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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

Through the medium of television our senses are everyday bombarded by the sights and sounds of student unrest on our college campuses. Radical students take over campus buildings, go on strike and refuse to attend classes until their "demands" are met. They want a "piece of the action" even to the hiring and firing of professors, and will risk expulsion to attain their goals. Even conservative students demand that curricula and instruction be upgraded though their methods for achieving their goals are less disruptive or dramatic. Liberal youth today are demanding the right to smoke marijuana, to "trip" on LSD, to live in mixed dormitories, in essence to "do their own thing." Conservative students appear, at least, to be more content with the status quo and to pursue their education in a more traditional manner. The unsettling attitudes of students in this and other countries is a matter of concern to people the world over. It would seem, therefore, that a research project concerned with liberal and conservative attitudes has relevance to present-day life.

It has come to the attention of this investigator that psychologists privately engaged in therapy with adolescents and in college counseling have observed that their liberal clients are more anxious and have lower ego strength than their more conservative clients. These conclusions by experienced clinical psychologists are admittedly subjective.
observations made during the pursuit of their profession. An interest in an experimental study to ascertain the validity and generality of these clinical judgments was the impetus for this study. Accordingly, the relationships between both anxiety and ego strength and the liberal-conservative continuum was investigated. The generality or specificity of liberalism-conservatism was investigated also.

The Concept of Attitude. Attitudes have long been an accepted psychological concept. As early as 1862 Herbert Spencer wrote in his First Principles that "Arriving at correct judgments on disputed questions, much depends on the attitude of mind we preserve while listening to, or taking part in the controversy," (Allport, 1935). By 1888 experimental psychologists recognized the place of attitudes (set) in connection with reaction-time studies by L. Lange. He discovered that subjects who were intent upon pressing a telegraph key immediately upon receiving a signal, did so more quickly than subjects whose attention was directed mainly to the signal itself. Additionally, in investigations of perception, recall, judgment, and volition the importance of the subjects' preparedness became recognized. According to Allport, the experiments of the Wurzburg school established the fact that attitudes are unconscious. The early experimentalists in effect demonstrated that the concept of attitude was a valuable psychological tool. Under the influence of Freud's psychoanalytic theory, the unconscious character of attitudes became more fully recognized. Allport felt that the concept of attitude was "probably the most distinctive and indispensable concept in social psychology."

Attitudes Defined. In reporting their study of Polish peasants,
W. I. Thomas and F. Znaniecki frequently used the term "attitude" and defined attitudes as "individual mental processes which determine both the actual and potential responses of each person in the social world" (Allport). Allport himself says that an attitude is "a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's responses to all objects and situations with which it is related." Remmers (1954) sees attitudes as "ideas predisposing an individual to action." The definition favored by Edwards (1957) and by this investigator is that suggested by Thurstone (1946), namely that attitude is "the intensity of positive or negative affect for or against a psychological object."

An individual with positive affect or feeling toward organized religion, for example, may be said to have a favorable attitude toward organized religion (the psychological object). An individual who has negative affect or feeling toward organized religion may be said to have an unfavorable attitude toward that psychological object.

**Attitude Determinants.** The most complete discussion relative to the determinants of attitudes may be attributed to Allport. He cites four common conditions which contribute to the formation of attitudes: integration, differentiation, trauma, and adoption. Integration is the development of an attitude through accumulation of many experiences over a long period of time, all of which influence the individual in a given direction, i.e., repeated successes in solving arithmetic problems will be integrated by the student into a favorable attitude toward arithmetic. The splitting off of a specific attitude from a more general one is described as differentiation, i.e., the student likes arithmetic because he likes all other school subjects. Trauma or shock
(unusual, violent, or painful experiences) is illustrated by the child who has an unfavorable attitude toward doctors as the result of injections administered by his physician. An illustration of adoption (following the example of parents, friends, teachers, newspapers, and other opinion-molding agencies) is the boy who is a Democrat because his father is a Democrat.

A study by Vetter and Green (1932) lends support to Allport's classification of attitude determinants. They studied the origin of anti-religious attitudes of 350 members of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism. In response to the question "Could you in a few words attribute your breaking away from religion to any particular event, person, or book?" one third of the members stated that the accumulation (integration) of influences derived from the reading of science, religion, and history resulted in the gradual formation of their attitudes. Other members spoke of their atheism as a by-product (differentiation) of their more general philosophy of materialism. Still others said the source of their atheism was an intense or severe experience of grief or horror (trauma). Occasionally they reported the influence of a friend whose atheistic views they adopted (adoption). Allport's conception of attitude determinants in a broader sense are seen as (1) personality differences and (2) conformity-enforcing social institutions.

A Basic Social Attitude. Liberalism-conservatism is a basic dimension of social attitudes. The major evidence relative to this statement comes from factorial studies of social attitudes. Thurstone (1934) reports the results of research carried out by his wife, T. G. Thurstone. She gave 11 Thurstone attitude scales to 380 students in several universities. As Thurstone puts it, the factor analysis revealed
"a conspicuous common factor that we recognize as radicalism." The variables heavily loaded with radicalism were favorable attitudes toward birth control, easy divorce, evolutionary doctrine, and communism. In the opposite direction (conservatism) were heavy loadings of attitudes favorable toward the church, prohibition, Sunday observance, and a belief in a personal God.

Carlson (1934), employing the 11 Thurstone scales with 215 university students and using Thurstone's technique of analysis, also extracted one meaningful factor, "Radicalism-Conservatism."

Ferguson (1939) administered Thurstone attitude scales to 185 college students, analyzed his data by the centroid method, and isolated a factor he labeled "Religionism" which was defined by the same scales as Thurstone's "Radicalism-Conservatism."

Eysenck (1944) utilized data collected by a colleague from 694 subjects (members of various English societies ranging from the Sun-bathing Society to the National Society of Non-Smokers) in an investigation dealing with "progressive or unorthodox opinion" on various social issues. Analyzing this data by the centroid method, he obtained a general factor assumed to underlie attitudes toward social issues, "Radicalism-Conservatism," which accounted for 33.6% of the variance. The radical end loaded heavily with attitudes favorable to socialism, communism, birth control, pacifism, divorce reform, eugenics, and sexual freedom. In the conservative direction were high saturations favoring patriotism, Sunday observance, capital punishment, censorship, harsh treatment of criminals, and organized religion.

Liberalism-Conservatism Defined. Relative to social issues, then,
it may be said that there is a liberalism-conservatism continuum along which attitudes of college students will fall. For the purpose of this research, this continuum is defined as ranging from the radical position of favoring fundamental or maximal social change without delay, to the ultra conservative position, favoring change only as a slow, evolutionary process with minimal disruption of social institutions.

Liberals-Conservatives—Correlates and Differences. A brief summary of the research relative to correlates of and differences between liberals and conservatives will be presented. In comparing the most liberal and most conservative 10% of 375 Dartmouth undergraduates, Allport (1929) found that liberals showed much less prejudice than conservatives, had higher grades, tended to be less religious, and felt more strongly about politics.

Lents (1939) investigated correlates of liberalism-conservatism with 409 adults who indicated the six most admired persons from a list of famous people. He concluded that conservatives are more opposed to change, more prudish on sex matters, more timid and superstitious, more reluctant to argue, admit more race prejudices, are less tolerant and sympathetic toward the underdog, less imaginative and less feministic than liberals.

Fay and Middleton (1940) examined the relationship between liberalism-conservatism and (1) father's occupation and (2) size of hometown. They discovered that the most liberal of their 575 college subjects lived in cities over 500,000 or in rural areas, and the father's occupation was classified Managerial or Agricultural. The most conservative students lived in cities ranging from 25,000 to 500,000 and their fathers belonged to Clerical or Commercial groups.
Harris, Remmers, and Ellison (1932) found no significant relationship between liberalism-conservatism and size of hometown or father's occupation.

Vatter (1947) measured attitudes of 706 college students toward attitude objects encompassing religion, communism, morals, individualism, paternalism, capitalism, and favoring or opposing changes in social institutions. His findings indicate liberal students are more in favor of change and more individualistic than conservative students.

Numerous studies have reported low correlations between intelligence and liberalism-conservatism, in the area of .26 to .32. The consensus of opinion is that there are factors of more importance than intelligence in determining attitudes.

In summarizing the literature on correlates of politico-economic liberalism-conservatism, Kerr (1944) reports many studies with conflicting results, but indicates the evidence shows that:

1. Political-economic liberalism tends to increase with years in school.
2. Liberal college students tend to be better students, better informed, and more intelligent than conservatives.
3. Liberals tend to be more introverted than conservatives.
4. Liberals at the college level tend to be more pessimistic—but not necessarily lower in morale—than are conservatives.
5. Evidence on the relative liberalism of males and females is conflicting.
6. Liberals are less favorable toward religion and less prejudiced against minority groups.
7. College students in religious groups (campus) and students in most denominational colleges tend to be more conservative than other college students.
8. Evidence on the liberalizing effects of various courses of
study is conflicting, but there is a tendency for students in the social sciences to be more liberal than students in almost any other curriculum.

That liberals and conservatives differ appears clear, though the degree of difference is probably never 100%. The distinguishing characteristics are necessarily dependent upon the instrument employed, even upon the wording of statements in scales or questionnaires.

The Generality or Specificity of Attitudes. Some writers maintain that attitudes are specific, that they represent tendencies to make particular responses to particular situations (Hartshorne and May, Symonds, Bogardus). Others believe that attitudes are general, inferring that an attitude held toward one psychological object will be generalized to other objects, i.e., it would be said that an individual who is liberal toward race would also have a liberal attitude toward other psychological objects such as politics and sex (Cantril, Likert, Pintner, and Kerr).

According to both Allport and Remmers, the most influential research supporting the doctrine of specificity has been the extensive investigations of Hartshorne and May in their Character Education Inquiry. Among the problems studied was the tendency of children to cheat. It was found that although a child who cheated in one classroom would also cheat in another, he might be absolutely honest in other situations. It was noted that stealing money was unrelated to cheating on an examination. Hartshorne and May concluded that attitudes relative to the concept of honesty were specific.

Most of the research in this area favors the generality of attitudes. Allport reports that Cantril examined the responses of college students to a series of statements, personality sketches, terms, and the Allport-Vernon Study of Values. Cantril reported that reaction times to
stimulus words are in direct proportion to the magnitude of the subjects' interest in the value to which the word refers, i.e., a man with strong religious interests responds more quickly to such words as "prayer," "church," and "Christian." He concluded that "A general attitude seems to serve as a dynamic or directive influence upon more specific attitudes and reactions."

Allport cites a study by Likert who obtained a positive $r$ of .67 between his test for internationalism and the Thurstone-Dobra anti-war scale. Likert feels that strong well-integrated generalized attitudes will dominate and take precedence over all specific tendencies, but if no strong general attitudes are present, then the particular stimulus situation determines the individual's reactions. Pintner (1933) correlated religious interest scores of 187 college students on the Study of Values with their scores on the Thurstone scale measuring attitude toward the church. An obtained $r$ of .78 indicated that students who rated high on interest in religion by one scale exhibited a favorable attitude to the church on a second scale. Such correlations of independent scales suggest the generality of attitudes.

Kerr concluded from his survey of research on politico-economic liberalism-conservatism that politico-economic liberals also tend to be above average in racial and social liberalism. He further concluded that older people tend to be more consistent in their liberalism than those under 25 years of age. This conclusion lends support to Remmers' suggestion that different findings regarding generality and specificity may be partly due to age differences in groups studied. Remmers points out that attitudes become more generalized as age increases.

After reviewing both sides of the controversy, Allport concludes,
"There can be no doubt that general attitudes exist. They are discovered by tests, by experiment, and in everyday life. On the other hand, it is undeniable that attitudes of quite specific order also exist."

The Measurement of Liberalism-Conservatism. Criterion groups for the present study were selected on the basis of student responses to three attitude scales which measure liberal-conservative attitudes toward the Negro, religion, and politics. The scales measuring attitude toward the Negro (Desegregation Scale) and attitude toward organized religion (Religion Scale) were developed at the University of Texas under the direction of Wayne H. Holtzman (Holtzman and Young, 1966). Both scales have been used a number of times at the University of Texas in a comprehensive study of change in attitude over a period of nine years. The Desegregation and Religion scales are both composed in part of items from a previously developed 90-item questionnaire on social issues and in part of items written especially for the respective scales. One hundred students served as item judges and scaling was by the Thurstone method.

The Liberalism-Conservatism Scale (political) was developed at Wake Forest College by Wright and Hicks (1966). Scaling was by the Thurstone method with 45 psychology students acting as judges. The scale was administered to Wake Forest members of the Young Republicans and Young Democrats just prior to the 1964 presidential elections. An \( r \) of .64 was obtained between political affiliation and scale scores, leading Wright and Hicks to conclude that the scale was in fact measuring the "political-orientation construct of liberalism-conservatism."

The Measure of Anxiety. The Manifest Anxiety Scale (MAS) developed by Taylor (1953) has been used repeatedly as a research tool for the measurement of anxiety, as will be the case in this study. It
was derived from approximately 200 items from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). Fifty items, which five clinical psychologists judged indicative of manifest anxiety (80%-100% agreement), constituted the final scale. Taylor states that in an extensive normative study Hedlund, Farber, and Dechtoldt administered the MAS to 1971 college students with the resultant norms revealing a raw score of 13 at the fiftieth percentile, 21 at the eightieth, and 7 at the twentieth percentile, and a mean score of 14.56. Their test-retest studies reported reliabilities of .89 after a lapse of three weeks, .82 over five months, and .81 after longer periods (9-17 months). They noted no significant sex differences and no practice effects.

The MAS was constructed at the University of Iowa for the purpose of selecting subjects for experimental groups in studies concerned with the role of drive in eyelid conditioning. The Iowa group made the assumption that drive level in the individual is related to the level of anxiety and that the intensity of this anxiety could be measured by a paper and pencil test whose items described overt or manifest symptoms of anxiety (Taylor, 1956). As Taylor points out, however, "no attempt has ever been made to claim that the only differences between individuals receiving different scores on the MAS is drive level. Undoubtedly there are many characteristics other than drive level on which anxious and non-anxious Ss differ." Taylor herself foresaw the clinical use of the scale when its validity as a measure of manifest anxiety had been established (1953). Two studies relating observed anxiety and MAS scores will be cited.

In a study designed by Gleser and Ulett (1952) to validate the Saslow Screening Test as a measure of anxiety-proneness, psychiatric
interviews and a battery of psychological tests including the MAS were given 151 normal males and 140 male psychiatric patients in which anxiety was a major feature of their illness. Both the psychologist who administered the test battery and the psychiatrist who interviewed them, rated all subjects on an 8-point scale for anxiety-proneness (defined as the tendency for overt symptoms to appear in a stressful situation). An intercorrelation matrix revealed an \( r \) of .61 between psychiatric ratings and MAS scores.

Buss, Wiener, Durkee, and Baer (1955) report an investigation utilizing hospitalized psychiatric patients. Each of 64 patients was interviewed by the same psychologist in the presence of three other psychologists who rated the patients' manifestations of anxiety as defined by distractibility, restlessness, sweating, flushing, breathing disturbances, and excessive swallowing. Patients were then administered the MAS by a staff member in another room. A correlation of .60 was obtained between judges' pooled ratings of the over-all anxiety observed and the MAS scores.

The Measure of Ego Strength. Barron's (1953) 68-item Ego-Strength Scale (Es), used in this study is a measure of ego strength and was derived from the MPI on the basis of significant correlation with rated improvement in psychoneurotic patients. Although initially developed for predicting response to psychotherapy, Barron found it was useful in assessing adaptability and personal resourcefulness in "any situation" where such evaluation is wanted. In Barron's study, the Es was administered to 33 patients prior to psychotherapy. Following six months of therapy all patients were studied intensively by two skilled judges who then rated 17 patients "clearly improved" and 16 "unimproved"
with a high degree of inter-judge agreement ($r$ of .91). The mean Es score of Improved patients was 52.7; Unimproved patients, 29.1, a difference significant beyond the .01 level. Barron reports that the odd-even reliability of the scale in a clinic population of 126 patients is .76 and test-retest reliability after three months is .72. Among the characteristics which are collectively referred to as ego strength on the Es are a strong sense of reality, feelings of personal adequacy and vitality, spontaneity, and intelligence. According to Barron, the Es seems to be measuring constructive forces in the personality.

In a study to evaluate the construct validity of the Es, Tamkin (1957) found significant correlations with two measures of general psychopathology, the Critical Item (CI) and F Scales of the MMPI. Tamkin reports that clinical experience suggests the CI Scale has a close relationship to severity of mental illness. In a random sample of 30 male psychiatric patients Tamkin found negative correlations between Es and CI of -.62; Es and F, -.39, which he considered "encouraging for the question of validity."

In a replication of the above study, using 100 subjects, the $r$ between Es and CI was -.66; between Es and F, -.56 (Tamkin and Klett, 1957). An additional finding was an $r$ of .32 between Es and full scale Wechsler-Bellevue I.Q. and $r$ of .45 with amount of education. The significant correlation between Es and I.Q. is in line with Barron's finding of .44 for the same relationship. Tamkin and Klett conclude that their results are "suggestive of construct validity for Barron's scale as a measure of ego strength."

In a test of the validity of Es when administered as an individual test, not part of the MMPI, Silverman (1963) obtained significant
correlations between the two methods. He administered the full MMPI followed a week later by Es alone, to 40 male chronic schizophrenics and 40 male "normals." The Es scores under the two methods correlated .91 for the "normals" and .85 for the schizophrenics. These findings support the validity of using the Es scale as a separate measure apart from the MMPI. If the Es is valid, one would further expect the normals to have higher ego strength scores than chronic schizophrenics. Silverman noted a significant difference (0.1) between the two groups under both methods.
Subjects and Materials. Three Thurstone scales designed to measure attitudes on a liberalism-conservatism continuum were administered to 115 sophomore, junior, and senior psychology students of both sexes. A scale measuring attitude toward Negroes, The Desegregation (D) Scale (Kelly, Ferson, and Holtzman, 1958); The Religion (R) Scale (Holtzman and Young, 1966), a measure of attitude toward organized religion; and a scale measuring political attitudes, the Liberalism-Conservatism (P) Scale (Wright and Hicks, 1966) were combined into one 67-item scale for administration to subjects (P scale, items 7-24; R scale, items 25-47; and D scale, items 48-73). Items 1-6 were biographical in nature, requesting information concerning Ss' year in college, sex, age, size of hometown, father's annual income, and cumulative grade point average as a basis for future research.

Printed instructions for the biographical and attitude items were: "This is a survey of your opinion on some social issues. There are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers. The best answer is your frank and honest opinion. You will probably agree strongly with some of the statements, disagree with some, and find yourself more or less neutral about others. Will you please:

a) Write your hometown telephone number in the space marked NAME on your answer sheet."
b) Read each statement carefully and mark it according to your first reaction. It isn’t necessary to take a lot of time for any one question.

c) Answer every question.

d) Give your personal point of view.

e) In marking your answers on the answer sheet, be sure that the number of the statement agrees with the number on the answer sheet. Make your marks heavy and black. Erase completely any answer you wish to change.

For items 1-6, please mark the space that best fits your answer.

For items 7-73, please mark the answer sheet to indicate your personal reaction to the statement according to the following code:

COLUMN
1 Strongly Agree
2 Agree
3 Undecided or Uncertain
4 Disagree
5 Strongly Disagree

Please do not write your answers on the questionnaire.

Additionally, the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (MAS), Taylor (1953) and the Barron Ego-Strength Scale (Es), Barron (1953) were administered to all Ss. Instructions for these scales were identical to those for the MMPI.

Procedure. Testing was achieved in one class period for each of the advanced psychology courses in which Ss were enrolled. Considering the fact that one personality test was concerned with the general level of anxiety, not anxiety toward a specific object, attitude scales were administered to all Ss first, followed by the personality scales. Before distribution of the questionnaires, Ss were orally instructed as follows: "The scientific value of the study in which you have been asked to participate is dependent upon your complete frankness in responding to the statements you will be given. Please do not sign your
that is requested is that you give your hometown telephone number. Since the name of the town is unknown to the investigator, you will remain completely anonymous."

Attitude scale items were scored according to the Likert weighting procedures. Arbitrary weights of 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 were assigned to the five response choices of each item (Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided or Uncertain, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree) and a total score was obtained by summing weights. If the content of the statement was conservative (scale value 7.45 or above on the P scale, 7.54 or above on the R scale, and 7.34 or above on the D scale), a weight of 0 was given to the response of Strongly Agree and a weight of 4 was given to the response of Strongly Disagree. The weights were reversed when the item content was liberal (4.84 or below on the P scale, 4.78 or below on the R scale, and 4.30 or below on the D scale). The possible range of scores for P was 0-72; for R, 0-92; and for D, 0-104. Raw scores for data analysis were three attitude scores per S, one each for P, R, and D. High scores denoted liberal attitudes; low scores, conservative attitudes.

The MAS and ES scores were obtained by summing responses to items keyed for high anxiety and for high ego strength. Two personality scores per S were available for data analysis, one each for MAS and ES.

Data Analysis. To assess the generality-specificity of liberal-conservative attitudes, intercorrelations were obtained between P, R, and D. The significance of each Pearson r and the significance of the differences between Pearson rs were obtained.

To determine the relationship between anxiety and liberalism-
conservatism, Pearson $r$s were obtained between MAS and P, MAS and R, and MAS and D. The significance of each Pearson $r$ and the significance of the differences between Pearson $r$s were computed.

The relationship between ego strength and liberalism-conservatism was similarly analyzed (Pearson $r$s and appropriate tests of significance and differences between Es and P, Es and R, and Es and D were computed).

Multiple linear correlations ($R$s) between dependent variables MAS and Es, and the three attitude scales were obtained. The significance of the multiple $R$s and the significance of the difference between multiple $R$s were tested.

Employing the appropriate F test, the difference between the Pearson $r$ (Es--R) and the multiple $R$ (Es--P, R, and D) was assessed to determine if the addition of P and D as predictor variables resulted in a significant increase of the multiple $R$ over the Pearson $r$.

Correlation coefficients, whether Pearson or multiple, were computed with the aid of the IBM 1620 Single and Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Program.

**Statement of the Problem.** In view of the clinical observations that liberal clients are alleged to be more anxious and to have lower ego strength than conservative clients, and current public concern relative to liberal college students, an empirical investigation of whether there are significant relationships between both ego strength and anxiety and the liberal-conservative continuum in a college population was undertaken.

Although the college in question is popularly considered to have a conservative student body (the absence of "confrontations" tends to support this opinion), it was nevertheless assumed that with a sample of
115 psychology students, a relatively normal distribution of liberals and conservatives would be obtained.

The question of the generality or specificity of liberalism-conservatism remains in some doubt. The first phase of the investigation was determining whether students who are liberal toward one psychological object are likewise liberal toward other psychological objects employed in this study, or are they both liberal and conservative, depending on the attitude object. No hypothesis is made in regard to this issue.

The major purpose of this study is to ascertain by the correlational method the validity and generality of the aforementioned clinical observations. It will be recalled that high scores on the attitude scales (P, R, and D) indicate liberalism and high scores on MAS and ES indicate high anxiety and high ego strength respectively. It is hypothesized that there is a positive linear relationship between liberalism-conservatism and anxiety. It is further hypothesized that there is a negative linear relationship between liberalism-conservatism and ego strength.

The .05 level of significance is used throughout the study.
Chapter III

RESULTS

All intercorrelations between attitude scales are statistically significant (Political-Religion, $r = .20, p < .05$; Political-Desegregation, $r = .34, p < .01$; Religion-Desegregation, $r = .32, p < .01$). Tests of the significance of differences between these three correlation coefficients are not significant. Mean score on the Political scale is 42.16, $s = 8.2$; mean Religion score, 39.16, $s = 8.4$; mean score for Desegregation is 57.81, $s = 14.7$.

No significant correlations were found between Anxiety and P, R, or D.

The correlations between Ego Strength and the Political and Desegregation scales do not reach significance, but the correlation of Ego Strength with Religion is significant ($r = .25, p < .05$). Tests of the significance of the differences between these three Pearson $r$s are not significant.

The multiple correlation between Anxiety and P, R, and D combined does not reach significance, but the multiple $R$ for Ego Strength and P, R, and D combined is significant ($R = .26, p < .01$).

An F test revealed that the difference between the Pearson $r$ (Ego Strength and Religion) and the multiple $R$ (Ego Strength and P, R, and D combined) fails to reach significance.
**TABLE 1**

Pearson Correlations: Political, Religion, and Desegregation Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01
TABLE 2
Correlations of Anxiety and Ego Strength with Political, Religion, and Desegregation Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Scales</th>
<th>Pearson rs</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.25*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
TABLE 3
Mean, Standard Deviation, and Range
of Criterion and Predictor Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Neutral Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Obtained Range</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety (MAS)</td>
<td>13.96</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>2-53</td>
<td>0-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego Strength (Es)</td>
<td>46.89</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>27-59</td>
<td>0-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political (P)</td>
<td>42.16</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>18-62</td>
<td>0-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (R)</td>
<td>39.16</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>11-74</td>
<td>0-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregation (D)</td>
<td>57.81</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>5-93</td>
<td>0-104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter IV

DISCUSSION

The Generalility or Specificity of Attitudes. The finding of low intercorrelations between the attitude scales P, R, and D suggests a specificity of liberal-conservative attitudes in the present study. In view of past research by Cantril (Allport 1935), Likert (Allport 1935), and Fintner (1933) and in view of the opinions of those who have reviewed research in this area (Allport 1935, Remmers 1954, and Kerr 1944) this finding is contrary to the expectation that subjects in this research would have generalized attitudes. It will be noted (Table 3) that mean scores on the Political and Desegregation scales fall in the liberal range of the liberal-conservative continuum, while the mean score on the Religion scale falls in the conservative range. Inasmuch as it might be assumed that current antipathy to the war in Vietnam may have been a factor leading to the liberal viewpoint in the Political area, it should be noted that only one statement on the Political scale was in any way connected with war, namely, "Isolation (complete) is the answer to our foreign policy." It seems evident, therefore, that the students in this investigation are selective in their attitudes toward politics, organized religion, and the Negro.

This study was conducted in a Baptist-affiliated college and it is therefore not surprising that 65% of the Ss have a conservative attitude toward organized religion. It was anticipated that the majority of Ss would score in the conservative range with respect to the political
and racial issues as well. As was previously noted, Ss were drawn from a college considered conservative by today's standards. It will be recalled that Karr (1944) concluded from his survey of research relevant to this issue, that college students in most denominational colleges tend to be more conservative than other college students. The finding that 72% of the Ss indicated a liberal attitude toward political issues and 63% a liberal attitude toward Negroes is, therefore, unexpected.

Several factors, either singly or together, may account for the observed specificity. First, it could be argued that the Desegregation scale used in this study no longer discriminates between liberal and conservative attitudes toward the Negro. As previously reported (Chapter II), the D scale was constructed at the University of Texas and first used in 1955 as a measure of attitude toward Negroes (statements with a scale value of 7.34 or above indicating conservatism and 4.30 or below indicating liberalism). In 1958 and again in 1964, the D scale was administered to University of Texas students, carefully equated with the 1955 group, in order to measure change in attitude toward Negroes.

Young, Clore, and Holtzmann (1966) report that while no significant change in attitude occurred between 1955 and 1958, there was considerable change toward a "more accepting" (more liberal) attitude toward Negroes between 1958 and 1964 (F = 26.34, p < .001). They were concerned with the possibility that any changes found might reflect the "obsolescence of the scale rather than attitude change" and consequently analyzed seven items from the D scale (items representing as great a range of liberal and conservative statements as possible). This analysis revealed that there had been a change in attitude toward six items in the direction of more favorable attitudes toward Negroes, and no change in one of the seven
items (the statement which had been responded to most favorably, i.e.,
liberally, in both 1958 and 1964). A rank order correlation between
mean scale values of the seven statements was 1.00. Young et al. con-
cluded that the change in D scale scores represented a change in attitude
rather than obsolescence of the scale itself. This investigator accepts
the validity of the D scale as a measure of liberalism-conservatism as
of 1964 and assumes it remains valid in 1969.

Second, there is the possibility that the injustices to and
oppression of Negroes is so widely recognized and the need for social
reform in this area so widely agreed upon that the "Negro question" is
no longer a major social issue. If this is the case, it would be un-
likely that any scale allegedly measuring liberal-conservative attitudes
toward Negroes would be discriminating. The investigator suggests that
a scale measuring attitude toward drugs, for example, may elicit a wider
range of scores in 1969 for liberalism-conservatism than a scale measur-
ing attitude toward Negroes.

The third factor suggested as an explanation of the observed
specificity of attitudes is concerned with the influence of television
upon present Ss. Present-day college students are the first generation
to have grown up with daily witnessing of current events on television
screens in their homes. In assessing the impact of television on our
current generation of students, it is relevant to recall Allport's (1935)
four attitude determinants; "integration," "differentiation," "trauma,"
and "adoption." "Adoption," which would seem closely related to habitual
television viewing, is defined by Allport as "following the example of
parents, friends, teachers, newspapers, and other opinion-molding
agencies." This investigator suggests that the most modern opinion-
molding agency, television, has been a particularly persuasive attitude determinant for today's college student, especially in the area of social issues. It has afforded him the opportunity to balance the merits of events as they are witnessed, or are described by reporters, against the often biased opinions and beliefs of their families, friends, teachers, and newspapers, thus increasing the likelihood that he will be selective or specific in his feelings for or against various social issues. It is further suggested that television not only plays an important part in the process of "adoption," but foists upon the viewer no small amount of "trauma" (defined by Allport as an "unusual, violent, or painful experience"). It is reasonable to assume that the sight of war, murder, riots, and other disturbing social events projected into homes is for many students an "unusual, violent, or painful experience," thus intensifying and fortifying attitudes and opinions related to the events themselves.

The Relationship of Anxiety to Liberalism-Conservatism. The absence of significant correlations, either Pearson $r$ or multiple $R$, between anxiety as measured by Taylor's Manifest Anxiety Scale and liberalism-conservatism as measured by the Political, Religion, and Desegregation scales, indicates that $P$, $R$, and $D$ do not predict anxiety either singly or together. Present evidence fails to support the hypothesis that there is a positive linear relationship between liberalism-conservatism and anxiety. The absence of a significant relationship between anxiety and liberalism-conservatism in the present study does not support clinical observations that liberal clients are more anxious than conservative clients. While these clinical impressions may be valid in the areas of counseling and therapy, it cannot be said that a similar
relationship exists in the college population. Although liberal students in this study cannot be equated with student activists at the University of California, Berkeley, it is of interest to note that a study by Trent and Craise (1967) concerned with the distinguishing characteristics of activists and non-activists on the Berkeley campus revealed no significant differences in manifest anxiety (measured by the Taylor MAS) between these groups. The California study and the present study yield compatible results.

The Relationship of Ego Strength to Liberalism-Conservatism

Before proceeding with the discussion of current findings, it should be recalled that Barron (1953) reported that individuals scoring high on the Ego-Strength Scale can be described as having "feelings of personal adequacy, a strong sense of reality, and a lack of ethnic prejudice." It should be recalled also that for the purpose of this study, the liberal-conservative continuum is defined as "ranging from the radical position of favoring fundamental or maximal social change without delay to the ultra conservative position, favoring change only as a slow, evolutionary process with minimal disruption of social institutions."

The results of this investigation (Table 2) indicate that no significant relationship exists between ego strength as measured by Barron's Ego-Strength Scale and the liberal-conservative continuum when this continuum is measured by the Political or Desegregation scales. Therefore, the data obtained with regard to the P and D scales does not support the hypothesis that there is a negative linear relationship between liberalism-conservatism and ego strength. Ego strength is found to have a positive linear relationship to liberalism-conservatism when this attitude continuum is measured by the Religion scale (Pearson $r = .25$,
p (.05) or by the Political, Religion, and Desegregation scales combined.

The Religion scale alone and the three attitude scales together are predicting ego strength, but in the direction opposite to that hypothesized, again failing to support the hypothesis as stated above. Since the difference between the Pearson r and the multiple R is not statistically significant (F = .75, p > .05), the indication is that the addition of the Political and Desegregation scales does not improve the predictive ability of the Religion scale; the Religion scale is as good a predictor of ego strength as the three attitude scales together.

The continuing discussion will concern itself with the relationship of ego strength to liberal-conservative attitudes toward organized religion. Implicit is the investigator's awareness of the predictability of the combined attitude scales and the absence of significant relationships between ego strength and attitudes toward politics and ego strength and attitudes toward Negroes.

Since the direction of the observed relationship between ego strength and liberalism-conservatism is positive it means that, relative to the population under investigation, as the individuals' attitudes increase in liberalism, there is a tendency for a corresponding rise in the level of ego strength. As the students' attitudes toward organized religion become increasingly liberal, the results reflect that they have less racial prejudice and, having a stronger sense of reality and fewer self doubts, they are able to resist the authority of the church.

The correlational evidence fails to lend credence to the previously mentioned impressions of clinical psychologists, namely that liberal clients have lower ego strength than conservative clients, and in fact,
suggests that liberal clients would be expected to have higher ego strength than conservative clients. Inspection of raw scores on all three attitude scales reveals that the sample is quite homogeneous, containing no ultra liberals or ultra conservatives. It is speculated that a clinical client population is less homogeneous than the present sample and contains a greater proportion of individuals at the extremes of the liberal-conservative continuum. No generalizations may be made properly from the client population to the student population.

It should be noted that observation of scatter plots indicates that none of the relationships in this study are curvilinear.

It is suggested that the instruments involved in this study are not sensitive enough to detect subtle differences in a basically homogeneous sample, and that a study of liberalism-conservatism might better be conducted with a less homogeneous population. A restriction in the range of scores lowers correlations and may serve to mask effects that may be observed in a more heterogeneous sample. Clinicians interested in further research in this area may want to utilize business or industrial populations in an effort to increase the range of scores. If the interest is in a student population, a large state university may provide a sample covering the full range of the liberal-conservative continuum.

Consideration should be given to employing other measures of anxiety and ego strength in future research. Shock and shading responses on the Rorschach are, for example, potential measures of anxiety, and form quality might serve as a measure of ego strength.

In the interest of obtaining more discriminating measures of liberalism-conservatism, it is felt that the construction of new modern attitude scales should be undertaken before further investigations related to liberalism-conservatism are made.
Chapter V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A correlational study was undertaken to ascertain the validity and generality of clinical observations that liberal clients are more anxious and have lower ego strength than conservative clients. The generality or specificity of liberal-conservative attitudes was investigated also. Subjects were 145 undergraduate Psychology students of both sexes. Liberalism-conservatism was defined by scales measuring attitude toward politics, organized religion, and Negroes; anxiety by Taylor's Manifest Anxiety Scale; ego strength by Barron's Ego-Strength Scale.

Based on the obtained findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

(1) Attitudes were found to be specific to the attitude object, i.e., liberal toward politics and Negroes and conservative toward organized religion.

(2) Anxiety measures were not significantly related to liberalism-conservatism.

(3) No significant relationship was found between ego strength and liberal-conservative attitudes toward politics or Negroes.

(4) The level of ego strength tended to increase as attitude toward organized religion became more liberal.

It is suggested that:

(1) "Attitude toward Negroes" is not an adequate measure of liberalism-conservatism today.
(2) Television is an important factor in determining social attitudes and in part accounts for the observed specificity of attitudes.

(3) A more heterogeneous sample is desirable for a study of liberalism-conservatism.
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APPENDIX A

Political Scale
1. Social Security should be abolished.

2. T.V.A. is a very effective and beneficial program.

3. The government should provide and create jobs to relieve the unemployment situation.

4. The U.S. should withdraw from the U.N. because we bear the financial burden.

5. Government sponsored medical care for the aged is definitely desirable.

6. We should cut out foreign aid in order to reduce our national debt.

7. I favor a de-centralization of the federal government.

8. Foreign aid spending should be abolished.

9. I believe in less federal tax and more state tax.

10. The National Defense Education Act is a good policy for educational improvement.

11. The government should finance college education.

12. I favor increased federal aid to higher education.

13. Labor unions play an essential role in American democracy.

14. The federal government should attempt to cut its annual spending.

15. All old people should be taken care of by the government.

16. It is the concern of the federal government to indicate, direct, and finance relief programs for poverty stricken areas.

17. Efficient large-scale production necessitates government intervention.

18. Isolation (complete) is the answer to our foreign policy.
APPENDIX B

Religion Scale
1. There is no God.

2. There exists a personal God who is aware of my actions.

3. Many students attend church only because of family pressure.

4. Immortality is a meaningless idea.

5. There must be some kind of a power higher than that of man.

6. The church is losing ground as education advances.

7. Very religious people are usually narrow-minded.

8. The church helps one to be more honest and creditable.

9. Belief of eternal life is a fond hope of weak people.

10. People pray—but they really don't expect anything to come of it.

11. Those who feel that prayers are answered are just deceiving themselves.

12. Some sort of religious outlook is necessary to achieve a fully mature philosophy of life.

13. The church is the greatest institution in America today.

14. Church attendance is worthless.

15. Church membership is almost essential to living life at its best.

16. At least part of our life is determined by God.

17. Most people read the Bible because they have been taught to.

18. Church attendance does not provide spiritual uplift.

19. Life should be centered around religion.

20. Man is good because he has a spark of God in him.

21. People attend church mostly to be with friends.

22. The church is a powerful agency for promoting both individual and social righteousness.

23. People who do not attend church regularly usually lead unconstructive lives.
APPENDIX C

Desegregation Scale
1. The prospect of intermarriage between Negro and white is repulsive to me.

2. If a Negro were elected to public office, social pressures would prevent his doing a good job.

3. I would not mind sharing a table with Negroes in a crowded cafeteria.

4. Negroes should be allowed to enter any university they choose.

5. The Negro race will eventually reach the cultural and intellectual level of white people.

6. Admitting Negroes to white schools will not work because most Negroes do not have the necessary background to keep up with white students.

7. A Negro Army officer could never do a good job leading white soldiers because they might lack confidence in him.

8. Negroes should be allowed to occupy any seat they can afford to pay for at a concert, sports event, or other public program.

9. Negroes living in white neighborhoods lower the standards of cleanliness.

10. One of the reasons for maintaining segregation is that the Negro will be able to find more equal opportunities with his own people.

11. I would not object to participating in school athletics with Negroes.

12. The best way to solve the race problem is to encourage inter-marriage so that there will eventually be only one race.

13. If one of my best friends married a Negro, I would stop inviting him to my home.

14. I would consider dating a Negro, providing he or she met all of my other standards.

15. I would not mind having my children taught by a Negro school teacher.

16. The trouble with letting Negroes into white schools is that they would gradually give them a typical Negro atmosphere.

17. The Negro will remain ignorant and superstitious despite equal educational opportunities.

18. Separate churches for white and colored people should be maintained, since church membership is a matter of individual choice.

19. The Army's desegregation policy is an advance toward interracial understanding.
20. I would not object to sharing a public swimming pool with Negroes.

21. The fact that there is no racial segregation in certain European countries indicates that desegregation can be made to work here.

22. I would not hesitate to join a fraternity or sorority which admitted Negroes.

23. If Negroes are allowed to share all public facilities and institutions with white people, they will soon become arrogant and overbearing.

24. Negroes are often dishonest and would increase cheating if admitted to white schools.

25. I would accept a traffic ticket as graciously from a Negro as from a white police officer.

26. I would not object to dancing with a good Negro dancer.
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