejudice,'" Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLIV (October, 1949), 470-489.
- Srole, Leo. "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries, an Exploratory Study," American Sociological Review, XXI (December, 1956), 709-716.
- Tieg, Ernest, Clarke, Willis, and Thorpe, Louis. "1953 Revision of the California Test of Personality, Adult Form, AA," California Test Bureau, Los Angeles, 1953.
- Wilson, W. Cody. "Extrinsic Religious Values and Prejudice," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LX (March, 1960), 286-288.

Unpublished Material

- Putney, Snell, and Middleton, Russell. "Dimensions and Correlates of Religious Ideologies." Paper read at Southern Sociological Society, April, 1960.

A STUDY OF PREJUDICE IN RELATION TO PERSONALITY,
EDUCATION, AND RELIGION

by

EUNICE NIELSON BRUCE

B. A., University of Kansas, 1941

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Economics and Sociology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1963

The relationship between prejudice and nine different variables was tested in this study. These included six personality variables - authoritarianism, anomia, conservatism, status concern, withdrawal tendencies, and anti-social tendencies; three religiosity variables - orthodoxy, extrinsic religious values, and church participation; and education.

Hypotheses for the relationships to be tested in this study were based on a group of other prejudice studies in the literature. Most of these had been done in an effort to test certain prejudice theories advanced originally by Gordon Allport. This study aimed to add further information about prejudice by re-exploring its relationships to personality, religion, and education in a different setting, and by adding a new religious variable, church participation.

Information for the study was obtained by the use of anonymous questionnaires. These were filled out by the members of several different congregations while they were attending regular Sunday morning church services. The questionnaires were composed of tested scales for measuring personality traits and religious attitudes, and check lists for determining educational standing and church participation patterns.

A sample of 300 schedules, stratified according to participation and orthodoxy, was selected for total scoring. Relationship of prejudice to each of these nine variables was then calculated by the zero order correlation formula. The correlation of each variable with every other variable was also calculated.

Five of the six personality traits: authoritarianism, anomia, conservatism, status concern, and anti-social tendencies, were found to have a significant positive association with prejudice. The sixth personality variable, withdrawal tendencies, was found to have a positive relationship also, but it was not strong enough to be termed significant. Authoritarianism was the personality trait showing the strongest positive relationship to prejudice. There has been disagreement in the literature in regard to this "most important" personality trait associated with prejudice.

Education showed a significant negative relationship to prejudice. This finding has been almost universal in investigations of prejudice.

Extrinsic religious belief showed a significant positive correlation with prejudice. Religious orthodoxy, another debated point in the literature, was found to have a slightly positive correlation with prejudice, but the relationship was not strong enough to be considered statistically significant. Church participation, the previously untested variable, was found related to prejudice negatively and to a significant degree.