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Summary

The research aim was to investigate the variables of racial prejudice under differing social conditions. Two main areas of contention were examined: the factors which account for the heightened prejudice in South Africa; and an examination of the concept of authoritarianism as measured by the F and Dogmatism Scales.

Preliminary research was undertaken with a sample of 138 University of Edinburgh students and, from the results obtained, a thirty item prejudice scale was constructed. The evidence suggests that the scale is both a reliable and valid measure of racial prejudice. Included in this instrument are two sub-scales: racial stereotypy and discrimination.

From the pilot study findings, a questionnaire consisting of the following eight measures was compiled: Anomie, Dogmatism, Extraversion, F, Neuroticism, Political Concern, Prejudice and Rigidity. These were administered to university students. The two main samples selected were the British and South African, each numbering 114 respondents, with age and sex controlled. Research was also undertaken with a group of 61 Southern Africans (both South African and Rhodesian) studying at British universities; with 35 student Communists, and 15 student nuns.

Research has shown that samples of South Africans, although extremely prejudiced, do not score excessively on authoritarianism. In an attempt at explanation, two alternative hypotheses were tested: non-authoritarians in South Africa will, because of conformity to intolerant race norms, tend to be prejudiced; and in contradiction, non-authoritarians in Britain and South Africa will be equally
tolerant, but the difference in prejudice between the samples occurs because authoritarians in South Africa will tend to be more prejudiced than authoritarians in Britain. The findings support the latter postulate suggesting that social influences function only within the framework of the individual personality structure.

Some indications were obtained to show that prejudice is suppressed in response to tolerant race norms in Britain. The results suggest that the concept of latent prejudice may provide an explanation of suppressed prejudice. It was also indicated that the political concern scale, constructed here, may constitute a further dimension in the study of racialism. The findings throughout stress the vital role of both personality and the social environment on race prejudice. It is concluded that the prevailing race norms determine the level of prejudice expressed by those individuals who, in personality, tend towards authoritarianism.

The comparison of the F and Dogmatism Scales focused largely on political preference groups within the samples. Only partial support was obtained for the claim that the Dogmatism Scale is a measure of general authoritarianism. Although Communist and Conservative groups obtained statistically similar means on dogmatism, it cannot be concluded that individuals at the opposite extremes of the political dimension display similar personality characteristics. Dogmatism of the Left shows an affinity with neuroticism while dogmatism of the Right relates to F and rigidity. Further, eleven of the forty Dogmatism Scale items were indicated to measure content rather than structure. Further research is required into both the concept of a content free measure of authoritarianism and into differences in authoritarianism as expressed by individuals of differing political orientations. In the study of racial prejudice the Dogmatism Scale does not appear to provide an alternative improvement on the F Scale.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The psychological and sociological study of racial prejudice:

Social psychologists and sociologists have both claimed that racial prejudice, as a field of scientific enquiry, was best served by their own particular discipline. Psychologists have tended to emphasize the personality of the bigot, attention being largely focused on authoritarianism, while sociologists have stressed the importance of the social environment as the major determinant of racial prejudice. The diverse nature of the problem has allowed the propagators of both viewpoints to argue vindication for their own approach. However, the significant results achieved by both, appear to suggest their equal relevance, rather than the supremacy of the one over the other.

Simpson and Yinger (1958, p. 70-71) find that research into racial prejudice has developed around three related but distinct factors: the individual personality; the structure of society; and culture.

Stagner (1961) writes that, "the psychology of personality seeks principles which explain patterns of differences between persons." (p.15) The personality study of racial prejudice places emphasis on factors which differentiate the more prejudiced from less prejudiced individuals. In the present study, the characteristics of the groups against whom prejudice and discrimination are directed, are not investigated. The concern is solely with the contrast in personality between prejudiced and tolerant individuals.

Research into the structures of society stresses the political, economic, and social institutions of the society. The extent and manner in which these contribute to the creation of group hostilities
is investigated; for example, Marxism explains prejudice in terms of economic exploitation whereby the ruling class sustains racial conflict in order to gain economic advantages.

The culture, as a cause of prejudice, is illustrated in the observation that every generation in a society is taught appropriate beliefs and practices regarding other groups. Individual experience with minority groups is not necessary; the cultural heritage provides ready-made evaluations of out-groups.

Banton (1967) points out that the psychologist and sociologist examine the same data, but from different aspects. The distinction between personal and social factors in prejudice, Simpson and Yinger stress, is analytical. Cultural norms do not explain the origins or the continuation of a society's traditions; reference must be made to personality and group structures. Similarly, the individual does not function as an isolate within society; personality needs to be considered as an interaction between the unique individual and his total environment. The individual personality is moulded by his cultural heritage, and functions within the group structures of society; personality, culture and societal structure must be considered in dynamic terms, each continually interacting with, influencing and being influenced by the others. Thus, an emphasis on one aspect will not provide the total picture, rather, such study aims to contribute to an eventual theory of racial prejudice, incorporating all the dimensions of the problem.

T.F. Pettigrew (1958), noted the need for mutual recognition within the social sciences when he wrote:

"As further data are gathered with more refined research tools, it becomes increasingly apparent that the psychological and sociological correlates of prejudice are elaborately intertwined and both are essential to provide an adequate theoretical framework for this complex phenomenon." (p. 29)
Aims of the Research:

The present study of racial prejudice, although limited in its scope, attempts to embody the essence of Pettigrew's statement in its objectives. The background of the present orientation, while biased towards the personality standpoint, includes social factors of racial prejudice in its design. The central theme of the research is the personality variable of authoritarianism as measured both by the Adorno et al (1950) F Scale and Rokeach's (1956) Dogmatism Scale; it is these two concepts of authoritarianism which constitute the two main sections of the study. Other personality variables investigated are Anomie, Extraversion, Neuroticism and Rigidity. In addition, a racial prejudice scale and a measure of political concern were constructed during the present research.

Thus, eight measures comprised the questionnaire which was administered to diverse groups. The scales utilized were aimed essentially at information concerning the respondents' personality, while social factors were taken into account in the sample selection. The main samples consisted of University students drawn in Britain and South Africa. Within these samples various political preference and religious affiliation groups were delineated. Secondary samples were of Southern African students in Britain, British communists and nuns. The rationale of this approach was to investigate personality variables of racial prejudice while controlling for social influences. The specific problems which stimulated the research are elucidated in the discussion below.

The relationship between prejudice and authoritarianism:

In the psychological study of racial prejudice, the major contribution has been "The Authoritarian Personality" (1950) by Adorno.

1. Also referred to as the S.A. (in Br.) sample.
The concern of the present study is a re-examination of the Adorno et al. concept of authoritarianism. Racial prejudice, they suggest, is an expression of an underlying personality structure, which could be measured at the personality level. For this purpose they constructed the F Scale. Although subsequent research has repeatedly demonstrated the existence of a positive correlation between the F Scale and various measures of racial prejudices, questions of both the precise nature of this relationship and of the validity of the F Scale remain to be resolved. Aspects of these problems form the areas of research in the present study.

The first section of this work deals with the relationship between prejudice and authoritarianism under varying social conditions. In order to fulfil this objective, British and South African samples were cross-culturally compared. The analysis centred on F and prejudice scale responses. The research undertaken by Pettigrew in South Africa (1958), and in the United States (1959) with Northern and Southern samples provided the frame of reference for the present comparison.

Social Conformity and Prejudice:

The Adorno et al. research did not investigate the influence of the social environment on racial attitudes; accordingly, their findings have tended to be dismissed, by those inclined towards a social solution of the problem, as being of only marginal relevance. Pettigrew, in his research, attempted to reconcile personality and social factors within his theoretical framework.

The problem to which the Pettigrew researches addressed themselves was the apparent contradiction between: on the one hand, the assertion made by Adorno and his associates, that racial prejudice could be measured indirectly at the personality level by means of the F Scale;
and on the other, by the observable heightened racial tensions existing in areas such as South Africa and the American South which could not be accounted for by increased authoritarianism.

Pettigrew investigated authoritarianism and social conformity using samples from the above regions. Pettigrew accounted for the heightened prejudice in the South African and American Southern samples by social conformity to the prevailing norms of racial intolerance. In these areas, Pettigrew declared, at least some non-authoritarians would express prejudiced attitudes. Thus, according to Pettigrew, there were substantial numbers of individuals whose racial attitudes could not be predicted from their performance on the F Scale, and therefore, in terms of this explanation, the authoritarian solution provided by Adorno and his associates was limited in its application to areas of relative racial tolerance. The implications for personality theory in the Pettigrew studies required that verification be sought. The hypotheses were interpretations of, rather than being substantiated by, the data. Furthermore, these appeared to be open to interpretations other than those provided by Pettigrew. Taking Pettigrew's findings into account, alternative hypotheses, largely based on the original Adorno et al thesis, were formulated during the present study, and both these and Pettigrew's were subjected to test with British and South African samples.

Pettigrew's work confirmed the importance of both personality and social factors in the study of racial prejudice. However, he did not achieve the objective of integrating into a theoretical framework the findings from both orientations. Implicit in Pettigrew's conclusions is, that in areas where racism is not officially sanctioned, personality

1. Presented in Chapter 6 below.
provides the key to the study of racial attitudes. In areas of racial hostility, while personality remains important, social conformity is crucial. This explanation failed to consider conformity to norms of tolerance in the former areas, and in the latter, no indication was given of the relationship between personality and social conformity. The aim of the present study is to extend Pettigrew's findings by investigating the interaction between the personality and social factors of racial prejudice, in order to arrive at an eventual theoretical framework which incorporates both these variables. The selection of the Southern Africans in Britain sample was motivated primarily by the need to investigate the influence of the social environment on personality. As these individuals have had personal experience of the racial attitudes prevalent in both South Africa and Britain, it was thought that the comparison of these with the main samples drawn in the two countries would facilitate the investigation of the social influences on the personality correlates of racial prejudice.

Social conformity and extraversion:

The primary aim of the present research is to account for the heightened prejudice in South Africa compared with that in Britain, by means of a theoretical framework incorporating the findings of both the authoritarian and the social conformity hypotheses. The second objective of the study, also arising from Pettigrew's work, is the examination, under differing conditions of racial intolerance, of personality variables, other than authoritarianism, which relate to prejudice.

Pettigrew did not find that all the respondents in his South African and Southern samples were racially prejudiced, and it can be assumed that those who were tolerant, also scored low on the F Scale.1

1. This assumption may be justified by the positive correlations between F and prejudice obtained by Pettigrew.
The question that arises is why do some non-authoritarians conform to the society's norms of racial intolerance while others do not?

The intention of the present research is to compare the responses of tolerant and intolerant low F Scale scorers on a number of personality variables. The extraversion-introversion dimension appeared, from the work of H.J. Eysenck, in "The Psychology of Politics" (1954), to be relevant as a factor of both prejudice and social conformity, and was therefore utilized in the present research.

Eysenck postulates that socialization is mediated by conditioning and that extraverts condition poorly while introverts condition well. Extraverts, Eysenck suggests, tend to be racially prejudiced and introverts tend to be tolerant. However, in his general discussion, Eysenck stresses that the direction of the conditioning process needs to be taken into account. Thus, in South Africa, introverts may condition to norms of intolerance, while this would be less likely to occur in Britain. The differences existing in the race norms of Britain and South Africa would therefore be expected to result in differences in the relationship between prejudice and extraversion being obtained in the sample comparison.

Eysenck relates the extraversion-introversion factor to social attitudes. Extraverts, he suggests, are responsive to conformity pressures, while introverts are relatively immune. According to Eysenck, extraverts tend to be both racially prejudiced and conformist. Thus, linking Eysenckian theory with that of Pettigrew, it is suggested that the conformity behaviour which distinguishes the intolerant from the tolerant non-authoritarian, may be explained by the former group of individuals being characterized by the extraverted personality type, while the latter are characterized by introversion.
Thus, the relationship between extraversion and both prejudice and social conformity is investigated, but the latter only is dependent on the outcome of Pettigrew's hypotheses.

**Social conformity and dogmatism:**

Milton Rokeach, in his book "The Open and Closed Mind" (1960), gives prominence to social conformity. Here he suggests that conformity to social pressures is a characteristic of the closed minded or dogmatic individual.

Rokeach views his concept of authoritarianism as an alternative improvement to that provided by Adorno and his co-workers. Rokeach claims that the Dogmatism Scale is a measure of general authoritarianism as opposed to the F Scale which is a measure of authoritarianism of the political right. In terms of Rokeachian theory, it may be feasible to suggest that because of deficiencies in the F Scale, intolerant individuals, although scoring low on the scale, are misclassified as non-authoritarians. In other words, these individuals are in fact authoritarian, but because they are not politically right-wing, it is only the latter aspect which is registered by the F Scale. Thus, tolerant and intolerant low F Scale scorers would be expected to be placed, respectively, at the low and high extreme of the open and closed minded dimension.

**The Role of social conformity in the research:**

Pettigrew's analysis thus provides the link between the various concepts utilized in the present study. The over-all objective is the investigation of personality variables of racial prejudice under the social systems prevailing in Britain and South Africa. The research is independent of Pettigrew's work which provides a unifying framework. In the event of the failure of Pettigrew's hypotheses to materialise, it is anticipated that the unitary nature of the research will be
affected rather than the quality of the results obtained. This contingency is in fact predicted in the hypotheses formulated to account for the heightened prejudice expected for the South African sample. These are in contradiction to those presented by Pettigrew. Thus, while the substantiation of the intolerant non-authoritarian hypothesis determines the degree of prominence given to Eysenckian theory in the present study, this dependency did not apply to Rokeach's concepts.

The primary concern in this study using the Dogmatism Scale is to clarify the concept of authoritarianism by a comparison of its performance with that of the F Scale. This objective occupies the second part of the investigation. The possible invalidation of Pettigrew's postulates would thus merely blur, to some extent, the connection between this and the earlier concern of examining the relationship between prejudice and the F Scale. In this event, social conformity would no longer provide a unifying concept.  

The Dogmatism Scale as a measure of general authoritarianism:

The existence of a relationship between prejudice and authoritarianism advances knowledge in the field in so far as the nature of authoritarianism is amenable to precise definition. Although extensively investigated, ambiguity still pertains to the F Scale. Rokeach (1956, 1960) challenges the Adorno et al conception of authoritarianism, suggesting that it is limited in its application only to the right-wing of the

---

1. The results obtained during the research (presented in Chapter 13) did not support Pettigrew's hypothesis. As Pettigrew's interpretations were not verified, it was no longer necessary to extend them. Accordingly, the Dogmatism Scale results centered on the concept of general as opposed to right-wing authoritarianism. Furthermore, Eysenckian theory was thus relegated to a relatively minor role in the presentation.
political spectrum. Rokeach asserts that whereas the previous research had measured content, emphasis needs to be given to structure. Rokeach presents his Dogmatism Scale as a measure of general authoritarianism, free of ideological content.

The validity of Rokeach's measure needs to be established if it is to replace the F Scale in authoritarian research. Rokeach's claim that the Dogmatism Scale is a measure of general authoritarianism, however, rests largely on the results he obtained from a group of English communist students numbering only thirteen. Clearly, further testing with more adequately sized samples is required. A group of communists were sampled in the present study specifically to test Rokeach's assertions. The analysis centred on the F and Dogmatism Scale results obtained from the Communists and from other political preference groups among the main samples. Religious dogmatism also figured prominently in Rokeach's research, and accordingly, was examined among religious affiliation groups taken from the respondents sampled. For this purpose an additional sample of student nuns were also selected. In both the political and religious group comparisons, the relationship between both the measures of authoritarianism and other personality variables are investigated.

Rokeach, unlike Adorno and his co-workers, clearly states the expected relationship between his scale and both anxiety and rigidity; closed mindedness was a defence mechanism against anxiety but was discriminably different from rigidity. The influence of the social environment on the variables associated with the two measures of authoritarianism is investigated, using scales of neuroticism and rigidity. Predicted relationships between dogmatism and anomie, and between dogmatism and political concern are also tested.
Summary of the Research aims:

To recapitulate, the aim of the first section of the study is to investigate the relationship between prejudice and authoritarianism (P) under differing social environments. The second part compares the F and Dogmatism Scales with the aim of testing the validity of both versions. In particular, the credentials of the latter are examined. Thus, while the previous section of the report deals with samples of British and South African nationals, the emphasis here is on sub-groups within these samples, in addition to other groups especially selected for this purpose. The over-all objective of the study is to investigate the personality variable of authoritarianism, so as to demarcate its function in the study of racial prejudice.

The Construction of the Prejudice Scale:

A racial prejudice scale was constructed during the present study, and although this instrument was to provide the means of achieving the research objectives rather than being an end in itself, the success of the entire project hinges largely on the validity of the scale. Thus, in these introductory remarks, mention needs to be made of the motivation for creating a new measure in a field where numerous other scales already exist.

The advantage gained from the use of measures which have established coefficients of reliability and validity, did not appear to outweigh the disadvantage of using possibly outdated items, not specifically attuned to the prevailing social conditions relevant to the samples selected here. The successful measurement of racial attitudes requires cognizance to be taken of the nuances of racism existing in the society. Racialist views are, for instance, increasingly accompanied by sophisticated justification, whereas, previously, admission to racial prejudice was more freely forthcoming. This point is illustrated by
items taken from early prejudice scales: thus, Moore (1925) asked Yale and Dartmouth undergraduates:

"Are you more impressed with the dangers of race prejudice than with its possible advantages." (p. 236)

and, among the alternatives provided for Likert's (1932) respondents to the hypothetical situation of a negro being insolent to a white man, were whipping and lynching.

A present day researcher might find difficulty in locating a subject who responded negatively to Moore's item, or who considered lynching an acceptable remedy for insolence. The examples quoted are extreme, but they do nevertheless demonstrate the changing pattern of race attitudes. It is not suggested that racial prejudice and discrimination are a less urgent problem today than they were in the early decades of this century, or that their resultant hardships are less severe. The argument is merely that racial attitudes have found greater subtlety of expression, and are thus more difficult to measure.

The research requirements for the prejudice scale were that it be sufficiently sophisticated for use with student populations and that it be equally applicable in both Britain and South Africa. A thirty item scale was constructed which included sub-scales to measure stereotyped belief and discrimination.

As a prelude to the review of the pertinent literature, the historical background of racialism is traced in the next chapter. The historical analysis does not have a bearing on the research project as such, but as the theoretical framework aims at incorporating the social influences of racial prejudice, it is necessary to obtain some understanding of the processes which have contributed, past and present, to the prevailing social climates in the areas under study.
PART 1

THE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND HYPOTHESES
A. PREJUDICE AND AUTHORITARIANISM.
In a cross-cultural study it is useful to obtain a historical perspective of the social, political and economic heritage of the societies from which the samples are drawn. It is not intended to provide an extensive analysis, but rather, a brief compendium of some of the outstanding events in the development of racialism in the Western World. This method of historical selectivity contains dangers of distortion, but is unavoidable if the historian's role is not to be usurped. Moreover, the historical evidence does not reflect on the testing of the research hypotheses, but merely provides a frame of reference for evaluation.

The rationale of the discussion is that common to the Western World is a cultural tone of white superiority - black inferiority. The history of the coloured people in Britain extends over four hundred years. (Banton 1959, p. 55.) For convenience, three main features of this period are demarcated and dealt with separately. These are slavery, imperialism and the post-war immigration of coloured peoples into Britain. Racism in South Africa is then discussed, and finally, analogies are drawn with conditions in the United States.

**Slavery:**

No attempt is made to trace the origins of racism. African slaves replaced poor whites on the West Indian sugar plantations, and thus, racism does not provide an explanation of the slave trade. In the words of Williams (1967);

"Slavery was not born out of racism: rather, racism was the consequence of slavery." (p. 7)
In retrospect, the development of racism from the African slave trade was inevitable. It is hardly conceivable that the physical dehumanization involved in enslavement would not be accompanied by a similar mental barrier being created by the enslavers to distinguish themselves from their victims. As Fanon (1967a) pointed out:

"It is not possible to enslave men without logically making them inferior through and through. And racism is only the emotional, affective, sometimes intellectual explanation of this inferiorization." (p. 40)

Whatever the initial motivations, it is beyond reasonable doubt that the slave trade did in fact become closely linked to racialist thought. Questionable, however, must be the extent to which racialism contaminated the cultures of the slave trading nations, of which Britain was the foremost. The argument here is that these influences were considerable.

Williams (1967, p. 39) talks of the united front, prior to 1783, presented towards the slave trade by all classes of English society. Those individuals with direct financial interest in slave ventures were supported, not only by the wielders of power - the Monarchy, the Government and the Church - but also by British public opinion in general. It must be remembered that it was only in 1823 that emancipation became the avowed aim of the abolitionists. The thesis, outlined by Williams, links slavery with capitalism. The abolitionist leadership condemned only Negro slavery in the British West Indies. Slavery in Brazil or India, for example, did not appear to meet with their condemnation. Thus, even in the anti-slavery movements, Williams argues, economic motives may be discerned. They, Williams writes:

"... show a curious affinity with the rise and development of new interests and the necessity of the destruction of the old." (p. 211)

The profits and the extent of the slave trade were enormous. In 1773, for instance, one-quarter of British imports came from the
Caribbean. (Williams 1967, p. 53) Clearly, the slave trade was significantly related to British economic development. It was responsible for the growth of seaports, the most prominent of which were Bristol, Liverpool and Glasgow. It provided a stimulus to shipping and shipbuilding and to numerous manufacturing industries, notably wool, cotton and sugar refining, to name but a few. Although the slave trade was essentially controlled by large companies, shares enabled the ordinary citizen to participate. Liverpudlians, in particular, appeared to have availed themselves of this opportunity.

The economic consequences of the slave trade for the European powers were undoubtedly on a massive scale; and this fact alone, leads to the conclusion that slavery must have had some bearing on the cultures of these nations. The extent of the undertaking: the traffic in human beings was to be counted in the millions; the vast profits that accrued; the employment that it directly and indirectly provided; could not have left many people indifferent nor failed in some way to have marked European culture.

**Imperialism:**

Elkins (1963) considers that, by the nineteenth century, the morality of slavery was being discussed in Europe and America. This century marked the decline and final abolition of slavery as an institution. While the ideas of racial equality gained currency, it must be noted that the pro-slavery arguments were not silenced, on the contrary, these appeared eventually to gain supremacy. For instance, Elkins (1963) points to the considerable influence of the historian, Ulrich Phillips, whose basic premise of slavery was racial inferiority. Phillips's major work was published in 1918, and Elkins suggests that Southern racial dogmas were most widely accepted throughout the United States at the beginning of this century. (1963, p. 13)
It is not argued here that the humanitarianism which affected the abolition of slavery was only momentarily influential in European thought. The point is that the social climate was able to accommodate, in addition to egalitarian philosophy, ideas of European racial superiority. Banton (1969) points out that during the 1850's, a spate of racist treatises appeared. Ideas of racial superiority, Banton suggests, were:

"... seized upon and magnified, and publicised, because it was convenient to those who held power in Europe of that day. Europeans were flattered when told they were innately superior." (p. 551.)

That the end of slavery did not also finally discredit racist ideology, may be explained by no abrupt cleavage having occurred. Non-Europeans continued to occupy the inferior position in world society. The freed slave did not over-night lose the taint of slavery. Elkins (1963) postulates that, in the American South, the institution of slavery had created an individual whose personality did conform to the derogatory stereotype held of him. Indentured labourers from the Indian sub-continent replaced the negro slave on the West Indian plantations. Various forms of forced labour persisted long after the abolition of slavery.\(^1\) The emancipation of the slaves ushered in the era of Imperialism, and the process appears to be best regarded as continuous. The evidence quoted below suggests that the racialism, which vitiated Western thought during the period of slavery, continued to receive succour during Imperialism.

Hobson (1968), in his classical work first published in 1902, marks the 1880's as the period in which Imperialism attained its full impetus. By 1900, British Colonies and Dependencies exceeded 15 million square miles.

---

1. For example, there is some evidence to suggest that forced labour continues in the present day to govern policy in the Portuguese African territories. (Mondlane 1969.)
miles with an estimated population of over 366 millions. (Hobson 1968, p. 20.) Kiernan (1969), points out that: of the fourteen sovereign states of Europe in 1914, excluding the Balkans, eight had — and a ninth, Spain, had until lately — overseas possessions. In spite of competition, "when it came to serious colonial upheaval", Kiernan writes, "white men felt their kinship, and Europe drew together." (1969, p. 27.)

Imperialism, although not synonymous with slavery, was its natural heir. Hobson felt that both, "express the same character at bottom." (p. 248) Hobson wrote:

"This is the root fact of Imperialism so far as it relates to the control of inferior races; when the latter are not killed out they are subjected by force to the ends of their white superiors." (p. 253)

Indeed, the age of Imperialism continued the destruction and bondage begun with slavery, of the peoples of the New World. It was imperialism which finally witnessed the near extinction of the Indians in the United States, the Aborigines of Australia, the Maoris of New Zealand, the Bushmen and Hottentots in South Africa, the Negritos of Asia, and so forth. In Kiernan’s (1969) words, "whole healthy races were wiped out." (p. 311).

Another aspect of Imperialism, often quoted in its defence, was the benefits of civilization that its adherents purported to bring to the colonized peoples. The discussion here is not involved in the merits or demerits of Imperialism, but with the racialistic connotations engendered by the system. Kiernan’s (1969) thesis was that European attitudes during the era of Imperialism were essentially governed by feelings of racial superiority over the peoples with whom contact was made. This appeared to apply equally to settler, soldier, trader or missionary. Once European government had been established in Africa
and India, missionaries, Kiernan alleges, "usually felt obliged ... to acquiesce in whatever its policies might be." (p. 204)

Indeed, only the arrogance born out of a racialist belief in the superiority of one's own culture could have sanctioned the missionary seal which attempted to impose, in the name of altruism, and by force if necessary, a European way of life on the rest of humanity. Levi-Strauss (1953) makes the point that the Western way of life has been adopted by the colonized peoples less as a result of free choice than of the absence of any alternatives. This was achieved either through imposition or by creating such conditions as to cause the existing native patterns to collapse. Kiernan (1969) notes that eventually doubt came to be expressed about whether European civilization was really good for those exposed to it. But here again, the attitude was one of racialism, and is perhaps reflected in the Southern phrase, 'uppity nigger'. Kiernan writes;

"The least objectionable inhabitants of British India, in British eyes, were those least touched by the white man's learning." (p. 312)

Hobson refers to Imperialism as a "depraved choice of national life." (p. 361) It is difficult to conceive of the Imperialistic venture merely as the concern of those directly involved, rather than its having an impact on large sections of the participating nations.

Hobson saw the influence of Imperialism to be considerable and widespread. He suggested that the Imperialists;

"... by controlling the press, the schools, and where necessary the churches, impose Imperialism upon the masses under the attractive guise of sensational patriotism." (p. 361)

Lenin, in his study of Imperialism, lamented the divisions that it had created in the British working class - "the tendency of imperialism to split the workers." (1968, p. 100) Kiernan (1969) notes that the
unfree Europeans tended not to identify with the Colonial peoples — generally, "ignorance or indifference or 'European' feeling, prevailed." (p. 29)

The prosperity of the West owes much to the imperialistic exploitation of the rest of the world. Again, the racialist justification for these actions, must have considerably influenced the culture of the participating nations. 'Little Black Sambo', 'Ten Little Niggers', '... catch a nigger by the toe', Golly-wogs, all reflect a racialist element in British culture that has not yet disappeared. Other examples are, 'work like a nigger', 'nigger in the woodpile.' The Concise Oxford Dictionary (1964, p. 266) defines 'coon' as, "sly fellow; a Negro; gone—, one whose case is hopeless."

Polisakov (1967) writes that, "generally speaking, racial thinking was natural to nineteenth-century Westerners." (p. 229) Banton (1959) reviewed the racist philosophy and pseudo-science which flourished during this period. For example, Carlyle considered that Negroes would have to be servants to the whites — "those born wiser than you." (Banton 1959, p. 58). Bagehot equated the national strength with racial superiority. Gobineau developed the theory of the purity of the races, miscegination leading to decay. Pearson, Galton's pupil, believed in the genealogical inferiority of Negroes. (Banton 1959, p. 58-65.) Tobias (1961) found that all manner of proofs have been put forward to demonstrate the inferiority of the non-European races. For example, at various stages it has been suggested that the negro has a smaller brain; a thicker skull; a less convoluted brain; was nearer to the ape in the evolutionary scale; and so on. With the scientific invalidation of these arguments, justification for racial discrimination has been sought in cultural differences. Tobias writes:

"Yet, even now, despite the sophisticated turn in the argument, there is the underlying thought that these cultural differences are unchangeable, are part of man's nature, his heredity." (p. 14)
Racialism was undoubtedly a component of Western thought during the era of Imperialism. The scale of the Imperialistic undertaking was so vast that it is highly improbable that the citizens of the participating nations did not view the races of mankind as being hierarchically ordered, the position of superiority being occupied by themselves. In this respect, it must be remembered that it was only in the late 1950's that Europe deemed Africa to be sufficiently capable of self-government. This acknowledgement still remains to be achieved in the Southern part of the African continent. The division of the world into rich and poor nations still roughly corresponds with the classification of the world into European and other races. In spite of some moral protestations, the West, at least in its attitudes to trade and diplomatic recognition, finds the doctrines of racism perpetrated in Southern Africa quite acceptable. Britain has over £1,000 million invested in the Republic of South Africa. In trade, Britain exports some £150 million a year to South Africa and imports some £120 million worth.

Racialism in Britain:

Segal (1967) interprets a persistent racialist environment in Britain when he writes:

"The racism so marked in Britain today that it has become a major influence on the main political parties is recent only in its domestic application. No society but one with an assumption of racial superiority would have conducted and countenanced the slave trade so long, or have acquired and ruled so vast a coloured empire with such self-assurance." (p. 300)

The argument followed in the present discussion concurs with Segal's view. The crux, however, is in the demonstration that the racist heritage of the British people has not yet been dissipated.

Legislative evidence is pointed to by Hepple (1966), in the shipping industry which has a long history of racial discrimination. The Merchant Shipping Act 1894, still in force, continues to differentiate between seamen on racial criteria. (p. 43) The 1968 Immigration Act was described by the International Commission of Jurists as racist in character. Foot (1965) refers to the "knife edge" (p. 235) of race relations in Britain. The political agitation for the restriction of coloured immigrants into the country detailed by Foot, gained momentum during 1968, following the, "explosive race speech by Enoch Powell." In this he called for the immediate cessation of immigration and for the emigration of those already arrived. By allowing coloured immigration, he said, Britain was, "Busily engaged in heaping up its own funeral pyre." Henderson (1960) writes that the 'colour problem' in Britain has some reality, both in the minds of white people and in the way in which they behave towards coloureds. (p. 91) The studies reported by social scientists confirm the prevalence of racial prejudice and discrimination in Britain. No research which has come to the author's notice has reported an absence of prejudiced attitudes among samples of British respondents.

Hepple (1966) writes that most of the coloured workers brought into England during the Second World War as a result of the labour shortage were repatriated after the cessation of hostilities. For those that remained in the country, there was a substantially higher rate of unemployment than among white workers. (p. 46) Little (1947), in a study in Cardiff during the War, found that coloured people were socially

1. Quoted from The Times, 12 June, 1968.
3. As quoted from The Sunday Times, 21 April, 1968.
and geographically segregated. Little attempted to develop a theory relating colour to social class - "colour-class consciousness" (p. 232). The tendency was observed for British people to identify those who were coloured with the lowest social class. Little, in his discussion, emphasized the importance of historical attitudes, reaching back to the slave trade, in determining the stereotype held of coloureds. Richmond (1954) also reports evidence that West Indian immigrants arriving in Liverpool were judged on preconceived notions, most of them derogatory. Richmond found that the most intense prejudices against West Indians were expressed in the field of employment. This was followed, in intensity, by the sexual stereotypes of West Indians, held by the host community.

Later studies have tended to confirm the earlier findings. Rex and Moore (1967) conclude from their research:

"We should be inclined to say, if we were asked what the future of race relations in Britain's cities is likely to be, that a tendency towards segregation of coloured immigrants in cities will continue and that the inhabitants of these areas will more and more become the target of punitive policies and racial hostility." (p. 271)

Richmond (1965) quotes an unpublished survey which estimated that two-thirds of the population of the United Kingdom were liable to express some antipathy towards coloured people, and that half of these express a fairly marked colour prejudice. (p. 82) Richmond does make the point that the attitudes expressed towards coloured immigrants are similar to those expressed against earlier waves of immigrants into Britain - Jewish, Catholic, Irish, Polish and Italian - and thus cannot be entirely explained in terms of colour prejudice. Benton (1955) considered that the discrimination suffered by coloured workers was often not based on racial prejudice. Patterson (1965), tended in her study, to emphasize the antipathy felt by the British to immigrants in general, colour merely exacerbating the problem. Kawwa (1968), in a
study of school children, found greatest hostility towards Cypriots; attitudes being related to the percentage of immigrants living in the area rather than to race.

The evidence, however, on balance, appears to suggest that colour is the crucial factor in the hostility. Daniel (1968), on the bases of the P.E.P. Report, concluded that, "... no doubt that the major component in the discrimination is colour." (p. 209). The P.E.P. Report on Racial Discrimination (1967) provides conclusive and well-documented evidence of racial discrimination in Britain in the fields of employment, housing, and the provision of services.

This research project showed that the West Indians, Pakistanis and Indians studied found discrimination the most disappointing feature of life in Britain, in contrast to the Cypriots whose disappointment was largely centered on other aspects of life.

The claimed incidence of discrimination in employment was 45 per cent for the West Indians, compared to 6 per cent for the Cypriots. (p. 20a) In a follow-up study, the claims of colour discrimination were shown to be largely justified. When an Englishman, Hungarian and Coloured, all applied for the same jobs, out of thirty possibilities, the Hungarian was discriminated against thirteen times, and the Coloured, twenty-seven times. (p. 9) Evidence was also obtained to suggest that the general attitude of employers was that coloured immigrants would be employed only if the labour shortage became acute or only for particular menial tasks. Further, the higher the qualification of the immigrant, the more frequently was discrimination claimed. Substantiation was obtained from Employment Bureaux who stated that the majority of employers would not accept coloured staff even when properly qualified.
In housing, again greater discrimination was suffered by Coloureds than by Cypriots. In the Research with English, Hungarian and Coloured applicants; out of sixty advertisements answered, the coloured tester was refused in forty cases, and asked higher rent in five. The discrimination reported against the Hungarian were, in contrast, minimal. Enquiries at accommodation bureaux and estate agents revealed similar results. The coloured invariably tended to be offered no addresses or fewer than were either the Englishman or Hungarian. Quoted, (p. 11) was the Milner-Holland report on housing in London, which suggests that only 11 per cent of privately let property is both advertised and does not specifically exclude coloured people. These 11 per cent, the P.E.P. Report showed, tended, in the majority of cases tested, to discriminate on racial grounds. For purchasing accommodation, out of 42 estate agents tested, 27 were found to discriminate. Evidence was also obtained showing racial discrimination in council housing.

The data also revealed substantial discrimination in motor insurance. Coloureds tended to be either refused insurance, or quoted a higher premium. Hepple (1968) reports a case of a West Indian refused insurance by fifteen companies (p. 215). The evidence cited by Hepple tends to corroborate the findings of the P.E.P. Report, and in addition, provides examples of discrimination in numerous other fields not specifically tackled in the latter study.

The conclusion drawn from the P.E.P. Report was that there is, "without doubt, substantial discrimination in Britain against coloured immigrants." (p. 12).

No evidence has been uncovered which may suggest that the British born offspring of coloured immigrants are likely to fare any better than
their parents. Hepple (1968), finds that second generation coloured citizens tend equally to face racial discrimination. Banton (1967), sees the possibility of future race relations in Britain emulating those of the United States:

"It is possible that these tendencies may strengthen and that the second-generation West Indian, Indian or Pakistani in Britain may find himself in a position comparable to that of the child of a Negro who emigrated to New York City in World War I." (p. 392)

The studies listed above illustrate the prevalence of racial antipathies existing in Britain. The earlier studies quoted, undertaken prior to the mass immigration of coloured people into Britain - in 1950 the coloured community numbered about 100,000 (Daniel 1968, p. 9) - refute the suggestion that prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory practices developed in response to the influx of immigrants in the late 1950's and early 1960's. From the previous discussion of slavery and Imperialism, it is suggested that the immigrants entered an environment in which they were already labelled as inferior.

South Africa:

The whites in South Africa have geared their society towards maintaining the status quo of white superiority and the concomitant subjugation of the non-white peoples of the country. The South African system is firmly based on the ideology of segregating the whites at the apex of the society, in the economic, political and social spheres, from the black masses at the bottom.

Roskam (1960) finds that the African is being:

"Permanently relegated to a subordinate position in a state dominated by the South African nation proper, that is, the white group(s)." (p. 132)

The intended permanency of this state of affairs is confirmed by reference to South African legislation and the views expressed by the white leaders. For example, Dr. Verwoerd, the late Prime Minister,
elucidating on the aims of Bantu (African) education stated:

"... no place for Bantu in the European community above the level of certain forms of labour."

The implementation of this policy is evidenced in the annual expenditure on education in South Africa - £72 on the white child compared with £6.10.0 on the African child. The Unesco (1967) report on South Africa concludes:

"The image of man - to whatever ethnic group he belongs or is made a part of - which results from the policy of Apartheid in South Africa, is an image which is clearly opposite the one to which the community of nations is ethically and legally dedicated." (p. 204)

The argument that the system in South Africa is based on cultural rather than racial criteria is refuted by the inferior status held by the people of mixed descent, (referred to as coloureds in South Africa). In the Cape Province, where the majority of these people live, Malgas (1968) shows that 91.5 per cent are Afrikaans-speaking and 7.3 per cent, English-speaking. Furthermore, 90 per cent of the coloured people belong to churches of European origin of which almost 40 per cent belong to the Dutch Reformed Churches. (Malgas 1968, p. 54 and 55.) These people are thus culturally European, the basis on which they are discriminated against is colour.

In an early psychological study, MacCrone (1937) described the white group's stereotype of Africans:

"The white sees a member of that race, not as an individual personality like himself, but as a representative of an alien group, whose most striking characteristics are inferiority in intelligence and knowledge, an inferiority in standard of living and occupation, a tendency towards violent and criminal practices, a behaviour which is childish and often ridiculous, in short, the opposite of all those qualities which form the image which the white man has in mind when he thinks of his own group." (p. 236)

1. As quoted by Danziger (1963), p. 33.
2. As quoted in the pamphlet, "Workers and Trade Unions Against Apartheid." Published by the World Federation of Trade Unions, p. 7.
There is every reason to believe that such stereotypes continue to govern the attitudes of whites towards Africans in present-day South Africa.

Britain and South Africa compared:

There can be little doubt, even from the brief description given above, that the South African system is based on the total domination of the majority of the people by a numerical racial minority; an equivalent system obviously does not exist in the United Kingdom. Whereas in South Africa legislation enforces racial segregation in most, if not all, aspects of life, in Britain, the Race Relations Bill of 1968 seeks to make racial discrimination an offence.

This study of racial prejudice in Britain and South Africa is based on the rationale of these societies being different in respect of their prevailing race norms. Other things being equal, differences obtained from these two samples, on an identical questionnaire, are attributable to societal influences. While it is comparatively simple, by means of even cursory examinations of the respective legislation, to demonstrate that a difference exists, difficulties arise in attempting to isolate precisely what is meant by race norms, and how these, if at all, operate at the level of individual personality. A scientific investigation into race norms is beyond the scope of this study; however, by the examination of the extent and manner in which racism exists in the two countries, it is hoped to arrive at a standpoint from which the differences in results may be evaluated.

As has been shown earlier in this chapter racial prejudice and discrimination are present in British life. The necessity for legislation forbidding racial discrimination tends to confirm its existence. Clearly, the race norms existing in South Africa and in Britain cannot be equated. Clearly too, a hypothesis evaluating the
race norms in the two countries which suggests a dichotomy between an intolerant and a tolerant society does not adequately reflect reality. The practice of designating South Africa or the American South as areas of racial intolerance, and Britain and the American North as examples of tolerant areas, has been shown in the light of recent events, particularly during the sixties, to be an oversimplification. The results obtained from the race prejudice studies and the widespread occurrence of racial conflict, are remarkable for the apparent presence of a common denominator in all the regions, rather than for the differences found.

Pettigrew (1961) observed:

"The close parallel between these (South African) data and the American data strongly suggests that racial, religious, and ethnic prejudice operate in similar ways in various Western Societies." (p. 253)

Any investigation into racial prejudice in Britain and South Africa must immediately be confronted by the contrasting proportions that the whites constitute in the populations of each society—respectively, about 96 per cent and 20 per cent. It is estimated that the coloured community in Britain is slightly over one million or roughly 2 per cent of the total population. (Daniel 1968, p. 9.) In South Africa, roughly 15 million or over 80 per cent, out of a population of 18 million are classified as non-white. (Horrell 1966, p. 122.)

This is not to imply that the critical element in race relations is necessarily population ratio. Research has indicated that the problem is more complex. For example, Allport (1956) makes the point that most Americans express social distance towards Turks, although few have ever seen one. Horowitz (1936) suggested that attitudes towards Negroes were determined primarily, not by contact with Negroes, but by contact with the prevalent attitudes towards Negroes.

1. Discussed more fully in the ensuing chapters of this section.
Nevertheless, the difference in the population make-up of Britain and South Africa may offer some explanation for the difference in the prevailing attitudes. An assessment of the comparative race norms in Britain and South Africa is perhaps more complex than may appear at first sight. Some clarification is provided by reference to race relations in the United States.

The United States:

It is reported that in 1966, 79 per cent of all the whites in the United States, and 92 per cent of Southern whites would mind if a close friend or relative married a negro. The report of the National Advisory Commission of Civil Disorders (1968) attributed race riots in Northern cities largely to "white racism."

"Race prejudice has shaped our history decisively in the past; it now threatens to do so again. White racism is essentially responsible for the explosive mixture which has been accumulating in our cities since the end of World War II." (p. 91)

Lipset (1968) reported that over 40 per cent of whites interviewed by the Gallup Poll expressed favourable, as opposed to 45 per cent unfavourable, views of the Southern segregationist, George Wallace. Lipset viewed the country-wide popularity of Wallace with obvious alarm when he stated:

"Regardless of the ultimate size of the Wallace vote, the fact that a racist demagogue like him can be supported by 20 per cent of those polled nationally in September, that a quarter of the young voters endorse his candidacy, that his political activities are viewed in positive terms by most white Protestants, suggest that American democracy is in serious trouble." (p. 485)

Myrdal (1964), comparing the American North and South, suggests that social segregation and discrimination, lacking ideological sanction and developing directly contrary to the openly accepted

---

1. As quoted by Newsweek, August 22, 1966. It must be noted that the difference between the Southern and 'all the whites' tended to be greater in the other social distance questions in the survey.
equalitarian creed, is merely kept sub rosa in the North (p. 600). Elkins (1967) noted that an address by President Johnson in 1965 concerning black Americans was the first time that any President had suggested that a minority group needed anything more than an equal opportunity in order to take its rightful place in society at large (p. 192). Carmichael and Hamilton (1967) claim that the society either pretends it does not know of the discrimination against the black inhabitants of the Northern cities or that it is incapable of doing anything meaningful about it. (p. 4). Carmichael and Hamilton argue that there is no "American Dilemma" (p. 5). If there is no official recognition of racism in the North, they suggest that this is due not to the absence or ineffectiveness of racial prejudice and discrimination, but to the existence of covert institutional racism which makes legal enforcement unnecessary. Carmichael and Hamilton elaborate:

"Institutional racism relies on the active and pervasive operation of anti-black attitudes and practices. A sense of superior group position prevails: whites are 'better' than blacks; therefore blacks should be subordinated to whites. This is a racist attitude and it permeates the society on both the individual and institutional level, covertly and overtly." (p. 5)

The above view is corroborated by Krech and Crutchfield (1948) when they write:

"Although separation of races has no direct legal status in the states above the Mason-Dixon line, various individual and business legal devices are used to enforce segregation. It would be impossible to find a single kind of segregation that is not supported by law in some part of the United States. From birth to death and burial the law segregates the people in the United States in terms of race." (p. 68)

Berelson and Salter (1957), in a content analysis of the most widely read magazines in the United States during 1937 and 1943, found on almost every index, white Protestant Americans to be the most
favourably depicted, and Jews and Negroes the least favourably. Haararden reported evidence of white superiority reflected in the writing of history, in novels, drama, the cinema, radio, television and the press. Haararden, although writing with particular reference to South Africa, frequently mentioned the occurrence of these biases in both Britain and the United States. Indeed, the Western World shares among its member nations much of its mass media. The cinema, literature and news in particular tend to be internationally distributed.

The evidence cited above affirms the prevalence of racism in the United States, and indicates its occurrence in the North as well as in the South. As in South Africa, racialism is entrenched in the institutions of the American South. Differences occur between the North and the South in what may be termed petty segregation - services in public places are largely integrated in the North. However, in the significant aspects of life - employment, housing and education - the disadvantages suffered by Negroes in the North are in many ways comparable with the position of their fellows in the South. The net result in both areas is second-class citizenship and as such, it matters little to the recipients whether those dominant in the society openly embrace doctrines of racism or whether they proclaim equality.

Racialism in the West:

Tillman (1964) sees racism for Western man as a manifestation of his attempt to escape from himself. Racism, Tillman writes, "permeates and suffuses the whole fabric of Western culture." (p. 50) The literature so far reviewed concurs with Tillman's accusation of racism being endemic to Western society. Emanating from Europe, it appears

1. Date of publication not provided.
2. Reference has only been made to racism in Britain, South Africa and the United States. Similar situations appear also to exist elsewhere. For example, this is illustrated in the writings of the psychiatrist, Fanon (1967a), who described his experiences as a black man caught up in French culture.
that racism, both colonial and domestic, in its persistence and frequent outbursts in modern times, and in its influence, almost everywhere, on the whole range of human activity, points to the prevalence of a common cultural tone of white superiority in the West.

In spite of the differences in the racial composition of the populations of Britain and South Africa, and in the contrast between the official commitment, respectively, to multi-racialism and racial segregation, a common denominator of white superiority-black inferiority may be imputed from both environments. This assumption, ignoring numbers and the degree of legalized discrimination has received recognition in the literature as is shown in the definition offered by Wirth (1945) of majority-minority group conflict:

"We may define a minority as a group of people who, because of their physical or cultural characteristics, are singled out from the others in the society in which they live for differential and unequal treatment, and who therefore regard themselves as objects of collective discrimination. The existence of a minority in a society implies the existence of a corresponding dominant group enjoying higher social status and greater privileges." (p. 347)

The black communities in the United States, be they in the North or the South, the coloured immigrants and their offspring in Britain, and the African, Asian and Coloured peoples of South Africa, all conform to the requirements of the definition of minority group offered by Wirth.

The discussion has centered on the similarities of racist attitudes and practices in the various countries. An attempt was made to illustrate that the racism prevalent in Britain and South Africa does not epitomize, respectively, opposite extremes of tolerance and intolerance. It has also been stressed that the racial situation in the two countries cannot be regarded as being identical. An assessment of the respective race norms, it is suggested, falls in between the two alternatives of dichotomy and equation.
The relative absence of formal racial discrimination in Britain may be indicative of the existing norms being adequate to maintain the status quo of white superiority rather than of indicating an egalitarian society. If a similar situation as exists in South Africa were desired for Britain, it would still not be necessary for South African type legislation to be enacted. The informal structures are sufficient to maintain a system whereby the minority are subordinated in the society. The findings, particularly the P.R.P. report (1967) clearly indicated the severe disadvantages suffered by the coloured minority group in Britain. The lack of discriminatory legislation, thus, does not necessarily provide evidence that the society operates on a basis of racial equality. This point is unequivocally supported in reality by the black ghettos in the Northern cities of the United States.

The difference between what Carmichael and Hamilton (1967) call overt and covert racism provides a criterion on which racism in Britain and South Africa may be evaluated. South African society is openly dedicated to racial discrimination, in both its attitudes and its practices. In this instance, overt and covert racism have merged and are indistinguishable. In Britain, on the other hand, covert racism is predominant. The innate inferiority of the black man is believed in; a belief that gains reinforcement from the inferior status occupied by the coloured community. Belief in discrimination is contrary to the national norms of equality. That discrimination exists in actuality, if recognized, is justified by recourse to stereotypy; the black man occupies an inferior position in the society because he is inferior.

In the above terms, the difference between racism in Britain and in South Africa is a difference merely in degree. The increased rigid enforcement of racial segregation in South Africa may be viewed as a
reaction to a perception of an increased threat to the status quo.
The coming to power of the Nationalist Party in 1948 is viewed by
Van den Berghe (1965) as a "logical evolution from, rather than a
rupture with, the traditional White South African Weltanschauung."
(p. 115) Urban, industrial, and social change, particularly the
growth of the non-white population, posed a threat to white supremacy.
No such threat endangers British society.

It is suggested that the sum total of slave and colonial history,
persistent attitudes of white superiority, close cultural and economic
ties with South Africa, and the discrimination suffered already by
the recently arrived coloured population, all add up to conditions in
Britain which may be conducive to a path of racist extremism, not
unlike that existing in South Africa, being taken in the future as a
reaction to a perceived threat to white domination.

Conclusions:
The conclusions drawn from the discussion are that stereotypes of
black-inferiority pertain to both British and South African societies,
and that in both reinforcement is gained for these attitudes from the
position occupied by the non-white inhabitants in each country. In
Britain, unlike South Africa, racial discrimination is not officially
sanctioned. Contradictions between practice and theory thus arise
in the former, but not in the latter society. Attitudes favouring
discrimination would thus be more firmly entrenched among white South
Africans than among the British. For them, beliefs in black inferiority
interact with beliefs in discrimination, whereas for the British these
would only serve to rationalize the status quo, and would thus gain
no additional sustenance from the environment.

South Africa provides an example of an extremely intolerant society.
Relative to South Africa, Britain is a tolerant society; in the study
of race prejudice this has tended to be the basis on which the two societies have been compared. However, the common elements of racism in both countries must be noted, and the societies viewed as differing only in degree.

Hypotheses:

The prejudice scale used in the present study contains sub-scales of stereotypy and discrimination. Following from the discussion, it is predicted that while the South African sample will score significantly higher on the prejudice scale than the British sample, this difference will be largely centred on attitudes towards discrimination. It is suggested that the South African sample will score higher on discrimination, but that both groups will tend to express stereotyped beliefs of black inferiority.

It is stressed that the substantiation of the above hypotheses is not intended to provide verification of the preceding historical discussion. The assertion that racial stereotypy is a common factor in the Western World cannot possibly be ascertained by the presence or absence of stereotyped attitudes in the limited British sample tested here. Historical argument, while not easily verified by the methods of social science, facilitates the interpretation of results obtained in the field, and it is in relation to this latter objective that the historical evidence was presented. The view that Western Culture contains elements of racialist beliefs enabled prejudice sub-scale data obtained by Pettigrew (1959)¹ to be interpreted, and guided the predictions made for the present research.

1. Dealt with in detail in chapters 4 and 5.
CHAPTER 3

SOCIAL AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES OF RACE PREJUDICE.

In the study of race prejudice a cleavage exists between the 'personality' and 'cultural' orientations. While it is generally acknowledged that both the psychological and sociological variables of racial prejudice have at least a modifying influence, the essential argument appears to be centered on the degree of emphasis that need be given to either of the approaches. At both extremes, there is a tendency to relegate the other's contribution to a position of secondary importance. There is, however, a substantial body of evidence to indicate the relevance of both the psychological and social aspects of race prejudice.

Evidence indicating the importance of the social determinants are briefly outlined below. This is followed by a discussion of personality and race prejudice, largely confined here to the work and influence of "The Authoritarian Personality"¹ by Adorno and his associates (1950). The discussion then proceeds, in the next chapter, to a detailed analysis of the Pettigrew (1958, 1959) studies. Pettigrew has attempted to provide a theoretical framework which utilizes the findings of both disciplines, and the data obtained during the present research are assessed with particular reference to Pettigrew's work. Account is also taken of the race norms prevailing in the societies from which the samples were drawn. Thus, while the discussion here starts from the personality standpoint, in the hypotheses examined consideration is given to both orientations.

¹ Also referred to as the Berkeley or Californian study.
Social variables of race prejudice:

Evidence indicating the relevance of sociocultural factors in the study of race prejudice abound in the literature, and most certainly cannot be ignored by the personality theorists.

Sims and Patrick (1936) observed changes in the attitudes of Northern students at universities in the American South. They tended gradually to absorb Southern attitudes, thus showing the effect of environmental influences in the shaping of attitudes.

Allport and Kramer (1946) showed, by asking respondents to estimate the age at which they became prejudiced, that pressure to conform to racialist attitudes increased as children grew older.

Fensterheim and Birch (1950), in a study of a refugee camp, just after the Second World War, found that individuals who joined political groups with either an authoritarian or an egalitarian outlook adapted their behaviour according to the group they joined. Little evidence was found for the hypothesis that individuals gravitated towards the group whose ideology most resembled their own personality. Fensterheim and Birch thus attribute primary importance to situational determinants of individual ideology.

In a cluster-analysis of F Scale scores, Christie and Garcia (1951) found sub-cultural differences in authoritarianism between Californian and Southern samples. Evidence that Southern culture sustains hostility towards Negroes, but not towards other out-groups is provided by Prothro (1952). He reported a relatively low incidence of anti-Semitism in his Southern sample, which indicates that anti-Negro prejudice may not, in the American South, embrace a general anti-minority group feeling.

Kinard (1952) estimated that sixty per cent of the coal miners he studied were integrated with Negro miners below the surface but adhered
to segregation once out of the mine. The remainder were equally divided among those who were either consistently tolerant or consistently prejudiced, in and out of the mine.

In a study of army recruits, Christie (1952) concludes that both situational and personality factors are important in the acceptance of authoritarian ideology. Christie suggests that the primary determinant appears to be the degree to which the individual's behaviour in a structured society is favourably viewed by his peers and superiors.

Results from a study in Southern Rhodesia undertaken by Frantz and Rogers (1962) indicates the importance of social pressures. It was found that integration with existing European attitudinal norms about Africans was positively correlated with increasing length of residence in the country. After five to nine years of residence in Rhodesia, European attitudes tended to become homogeneous.

Kawwa (1968), in a survey of ethnic attitudes among British adolescents, found that attitudes are related to the percentage of immigrants living in the area; the greater the number of immigrants in the area, the greater the hostility towards immigrants.

The literature also indicates class differences; the working class tending to be more prejudiced than the middle class. Westie (1952) showed class differences in terms of social distance and willingness to distinguish among Negroes in various occupations. Mackimon and Centers (1956), found that in their sample, working class members contained a higher proportion of authoritarians than either the middle or upper classes. Lipton (1964) feels that extremist or intolerant movements are more likely to be based on the lower classes in society. Nyesenck (1954) found that working class subjects as a whole tend to be more tough-minded than middle class subjects.
Although the research cited could be multiplied, almost ad nauseam, the selection provided is sufficient to demonstrate that sociocultural factors are germane to the study of race prejudice.

**Personality variables of race prejudice**:

In personality study of intolerance, the monumental achievement has been "The Authoritarian Personality" (Adorno et al 1950), which, since its publication, has stimulated a wealth of research. Its measuring instruments, in particular the F Scale, have been used extensively. Titus and Hollander (1957), in a review of the F Scale in psychological research up to 1955, quote sixty-four studies. Christie and Cook (1958) list two hundred and thirty references, up to 1956, relevant to the Californian study. Books devoted entirely to the assessment of authoritarianism are those by Christie and Jahoda (1954) and Kirsh and Dillehay (1967). Moreover, text books in social psychology usually devote at least one chapter to the topic. (Brown 1965, Byrne 1966.)

**Early authoritarian research**:

Much of the work of "The Authoritarian Personality" had been anticipated. As early as 1925, Moore tentatively suggests that there may exist "a temperamental predisposition towards conservatism or radicalism." (p. 243). Stagner (1936) introduced concepts of structures to explain ideology. He developed a scale to measure fascism in which he identified three major factors: regard for property as opposed to human rights; middle-class consciousness; and aggressive nationalism. Ferguson (1941) found two main factors which he believed to underlie the structure of social attitudes: humanitarianism and religionism.

An early influential writer in the field was Erich Fromm:

"By the term 'authoritarian character', we imply that it represents the personality structure which is the human basis of Fascism." (Fromm 1942, p. 141.)
The most important feature of the authoritarian character, according to Fromm, is power. Authoritarianism Fromm lists as a mechanism of escape from freedom, the most distinct forms of which are striving for submission and domination.

Maslow (1943), in his description of "The authoritarian character structure", acknowledges his debt to Fromm. Maslow attempted to tie together the various characteristics of the authoritarian - which had already been established - under a unifying principle. The solution he provides is the authoritarian's "world-view" (p. 402), that is, a jungle-like reaction to the world. Hostility, hatred and prejudice, Maslow points out, are the best known characteristics of the authoritarian.

Hartley (1946) reported a general anti-group attitude. Intolerant subjects in Hartley's social distance study responded negatively to non-existent groups with whom they obviously could not have had any contact. Simpson and Yinger (1958, p. 93) point to the close correspondence between Hartley's description of the intolerant personality and the postulates of the Californian study. Again, Brown (1965) points to the similarity between Sartre's anti-Semitic personality published in 1946 and the Adorno et al (1950) authoritarian personality.

The authoritarian personality:

Although not all original the Berkeley research was the first to incorporate the various findings into a unifying system, based on psychoanalysis. It must be noted, however, that the research constituted a loosely organized programme, the guiding theoretical framework tending to be of an ad hoc nature. (Kirscht and Dillehay 1967, p. 4-5.) The study arose as an investigation into anti-Semitism, and developed to embrace ethnocentrism and political and economic conservatism. Finally, from the results of these preliminary
researches, attention was focused on the hypothesis that social attitudes are expressions of personality organization. The authors identified potential fascism as an underlying personality syndrome.

"The most crucial result of the present study, as it seems to the authors, is the demonstration of close correspondence in type of approach and outlook a subject is likely to have in a great variety of areas, ranging from the most intimate features of family and sex adjustment through relationships to other people in general, to religion and social and political philosophy." (Adorno et al 1950, p. 971).

Racial prejudice was seen as a manifestation of personality structure. The F Scale was constructed to discriminate, at the personality level, between prejudiced and non-prejudiced respondents. In so far as it is an indirect measure of prejudice, the F Scale has the advantage of minimizing socially acceptable responses, and it also avoids statements which may provide encouragement to bigots, as apparently was the complaint with their anti-Semitism scale. Verification that the personality variables measured by the F Scale predisposed individuals towards prejudice was obtained by means of clinical interviews.

"The Authoritarian Personality" has provoked severe criticisms1 (Christie and Jahoda 1954), but as these are well documented, and the interest here is essentially race prejudice, the discussion will be restricted to the relationship between the F Scale and prejudice, rather than to an evaluation of the entire work.

The F Scale and prejudice:

The literature firmly indicates the existence of a relationship between the F Scale and racial prejudice. Invariably, significant positive correlations are obtained between the scale and measures of prejudice. Christie (1954) found no evidence reported in the
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1. The F Scale as a measure of right-wing, rather than general authoritarianism, is dealt with later, in the chapters on Dogmatism.
literature of a negative correlation. Evidence seems to confirm that in all the communities studied, irrespective of the measure of racial prejudice, authoritarians score higher on prejudice than do non-authoritarians. Brown (1965), in an evaluation of the criticisms of the Californian study, draws the following conclusion:

"In spite of their cogency it seems to me that there is a substantial residual probability that the chief conclusions of the questionnaire work is correct: Attitudes of anti-Semitism, ethnocentrism, and authoritarianism do generally go together." (p. 523.)

Though the relationship between the F Scale and prejudice has been conclusively demonstrated, the caution evident in Brown's statement is indicative of the relative paucity of knowledge regarding the precise nature of this relationship. Titus and Hollander (1957) make the point that few studies have dealt with the F Scale's relationship with prejudice per se.

The functions of the F Scale:

At least some of the prevailing confusion originates from the ambiguous theoretical presentation in the original work. This is aptly illustrated by the following quotation from a later article of one of the authors:

"Because these various attitudes are closely interrelated, such terms as 'authoritarian', 'ethnocentrism', 'prejudice' and 'antiDemocratic' attitudes will be used interchangeably throughout this presentation." (Frenkel-Brunswik 1952, p. 51.)

In its construction, dual aims were listed for the F Scale. It was to be both a measure of prejudice with no mention of a minority group, and it was to obtain, "a valid estimate of anti-democratic tendencies at the personality level." (Adorno et al 1950, p. 223). These aims are complementary in that prejudice is not assumed to be an isolated attitude, but rather an expression of personality structure,
and thus may be measured indirectly at the personality level. Nevertheless, the scale has come to be viewed primarily as a measure of personality predisposition towards prejudice. Subsequent researchers have tended to use the scale in conjunction with, and not as a substitute for, a measure of racial prejudice. The tendency is to equate high scorers on the F Scale with authoritarianism, although as Christie (1954) has noted, it was never referred to as such during its construction. Thus, the distinction between authoritarianism and prejudice, even if largely tacit, has been acknowledged in the literature. This differentiation appears to be vital to an appraisal of the F Scale’s relationship with racial prejudice. Indeed, in the original text, reference is made to the discrepancy in the relationship:

"If the F Scale were to be regarded as a measure of anti-democratic potential - something which might or might not be expressed in open hostility against outgroups - then it could not be perfectly correlated with anti-Semitism or ethnocentrism." (Adorno et al 1950, p. 224.)

Under circumstances where personality potential towards prejudice remains latent, and prejudice is not expressed, the psychoanalytical orientation of the authors allows for an explanation in terms of suppression. In this instance, however, the objectives assigned to the F Scale become equivocal, and empirically it is difficult to demonstrate what actually has been measured.

Personality potential towards racial prejudice, and overt prejudice, may be viewed theoretically in terms of a basic personality structure, but operationally, they cannot be regarded as synonymous. Verification of the scale’s validity cannot be obtained by both the presence and the absence of an association with prejudice. Where individuals do not manifest their potential, that is, high F Scale
scoers not expressing prejudice, a relationship cannot be assumed unless revealed by investigation using other techniques. In the absence of further intensive study of such cases, individuals scoring high on F but not on prejudice, must be regarded as non-prejudiced. Similarly, prejudice must be assumed in low F - high prejudice scorers. The possibility of these deviations from the expected pattern of high F - high prejudice is acknowledged by Adorno et al when they write:

"Surely there are some individuals who have the kind of susceptibility to fascist propaganda with which the F Scale is concerned but who for one reason or another tend to inhibit expression of hostility against minority groups (subjects high on F but low on E)" (p. 264)

and again:

"And we have good reason to believe that there are other people who rather repeat the clichés of ethnocentrism - perhaps in accordance with the climate of opinion in which they are living without these being expressive of deep-lying trends in their personalities (subjects high on E but low on F)" (p. 264)

**Authoritarian syndromes:**

In their categorization of high and low authoritarian syndromes, Adorno et al identify six sub-classifications of the former and five of the latter. Of the six syndromes among high scorers, two may include, among others, the individual for whom prejudice is not an expression of personality structure.

The "surface resentment" syndrome: "not in and of itself a psychological 'type'" (p. 753) and, "we refer here to people who accept stereotypes of prejudice from the outside, as ready-made formulae, as it were, in order to rationalize ..." (p. 754). The "conventional syndrome": "represents stereotypy which comes from outside, but which has been integrated within the personality as part and parcel of a
general conformity." (p. 756). It is suggested that prejudice for these individuals is only identification with group opinion and may not be expressed in all situations.

Similarly, of the syndromes among the low scorers, the "Rigid" (p. 771) is seen as being non-prejudiced because of an external ideology and not as a result of its relevance at the personality level. These are postulated to be counterparts of the surface resentment type of high scorer. The "impulsive" type, "... respond so strongly to all kinds of stimuli that the ingroup-outgroup relation has no meaning to them - rather, they are attracted by everything that is 'different' and promises some kind of gratification". (p. 777). Thus, although not prejudiced, it appears that these individuals may exhibit authoritarian aspects of personality.

In these syndromes, provision has clearly been made for individual variations in the authoritarian - prejudice pattern. Nevertheless, Adorno et al stress that the "distinction between potential and manifest should not be overdrawn." (p. 224). They go on to emphasize that discrepancies in the relationship between F and prejudice scale scores would be exceptional, and would require special explanation.

Authoritarianism and the social environment:

If following Adorno et al (1950), authoritarianism is considered generally to account for degree of prejudice, then the F Scale clearly functions as a predictor of prejudice. On the other hand, if other factors are seen as radically altering this pattern, the F Scale becomes of specific rather than general utility. If it is tenable to postulate the frequent occurrence of authoritarians not expressing prejudice, or conversely, the phenomenon of the prejudiced non-authoritarian, then the predictive value of the F Scale is severely limited. To the extent to which this occurs, and authoritarianism
and prejudice are slightly related, or unrelated, the F Scale becomes of only marginal relevance. To varying degrees, this point of view has relatively wide support.

The authors of "The Authoritarian Personality" cannot be accused of refusing to acknowledge the sociocultural influences of race prejudice, they can merely be faulted for failing to solve, single-handed, all the problems in the field. It was not intended that their work should be the last word on the subject. This is clearly indicated in the following quotation:

"Furthermore, our findings are strictly limited to the psychological aspects of the more general problem of prejudice. Historical factors or economic forces operating in our society to promote or to diminish ethnic prejudice are clearly beyond the scope of our investigation. In pointing toward the importance of the parent-child relationship in the establishment of prejudice or tolerance we have moved one step in the direction of an explanation. We have not, however, gone into the social and economic processes that in turn determine the development of characteristic family patterns." (Adorno et al 1950, p. 972.)

The Berkeley investigators attempted to uncover the reason for one individual, in a particular social climate, responding negatively, while another responds positively. The solution posed was that:

"The potentially fascist character has to be regarded as a product of interaction between the cultural climate of prejudice and the 'psychological' responses to this climate." (p. 752)

The influence of the social climate was thus recognized; it was for later research to demonstrate the potency of these influences. No claims were made for the homogeneity of all existing social systems, and as such, their failure to take account of all of them detracts not from the study, but from the possible generality of their conclusions. Similarly, the aim of the investigation was to uncover the personality variables of those individuals with an affinity
towards right-wing ideology, and subsequent research has vindicated their claim that racial prejudice tends to be a manifestation of the political right. That there may be varieties of authoritarianism, other than the right-wing type isolated by them, may only limit their concept of authoritarianism; it does not invalidate it.

The study here is an attempt to investigate the "psychological responses" of individuals in the prevailing cultural climates of Britain and South Africa. The extent to which different social climates influence the authoritarian response to prejudice, is the area of contention dealt with in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 4

THE F SCALE IN RACIALLY INTOLERANT AREAS: THE FETTIGREW STUDIES IN SOUTH AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES.

While it is generally conceded that the F Scale has made a considerable contribution to the understanding of racial prejudice, it is thought by many workers in the field to be insufficient to explain the different patterns of prejudice arising in different situations and in different regions. Raab and Lipset (1965), hold that the social situation, rather than pre-existing attitudes, is crucial in the study of prejudiced behaviour. Rose and Rose (1965) summarize the objections to the formulations of "The Authoritarian Personality" when they write:

"Obviously, not all prejudiced people have 'authoritarian personalities' else most white Southerners and a large proportion of Northerners would have to be thought of as authoritarian." (p. 319)

Rhyne (1963) considered personality and sociological orientations to be "mutually contradictory" (p. 44). The view taken here is that they are inter-dependent. Pettigrew, in his South African research (1958), and in his comparative study of the American North and South (1959), concurs with this latter conception of the problem. He attempted to integrate the findings of both disciplines. Personality, Pettigrew holds, is important in all regions, but where racial prejudice is culturally potent, it is superseded by social variables as the major determinant of prejudice.

Pettigrew's research constitutes the only attempt so far reported to formulate a framework in which authoritarianism may be related to societal norms of racial intolerance. Because of their obvious implications on the generality of the findings of "The Authoritarian
Personality", the Pettigrew studies are discussed, below, in detail. Furthermore, the Pettigrew research which was undertaken in South Africa, enables partial replication in the present study.

The South African Study:

In his study of white South African students, Pettigrew (1958) found, "considerable hostility towards Africans," (p. 31) while the sample's F Scale scores were "roughly comparable"1 to those usually reported for American student populations. The heightened prejudice in South Africa could not, in Pettigrew's sample, be accounted for by authoritarianism. Further, the correlations obtained between the F Scale and Pettigrew's measure of anti-African prejudice were within the range typically reported by American studies. Pettigrew's Conformity Scale also correlated significantly with prejudice.

Pettigrew interpreted these results to suggest the following:

"(a) that personality factors are as important correlates of prejudice in this sample as they are in other, non South African samples;
(b) that social conformity ... is a particular crucial personality variable in this sample's attitudes towards Africans; and
(c) that personality components do not in themselves account for the heightened intolerance of this sample." (p. 32)

Pettigrew produced additional data in support of these hypotheses. The results obtained indicated that those students who had been exposed to a greater degree of societal pressures were more prejudiced, but not more authoritarian, than other, less conforming students in the sample. Pettigrew tested for differences between subjects who were
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1. American college samples, Pettigrew (1958) writes, (p. 32), generally average slightly below the neutral point on F Scale statements, while his South African sample averaged slightly above the neutral point.
born in Africa and those born elsewhere; between supporters of the governing National Party and supporters of other parties; between those whose fathers were manually employed and those whose fathers were non-manually employed; and between Afrikaans and English-speaking subjects. In each of the four comparisons, the first mentioned, that is, the conforming group, revealed a significantly higher prejudice mean which could not be explained by greater authoritarianism.

Pettigrew's analysis of the anti-African attitude scale items showed that the items which least distinguished between Afrikaans and English-speaking respondents, measured stereotyped-belief of Africans, while the best were those that measured exclusion discrimination. Thus, Afrikaans and English speakers did not differ sharply in the degree to which they harboured the traditional stereotype of the African, but did possess markedly divergent views on discrimination against Africans.

All these findings, Pettigrew concludes, point to the crucial role of the environment in shaping racialist attitudes in South Africa. Those who were especially responsive to the dominant norms of the white society, Pettigrew continues, tended to be intolerant of Africans to some degree, regardless of their basic personality structure (p. 35).

The American Study:

Pettigrew's (1959) research undertaken in the United States consisted of randomly selected adults in eight roughly matched communities in the North and the South. This study had the advantage, unlike the South African research, of non-student samples. There were also differences between the two studies in the research instruments used. Of the eighteen prejudice items administered in South Africa, only twelve constituted the scale in the American project. The shortened
versions of the F Scale used also differed; there were thirteen items in the South African study, and ten in the American; of these seven were common to both researches. The Social Conformity Scale contained in the South African questionnaire was not presented to the American samples, and the American interview schedule contained an eight-item anti-Semitism scale not included in the former study. Nevertheless, Pettigrew was able to support his hypotheses in both the South African and the American data.

The sample drawn from the American South was found to be significantly higher on the measure of anti-Negro attitudes than the sample of Northerners. The difference between the samples on the F Scale did not reach statistical significance. Milton (1952), and Smith and Prothro (1957) have also reported F Scale means for Southern samples well within the range usually obtained in Northern studies.

Pettigrew was thus able to report similar results from his American and South African investigations. The heightened prejudice found in the samples from South Africa and the American South could not be explained by recourse to F Scale scores.

The anti-Negro (N) Scale was divided into sub-scales of stereotype-belief and exclusion-discrimination items. In accordance with prediction, the Southerners were significantly higher on both sub-scales. As with English and Afrikaans-speaking respondents in South Africa, the American Southern sample contrasted most sharply with the Northerners on the exclusion-discrimination statements.

Following from his central hypothesis, Pettigrew predicted a closer relationship between authoritarianism and prejudice in the North than in the South. The data, however, did not support the prediction, but indicated F and N to correlate to similar degrees in both regions.
Also, contrary to expectations, anti-Semitism did not correlate higher with \( N \) in the North than in the South. Pettigrew concluded that social variables were more significant in the South, but reconsidered the hypothesis that personality variables would be of decreased importance there. Thus, in the light of the results obtained, he modified his postulate to read, "... authoritarianism is equally relevant in both regions for the samples polled." (p. 34).¹

Additional data were obtained in the American study in support of the hypothesis that, "social variables are more important in the South." (p. 34). In the Southern sample, differences were found on the \( N \) Scale between groups classified as conformist or non-conformist within the Southern sub-culture of the United States.

Thus, those who identified with either the Democratic or Republican parties were more intolerant of Negroes than were political independents; church-goers were more prejudiced than non-attenders; and those with no military service were higher than veterans. In all three of these comparisons no differences were found on the anti-Semitism Scale, which indicated that cultural pressure was exerted on attitudes towards Negroes, but not towards Jews. The political and military service groups, furthermore, did not differ on the \( F \) Scale. Thus, the higher anti-Negro scores reported cannot be explained by greater authoritarianism. The church attenders were, however, higher on both the \( N \) and \( F \) Scales than were the non-attenders.

Most crucially, for Pettigrew's hypotheses, similar comparisons in the Northern sample yielded no significant differences. Thus, conformity in the South was associated with increased hostility towards
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¹ The implications of this alteration in the hypotheses are dealt with later in the critical review of Pettigrew's research.
Negroes, whereas in the North, the conformists scored similarly to the non-conforming groups. These results reflect the potency of anti-black attitudes in the Southern sub-culture.

Further, but perhaps more ambiguous evidence, was obtained by Pettigrew in substantiation of his hypotheses. Data obtained from socially mobile groups yielded opposite trends in the Northern and Southern samples. In the North, those downwardly mobile were significantly higher on the N Scale than those who were stable manual workers. In the South, the downwardly mobile were the more tolerant group. The comparison of upwardly mobile and stable groups, may have been expected to show the former group to be more prejudiced. The results, although in the predicted direction, failed to reach an acceptable level of significance in both the samples.

Sex differences were also reported for the South, but not for the North. In the South, females—"the carriers of culture" (p. 30)—scored significantly higher on F than the males in the sample, and the difference approached significance on the N Scale (.08).

Finally, respondents drawn from a Southern town with a low ratio of Negroes scored significantly less on the N Scale than did those drawn from a town with a higher percentage of Negroes living in the community. No differences were obtained on either the anti-Semitism or F Scales for this comparison. No comparable data were presented for the Northern sample.

1. Measured in terms of manual occupation for the respondent whose father was non-manually employed. Stable manual workers were those whose fathers were also manually employed.
Conclusions:

The American study largely duplicated the findings reported by Pettigrew (1958) from South Africa. Both researches provide strong evidence for the hypothesis formulated in conclusion of the South African study:

"In areas with historically imbedded traditions of racial intolerance, externalizing personality factors underlying prejudice remain important, but socio-cultural factors are unusually crucial and account for the heightened racial hostility." (p. 40)

The significance of the Pettigrew studies for the theory presented in "The Authoritarian Personality" is decreased because of the shortened forms of the F Scale used in both South Africa and the United States. Nevertheless, they reflect the generality of authoritarianism as a determinant of racial prejudice, largely limiting its predictive value to areas of relatively low racial hostility. Pettigrew (1959) writes:

"These results indicate the existence in the South of a large number of culturally intolerant individuals who subscribe to the typical regional attitudes concerning the Negro but who are not authoritarians." (p. 35)

In reviews of Pettigrew's findings, subsequent writers (Newcomb et al 1965, Banton 1967) conclude that the formulations of the Californian research have limited application. Kirschen and Dillehay (1967) write:

"... powerful cultural demands or group norms that attain the character of moral precepts may override or mask personality dispositions." (p. 87)

The implications of Pettigrew's research for authoritarianism is obviously serious, and as such requires special scrutiny. The Pettigrew studies are critically reviewed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5
A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE SOCIAL CONFORMITY HYPOTHESES

The Pettigrew (1958, 1959) studies were an attempt to delineate the relative importance of social and personality factors in the formation of prejudiced attitudes. The present research, while based on Pettigrew's findings, disagrees with his interpretation of the data.

The Implications of Pettigrew's hypotheses:

The F Scale, in Pettigrew's research, failed to discriminate between different racially orientated samples, and thus, limitations in the scale's discriminative ability are indicated. The purpose assigned to the F Scale during its construction was to distinguish, at the personality level, between tolerant and intolerant individuals. Pettigrew established that samples drawn from areas of differing racial climates nevertheless scored similarly on the F Scale. The observable racial tensions existing in such areas as the American South and South Africa could not be explained by a greater incidence of authoritarianism in these regions.

Pettigrew conclusively demonstrated limitations in the theory presented by Adorno et al (1950). Clearly, personality, as the sole explanation of racial prejudice, is insufficient to account for regional variations. Pettigrew's work shows that both the personality and social influences of race prejudice are pertinent and stresses that the problem needs to be tackled by means of a theoretical framework which incorporates both these factors.

The heightened prejudice in South Africa, Pettigrew suggests, can be explained by prejudice being expressed by non-authoritarians. Similarly in the United States, the higher anti-Negro mean obtained
by the Southern sample is attributed to prejudice being expressed by non-authoritarians. Mathematically, this hypothesis implies that the mean obtained by the Southern sample exceeded that of the Northerners because the former was made up of the prejudice expressed by authoritarians plus the prejudice expressed by non-authoritarians, while the latter's mean was contributed to largely by authoritarians only.

Prejudiced non-authoritarianism is explained in terms of social conformity to the prevailing race norms in societies where racial segregation is officially sanctioned. Pettigrew claims support for the hypothesis from the data in both his American and his South African studies. In numerous demonstrations, it was statistically shown that groups designated as conformist within the intolerant milieux were more prejudiced, but not more authoritarian than were other, less conforming groups. However, while providing this evidence that conformity is a significant factor in the extremity of prejudice expressed in these regions, nowhere, in either the American or South African research, is it demonstrated that non-authoritarians are in fact prejudiced. Pettigrew's hypothesis of prejudiced non-authoritarians is thus an interpretation of, rather than being substantiated by, the data. Nevertheless, Pettigrew's assumptions have been widely accepted as proven. (Newcomb et al 1965, Banton 1967, Kirscht and Dillehay 1967.)

The advantage of Pettigrew's suggestions is that they avoid the hierarchical ordering of various Western societies along a dimension of authoritarianism; South Africa most differs from other Western countries in racial legislation rather than in the personalities of its white citizens. Pettigrew's hypotheses take cognisance of the fact that not every white South African conforms to the image of Adorno et al's prototype authoritarian. Furthermore, Pettigrew's solution confirmed the often voiced uneasiness felt about the
generality of the authoritarian thesis. Nevertheless, in spite of
their acceptance, these hypotheses remain to be substantiated.
Pettigrew did not attempt to demonstrate, in his statistical data,
that non-authoritarians in racially segregated environments tended
to be prejudiced.
The following discussion attempts to illustrate that Pettigrew's
social conformity hypotheses do not adequately cater for all the
results that he obtained.

The Correlations between F and Prejudice:

Contradictions appear between the correlational data and Pettigrew's
hypotheses. Prejudice and F are reported to relate about equally in
all the samples studied. Pettigrew thus concludes that personality
is equally important in all regions, which contrasts with his inter-
pretation of the prejudice and F Scale means that he obtained. These
results indicate, according to Pettigrew's claim, that social variables
are of greater importance in racially intolerant areas than is personality.

For the American data, Pettigrew hypothesized that in the South
some individuals would be prejudiced although not authoritarian in
personality. The lack of a relationship for these individuals,
Pettigrew believed, would be revealed in a lower correlation being
obtained for the Southern sample. This expectation did not materialize
in the results; the correlations between prejudice and F for both the
Northern and Southern samples were found to be roughly comparable.
The size of the Southern sample's correlation may be partially ex-
plained by the greater prejudice range that they obtained, thus off-
setting the results for the non-authoritarian prejudiced individuals
in the sample. Even if this is the explanation, authoritarianism
could still not be thought of as being equally important in both
regions. Authoritarianism is clearly not crucial for the racially bigoted low F Scale scorer in the South.

This difficulty may be overcome if conformity to a norm of antiracism is postulated in areas of relatively less racial hostility. Thus, in the American North, some individuals would need to be thought of as being authoritarian although racially tolerant. In other words, the reverse of that hypothesized for the South so that in both areas there would be a group of individuals whose attitudes were not affected by the authoritarian personality factor.

The suppression of prejudice:

The possibility that suppression of prejudice operates in response to norms of racial equality warrants further consideration. The converse of Pettigrew's hypothesis is logically consistent with his argument. Thus, an authoritarian who perceives the race norms of his society to be racially tolerant may suppress prejudice in response to societal restraint. Christie and Garcia (1951) consider that identification with groups of differing ideologies tends to modify the individual's own attitude. Thus, for example, in the United Kingdom, an individual may be exposed to almost the entire range of the political spectrum; whereas in South Africa, 'left-wing' and most integrationist organizations have been legally prohibited, the predominant exposure thus being 'right-wing' and racialist. It is feasible to suggest that under these conditions, the individual in Britain would be subjected to inhibitory pressures, while in racially segregated environments, this effect would be minimal. Pettigrew explains the relatively low prejudice score of veterans in the American South to exposure to contrary ideas. Following from the discussion, Pettigrew's postulated phenomenon of prejudiced non-authoritarians would, in less traditionally
racist societies, be counter-balanced by individuals who were tolerant although authoritarian in personality.

Adorno et al (1950) made provision for the occurrence of both the bigoted non-authoritarian and the tolerant authoritarian.† Pettigrew, in his hypotheses, considered only the former, although what evidence there is appears to suggest the greater probability of the latter occurrence. The phenomenon of the tolerant authoritarian conforms to the definition provided by Adorno and associates as they included conventionalism as one of the characteristics of the authoritarian personality. Authoritarians could thus be expected to concur with the consensus of public opinion even where this was contrary to their personality predisposition of racial intolerance.

Later evidence, provided by Hamblin (1962), suggests that non-authoritarians do not conform to pressures which are in opposition to their personality structures. Hamblin found that as authoritarianism decreased, the importance of friends' pressure as a possible determinant of discrimination also decreased. Non-authoritarians, it appeared, refused to discriminate even when under pressure to do so. Hamblin's study thus does not provide confirmation of Pettigrew's postulates of non-authoritarian prejudice.

Further suggestive evidence that prejudice may be suppressed comes from comparative studies where the higher correlation coefficient between F and prejudice has been obtained by the sample drawn from the racially segregated area. Christie and Garcia (1951) report a correlation of .63 for their Southwest city sample, and a correlation of .53 for their Californian sample. Pettigrew (1958) obtained
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† Discussed previously in Chapter 3.
correlations of .56 and .46, respectively, for his Afrikaans and English-speaking respondents. Pettigrew (1959) found correlations of .34 for the Southern sample, and .27 for the Northern sample. As there tends to occur a truncation at the high extreme of the prejudice distribution for samples drawn from tolerant areas, the wider range of scores from the racialist regions may provide an explanation for these results. On the other hand, the paucity of high prejudice scorers in the tolerant regions may be indicative of mechanisms of suppression operating.

On a number of grounds, however, the suppression hypothesis appears unable to provide an adequate explanation. It is unlikely if only because of built-in instrument bias; the F Scale having been standardized in California. Further, it may be argued that a racialist undercurrent of white supremacy prevails in the West.\(^1\) If this were the case, the possibility for authoritarian identification with racist thought would minimize the need for prejudice to be suppressed. In spite of these objections, the question of authoritarians suppressing prejudice in tolerant areas may provide a fruitful field for further investigation and was given consideration in the present research.

Group Conformity

The hypotheses formulated by Pettigrew depend considerably on the demonstration that 'conformist' groups were more prejudiced but not more authoritarian than 'non-conformist' groups. Pettigrew's explanation was in terms of the greater incidence of racial hostility in places like South Africa and the American South. It is suggested that the results are more accurately depicted in hypotheses which emphasize the greater intensity of racism which exists in these regions.

---

1. Discussed previously in Chapter 2.
The non-conformist groups in the American Southern sample\(^1\), although scoring lower on prejudice than the conformist in the Southern sample, scored higher than either group in the Northern sample.\(^2\) In other words, groups in the South, whether conformist or non-conformist, scored higher on $N$ than did the Northerners. Thus, the differences obtained by Pettigrew in his Southern comparison could be said to have resulted from the exceptionally high means obtained by the conforming groups rather than by the low scores being obtained for the non-conforming groups. Thus, neither could be classified as non-prejudiced; the conformists merely being more prejudiced.

Pettigrew, thus, established that conformity is an important factor in the racism of intolerant societies. It may be expected that identification with a group or institution professing a racist ideology would result in additional reinforcement being received for prejudice. Compared with individuals who are prejudiced, but not affiliated to racist organizations, both may be expected to exhibit equally high authoritarian personality characteristics, but the prejudice expressed by the identifiers would be increased.

Additional stimulation towards prejudice may be said to occur for supporters of the National Party in South Africa; for Democrats and Republicans in the South as both are segregationalists; for Afrikaners adhering to Afrikaans Nationalism; and Southern church-goers; Dollard (1949) writes that churches in the American South initially segregated Negroes in a part of the church, but later they were excluded, leading to the formation of separate Negro congregations.
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1. The group means were not given in the South African data.
2. The downwardly mobile group in the Southern sample were the one exception to this trend and their results are discussed later in this chapter.
In terms of his non-authoritarian-intolerant hypothesis, Pettigrew indicated that the direction in which race attitudes were likely to be expressed depended on the particular group's susceptibility to normative pressures. He did not pose the problem of non-authoritarians within these groups reacting differently from other similarly disposed individuals. Pettigrew did not consider the reasons for some non-authoritarians conforming to racist norms while others did not. For example, unless all non-authoritarian Afrikaners are thought of as being racially intolerant, additional explanation is required for the responses of the exceptions. The theoretical framework provided by Pettigrew does not admit the possibility of this occurrence.

While not all non-authoritarian members of prejudiced groups may, as in Pettigrew's terms, with any justification, be thought of as racially intolerant; equally, affiliation with a racist institution cannot be considered as necessarily being indicative of an authoritarian personality structure. It appears that, particularly where membership is by virtue of birth, non-authoritarianism may occur. Thus, all Afrikaners cannot be said to be authoritarian. The mechanisms by which non-authoritarian individuals are able to maintain attitudes of tolerance while identifying with groups possessing elements of racism in their ideology is uncertain and may only be speculated upon here. Perhaps such individuals are only fringe members of the group, identifying with only some aspects of the ideology. Berelson et al (1954) showed that in voting behaviour there is a tendency to support the group - "traditional social allegiance" (p. 309)—rather than to

---

1. There were insufficient Afrikaans-speaking respondents in the South African sample of the present research to justify statistical analysis. Thus the personalities and attitudes of individuals, who by virtue of birth, adhered to a racist ideology, were not able to be investigated. It is suggested that further research in this area may prove to be of interest.
vote on principle. Feelings of group cohesion for such individuals would need to be further investigated.

Social mobility and racial prejudice:

The social mobility data, in Pettigrew's South African study, showed the upwardly mobile, that is, those whose fathers were manually employed, to be more prejudiced and authoritarian than those students whose fathers were non-manually employed. The difference in prejudice remained when F was controlled. In contrast, Van den Berghe (1962), from his South African research, concludes that there was no clear and simple relationship between social distance and either father's occupation or father's income.

In the American study, the social mobility data did not provide conclusive support for Pettigrew's hypotheses. The comparison of upwardly mobile and stable respondents did not produce significant differences, although the differences were in the expected direction, particularly for the Southerners (p=.20). The results obtained by Greenblum and Pearlin (1953) suggested that the upwardly mobile would be both prejudiced and conformist.

The downwardly mobile and stable group comparison reached significance in the South. Not noted by Pettigrew, however, was the exceptionally low mean obtained by the downwardly mobile group, who scored 3.57 on the N Scale, (p. 32) which was lower than both the Northern groups in the comparison. Further, when compared to the means obtained by the total samples - 6.64 for the South and 4.49 for the North (p. 29) - the Southern downwardly mobile were exceptionally low, and thus, special explanation appears to be required.

Sex differences in prejudice:

Pettigrew (1959) claims that females are more conforming to the norms and the expectations of the culture than are men (p. 34).
Although Pettigrew finds support for his hypotheses from the sex differences revealed in his data, these may be viewed as not fulfilling his expectations. Southern females were found to be more authoritarian than males. The difference on the N Scale, however, only approached significance. A greater difference may have been expected if it is accepted that females adhere more closely to Southern mores. An explanation may be found in terms of less behavioural reinforcement. Bollard (1949) has clearly shown that white males in the South have access to Negro women, described as the "sexual gain" resulting from the discriminatory racial system. White women, however, are not permitted Negro males.

Van den Berghe (1962) found that women showed more social distance than men in his South African study. However, Frantz and Rogers (1962), in their Southern Rhodesian research, found that sex was not significantly related to prejudiced attitudes. Kelly et al (1958) found no sex differences in their sample drawn in the American South.

Clearly, the relationship between sex of respondent and racism remains ambiguous. Hypotheses based on the prejudice expected to be expressed by the sexes appear to have no firm foundation in the literature.

Stereotypy and Discrimination:

Another instance of Pettigrew's data not adequately explained by the hypotheses is the anti-Negro sub-scale results reported from the American project. Significant differences were found between the Northern and Southern samples on both the stereotyped-belief (s-b) and the exclusion-discrimination (e-d) sub-scales. The samples differed most markedly on e-d, which was taken by Pettigrew to indicate conformity to the discriminatory practices in the South.
The means obtained by the Northern and Southern samples on s-b were, respectively, 5.07 and 6.88, and 3.90 and 6.28 for the e-d sub-scale. The disparity in the Northern results was not explained by Pettigrew.

Both samples scored relatively high on the s-b subscale, which reflects the acceptance of adverse Negro sentiment in both the North and the South. Thus, in terms of social conformity, the results would need to be explained in terms of conformity, in both the North and the South, to the prevailing stereotypes of Negroes. Similarly, for the e-d results, conformity would need to be hypothesized for both samples. An explanation of the low e-d mean obtained by the Northern sample may be provided in terms of conformity to a norm of egalitarianism existing in the North.

Myrdal's (1964), "American Dilemma" suggests that the norm: equal opportunity for all, has high valence in the United States. The contradiction between theory and practice may be overcome by believing that Negroes form the most depressed section of the Nation, not because of inequality of opportunity, but because of their innate inferiority. This interpretation is indicated by the relatively high s-b mean obtained by the Northern sample. The differences obtained in the North and South on the e-d sub-scale, are explained by conformity in the North to a norm of 'equal opportunity', and in the South to a norm of racial discrimination. However, as opportunity is not in reality equal for the inhabitants, for example, of black Harlem and white New York suburbia, it is difficult to ascertain the mechanisms of conformity in the North.

Further, as racial segregation, whether officially sanctioned or not, prevails throughout the United States, it is difficult adequately to explain why stereotypy of black inferiority is a less
potent force towards conformity than officially sanctioned discrimination.

The results obtained may reflect the inherent weakness of responses required from attitude scales. To illustrate by a hypothetical example; A Northern respondent answers negatively to the question, 'Would you mind if a Negro moved in next door?' This response may be indicative of racial tolerance, but may also be open to the interpretation of the question being irrelevant within the Northern sub-culture. In the North there is no threat in numbers to white domination. The unofficial structures of discrimination operating in the society adequately maintain the status quo. The poverty of the Negroes ensures that they will largely be confined to the Black ghettos of the Northern Cities. For the few who manage to emerge, white neighbourhood committees, estate agents and the like form a second line of defence against black intrusion. Thus the likelihood of a Negro moving in next door is remote. Admission of discrimination would cause conflict with the American norm of equality, and furthermore, would have the effect of reducing the North to the level of the South which is viewed as being inferior. Thus until such time as the question becomes personally relevant, discrimination is not endorsed.

The above reflects critically on questionnaire studies in general, the present research included. What must not be lost sight of is that attitudes, in questionnaire research, are merely what the attitude scale measures, and this need not always correspond with the reality of the situation. The above is suggestive of the possibility that the low discrimination scores obtained by Pettigrew in his Northern sample, is not necessarily indicative of racial tolerance. In any event, the hypocritical situation arising from the low s-d and high s-b scores obtained by the Northern sample is not adequately explained by Pettigrew.
The discussion now turns to a consideration of the anti-Semitism results obtained in Pettigrew's American study. The anti-Semitism Scale did not discriminate between the groups tested. According to Adorno et al (1950), outgroup hostility is a reflection of personality disposition and thus may be expected to be revealed in a generalized pattern of intolerance to all outgroups. However, it may be that for the white South, the essential outgroup is the Negro. In the face of white-black conflict, divisions within the dominant group may become secondary; colour of skin and not religion being the fundamental definition of outgroup. Allport (1958) believes that many white Southerners unite in resisting criticisms from the North and that the Nationalists in South Africa have been strengthened by outside disapproval. Allport concludes:

"Outside criticism is interpreted as an attack on the autonomy of the group. It usually results in greater cohesion. Hence the ethnocentrism that is under attack may become a necessary symbol of solidarity and flourish as never before." (p. 230)

Van den Berghe (1962) noted that anti-Semitism in South Africa was relatively mild by comparison with anti-black prejudice. Whites, while recognizing internal divisions, van den Berghe states, are eager to maintain a united front against the "black danger" (p. 63). Van den Berghe (1965) explains the lack of white English opposition to Afrikaner Nationalism, by the English-speaking South Africans not wanting to change the existing system of white oppression (p. 106).

It may be that in South Africa white unity overrides religious bigotry. Thus the failure of the anti-Jewish sentiment, in South Africa or the American South, to reach the level of anti-black feeling, does not necessarily invalidate the relevance of authoritarian theory. Rather, it may be suggestive of adjustments in the definition
of the outgroup. If feasible, the intensity of anti-Semitism would then not be expected to equal anti-black prejudice in intolerant regions nor to be higher in these than in more tolerant places.

In the present study, because of the large number of Jews in the South African sample, anti-Semitism could not be investigated.

Social Conformity and authoritarianism:

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to outlining the difficulties raised by social conformity as an explanatory concept in the study of racial prejudice.

"... susceptibility to conform may be an unusually important psychological component of prejudice in regions where the cultural norms positively sanction intolerance." (Pettigrew 1958, p. 40)

In spite of this declaration, the evidence for conformity provided by Pettigrew was essentially sociocultural; a distinction between these and authoritarianism, the psychological factor studied, is implicit in Pettigrew's work. Unaccountably, Pettigrew (1958), in his South African study did not present the correlation between the F Scale and his measure of social conformity. In the pilot study undertaken for the present research, the Pettigrew Conformity Scale was found to correlate significantly with $F(.55)$, Prejudice ($+.42$) and Dogmatism ($+.43$).

In that substantial correlations were obtained between conformity and authoritarianism, the delineation of either as the crucial factor in the expression of prejudice becomes of somewhat dubious validity. Furthermore, these results were obtained with a British sample which refutes the suggestion that conformity is most relevant in areas of traditional racial antagonisms.

A sharp distinction between conformity and authoritarianism is, further, not supported by the evidence available in the literature.

1. The pilot study results are presented in chapter 10 below.
Numerous studies have shown a relationship between the two variables. (Crutchfield 1955, Wells et al 1956, Beloff 1958, Small and Campbell 1960, Johnson and Steiner 1967). It is not clear to what extent these studies indicate an authoritarian-conformist personality syndrome or whether the results were due to an artifact of instrument bias. Further clarification of the relationship between the two concepts appears to be required. Nevertheless, Pettigrew (1958) calls for a heuristic separation of psychological and sociological factors as an aid for analysis in the study of race prejudice. At the present stage of our knowledge, this appears to be premature, and reflects partisanship within the social sciences rather than a realistic assessment of the data. It appears evident that the factors which make for social conformity are complex, and must be considered to be, at least partially, psychological in nature. An explanation of the greater prevalence of race prejudice in terms of social conformity may raise as many difficulties as it solves. To conclude that there is more prejudice in South Africa because of conformity to the higher incidence of prejudice there, verges on the tautological.

**Personality and authoritarian societies:**

The final aspect considered here, is the effects of authoritarian government on the individual personality. It may be that the authoritarian form of government in South Africa, which is electorally supported by an ever-increasing majority of the white electorate, (Horrell 1966, p. 6), creates an environment conducive to the formation of the authoritarian personality type. It does not seem unreasonable to postulate that an individual who accepts authoritarianism in the

---

1. Malherbe (1968) writes of South Africa: "There is little doubt that the authoritarian spirit has grown a good deal stronger during the last 20 years in this country. People who have authority today have come to believe that their supreme duty is to preserve their authority ..." (p. 2.)
political sphere may also tend to adopt an authoritarian outlook in the family situation. Christie and Garcia (1951) found their Oklahoma sample scored significantly higher on both F and ethnocentrism than their Californian sample. Melikian (1959) reports high F Scale means for his Arab sample which he explained by recourse to authoritarian aspects in Arab culture. Cohn and Garsch (1954) reported that the German workers tested by them were high on the F Scale, again attributed to authoritarianism in the culture.

While agreeing with Pettigrew (1958) that there is no evidence to suggest that South Africans tend to be more authoritarian in the family than other people, there is also equally little evidence, apart from student populations, to suggest otherwise. Moreover, since Pettigrew’s research was undertaken, authoritarianism may have increased in South Africa.

1. A cautionary note must be registered in that both Pettigrew’s (1958) and the present research were undertaken at English medium Universities in South Africa. This fact poses difficulties for Pettigrew’s social conformity hypotheses, as students at these institutions who express prejudice, to some extent, may be viewed as non-conforming to the ‘university norm on race’. The National Union of South African Students is multi-racial in its constitution and operates primarily at the English medium universities. These institutions may be regarded as "bastions of liberal thought" in South Africa. This assumption is supported by Pettigrew’s political preference data; of his sample, 72 subjects preferred the governing National Party compared to 483 who opted for the other parties. This tendency is also clearly reflected in the present study; almost 42 per cent of the South African sample indicated support for the Progressive Party, whereas it obtained only 3.1 per cent of the total votes cast during the 1966 South African General Election (Horrell 1966, p. 6). Thus while white South African Society at large is geared towards racial segregation, the English-language universities are less obviously so and as such must be regarded as constituting a special sub-culture within the South African context.
Authoritarianism in the family situation is investigated in the present study. Frankel-Brunswik (1949) found that rigidity of personality in children is related to homes where discipline is seen as overwhelming, or threatening, and where emphasis is placed on superficial rules. Adorno and his associates (1950) report that the childhood experiences of the most prejudiced subjects show a tendency towards rigid discipline on the part of the parents. These findings indicate that attitudes toward discipline may provide a rough indicator of authoritarianism. Information was thus obtained on the discipline experienced, and the discipline intended to be administered, by the respondents; the latter was included to ascertain future authoritarian tendencies in the South African sample.

**Summary:**

The discussion has questioned Pettigrew's interpretation of his data. The crucial point of contention is that the hypothesized phenomenon of non-authoritarian prejudice was not substantiated in either the American or the South African research. Pettigrew did not appear to have taken full account of his correlational data in his hypotheses. It is suggested here that personality variables can only be of equal importance in both tolerant and intolerant regions if low prejudice-high F is postulated for the former to counter-balance the predicted occurrence of high prejudice-low F in the latter regions. In this event it is stressed that suppressed prejudice would need to be investigated.

It is also suggested that while Pettigrew demonstrated the relevance of social conformity in racially intolerant areas, this is not shown to be necessarily contradictory to the authoritarian thesis.

---

1. The attitudes toward discipline questions are presented in chapter II.
scrutiny of the results reveal that conformity leads to exceptionally high prejudice scores rather than non-conformity leading to low prejudice. It is postulated that conformist and non-conformist groups are both authoritarian and prejudiced - hence no differences are obtained on F - the former are merely more prejudiced as a result of additional social reinforcement. A difficulty in this explanation is pointed out in that no explanation is readily available to account for the possibility of non-authoritarian identification with ideologies which contained aspects of racism.

The social mobility, sex differences and anti-Semitism data obtained by Pettigrew appear to provide inconclusive evidence in support of his hypotheses. Further, it is pointed out that Pettigrew neglected to account for his sub-scale results. No explanation was provided for the relatively high s-b and low e-d means obtained by the Northern sample. The known inter-relationship between conformity and authoritarianism did not seem to be fully appreciated by Pettigrew and is thus seen as detracting from his postulates. Finally, increased authoritarianism at the personality level in response to increased authoritarianism in the society is considered by means of questions ascertaining attitudes towards discipline.

An attempt has been made to demonstrate the untenability of Pettigrew's position. Alternative hypotheses were formulated for the present research, based largely on Pettigrew's data, but differing in explanation thereof. These are presented in the next chapter. Both Pettigrew's and the present hypotheses were subjected to test during this research.
CHAPTER 6

HYPOTHESES TO ACCOUNT FOR THE DIFFERENCE IN PREJUDICE BETWEEN THE BRITISH AND SOUTH AFRICAN SAMPLES.

The hypotheses presented in this chapter deal with the F, prejudice, discrimination attitude, and prejudice attitude scale results obtained by the British, South African and S.A. (in Br.) samples. The hypotheses (1-5), presented below, which are the predictions for the total samples, were based on Pettigrew's (1958, 1959) findings. The crucial hypotheses for the research are those for the British and South African comparisons. Secondary are the postulates formulated for the S.A. (in Br.) sample, as prediction for this group was based more on intuition than on previous research findings.

Hypotheses:

Prejudice and F Scale hypotheses for the total samples:

(1) The correlation coefficients obtained between the F and prejudice scales will be roughly comparable for the British, South African and S.A. (in Br.) samples.

(2) Mean differences on the F Scale, between the British, South African, and S.A. (in Br.) samples, will, in all three comparisons, fail to reach an acceptable level of significance.

(3a) The South African sample will score significantly higher than the British sample on the total prejudice scale.

(b) The total prejudice scale mean obtained by the S.A. (in Br.) sample will fall in between the means obtained by the other two samples.

1. The paucity of previous research and the number of possible influencing variables uncontrolled for, required caution in the wording of the hypotheses for the S.A. (in Br.) sample. Discussed in Chapter II on the sample selection.
The prejudice sub-scale hypotheses for the total samples:

Pettigrew's (1959) American samples diverge most on the discrimination sub-scale of his prejudice measure. The difference between the Northern and Southern samples, although significant on the stereotyped-belief sub-scale, is not as great as the difference that resulted in discrimination. It is accordingly postulated that the difference between the South African and British samples will be centred on the discrimination sub-scale. It is also suggested that stereotypy will be the major element of racialism for the British sample, and they are thus expected to score higher on prejudice attitude than on the discrimination attitude sub-scale.

(4a) The South African sample will score significantly higher on the discrimination attitude sub-scale than the British sample.

(b) The South African sample will score significantly higher on the discrimination attitude sub-scale than the S.A. (in Br.) sample.

(c) The S.A. (in Br.) sample will score significantly higher on the discrimination attitude sub-scale than the British sample.

(5a) Relative to the discrimination attitude results, the difference between the South African and British samples on the prejudice attitude sub-scale is expected to be less evident, although the South African sample will still score significantly higher.

(b) The British sample will score relatively higher on prejudice attitude than on discrimination attitude.

(c) The prejudice attitude sub-scale mean obtained by the S.A. (in Br.) sample will fall in between the means obtained by the other two samples; the difference in both comparisons failing to reach significance.

Following Pettigrew, it is predicted that the British and South African samples will obtain statistically similar means on the F Scale, but on the prejudice scale, the latter will score significantly higher. Pettigrew accounts for the relatively high prejudice score
obtained by his South African sample by postulating that, as a result of social conformity, non-authoritarians are prejudiced. The hypotheses formulated for the present research suggest that the results obtained by Pettigrew may be accounted for on the basis of the original Adorno et al. (1950) findings, slightly expanded to include cultural influence.

Hypotheses to account for the heightened prejudice in the South African sample:

In accordance with Adorno et al. and with Pettigrew's correlational data, it is postulated that degree of prejudice is directly related to degree of authoritarianism, irrespective of the prevailing race norms. However, where the culture provides positive reinforcement for racial antagonism, it is suggested, that for those who are in personality thus predisposed, the intensity of prejudice will increase. It is hypothesized that, in Western society, authoritarians will tend to be prejudiced, non-authoritarians will tend to be non-prejudiced, and where prejudice is normatively sanctioned, those whose personalities predispose them towards prejudice, will tend to give expression in more extreme form than would otherwise be the case.

In respect of the samples tested here, it is postulated that in both Britain and South Africa, prejudice will tend to be expressed only by authoritarians, and non-authoritarians in both samples will tend to be tolerant. The difference expected in the sample means is accountable, not by prejudiced non-authoritarians in South Africa as in Pettigrew's terms, but by the extremity of prejudice displayed by the South African authoritarian. Simply, the difference in the sample means is explained by authoritarians in South Africa being more prejudiced than authoritarians in Britain.
Personality and cultural influences:

If tenable, the hypotheses formulated here provide an alternative framework to that postulated by Pettigrew. Whereas for Pettigrew and later writers interpreting his results, cultural influences were seen as operating outside personality, the postulate here is that these influences function only within the limits of personality structure. It is suggested that irrespective of the prevailing culture, prejudice will be expressed only by authoritarians.

The present hypotheses thus challenge the notion that an individual behaving in accordance with his personality would be tolerant in one society but might, if placed in a more racially prejudiced environment, hold attitudes which did not concur with his personality organization. (Pettigrew 1958, 1959, Williams 1964, Banton 1967). The study by Hamblin (1962) suggests that non-authoritarians are not susceptible to authoritarian pressures. It has been reported from studies in the American South that those favouring desegregation tend to have Northern or other connections. (Killian and Haer 1958, Greenfield 1961). In Pettigrew's South African study, students born out of Africa tend to be less prejudiced than those born in Africa. The interpretation offered here of these findings is that non-authoritarians do not conform to the demands of a prejudiced society. Both Pettigrew's African- and non-African-born groups contribute almost equally to the non-prejudiced side of the continuum, suggesting that non-authoritarians, irrespective of place of birth, are tolerant.1 The difference between the groups arises out of the fact that more of the African-born group are highly prejudiced: 34 per cent as opposed to 17 per cent of the

1. The relatively high correlations between F and prejudice reported by Pettigrew imply that those who are tolerant also tend to be low F Scale scorers.
non-African contingent are prejudiced in the extreme (p. 34). These data accord with the present hypothesis which states that authoritarians receive social reinforcement from the environment for their bigotry.

According to Pettigrew, moving from an intolerant to a tolerant region would lead non-authoritarians to revert to their basic personality predisposition:

"As the South's norms regarding the Negro continue to change, these latent liberals can be expected to mirror these changes in their own attitudes." (Pettigrew 1959, p. 35)

The sample of Southern African students studying at British Universities, (the S.A. (in Br.) sample), drawn during the present research allows for these postulates to be tested. Based on Pettigrew's predictions, non-authoritarians in the South African sample would number at least some prejudiced individuals and therefore, would score significantly higher on the prejudice scale than non-authoritarians in the S.A. (in Br.) and British samples. Contrary to Pettigrew, it is here predicted that no significant differences will occur on the prejudice scale between non-authoritarians in the British, South African and S.A. (in Br.) samples.

**Non-authoritarian responsiveness to conformity pressures:**

The hypotheses for the present study are based on the assumption that non-authoritarians will tend to be responsive to normative pressures which are in accordance with their personality predispositions and not to those which are so in contradiction. Thus, in spite of racial discrimination being legally entrenched in the South African system, it is predicted that non-authoritarians from this sample will not endorse discriminatory practices. Although greatly varying in exposure to discrimination, it is thought that non-authoritarians in
the British, South African and S.A. (in Br.) samples will not differ statistically when compared on the discrimination attitude sub-scale. Neither are differences expected to result from the comparisons between low F Scale groups on the prejudice attitude sub-scale.

While non-authoritarians are not expected to conform to the demands of a prejudiced society, they are expected to be responsive to pressures which confirm their personality predisposition. This assertion may be tested by means of the Communist sample drawn during the present research. Communism, in its ideology, opposes differentiation based on racial criteria, and thus, adherents may be expected to be exposed to negative reinforcement concerning prejudice. These pressures, it is predicted, will be reflected in the Communists scoring lower on prejudice than an equivalent F Scale group from the British sample.

Thus, in the hypotheses formulated here, the difference expected between the British and South African samples on the prejudice scale is not accountable by non-authoritarians in the latter sample scoring high on prejudice. Instead, it is suggested that comparisons of middle range and high F Scale scores will show the South Africans to score significantly higher than their British counterparts. The high scores of the South African authoritarians is explained by their conformity, in accordance with their personality predispositions, to the racist demands of the South African environment. The hypotheses are presented, in summarized form, in the remainder of the chapter.

Hypotheses for non-authoritarians:

(6) Non-authoritarians will be responsive only to normative pressures which are in accordance with their personality predisposition. Thus, when F Scale scores are controlled, non-authoritarians in the British, South African and S.A. (in Br.) samples will all score equally low on the total prejudice scale, and on both the sub-scales: discrimination attitude and prejudice attitude.
(7) When F Scale scores are controlled, non-authoritarians in the British sample will score significantly higher on the total prejudice scale than the Communist sample.

Hypothesis 6 above, bears directly on Pettigrew's interpretation. This suggests that as a result of social conformity to South African norms of racial hostility, the non-authoritarian South African group will be expected to score significantly higher on prejudice than an equivalently low F Scale group in the British sample. Whereas at least some of the South Africans will score high on prejudice, the British group will respond according to their tolerant personality predisposition.

Pettigrew thus holds that non-authoritarians are susceptible to authoritarian pressures. Hypothesis 7 was formulated in the belief that non-authoritarians would be responsive only to pressures which confirm their personality predisposition. It is thus suggested that Communists, being subjected to such pressures, will score at the extremely tolerant end of the prejudice continuum.

Moderate authoritarians:

There is no direct counterpart in Pettigrew's analyses for comparing middle range F Scale scorers or authoritarians. Pettigrew was non-commital on the expected behaviour of authoritarians. On the one hand, as he hypothesized that the difference between his samples resulted from non-authoritarian bigotry, it could be assumed that he would have predicted no differences in racial prejudice for individuals tending towards authoritarianism. On the other hand, it could be surmised that conformity, and hence greater prejudice, would also be applicable to middle and high range F Scale scorers. In this event, differences between the British and South African sample would be expected. The postulates presented below aim at clarifying the ambiguous expectancies which result from Pettigrew's hypotheses.
(a) When F Scale scores are controlled, moderate authoritarians in the South African sample will score significantly higher than their British sample counterparts on the total prejudice scale, and on the discrimination attitude sub-scale. No significant differences are predicted on the prejudice attitude sub-scale.

(b) The South African and S.A. (in Br.) groups are expected to differ significantly on the total prejudice scale, and, in particular, on the discrimination attitude sub-scale; the South Africans scoring higher in both cases. No significant difference is predicted on the prejudice attitude sub-scale.

(c) The British and S.A. (in Br.) groups are expected to score similarly on the total prejudice scale and on the prejudice attitude sub-scale. It is predicted that the S.A. (in Br.) group will score higher than the British group on the discrimination attitude sub-scale.

Hypotheses for authoritarians:

(a) When F Scale scores are controlled, authoritarians in the South African sample will score significantly higher than the equivalent British group, on the total prejudice scale, and on both the sub-scales; differences on the latter measures will be most marked on the discrimination attitude sub-scale.

(b) The South African group will score higher than the equivalent S.A. (in Br.) group on the total prejudice scale. (However, over-identification with racist ideology may cause the difference to be less prominent.) The South Africans are expected to score higher on discrimination attitude; but on prejudice attitude, the difference is not expected to reach significance.

(c) The British group will score similarly on the total prejudice scale to the S.A. (in Br.) group. (Over-identification with racist ideology for the latter group, may cause a difference to occur.) The S.A. (in Br.) group is expected to score significantly higher on discrimination attitude, but on prejudice attitude the difference is not expected to reach significance.

South African political preference groups:

Pettigrew (1958) in his South African study, tested for differences between respondents who were Afrikaans and English-speaking; between African and non-African born; between those with manually and non-manually employed fathers; and between supporters of the Nationalist and other political parties. In the present study, because of a
lack of numbers, only the last mentioned comparison is able to be replicated.

(10) The supporters of the National and United Parties in the South African sample will score equally high on the F Scale and on the prejudice attitude sub-scale. Although both groups are expected to score at the intolerant extreme of the total prejudice scale and the discrimination attitude sub-scale, the Nationalists are expected to score significantly higher on both measures.

**Suppressed prejudice:**

Previously, it was suggested, in the text, that in areas of relative racial tolerance, prejudice may be suppressed. The suppression hypothesis was investigated, in the present study, by comparing low prejudice scale scorers in the three samples on the F Scale. If individuals in the British sample repress prejudice in response to a perceived norm of racial tolerance, the British group will obtain a higher mean on the F Scale than the S.A. (in Br.) group, who in turn, will score higher than the South Africans. However, as the research is of a preliminary nature, the postulates were formulated in terms of the null hypothesis.

(11) When total prejudice scale scores are controlled, no differences on the F Scale are expected for tolerant groups in the British, South African and S.A. (in Br.) samples.

**Attitudes towards discipline:**

Finally, attitudes towards discipline are investigated. It was suggested during the discussion that the increase in authoritarian government in South Africa may lead to an increase of authoritarianism in the family situation. In view of the expected similarity in F Scale scores for the samples, the predictions were based on the assumption of a greater tendency on the part of the South African sample towards authoritarianism, particularly with respect to future outlook. However, in terms of significant differences, the null
hypothesis is invoked in the formulation of the postulates.

(12a) No significant differences are predicted between the British and South African samples in the occurrence of 'restrictive' and 'permissive' responses obtained to the question requiring the subjects to describe the discipline they experienced as a child.

(b) No significant differences are predicted between the British and South African samples in the occurrence of 'more restriction' or 'less restriction' responses obtained to the question requiring the subjects to compare their own disciplinary experiences as a child with the discipline intended to be applied to their own children.

(c) When experience as a child is controlled for those who describe their own experience as 'restrictive', no significant differences are predicted between the British and South African samples in the descriptions obtained for the discipline intended to be applied to their own children.

(d) When experience as a child is controlled for those who describe their own experience as 'permissive', no significant differences are predicted between the British and South African samples in the descriptions obtained for the discipline intended to be applied to their own children.

Throughout the study, indications will be sought for Pettigrew's (1961) observation that patterns of prejudice are similar in various Western countries. The correlations obtained for the prejudice scale and the prejudice means obtained by political and religious groups - dealt with in detail later in the discussion - are of particular interest for the above hypothesis.
B. DOGMATISM.
CHAPTER 7

THE OPEN AND CLOSED DIMENSION.

The aim here is to examine the research evidence which has accumulated in response to the theory and findings presented by Rokeach (1960) in "The Open and Closed Mind." Within this broad perspective, attention is given to the contrast between Rokeach's work on the one hand and, on the other, the earlier research in the field, particularly authoritarianism (F) and rigidity. Rokeach claimed that his conceptualization provided an advancement on authoritarianism as previously formulated by Adorno et al (1950). Dogmatism is also defined as being distinct from the concept of rigidity.

The theory of Dogmatism:

Rokeach (1956, 1960) viewed his research as a departure from previous work in the field of authoritarianism because he placed emphasis on structure; whereas, hitherto, focus had been largely on the content of social attitudes. Rokeach contends that the degree of openness or closedness of a mind is determined by the manner in which a belief is held, and is independent of the actual belief itself, "... it is not so much what you believe that counts, but how you believe." (1960, p. 6)

Rokeach's concept of a belief-disbelief system includes all of a person's beliefs and disbeliefs. Rokeach (1960) writes:

1. Largely omitted from this discussion is the issue of the Dogmatism Scale as a measure of general authoritarianism. This is dealt with in the following chapter. Clarity rather than logical sequence determined the form of presentation. The content of the next chapter has an obvious bearing on the discussion here, but is separated because general authoritarianism is the major concern of the present study.
"... beliefs are organized into two interdependent parts: The disbelief system is further conceived as being composed of several disbelief subsystems, which vary in degree of similarity to the belief system. It is hypothesized that disbelief subsystems that are similar to the belief system are more acceptable than less similar ones." (p. 35)

The organization of individual belief-disbelief systems distinguishes the open from the closed mind. In contrast to those more open minded, the closed minded dogmatic individual manifests greater isolation within and between belief and disbelief systems. The closed minded are reluctant to see interrelations between beliefs, and thus the beliefs are isolated from each other. Closed minded individuals further tend towards greater differentiation between belief and disbelief systems, but have relatively little differentiation within the disbelief system, and greater rejection of disbelief systems. To illustrate, Rokeach (1960) offers the example of the American politician, Senator Joseph McCarthy who saw little difference between anti-communists and communists: he apparently did not distinguish between Communists, Socialists and Liberals.

Rokeach constructed the Dogmatism Scale to measure open and closed mindedness, the items being indirect measures of the following: (a) the accentuation of the differences between the belief and the disbelief systems; (b) the existence of contradictions within the belief system; (c) the lack of differentiation within the disbelief system; (d) the degree to which the person sees man alone and helpless; (e) fear of the future, a feeling of urgency in making decisions, and the compulsive repetition of ideas and arguments; (f) need for martyrdom; (g) conflict within the self; (h) defence against inadequacy; (i) belief in positive and negative authority; (j) belief in the cause; (k) intolerance toward the renegade and the disbeliever;
(1) tendency to make party-line change; (a) avoidance of facts incongruent with one's belief system; and (n) extent to which the belief-disbelief system is organized around the past or future. (As summarized by Schroder et al. 1967, p. 132-133.)

The brief outline offered here of Rokeach's theory is contrasted to the roughly thirty pages taken by Rokeach to develop his theoretical formulations. Although referred to again during the discussion, the presentation here, if only because of its brevity, does an injustice to Rokeachian theory.

The validation of belief-disbelief systems:

Powell (1966) examined similarities between Rokeach's belief-disbelief system and Sherif and Hovland's concepts of latitude of acceptance, rejection and noncommitment. Latitude of acceptance was defined as the range of positions on an issue which are acceptable. The complementary concept of latitude of rejection consists of positions which the individual finds objectionable. Latitude of noncommitment are those positions on an issue which are categorized as neither, in some degree, acceptable or objectionable.

Powell viewed Sherif and Hovland's concepts as having a parallel in the conceptualization of the open and closed dimension. The results obtained tended to support Powell's contentions. In three separate studies, Powell administered a shortened form of the Dogmatism Scale and statements representing different stands on specific issues; respectively, alcoholism, the 1964 Presidential Election, and the Church.

The hypotheses supported by the data in all three studies were, "The more closed minded an individual, the more extreme his stand (most acceptable position) on an issue," and "The more closed minded
an individual, the broader his latitude of rejection on an issue." (p. 454) Further, in two of the three researches, significant data was obtained for the hypothesis that, "The more closed-minded an individual, the narrower his latitude of noncommitment on an issue." However, although in the predicted direction, significant results were not obtained in support of the final hypothesis, "The more closed minded an individual, the narrower his latitude of acceptance on an issue."

Powell concluded that the, "... level of dogmatism is but an imperfect prediction of an individual's stand on a social issue, and that additional 'content-related' factors are also operative." (p. 456) Powell's study provides, at least, some validation for Rokeach's belief-disbelief system. The data appears to detract from the theory, not because of the Dogmatism Scale's imperfection in prejudicing an individual's stand on a social issue, but rather because it is able to predict at all. The results tend to equate dogmatism with extremity, while Rokeachian theory would have it that it is possible to be both moderate and dogmatic. Barker (1965) showed, in his study with political groups, that there was no relationship between Dogmatism and extremity of position. He did, however, stress that further testing was required with samples more politically extreme than were his groups. This question is considered in the present study, particularly in relation to the Communist sample.

The possession of contradictory knowledge:

Rokeach (1960) writes that the discrepancy in the amount of knowledge possessed, between the things a person believes in and the things he disbelieves in, may be taken as an index of the relative degree of differentiation of the belief as compared with the disbelief
system. Thus an open minded individual may be expected to possess greater knowledge contradictory to their own opinion than would closed minded individuals. Smith (1968), however, was only able to substantiate this hypothesis among those with little interest in the issue. Among those highly interested in the issue, the high dogmatics tended to have more knowledge contradictory to their own opinion than had low dogmatics. Dogmatism, in relation to interest, will be examined in the present study by means of the responses to the statements aimed at measuring political concern.

Schroder et al (1967) found that a difficulty may arise in interpreting the results obtained from the Dogmatism Scale, and point to an example of an item aimed at measuring the amount of knowledge possessed: "It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes."

Schroder et al comment that a dogmatic individual may wrongly believe that he knows everything about the ideas he opposes, and thus disagree with the item.¹

The distinction between Dogmatism and Rigidity:

Rokeach (1960) clearly differentiated dogmatism from rigidity, in contrast to the earlier authoritarian research which identified rigidity as a defining characteristic of the intolerant personality.

Adorno et al (1950) were cautious in their proposal of an association between authoritarianism and rigidity, and suggested that it is perhaps only valid in extreme groups. Furthermore, they pointed

¹ In the present research similar ambiguity was indicated for the item: "While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man like Einstein or Beethoven or Shakespeare." A respondent who strongly disagreed with the item claimed that this was his ambition but that it was not secret; he freely admitted to it. (Appeared in parenthesis on the questionnaire.)
to the "rigid low scorer" who "clings to liberal ideology in a rigid and stereotyped manner." (p. 464). Results from the literature show that rigidity has not unequivocally been related to the authoritarian syndrome. (Christie and Cook 1958, Brown 1965.)

Rigidity was defined by Rokeach (1960) as, "the resistance to change of single beliefs (or sets or habits)", and dogmatism as, "The resistance to change of systems of beliefs." (p. 183) Rokeach goes on to suggest that rigidity is related to the ability to analyse, and dogmatism to the ability to synthesise. The rigid individual;

"... cannot break down or overcome beliefs when they are no longer appropriate, in order to replace them with more appropriate ones. Thus, rigid thinking should be expected to lead to difficulties in thinking analytically." (p. 183)

On the other hand, for the dogmatic individual;

"... analysis by itself, if not followed up by synthesis, cannot topple a person's total belief system. Nor should synthesis in thinking topple it so long as a new belief can be readily integrated into the belief system."

If however, the new system threatens his existing belief system;

"... we should expect the synthesising process of thinking to slow down or be disrupted, to the extent that his belief system is dogmatic or closed." (p. 183-4)

These hypotheses were tested by means of the Gough and Sanford Rigidity Scale (quoted by Rokeach 1960, p. 418), and the Rokeach Doodlebug Problem. (p. 171-181). Subjects were categorized into high and low scorers on both the Rigidity and Dogmatism scales. When compared on the Doodlebug task, high and low rigidity scorers differed significantly in their ability to overcome beliefs. The open and closed subjects were not significantly different. For the synthesizing results, that is, the ability to utilize the new beliefs, the rigidity groups were found to be statistically similar, and the Dogmatism scale was found to differentiate significantly between the
subjects. Variations of the Doodlebug problem also provided support for the hypotheses. In addition, verification has also been obtained from the Fillenbaum and Jackman (1961) and Lyda and Fillenbaum (1964) studies.

The correlations reported by Rokeach between the Dogmatism and Rigidity Scales ranged from .35 to .55. The correlation between analysis and synthesis of thinking was found to be around .45. (p. 195) While pointing to these relatively high correlations which suggest that the traits tended to go together, it was insisted that the Doodlebug data indicated them to be discernibly different psychological processes.

Factor analytical studies have shown the Dogmatism and Gough-Sanford Rigidity Scales to have loadings on different factors. (Rokeach and Fruchter 1956, Fruchter et al 1958). Brengelmann (1960), quotes Nigwitzsky's factor analytical study with a representative French sample, where scales of rigidity, dogmatism, intolerance of ambiguity and fascism (F), were found to have high loadings on a factor termed rigidity.

Korm and Giddan (1964) obtained a significant negative correlation between dogmatism and flexibility. Ehrlich and Rauer (1966) found that when patients' dogmatism and flexibility scores were combined, no major changes over the original dogmatism correlations were obtained. They interpreted these results as being suggestive of dogmatism and flexibility, tapping the same underlying dimension. Ladd (1967) found that the Gough-Sanford Rigidity Scale correlated negligibly with the Dogmatism, and significantly with the F Scale. Ladd also found that dogmatism correlated significantly with Budner's (1962) Intolerance of Ambiguity Scale. High and low scorers on F and Budner's Scale, differed significantly on concept learning, whereas
dogmatism and rigidity did not differentiate. These results appear to stress the need for greater clarification on the relationship between Dogmatism, Authoritarianism, Rigidity, and Intolerance of Ambiguity. As the battery of tests used in the present study included the first three mentioned scales, the findings will be utilized towards this end.

Riley and Aralin (1965) investigated dogmatism and rigidity on a perceptual motor task. They followed Porteus' suggestion that rigid maze performance indicated a general inflexible personality. From the comparison of high and low dogmatic scorers on the maze, Riley and Aralin concluded that dogmatic thinking is accompanied by rigidity on a perceptual motor task.

Levy and Rokeach (1960) tested open and closed minded subjects on Witkin's embedded-figures test. They substantiated the hypothesis that this test measured analytical ability. They obtained no significant differences for the two groups. The subjects were then tested with Kohs Blocks, this being considered a perceptual synthesis task. Although in the predicted direction, the results showed no significant differences between the open and closed groups, when compared on solution time. In three out of six tasks, the difference approached significance. Measured in terms of passing or failing the perceptual task, for three of the designs, significantly more of the open group passed. In two of the non-significant results, the difference, however, was in the non-predicted direction. Nevertheless, on what appears to be weak evidence, Levy and Rokeach claim substantiation for their hypothesis.

Kessler and Kronenberger (1967), in their experiment controlled for field dependence (Embedded Figures Test), found no significant difference between open and closed minded subjects on the Kohs Block Test. The
authors, in contradiction to Levy and Rokeach, concluded that the open-closed dimension did not cause discriminatory differences in ability to integrate new perceptual systems. They also found that field independent and field dependent subjects differed significantly, and suggest that field dependence, not controlled in the Levy and Rokeach study, may have been the factor biasing their conclusions.

Mikol (1960) showed that, of open and closed groups which did not differ in their appreciation of conventional music, the open were more accepting of unconventional music. Zagone and Kelly (1966) obtained similar results with novel audio-visual experiences in a film. They concluded that these differences between open and closed subjects result from the novelty and lack of structure of the film, plus the synthesizing demands the film made upon the viewer.

It could be expected that dogmatism and creativity would be related. Jacoby (1967) obtained a correlation of -.248 between dogmatism and a test of creativity. Although in the predicted direction, the correlation did not reach an acceptable level of significance.  

Future orientation:

Rokeach assumed that the more closed the belief-disbelief system, the more would its organization be future orientated, and the more would the present be rejected as important. Rokeach and Bonier (1960), in an analysis of T.A.T. stories, found that the closed group used the future tense significantly more often than the open group. No differences, however, were found in frequency of use of the past tense. Zurcher et al (1967) report a significant correlation between the Dogmatism Scale and a measure of future orientation. The authors conclude that the study, although inconclusive, tends to confirm Rokeach's hypothesis.
Paranoid outlook on life:

Paranoid outlook on life was postulated as being a characteristic of dogmatic individuals. Ehrlich and Bauer (1966), however, found no significant correlation between paranoia and dogmatism. It must be pointed out that Rokeach did not utilize the paranoid outlook items in the final version of the Dogmatism Scale.

Resistance to change:

Resistance to change as a defining characteristic of the closed mind was investigated by Lefcourt (1962). He administered the Dogmatism scale to three groups of narcotic addicts, classified according to their potential to change in reaction to conventional psychotherapy. Closed-mindedness was found to increase with the groups less apt to change. Ehrlich and Bauer (1966) found that in psychiatric hospitalization, prognosis was poorer for high scoring dogmatism patients. Hallenbeck and Lundstedt (1966) report further of dogmatic resistance to change. They found that among blind persons who experienced gradual onset of disability, dogmatism was positively related to denial tendency.

Dogmatism and Anxiety:

Adorno et al (1950), and Rokeach (1960), attempted to integrate into their conceptual systems some form of psychotherapy.

The Californian investigators, admitting to speculation, proposed for further research, that high scorers would tend towards psychotic manifestations, while low scorers would tend towards neurotic disturbances. (p. 969) Authoritarians, are said to deal with anxiety through mechanisms of repression and projection. Anxiety and guilt feelings, they write, are kept in a repressed state by authoritarians. (p. 485) It is stressed, however, that the relationship between authoritarianism and psychopathology remains
uncertain. Christie and Cook (1958), in their review of the literature, emphasise the confusion which surrounds this relationship.

Studies undertaken in this area of research with the F Scale, report conflicting results. Masling (1954) found that F Scale scores tended to be unrelated to neuroticism. Dowling (1955) posed the hypothesis that both very tolerant and very intolerant individuals tended to be neurotic, while those who clustered around the mean in their scores, tended to be normal. Jensen (1957) argues that while mental illness is not necessarily indicative of authoritarianism, extreme authoritarianism may be indicative of psychological maladjustment. Both Masling and Jensen's hypotheses will be tested in the present study using the Prejudice, F and Dogmatism Scales.

Rokeach (1960) links his conception of authoritarianism with defence mechanisms:

F... in the extreme, the closed system is nothing more than the total network of psychoanalytical defence mechanisms organized together to form a cognitive system and designed to shield a vulnerable mind." (p. 70)

To the extent in which a belief-disbelief system is closed, Rokeach claims, it represents a cognitive network of defences against anxiety. (p. 347) The need to ward off threat results in the belief system becoming closed. Rokeach (1960) reports, with seven samples, significant positive correlations, ranging from .36 to .64, between dogmatism and anxiety. (p. 348).

The factor analytical studies by Rokeach and Fruchter (1956) and Fruchter et al (1958), showed dogmatism to have factorial content in common with anxiety. No such relationship was found for the F Scale.

Fillenbaum and Jackman (1961) reported a correlation of .49 between dogmatism and anxiety. Rebhun (1966), with three samples,
found significant positive relationships between dogmatism and test anxiety. Norman's (1966) results suggest that a positive relationship exists between dogmatism and anxiety, with depression, social introversion and lack of ego-strength also evident among dogmatic subjects.

Watson (1967) investigated dogmatism, rigidity and neuroticism, using Rokeach's Doodlebug Problem as the measure of rigidity (ability to produce novel responses) and dogmatism (ability to utilize novel responses). Neurotics and non-neurotics were found not to differ on the measure of rigidity; and on dogmatism, the inability to utilize novel responses was only manifested by introverted neurotics. These findings are in accordance with Eysenck's (1964) view that anxiety states characterize the neurotic introverted type, but do not correspond with his view that introverts tend to be rigid. Drakeford (1969) repeated Watson's study using scales of Dogmatism and Rigidity (Gough-Sanford). No significant relationship was found between rigidity, neuroticism, and extraversion. The dogmatism results, Drakeford stresses, were inconsistent with the predictions of either Eysenck or Rokeach. Of the groups tested, only the non-neurotic extraverts differed in the dogmatism mean obtained. They scored considerably lower than the other groups. Thus, neither neuroticism nor extraversion were shown to be the main effect in producing the dogmatism results; the high and low neurotic groups did not differ on dogmatism, nor did the extraversion-introversion dimension produce consistent results.

A further related area of contention generated by the open-closed dimension is the operation of defence mechanisms. Norman (1966) suggests that if dogmatism is viewed as a defence against anxiety,
it may be that both low and high dogmatism will manifest anxiety, depending on the functional adequacy of the defence. However, in the absence of adequate methods of determining the operation of defence mechanisms, substantiation cannot be provided for dogmatism by both the positive and negative relationships with anxiety. Evidence of a positive relationship between dogmatism and anxiety cannot be indicative of the failure of the defence mechanisms to provide protection, while simultaneously, a negative or lack of a relationship, is interpreted as evidence for the existence of such mechanisms. In view of Roeach's results, the necessary interpretation is that the defence mechanisms used by the closed minded individual fail to provide adequate protection against anxiety. A positive correlation between these two variables is thus hypothesized.

Byrne et al (1966) considered dogmatism and defence mechanisms in their study. Their results challenged Roeach's view that closed minded individuals utilize repression. In two samples, a significant positive correlation was obtained between Dogmatism and a scale of Repression-Sensitization. The authors conclude that intellectualization and sensitization, rather than repression and denial, are the specific mechanisms used by dogmatics as a defence against anxiety. Anxiety-arousing impulses, Byrne et al claim, are dealt with by dogmatics intellectually rather than emotionally. (p. 741).

Hallenbeck and Lundstedt (1966), with blind subjects, however, found that high dogmatic persons used denial. There was a tendency for them to deny their disability its cognitive implications and their feelings about it. Less dogmatic subjects tended to show depression as a reaction to the onset of their disability.

The study here, is not intended to investigate the specific defence mechanisms used by dogmatics, but instead aims at examining
the relationship between dogmatism and psychoneurosis. The evidence that a relationship exists between closed mindedness and anxiety appears to be well established. Accordingly, attention here is given to the broader concept of neuroticism. Following Eysenck (1964) and Eysenck and Rachman (1965), anxiety states will be attributed to introverted neurotics.

The relationship between dogmatism and neurosis is particularly pertinent in view of Rokeach's distinction between dogmatism and rigidity. Pervin (1960) points to a scarcity of studies which have attempted to relate rigidity to neurosis. Although a positive relationship is indicated, some of the results obtained have been in the opposite direction. Brendelmann (1960) suggests a positive relationship between neuroticism, manifest anxiety and rigidity. Further clarification of the distinction between dogmatism and rigidity may be obtained by comparing their respective associations with neuroticism.

Rokeach departs from the Adorno et al postulates in that, he predicts that high scorers will manifest more anxiety than will low scorers. Thus, according to Adorno et al, neuroticism may be expected to correlate negatively or minimally with the F Scale, and according to Rokeach, positively with dogmatism. In view of the disagreement prevalent when the F Scale has been used, and of the hypothesis suggested by Dowling (1955) and Jensen (1957), perhaps a more adequate test would be with extreme groups on the Dogmatism and F Scales.

1. Respondent co-operation was a determining factor in limiting the length of the questionnaire used in the study. As the battery of tests used included the EPI Neuroticism Scale, a manifest anxiety scale was not considered as vital to inclusion.
Another hypothesis that may be tested is that offered by Norman (1966). He suggests that where there are dogmatic elements in the culture, the relationship with anxiety may be less clear-cut than in cultures less dogmatically inclined. This is because the samples usually tested are drawn from University populations, the academic environment being relatively open minded. Closed-minded students experience emotional disturbances, Norman postulates, when expected to operate effectively within the University context. Thus the contrast between the open environment and the closed minded individual results in anxiety being manifested. Norman suggests that this may account for the reported relationship between dogmatism and anxiety. The lowest correlation reported between these variables by Rokeach was for his only non-student sample. (*36) In the present study, the relatively closed South African environment may lead to a less evident relationship between dogmatism and neuroticism for the South African data as compared to the British.

The relationship between anxiety and dogmatism for political groups is also considered. Rokeach found that dogmatists who were Right of Centre tended to score high on anxiety, but that Communists obtained relatively low anxiety scale means. Rokeach suggested an explanation in terms of Communism, by virtue of the greater demands it makes on its adherents, acting as an anxiety-reducing agent. Thus the association between dogmatism and neuroticism may be expected to be greater for the right-wing than for the left-wing groups. Neuroticism, as the determining factor in the formation of closed mindedness among members of different political groups, will be investigated.
Anomie:

Srole (1956) suggests that psychological anomie - normlessness, alienation - rather than authoritarianism is associated with ethnocentrism. Srole found that anomie remained highly correlated with prejudice when F Scale scores were held constant but the correlation between prejudice and F was largely removed by holding anomie constant. Roberts and Rokeach (1956), however, dispute Srole's methodology. They show that authoritarianism and prejudice are still positively correlated when anomie is held constant. Roberts and Rokeach conclude that anomie, authoritarianism and prejudice are all interrelated. McDill (1961) demonstrated that authoritarianism and anomie are equally important correlates of prejudice. From the results of a factor analysis, McDill reports a common psychological dimension - the perspective of being mastered by threatening forces beyond one's personal control - to underly anomie, authoritarianism and prejudice.

The relationship between anomie, prejudice, F and dogmatism will be tested here. McDill's findings appear to imply dogmatism - "fear of aloneness" - rather than the Adorno et al concept of authoritarianism. Thus, Srole's (1956) five item Anomie Scale provides an opportunity for testing the assertion that the closed minded individual perceives man as being alone and helpless; a high positive correlation between dogmatism and anomie is predicted.

The prediction of Dogmatism:

Haiman and Bums (1964) claim some behavioural validation for the Dogmatism Scale. In their study they obtained results which indicate that it is possible, with a modest but statistically significant degree of assurance, for observers to predict a subject's score on the Dogmatism Scale from his communication behaviour.
Reliance on authority:

Comparing high and low dogmatic groups, Zagona and Zurcher (1965a), found the former to be leader-orientated, its members preferring lectures to discussion, and they also followed minor regulations meticulously. The study suggests Rokeach's description of the closed minded individual and his reliance on authority.

Rebhun (1967) found support for the hypothesis that closed minded people tend to hold parental attitudes which encourage their offspring not to intrude upon their belief-disbelief system. This tends to promote a similarly dogmatic approach in their children. Dogmatic parents were found to foster dependency. Rebhun writes that the encouragement given to children to rely on their parents, prohibits clear consideration of competing beliefs and narrows the child's range of contacts, and in so doing, tends to produce a similar closed minded system in the child.

Restle et al (1964), in their study of learning-set and oddity problems, show that closed minded subjects perform better on the former, and the open minded, better on the latter. The theoretical interpretation offered was that closed minded S's depend passively on authority, whereas open S's seek an underlying principle. The design was that, in the learning-set problems, the experimenter acted as a "capricious authority". The closed minded willingly followed the experimenter, whereas, the open minded sought a general principle where there was none, and therefore did not perform efficiently. On the other hand, the oddity problems required a principle which would predict the reinforcements. The closed minded followed the experimenter's reinforcements passively, and thus did not quickly find the principle.
Tosi et al (1968) tested Rokeach's contention that the need to ward off threat results in a closed belief system. The method used was to ask S's to identify themselves by name or birthdate, the choice of birthdate being assumed to be indicative of threat under conditions of group personality testing. The proportion of non-threatening responses to threatening responses was greater for the middle groups than for either the low or high dogmatic groups. This led to the suggestion that the middle scoring group rather than the low group may be the most open-minded. The study's criterion for threatening may be open to question; nevertheless, interpretation of the results may be found in Bernhardson's (1967) Research.

Bernhardson found that the Dogmatism Scale correlated -.20, significant at the .05 level, with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. This study reflects adversely on the validity of the responses obtained by the Dogmatism scale. It may also explain the Tosi et al results. High dogmatics were responding to threat, while the low group may have preferred anonymity because of their affinity with socially desirable behaviour; they did not wish to be identified because of possible undesirable personality characteristics being revealed.

Sticht and Fox (1966) found that individuals who had changed residence frequently tended to be more dogmatic than those who moved only a few times. Dogmatism is seen as a defence against repeated social and environmental disruptions, and under such conditions, the only thing that is relatively permanent is one's own beliefs.
Dogmatism and learning:

Baker (1964) comments on Rokeach's contention that individuals with closed belief systems tend to reject new ideas that were incongruent with their belief systems. Baker's findings suggest that when individuals with closed systems are given the opportunity and incentive to learn and accept a new belief system, they develop superior retention of congruent concepts as compared to individuals who have open belief systems. Ehrlich (1961), however, reports the opposite to Baker. He found that a test of sociological generalizations and definitions was negatively correlated with dogmatism. Christensen (1963) found no relationship between achievement in an introductory psychology test and dogmatism. Co»tin (1965) in his findings replicated those of the Christensen's study. In a further project, Costin (1966), substantiated the hypothesis that dogmatism would be positively correlated with psychology students' retention of specific false beliefs about human behaviour, but would not be related to their acquisition of basic psychological principles. Ladd (1967) found that high and low dogmatism scorers did not differ significantly on concept learning which involved a card-sorting task.

The association between dogmatism and intelligence:

A related area of investigation is the argument that much of the dogmatism research findings may be accounted for by differences in intelligence. Rokeach denied a relationship between dogmatism and intelligence, and reports, in one study, a minimal correlation of -.02. (Rokeach 1960, p. 190) However, researchers in the field appear to be divided on this issue.

Christensen (1963) reports evidence in support of Rokeach. Baker (1964), similarly, accepts the null hypothesis of no difference
in intelligence between high and low dogmatic scorers. Costin (1965) found the correlation between the School and College Ability Test (SCAT) and dogmatism not to be statistically significant. Ladd (1967) found no significant correlation between dogmatism and academic aptitude.

On the other hand, Ehrlich (1961) found a significant correlation between dogmatism and the verbal scholastic aptitude test (−.20) but not with the mathematical test (−.11). Zagona and Zurcher (1965a) correlated the dogmatism scale and the verbal subtest of the College Qualification test. Zagona and Zurcher (1965b) from their observation in the class-room situation and statistically, conclude that:

"... despite Rokeach's repeated assertions to the contrary, a statistically significant relationship exists between factors generally associated with intelligence and scores on the Dogmatism scale." (p. 217)

A further report of an association between dogmatism and intelligence comes from Plant et al (1965). Ehrlich and Bauer (1966) found a significant negative correlation between dogmatism and education. Costin (1968) also found that Rokeach's scale correlated significantly with SCAT.

While agreeing with Zagona and Zurcher (1965a) that there is insufficient evidence available to conclude that closed mindedness is a function of intelligence, the implications of the findings are nevertheless serious for Rokeachian theory.

**Sex differences on the Dogmatism Scale:**

Rokeach did not consider that sex differences were influential in dogmatism scores. Anderson (1962), in a developmental study of dogmatism during adolescence, found no sex differences. He verified the hypothesis that there is a decline in dogmatism during
adolescent years. Alter and White (1966), from their review of six studies, claim that males show consistently higher scores than females. Vacchiano et al (1967) in a factor analysis of Dogmatism Scale scores, found different formations for males and females, indicating that the scale was not measuring the same dimensions of dogmatism for the sexes. Mean differences, for the sexes, however, were not found to be significantly different. The authors suggest that the sex differences were possibly due to the varying cultural roles played by men and women.

**Dogmatism and race prejudice:**

The final area of investigation raised during this discussion is racial intolerance. Rokeach claimed that discriminatory preferences are made primarily on the basis of belief congruence rather than on the basis of ethnic or racial congruence. For example, the social world is organized, not in terms of Negro-white distinctions as proposed by Adorno et al (1950), but in terms of Negroes and whites who agree with us, and Negroes and whites who disagree with us on specific issues we care about. The hypothesis suggested is that;

"... insofar as psychological processes are involved, belief is more important than ethnic or racial membership as a determinant of social discrimination."

(p. 135)

A qualification added to the hypothesis is that where racial prejudice and discrimination are institutionalized or sanctioned by law, social discrimination becomes coerced along ethnic and racial rather than belief lines. (p. 164) As this qualification includes South Africa, the hypothesis is not therefore amenable to testing with the South African sample, and no consideration is given to it during the present study.
Logical objections also influenced the omission of the race-belief hypothesis from the present research. Rokeach's example of a Ku Klux Klanner's (p. 133) choice of a "good nigger" in preference to a "nigger lover", does not appear to take sufficient account of the interrelationship between content and structure. The "good nigger" is presumably classified as such because he does not challenge the status quo of white superiority - black inferiority, and conforms to the white stereotype of a Negro. In short, he fits into the white dominated society, taking a place of inferiority. On the other hand, the "nigger lover" challenges the whole structure of the racially segregated society, aiming towards racial equality in a society where the Ku Klux Klan, the "good nigger" and the "uppity nigger" will all have equal status. That a Ku Klux Klanner prefers the "good nigger" over the "nigger lover" cannot be construed as evidence that belief rather than race is the determinant of social discrimination. The belief, after all, fundamentally involves social discrimination on racial lines. The problem of race prejudice would cease to be crucial if the social discriminatory element were removed.

Further, Rokeach sub-divided his measure into general and Negro-white beliefs. The four general beliefs dealt with were socialized medicine, God, Communism, and labour unions. All these may be linked with political attitudes which have repeatedly been shown to be associated with racial attitudes. Rokeach (1960) found that race prejudice increased from Left to Right along the political dimension.

An individual, for example, who finds biblical justification for racism, may favour a co-religionist who is a Negro in preference to a white who rejects the religious foundations of the society. The other topics are more obviously associated with left-wing ideology,
and thus more easily linked with racism. Implicit in the anti-Communist Negro is a preference for the status quo, while to the racist mind, a white Communist stands for racial integration.

Clearly, in racist belief, content cannot easily be distinguished from structure. Is it possible to believe in racial intolerance open-mindedly? The problem of content contaminating Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale items is returned to in the next chapter.

Conclusions:

The research described in the preceding pages was not meant as an exhaustive bibliography. "The Open and Closed Mind", like its Berkeley predecessor, has generated much activity in the social sciences. Its theory and measuring instruments have been continually utilized, far in excess of those dealt with here. The findings cited have merely been illustrative of the position that dogmatism has assumed in social psychology, and the issues it has raised. These it appears, remain open to question. It is evident that there is much evidence for and against Rokeachian theory. No final pronouncement ought to be made at this stage of our knowledge. Many of the studies so far undertaken suffered from sampling and methodological weaknesses, which may, rather than Rokeach's concepts, account for the conflicting results.

Another possible explanation for the disagreement is that verification of the theory has largely rested on the validity of the Dogmatism Scale. It must be emphasized that the substantiation of Rokeachian theory, but not its refutation, depends on the Dogmatism Scale. Obviously, if the scale proves to be invalid, the theory would not have been adequately tested. In this instance, all that would be concluded is that fault has occurred in the construction of
the scale, and not necessarily in the theoretical assumptions leading to the scale's construction. However, if the scale failed to predict according to theory, while this may or may not reflect on the basic concepts, it would be indicative of the scale's lack of validity. The scale is based on theory, not vice versa. Thus, the rationale is not disproved by inadequacies in the scale; however, the scale is dependent on the verification of the theory.

Many of the doubts cast upon the validity of the Dogmatism Scale are similar to the criticisms voiced against the F Scale. Response-set critics have assailed both scales. Both appear to be inversely related to intelligence. Christie and Cook (1958) report that the F Scale will correlate about -.20 with intelligence when education is held constant. The Dogmatism Scale, because it purports to be a cognitive measure, is more directly concerned with variables related to intelligence, and thus the reported association with intelligence perhaps raises more fundamental problems for dogmatism than it does for the F Scale. It appears that both measures are best used with relatively well educated, middle-class subjects.

Where the Dogmatism Scale, in the studies reviewed, has performed according to prediction, in many of the cases, the results have merely confirmed previous findings in studies using the F Scale. Christie and Cook (1958) quote reported relationships between the F Scale and numerous variables, many of which were mentioned here in connection with the Dogmatism scale. Plant et al (1965) in a study of the personality variables of dogmatism conclude;

"Compared to highly dogmatic subjects, the nondogmatic subjects would be described as being outgoing and enterprising, calm and patient, mature and forceful, efficient and clear thinking, planful and responsible and more likely to succeed in an academic setting than would be the highly dogmatic subjects." (p. 73)
The description offered by Adorno et al (1950) of the non-authoritarian shows striking resemblances to that provided by Plant et al of the open minded individual. For example:

"The low scorer also tends to be orientated more than is the high scorer, toward real achievement, toward intellectual or aesthetic goals, and toward the realization of socially productive values. His greater capacity for intensive interpersonal relationships goes hand in hand with a greater self-sufficiency. He struggles for the establishment of inner harmony and self-actualization ..." (p. 475)

The above is not suggestive of the dogmatism research merely duplicating that of "The Authoritarian Personality", on the contrary, much of it is clearly original. However, vital to an appraisal of Rokeach's theory, is its functioning vis-à-vis the earlier authoritarian personality studies. By virtue of its pre-dating the Dogmatism research, it has longer weathered the test of time. Its basic tenents have to some degree been accepted in the social sciences. The relationship between their major measuring instruments, the P and Dogmatism Scales, thus requires close examination, if the latter is to be accepted as an alternative to the former. This relationship is dealt with more fully in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 8

THE DOGMATISM SCALE AS A MEASURE OF
GENERAL AUTHORITARIANISM.

The F Scale, having originated from a study of anti-Semitism during the Second World War, gained its impetus from a need to understand fascism. Accordingly, it has been criticized, notably by Shils (1954), for focusing on right-wing, while ignoring left-wing, authoritarianism. Rokeach (1960) argues that while Shils's objections are sound, the study of authoritarianism, rather than concentrating on specific political types, should move to the investigation of the general properties held in common by all forms of authoritarians, irrespective of political associations. In other words, a content-free concept of general authoritarianism. The construction of the Dogmatism scale was guided by, and designed to provide a measure of, the open-closed dimension. Rokeach (1956) offers the Dogmatism scale as a measure of general authoritarianism, relatively free of political ideology, in contrast to the F Scale which measures only authoritarianism of the political right. The research evidence available and the theoretical implications of Rokeach's concept are dealt with below.

Rokeach presented the Dogmatism Scale as an improvement on the F Scale, and as such, the onus is on Rokeach to demonstrate that Dogmatism is both a reliable and valid measure, if it is to replace the F Scale in authoritarian research.

The reliability of the Dogmatism Scale:

The reliability coefficients reported by Rokeach (1960) for the final form of the Dogmatism scale ranged from .68 to .93. Subse-
quent research has tended to confirm relatively high reliabilities for the scale. Using the split-half method, Ehrlich (1961) obtained a coefficient of .75. Byrne et al (1966) report reliabilities of .74 and .77; Plant et al (1965), .84; and Bernhardson (1967), .75. Ehrlich (1961) also found a test-retest reliability of .75, and Zagona and Zurcher (1965a), after a fifteen week re-test, obtained a reliability coefficient of .697.

The validity of the Dogmatism Scale:

The validity of the Dogmatism scale was tested by the known groups technique. Rokeach (1956) predicted that Right-of-Centre students would score high on both the Dogmatism and F Scales, while left-wing students would score high only on the former. The similarity in performance by the right-wingers on both scales was to indicate the Dogmatism scale's ability to measure authoritarianism of the political right. The results of the left-wing group were to indicate that the Dogmatism scale measures general authoritarianism, that is, both the right- and left-wing varieties. In contrast, the F Scale's measure is confined to the former.

Rokeach also compared religious affiliation groups. The rationale of comparing different religious and politically orientated subjects was based on the assumption of institutionalized dogmatism, membership of which is characterized by closed mindedness.

"It is well known that there exists certain institutionalized hierarchically organized groups - among them the Catholic Church and the Communist Party - which require of their members strict adherence to doctrine. Whether a person becomes a member of such a group by birth or by joining later, once he is a member he is subject to its social pressures of reward and punishment. These pressures are meant to coerce him to commit himself in advance to the group's ideology and to reject in advance alternative ideologies. Such social pressures should, over time, leave their mark on the adherent's belief system - that is, his belief system should increasingly betray the defining characteristics of the closed mind." (Rokeach 1960, p. 118)
Rokeach was able to substantiate his predictions; though, unfortunately, only with small sized samples. Thirteen Communists, nineteen left-wing Labour Party supporters (Bevanites) and six religious non-believers, all scored high on the Dogmatism Scale relative to their F Scale scores. Conservative Party supporters scored significantly higher than the Communists on the F Scale, but on Dogmatism, no significant differences were revealed. In Rokeach's Michigan sample, Catholics were found to be more dogmatic than both Protestants and religious non-believers. No significant differences, however, were obtained for the comparison of religious groups in the New York sample. Hellkamp and Marr (1965) and Quinn (1965), have found Catholics to be significantly more dogmatic than non-Catholics. Together with the political group data - although of inadequate sample size - the religious group results lend at least tentative support for Rokeach's hypotheses.

Correlational evidence was provided by Rokeach to further substantiate the scale. Correlations ranging from .54 to .77, between the Dogmatism and F Scales were reported. A close association was to be expected as both scales were claimed to measure a general and particular form of the same phenomenon.

Evidence that the scales do not duplicate each other was indicated by correlations obtained from two measures of liberalism-conservatism; scores derived from the Opinionation Scale (Rokeach 1960), and from five items of the Political and Economic Conservatism Scale - FEC (Adorno et al 1950). In the ranges reported, F tended to correlate higher with these measures than did Dogmatism.

Plant et al (1965) confirmed Rokeach's assertion that F consistently correlates higher with FEC than does the Dogmatism Scale.
However, this is not surprising in view of the F Scale having been standardized in relation to the PEC scale. Similarly, Plant's (1960) conclusion that Dogmatism is less loaded with Ethnocentrism than is the F Scale, and is therefore a better measure of general authoritarianism, does not take into account the method by which the F Scale was constructed. F Scale items were selected on their ability to discriminate between high and low scorers on the Ethnocentrism Scale. The prejudice scale used in the present study, not having been constructed in relation to F or E, provides a further test of the relationship between Dogmatism and F, on the one hand, and prejudice on the other.

Dogmatism of the Right and Left:

Barker (1965), in two separate studies, investigated authoritarianism of the political right, centre, and left. In the first of these, Barker used the results from the PEC scale as the criterion for position on the political continuum, and scores above and below the mean on the Dogmatism scale, as the criterion to distinguish closed from open minded subjects.

The dogmatic right-wing group scored significantly higher on the F Scale than the dogmatic left-wingers, thus substantiating the hypothesis, that the F scale is essentially a measure of right-wing authoritarianism. Barker also showed that groups classified as dogmatics of the Right, Centre, and the Left, all scored similarly on measures of intolerance of ambiguity, anti-intraception, censorship, stereotype, and opinionation. The right- and left-wing groups differed in the direction in which censorship and opinionation was expressed.

Barker also compared organized right- and left-wing students and unorganized students. Again, the F Scale means were shown to increase
from left to right along the political continuum. For the Dogmatism scale, the left-wing and unorganized groups, while not statistically differing from each other, both scored significantly lower than the right-wing group. Although the differences were not as great as for the F Scale, nevertheless, closed mindedness tended to increase with an increase in right-wing orientation. Rokeach's predictions were thus not fulfilled in the data.

In the first of Barker's (1963) studies, Dogmatists of the Right, Centre, and Left appeared to exhibit similar characteristics, thus providing support for Rokeach. However, prediction does not necessarily imply validation. Had the criterion for authoritarianism been the F Scale and not Dogmatism, and had no differences been revealed, the probable conclusion drawn would have been that the variables studied were unrelated to political affiliation, not that the F Scale was a measure of general authoritarianism.

A more serious fault of the study was that the criterion used for political orientation (F&C scores), and for dogmatism (above or below the mean), does not appear to be sufficiently stringent. There is a danger of seeing political divisions where these are not meaningful in reality. Baker draws attention to the fact that for subjects who range from only mildly conservative to mildly liberal, authoritarianism and conservatism may be unrelated; but when extreme groups are compared, differences in general authoritarianism become apparent. This interpretation is in accordance with the findings; in the second study where politically active groups were sampled, differences in dogmatism were obtained between right- and left-wing groups, whereas, in the first study where political position was ascertained from scale scores, no differences were revealed for dogmatism on the measures used.
Di Renzo (1967), in a study of Italian politicians, showed that dogmatism means tended to increase along the political dimension from left to right. Di Renzo's results must be viewed with caution as an abbreviated ten-item version of the Dogmatism scale was used, and moreover, the scale may have suffered during the translation into Italian. However, in view of the relative paucity of studies using the Dogmatism Scale with politically extreme groups, the Di Renzo research is quoted at length.

In the study, Di Renzo followed Kogan's opinion of Italian political leaders being likely to choose candidates for parliament who will be reliable followers rather than independent and individualistic thinkers. Professional politicians would thus be expected to score higher on dogmatism than would non-professional supporters of the respective parties. This hypothesis was generally confirmed in the results for the right-wing and centre parties. No statistical differences, however, were found between the professionals and ordinary supporters of the left-wing parties.

Of the means reported for the politicians, although not statistically compared, dogmatism appears to increase from Left to Right. The Communists obtained the lowest mean (0.92), followed by the Socialists (2.23). Next were the Liberals (4.00) and the Christian Democrats (7.96). The highest means were obtained by the Monarchists (9.33) and the neo-Fascists (9.55). The exception to this trend was the Social Democrats who obtained a mean of 9.00.

The means obtained by the non-politician groups appear to defy prediction if their political ideology and the scores of their party representatives are taken into account. Thus, the neo-Fascists and Monarchists scored relatively low: respectively, 3.91 and 3.07,
which was less than the Liberals (4.52), and the Socialists (5.20). The Social Democrats, in contrast to their political leaders, obtained the lowest of all the means (1.21). The Communists were next lowest with a mean of 2.88.

No indications were obtained in support of the assertion that the Dogmatism Scale measures general authoritarianism. The results obtained from the Socialist Party supporters did provide an indication of left-wing authoritarianism. Both criticisms and verification of Rokeach, however, must be qualified by the limitations of the study.

Insko (1964) replicated Rokeach's findings that the Dogmatism scale discriminated between individuals thought to be either open or closed minded. Insko's students administered the Dogmatism and F Scales to the most and least dogmatic persons to whom they had access. The groups were significantly different on Dogmatism but not on the F Scale. The dogmatism differences remained significant when F was held constant. Evidence was thus provided for dogmatism being identifiably different from F.

In a study of the 1964 American Election, Zippel and Norman (1966) found that neither the Dogmatism nor the F Scale distinguished between preference for Goldwater or Johnson. The authors hypothesized that those individuals who changed their political preference would be placing ideological considerations over traditionally social ones. Ideological attitudes would need to be intense in order to overcome primary loyalty or identification. The results indicated that party-switchers were higher on both the Dogmatism and F Scales, although the difference was more marked in the former scale. The results may be interpreted as ideology being dogmatically held;
alternatively, however, ability to change, may be seen as being indicative of open mindedness.

Factorial differences between the Dogmatism and F Scales:

Rokeach and Fruchter (1956) and Fruchter et al (1958), in factor analytical studies, identified three factors using total scores from measures of Dogmatism, F, Rigidity, Ethnocentrism, and Anxiety.

In the 1956 study, dogmatism, F and rigidity all had their highest loadings on the same factor, labelled the rigidity authoritarian factor. Dogmatism also had substantial loadings in common with anxiety. F, on the other hand, had substantial loadings in common with ethnocentrism.

The Fruchter et al study obtained results which indicated that dogmatism had its highest loadings in common with anxiety, and substantial loadings together with F and rigidity. In this instance, F had equally negligible loadings in common with anxiety in both the samples tested, and high loadings in only one of the samples with ethnocentrism.

Both studies indicate that dogmatism has factorial content in common with anxiety, with F and with rigidity. F on the other hand appeared to be related to ethnocentrism. It must be pointed out that both the above factor analyses were undertaken with earlier versions of the Dogmatism Scale.

Kerlinger and Rokeach (1966) factor analysed results obtained from Dogmatism and F Scale items. Three second order factors were obtained and were interpreted as dogmatism; fascist authoritarianism; and authoritarian aggression and submission. The conclusion drawn from the study was that the variables hypothesized by Adorno et al (1950) and Rokeach (1960) to underlie the F and Dogmatism Scales
seemed to obtain empirical support. Thus, in spite of the high correlations usually reported between $F$ and dogmatism, the scales appear to be factorially different. Strong support for these conclusions comes from the study by Warr et al (1969). The authors factor-analysed Kerlinger and Rokeach's data by a different method, and arrived at results consistent with the earlier findings. In another investigation, Warr et al used the Dogmatism scale and a newly designed $F$ Scale, and again separate components were found identifiable as $F$ or dogmatism constructs. The conclusion drawn from this research is:

"Despite high $F$-$D$ intercorrelations and our initial scepticism, we have to conclude that dogmatism may validly be separated from authoritarianism." (Warr et al 1969, p. 123)

Vacchiano et al (1967), in their factor analysis of only the Dogmatism Scale, found that nine factors accounted for 50 per cent of the total variance, indicating that the scale was multi-dimensional, unable to be reduced to a single factor. Factor formations of items tended to group around Rokeach's theoretical definitions of items. However, this did not appear when separate factor analyses were undertaken for males and females. The factor formations obtained, indicated that the scale was not measuring the same dimension of dogmatism for the two sexes. The relatively small size of the samples - 87 males and 88 females - may have detracted from the generality of these results.

Studies with the $F$ Scale have also indicated its multi-dimensionality. Camilleri (1959) found that 7 orthogonal factors, at least, were required to account for the item variance. Krug (1961), from his study, reported that most $F$ Scale items share some common variance. Nevertheless, the total factor structure indicated
that the scale was multi-dimensional. Lever, in a study in South Africa with a shortened form of the F Scale, obtained five orthogonal factors.

The findings reviewed so far, confirm that the F Scale measures right-wing authoritarianism, as was indeed the intended aim of the scale. The F Scale, having been standardized in relation to measures of conservatism and racial prejudice, is more closely related to these variables than is the Dogmatism Scale. Strong evidence was also provided for the Dogmatism Scale's competence to measure right-wing authoritarianism, with the one exception of Di Renzo's extreme right-wing non-politician groups. It appears to be established that an area of behaviour which may be designated as authoritarianism, is measured by the Dogmatism Scale. Particularly from the factor analytical studies, evidence was provided to show that the Dogmatism Scale does not merely duplicate the F Scale, rather the two scales were shown to be discernibly different measures.

Dogmatism and Communism:

The question of the Dogmatism scale's ability to detect authoritarianism of the political centre, and particularly, of the left, appears to remain in dispute. Brown (1965) writes:

"My conclusion, then, is that it has not been demonstrated that fascists and communists resemble one another in authoritarianism or in any other dimension of ideology. No one thus far has shown that there is an authoritarian of the left." (p. 542)

Brown's view embraces an assessment of Rokeach's concept of dogmatism. Rokeach's study included only thirteen communist subjects, which

1. Personal communication with Dr. H. Lever, of the Department of Sociology, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
must be considered insufficient to validate his theory. Barker (1963) found that organized right-wing students are significantly more dogmatic than left-wingers. Di Renzo (1967) showed that communists tend to score low on Dogmatism. Further scrutiny of Rokeach’s hypothesis predicting closed mindedness among adherents to communism appears to be required.

Rokeach has stressed that dogmatism is not an alternative to the authoritarianism measured by the F Scale, but includes it within its wider frame of reference. Right-wing authoritarians are but one category of closed minded individuals. Thus similarities in the performance of the two scales are taken as an indication of the Dogmatism scale’s validity. However, differences in the performance of the two scales are also used to indicate the Dogmatism scale’s ability, and the F Scale’s inability, to measure other than right-wing authoritarianism. On such evidence, Rokeach’s interpretations may be correct, but it is plausible to suggest that the Dogmatism Scale measures authoritarianism of the Right which results in similarities in performance with the F Scale, plus other variables unrelated to authoritarianism, causing differences to occur between the scales. Thus, the results may be indicative of two alternative hypotheses. Although much evidence has been amassed in Rokeach’s favour, the latter alternative cannot be dismissed in view of the multi-dimensional nature of both scales, as revealed by factor analysis, and of the possible inverse association that each may have with intelligence.

**Content Bias of the Dogmatism Scale:**

Rokeach, by predicting high scores on the Dogmatism Scale, and low scores on the F Scale, for Communists, and high scores on both
measures for Conservatives and Catholics, is safeguarded against the accusation that sustenance is gained for his theory irrespective of the Dogmatism Scale's performance in relation to the F Scale. However, by predicting the direction in which dogmatism is likely to be expressed by various groups, Rokeach creates logical difficulties.

Rokeach conceded that the content of certain ideologies requires its adherents to believe in a closed minded manner. In the case of fascism, Rokeach (1960) writes, "ideological content and structure support each other." (p. 127) Rokeach concludes that authoritarianism may have a greater affinity with right- than with left-wing ideologies. The findings indicate that there is a greater tendency for persons Right of Centre to be more authoritarian than for persons Left of Centre. Thus, the claim that the Dogmatism Scale is content free becomes subjected to some qualification. The distinction between content and structure appears to be less valid than was indicated by Rokeach in his theoretical formulations.

If Communism requires, "strict adherence to doctrine", leading to closed mindedness on the part of Communists, and similarly for Fascists, it becomes difficult to predict an open minded individual who has fully internalized and accepted Communist or Fascist ideology. It may be that, for extreme or radical ideologies, content and structure merge, making it difficult to separate the one from the other.

Schroder et al (1967) suggest that many of the Dogmatism items have a political overtone. They also point to another problem contained in the distinction between structure and content in attitude measurement. To the extent to which items measure agreement with
content, they suggest, the structure of the attitude generating the agreement or disagreement is not measured. Schroder et al elaborate:

"For example, a person could be dogmatic and closed and believe that 'The United States and Russia have just about everything in common'. If he did, he would disagree with the item 'The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common', and would receive a correspondingly 'lower' score on dogmatism."

(p. 133)

The 1950 and 1960 researches into authoritarianism differ in that the former started off with ideology and attempted to associate it with beliefs, while the reverse may be true of the latter. Rokeaehean theory starts off with beliefs, and although claiming the contrary, appears to have associated these with ideology. Adorno et al (1950) distinguish between ideologies; a specific ideology, Fascism, being equated with authoritarian attitudes. Rokeach, on the other hand, equates the ideologies, Fascism and Communism, and claims that these display a similar type of authoritarianism. The hypothesis that generally, beliefs, on no matter what topic, may be dogmatically held, is logically plausible. Rokeach, however, deviates from this postulate by suggesting that some ideologies are only adhered to by the closed minded. The rationale of sampling Communists was based on the expectation that the sample would reveal dogmatic characteristics. More pointedly, adherence to Fascism presupposes a closed mind. Further, it still remains to be substantiated that various forms of dogmatic thinking are equatable.

Brown (1965), cited earlier, suggests that this has not been established in the literature.

Qualitative differences in authoritarianism may occur, that is, authoritarianism of the political right and left may be of a different kind. Rokeach points out that of the 66 items of the Dogmatism Scale
(Form D), the Communists in comparison with the other political groups, tended to score lowest on 22 items, and highest on 24 items (not necessarily significantly different). This pattern of results may suggest that the Communist scores on the Dogmatism Scale may have been arrived at differently than the scores of the other groups, and thus may mean something different. Further investigation appears to be required.

Finally, it is pointed out that Rokeach's prediction that adherence to Communist ideology would lead to closed mindedness was not fulfilled in the data. In his English sample, Rokeach found none of the political groups to be statistically different on the Dogmatism Scale, although the difference between the Liberals and Communists approached significance. There was no basis to believe that any of the non-communist groups would score either, particularly low or high, on dogmatism. Thus, the Communists may have been expected to score significantly higher than these, Right of Centre or Left of Centre, groups. Rokeach made much of the fact that the Communists, relative to their F Scale score, were high on the Dogmatism Scale. That they scored low on F was to be expected in view of the right-wing sentiment expressed in the scale. That they scored, together with the other political groups, around the theoretical mean of the Dogmatism Scale, may or may not be indicative of the scale's measuring general authoritarianism. What it does not show, is that Communist ideology predisposes its adherents towards closed-mindedness.

The conclusion to be drawn from Rokeach's data, is that there appears little reason to predict that Communists, because of their ideology, will score higher on dogmatism than will supporters of
other political groups. It may be expected, however, that dogmatism scores will tend to be normally distributed along the entire political spectrum, with the exception of the extreme right, as exemplified by the Nationalist Party in South Africa.

The present research:

Rokeach's hypotheses will be further tested in the present study. To this end, a sample of Communist students was especially drawn, and Rokeach's analysis will be replicated. Reference will also be made to the Catholic respondents in the British and South African samples. Rokeach's suggestion of "strict adherence to doctrine" leading to dogmatism may be statistically tested by a within comparison of the Catholic College sub-sample. Catholic students at the College would, it is suggested, be exposed to greater pressures to conform than would be non-Catholic students at the College. Further, closed mindedness would be expected to be revealed by the sample of student nuns.

South Africa appears to provide an example of a society where excessive pressures to conform are exerted. Malherbe (1968), writing of South Africa, stated:

"... we are as a people increasingly showing signs of docile acceptance of an incipient political and cultural totalitarianism similar to that which sent Germany to its doom and which is the chief characteristic of the much dreaded Communist state ..... there is not the slightest doubt that within the White group itself (English as well as Afrikaansers) docility is today at a premium." (p. 23)

It does not seem unreasonable to suggest that Rokeachian theory would predict that the South African sample would score significantly higher on the Dogmatism Scale than would the British sample.

1. The sample selection is discussed in chapter 11 below.
Fettigrew's (1958) analysis of authoritarianism in South Africa suggested that conformity pressures were responsible for the heightened prejudice. Low F Scale scorers, Pettigrew postulated, were prejudiced because of conformity to the prevailing race norms of intolerance. Implicit in the hypothesis, that attitudes are coerced into conformity by the social norms, are characteristics of the closed mind; contradictions within the belief system; belief in positive and negative authority; the tendency to make party-line change; avoidance of facts incongruent with one's belief system; belief in the cause; and so forth. These may be attributed to individuals expressing prejudice not in accordance with their personality predisposition. Following Pettigrew, it is thus suggested that non-authoritarian prejudiced individuals in South Africa will tend to score high on the Dogmatism Scale. The above postulate may go some way in providing an explanation for the problem, created in Pettigrew's work, of determining the reason for one individual being responsive to conformity pressures while another, similarly predisposed individual, is not. In other words, differences in dogmatism may explain the different prejudice responses expressed by equally low F Scale scorers.

It is intended in the present study to utilize Barker's (1963) method of comparing open and closed minded supporters of the Communist and Conservative Parties. In this comparison an attempt will be made to ascertain the validity of the concept of general authoritarianism; do closed minded Communists and Conservatives display similar personality characteristics? The scores obtained by the Communist and Conservative samples on the individual state-

1. Dealt with previously in chapters 4 and 5.
ments of the Dogmatism Scale will also be investigated. The statements, if any, which differentiate the two groups, will be examined for possible associations with variables that have been shown to be related to dogmatism. Thus, those items which indicate high scores for Communists, those which indicate high scores for Conservatives, and those which indicate no differences between the groups, will be considered as sub-scales. In addition to the total Dogmatism Scale means, the sub-scales will each be correlated with the other scales used in the research.

The rationale of the above correlational procedure is an examination of the variables which may account for the scores on the Dogmatism Scale obtained by the various groups. Indications from the literature suggest that rigidity and anxiety may be particularly pertinent here. For example, it may be that Conservatives high on the Dogmatism Scale are authoritarian, while Communists who are high are not authoritarian but neurotic. This is not put forward as a hypothesis, but rather, the investigation is regarded as exploratory, and no postulates are formulated as a guide to the research.
C. EXTRAVERSION.
The aim of the present research is to investigate the relationship between extraversion and racial prejudice. The discussion here follows Eysenck's hypotheses which suggest a link between prejudice and tough-mindedness and between extraversion and social conformity. The latter association is utilized here to reflect on Pettigrew's social conformity hypotheses.

Eysenck, in "The Psychology of Politics" (1954), relates personality variables to social attitudes. He provides a two-dimensional explanation of political and social attitudes; Radicalism-Conservatism, labelled the R-factor and Tough-minded versus Tender-minded, labelled the T-factor.

Eysenck (1954) suggests the hypothesis that:

"... tough-mindedness is a projection on to the field of social attitudes of the extraverted personality type while tender-mindedness is a projection of the introverted personality type." (p. 174)

Communists and Fascists, Eysenck postulates, score on the opposite extreme of the R-factor, but both score on the tough-minded extreme of the T-factor. Eysenck holds that the R-factor is a dimension of social attitudes while the T-factor is a reflection on social attitudes of fundamental personality traits. Eysenck further predicts that both Communists and Fascists will reveal characteristics of the extraverted personality type; extraversion correlates positively with tough-mindedness. Thus, while Communists and Fascists differ in their political expression, Eysenck believes them to be similar in personality.
Tough-mindedness and authoritarianism:

The Adorno et al (1950) F Scale, is held by Eysenck, to be essentially a measure of tough-mindedness, not restricted to right-wing authoritarianism. Eysenck (1954) quotes a study by Coulter where Fascists and Communists were said to score similarly on the F Scale, and also, both groups obtained comparable correlation coefficients between F and tough-mindedness. Brown (1965), however, points out that Coulter's Communists although relatively high on F, were nevertheless, on the equalitarian side of neutrality on the scale. The Fascists scored well above the scale's theoretical mean, higher in fact than any previous group tested. The average scores obtained on the F Scale were: 75 for a sample of soldiers; 94 for the Communists and 159 for the Fascist group. (Eysenck 1954, p. 152-153) The F Scale means obtained by the Communists and Fascists are thus notable for the difference between them and not as Eysenck perceived, for their similarity.

Christie (1956a) estimated, from Coulter's data, the groups' T scores. Again these point to a conclusion of Communist neutrality and Fascist tough-mindedness. Furthermore, the Communist F Scale scores obtained by Coulter were relatively high compared to those reported in other studies (Rokeach 1960). An explanation may be found in the working class background of the respondents rather than in their political affiliation. Christie (1954) points out that there is a realistic justification for the lower economic groups, as contrasted with the middle class, to view the world as threatening. Thus it is plausible to predict a greater acceptance of authoritarian statements among the working class, irrespective of political orientation.
In another study, Eysenck (1954) reports a Communist sample scoring high on tough-mindedness. Rokeach and Hanley (1956) analysed this data and found that the Communist sample were the most tough-minded on only six of fourteen statements of the T Scale, and the most tender-minded on the remaining eight statements. The former six statements, they suggest, measure "religionism", and the latter eight, "humanitarianism" (p. 171). The Communists, Rokeach and Hanley feel, could be more appropriately labelled as anti-religious and humanitarian than as tough-minded.

Eysenck's claim of a relationship between prejudice and tough-mindedness rests on the hypothesis that the F Scale is a measure of the T-factor. In further contradiction of Eysenck's hypothesis, the humanitarian cluster includes statements involving a belief in the inferiority of coloured people and in the innate cruelty of the Japanese. The Communist sample scored lowest on these items; Communists thus appear to be neither tough-minded nor prejudiced.

The view taken here concurs with Brown's (1965) assessment of the untenability of Eysenck's position following the debate that ensued between Eysenck (1956a, 1956b) on the one hand, and Christie (1956a, 1956b) and Rokeach and Hanley (1956), on the other. The main propositions outlined by Eysenck in "The Psychology of Politics" do not seem to withstand the criticisms levelled against them. The Eysenck Public Opinion Inventory, measuring the R- and T-factors, was accordingly not utilized in the present study.

**Extraversion and prejudice:**

In spite of the above criticisms, there appears to be sufficient suggestive and research evidence to warrant further investigation into the extraversion-introversion dimension as a variable in the study of race prejudice.
Of Coulter's groups, the Fascists obtained the highest extroversion scores derived from a Thematic Apperception Test. Taft (1958) found tolerant subjects to be more self-sufficient and less sociable than intolerant subjects. The Adorno et al (1950) study reveals that prejudiced individuals tend to emphasize what is generally socially approved and accepted. Indeed, one of the variables purported to be measured by the F Scale was termed "conventionalism"; defined as "rigid adherence to conventional middle-class values." (p. 228). Eysenck predicts that extraverts are unduly responsive to group opinion, standards and approval.

On the other hand, Williams (1964) claims that social distance towards ethnic groups tends to be associated with a generalized reaction of shyness, aversion or withdrawal in regard to meeting people. The description offered by Williams indicates the introverted personality type. Similarly, Robb's (1954) anti-Semitic respondents tended to be isolated, not belonging to organisations, with few, if any close friends. This is in sharp contrast to the tolerant group, and it appears from Robb's case studies that the anti-Semites tended towards introversion and the tolerant group towards extraversion.

The evidence suggests that the relationship between extraversion and racial prejudice is problematical; further investigation is required. Although the extraversion-prejudice hypothesis receives attention, the major preoccupation of the present study is an examination of the relationship between extraversion and conformity to race norms. Eysenck attempts to relate personality traits to social conformity; Eysenckian theory is traced in the discussion below.
Socialization and conditioning:

Eysenck (1964) summarizes his theory:

"(a) Socialization is mediated by conditioning.
(b) Extraverts condition poorly.
(c) Introverts condition particularly well." (p. 210)

In the discussion of socialization and personality, Eysenck follows Mowrer in calling for a distinction between problem solutions which are individually useful and which are learned, and problem solutions which are socially necessary and which are conditioned. Although stressing that this distinction is not clear-cut, Eysenck believes that there are sufficient differences to support a theory that states:

"the socialization process is mediated to a considerable extent by conditioning reactions of an autonomic kind (anxiety)." (1964, p.210)

In this way, society inculcates into its members, behaviour which it considers socially desirable, and obtains conformity to its precepts. Perhaps greater clarity is obtained by reference to the example cited by Eysenck to illustrate the difference between learning and conditioning:

"The infant learns walking, the multiplication table, the English language, and so forth; he becomes conditioned to use a pot, and to suppress the direct and immediate expression of his aggressive and sexual urges." (p. 208-9)

Franks (1956, 1957) in his experimentation found that introverts condition more quickly and to be more resistant to extinction than were extraverts. Eysenck (1964) provides evidence to show that the psychopath, who is characterized by anti-or a-social behaviour which is suggestive of inadequacies in the socialization process, tends to be extraverted. On the other hand, dysthymia, which Eysenck has labelled the personality disorder typical of introverts, is characterized by symptoms of over-socialization.
Extraversion and social conformity:

The extravert, however, has been defined as more sociable than the introvert. Eysenck, admitting to speculation, explains this apparent contradiction in terms of conditioned fear responses. The introvert being socialized, acquires a conditioned fear mechanism which provides immediate punishments and rewards (by drive reduction accompanying withdrawal from socially disapproved acts). This allows the introvert at least partially to withstand group pressures. The extravert, however, not having to the same extent acquired these conditioned fears, is more dependent on immediate rewards and punishments. Thus, extraverts tend to be unduly responsive to group pressures to conform. Some corroborative evidence for this theory is provided by Sinha and Ojha (1963). They substantiated the hypothesis that extraverts were more liable to be influenced by prestige than were introverts.

Eysenck stresses that attention must be given to direction taken by the conditioning process as well as to individual susceptibility to conditioning: "Fagin's school for thieves may produce introverted children conditioned to crime" (1964, p. 214). South Africa, where racial prejudice is normatively sanctioned, may similarly produce introverted prejudiced individuals. Thus, following Eysenck, it may be predicted that in the South African sample individuals scoring at both extremes of the extraversion-introversion dimension would express prejudice, while in the British sample, prejudice will tend to be expressed by extraverts only. In both samples, those who are racially tolerant, will tend to be introverted.

Extraversion and Pettigrew's hypotheses of social conformity:

In summary, Eysenckian theory suggests that:

(a) Extraverts are more susceptible to conformity pressures than are introverts.
Extraversion correlates positively with both prejudice and authoritarianism.

Pettigrew (1958, 1959) suggests that prejudice is expressed by non-authoritarians in racially segregated regions and in this manner, Pettigrew accounts for the heightened prejudice found in places such as South Africa. The prejudice of these individuals, Pettigrew postulates, may be ascribed to conformity to intolerant race norms.

Pettigrew's theory states:

(a) Authoritarians are prejudiced.
(b) Non-authoritarians are tolerant.
(c) In intolerant regions, because of social conformity, some non-authoritarians are prejudiced.

Pettigrew, however, does not explain the different attitudes of prejudice expressed by non-authoritarians from the same cultural environment; why do some non-authoritarians conform to the South African race norms while other, equally low F Scale scorers, do not? Eysenck's postulates may provide a solution. Utilizing Eysenckean theory, it is predicted that South African non-authoritarians who conform to the intolerant race norms will reveal characteristics of the extraverted personality type while tolerant low F Scale scorers will tend to be introverted.

Eysenck's postulates may also be related to Rokeach's (1960) formulations. Rokeach suggested that conformity to social pressures is a characteristic of the closed minded individual. Thus, both extraverts and the closed minded are said to be responsive to conformity pressures. A positive correlation is therefore predicted between extraversion and dogmatism.

It is also predicted that in the South African sample, the intolerant non-authoritarian will be further distinguished from his
tolerant F Scale counterpart by the Dogmatism Scale; the former will tend to be closed minded while the latter will tend to be open minded.

Similar predictions, as made for the South Africans, are not able to be formulated for the British sample because of the ambiguity of the race norms in the United Kingdom. Relevant here are Hollander's (1960) remarks on individual capacity to perceive a social situation correctly. Hollander claims that pertinent to the study of social conformity is the ability to perceive the demands of the social context. Thus, if race norms in Britain are ambiguous or if the values of equality and racial superiority both co-exist in the society, these anomalies will make for differences in perception for different people. While the expression of prejudice in racially segregated areas conforms to the norm, in less intolerant regions, prejudice may be equally described, depending on individual perception, as conformity or non-conformity behaviour. Individual perception of the race norms, however, was not measured in the present study.

**Summary:**

Eysenckian theory is utilized to explain the Pettigrew (1958) hypotheses of social conformity. Extraversion also provides a link with the open-closed dimension. It is stressed, however, that these formulations are dependent on the substantiation of Pettigrew's postulates; in the event of these not being supported by the data, the relationship between extraversion and social conformity will be unable to be tested.

Independent of the outcome of Pettigrew's hypotheses is the general relationship between, on the one hand, extraversion, and on

---

1. Discussed previously in chapter 2.
2. The results, presented below in chapter 15, do not support Pettigrew's hypotheses.
the other, prejudice and authoritarianism. For the South African sample, conditioning to intolerant norms is expected to result in some introverts being prejudiced. A closer relationship is thus expected between prejudice and extraversion for the British sample than for the South African sample.

Eysenckian theory predicts a positive correlation between the F Scale and extraversion. However, the evidence reviewed suggests that the F Scale is not a measure of tough-mindedness. The present study provides an opportunity to test Eysenck's postulate. It is suggested that conditioning to the authoritarianism existing in the South African environment will result in introverted authoritarians in the South African sample; a closer association is thus predicted between the F Scale and extraversion in the British sample than in the South African.

Common to both extraversion and dogmatism theory is social conformity; a positive correlation is predicted between the Extraversion and Dogmatism Scales.
PART 2

METROLOGY
CHAPTER 10

THE PILOT STUDY

The development of the research, from its preliminary stages, is outlined here. The rationale behind the pilot study, and the results obtained are presented to illustrate the manner in which these findings influenced the form of the later project.

The sample selection:

The pilot study was undertaken with a sample of University of Edinburgh students. The purpose of the research was to construct an attitude scale to measure racial prejudice and to obtain information concerning the applicability of various hypotheses indicated in the literature. Furthermore, difficulties in obtaining respondent co-operation necessitated that the length of the questionnaire should be limited. The results from the preliminary study enabled those scales which could be most fruitfully utilized to be delineated.

Previous research indicated that student populations tended to be racially tolerant (Adorno et al 1950). The aim of constructing a prejudice scale required samples which represented the extremes of prejudice. In view of the reported association between racial attitudes and political orientation (Rokeach 1960), the sample was selected from the membership of student societies. Those sampled were the Anti-Apartheid Movement; the Communist Society; the Conservative Club; the Council for Peace in Vietnam; the Men's Rifle Club and the Rugby Club.

The respondents were contacted by letter, requesting them to attend a testing session. The questionnaire was administered on
four different occasions during October and November 1966. The
responses obtained from 138 subjects were used in the analysis of
results.

The construction of the Prejudice Scale:

The construction of the prejudice scale is dealt with, followed
by a discussion of the results obtained from the other measures used
in the research.

For the purposes of the present research, no existing prejudice
scale was found which may have been utilized to compare the British
and South African respondents. For example, the widely used Adorno
et al (1950) E Scale suffered from several disadvantages: it was
relatively outdated; it contained only six anti-black prejudice
items; American cultural bias appeared to be present; the similar
wording of all the items made the scale subject to response set
criticisms; and, finally, the items measuring anti-Semitism were un-
suitable because of the large number of Jews expected to be drawn in
the South African sample.

The procedure followed in the construction of the prejudice scale
was to select a pool of sixty items, the majority of which were formu-
lated for the present research. The remainder consisted of items
used by Adorno et al (1950), Eysenck (1954), Pettigrew (1958), Banton
(1959), and Coupar (1966).

A seven-point scale was provided for each item ranging from
strong agreement (+3) to strong disagreement (-3). The neutral
point (0) was not offered as a choice and was only assigned in the
event of a no response. Half each of the items were worded so that,
respectively, agreement or disagreement indicated prejudice. Jackson
and Messick (1967) suggest the use of both positive and negatively
phrased items as a method of avoiding acquiescent response set. The scoring method employed took account of the differences in wording so that in all the items a high score indicated prejudice.

From the results of the pilot study, thirty items were selected from the original sixty to constitute the prejudice scale used in the study. The technique of discriminatory powers (D.P's) suggested by Likert (1932), was used as the criterion for item selection. This method involves the hierarchical ordering of the total scale means obtained by each of the respondents in the sample. The 25 per cent highest scorers in the sample were designated as the high prejudice group and those who scored in the lowest 25 per cent of the distribution were labelled the low prejudice group. The means obtained by these extreme scoring groups were then compared on each item. A group which has averaged a high score on a pool of items, may, if all the items adequately measure prejudice, be expected to score equally high on each individual item, and conversely, for the group of low scorers. If the item does not differentiate between the extremes of prejudice and tolerance, the high group will not score appreciably more than the low group on the item. In this event, the item would be indicated to be a poor measure of racial prejudice. Thus, the greater the mean difference obtained, that is, the greater the D.P. of the item, the better the item appears to measure prejudice.

Likert reports a rho coefficient of .91 for the order of excellence obtained by this method and the method of item-total scale correlations (p. 50). Likert's technique has the obvious advantage of being less time consuming while it obtains similar results to the correlational procedure. The scores in the middle range, however, are ignored. From "The Authoritarian Personality" study, Levinson
comments that items need to be evaluated on total group means in addition to differences between the high and low quartiles. He suggests that items with means above 5.0 or below 3.0 should be reworded so that fewer or more people, respectively, will agree. Ideally items require a mean near 4.0, but as students tend to be less prejudiced than the general population, Levinson goes on to add that a minimum mean of 2.5 may be permissible. (Adorno et al 1950, p. 80)

By taking total means into account, inadequacies in the item, not detected by the D.P. method, are indicated. Thus, an item in which the total sample scores high, because it does not differentiate tolerant scorers, but merely, the extreme prejudiced group score exceptionally high, may be eliminated from the scale, and similarly for items which only discriminate extremely tolerant subjects from the rest of the sample.

In that the rationale of the method requires the selection of both high and low extremes, sampling difficulties arise. Obviously, if extreme groups are not represented in the sample, the size of the D.P's obtained tend to be small. This causes difficulties in the item selection and may result in adequate items being discarded.

During the pilot study an attempt was accordingly made to draw samples from student groups thought to be either high or low on prejudice. The problem which presented itself was to obtain adequate representation of the former. The sample was biased in that groups thought likely to be high on prejudice were over-represented. However, in spite of this, the prejudice scale mean obtained was only 3.04 per item. Of the selected thirty items for the final version of the scale, twenty-eight had means of over 2.5. Thus
Levinson's criterion for student samples was achieved. The means for the remaining two items were 2.46 and 2.43. In a possible range from 1.0 to 7.0, a score of 2.5 may appear to be insufficiently stringent a criterion, however, it is suggested, this conclusion may not be shared by a member of a minority group. For example, an African may not be inclined to classify as tolerant, an individual who only disagrees a little with the statement that 'People who call for full equality are those who have no real knowledge of Africans.' (item 23)

The D.P's obtained for the final scale were, over 3.00 for fifteen items, between 2.99 and 2.50 for eleven, and for the remaining four items, the D.P's were between 2.49 and 2.00. From these results, it appears that the difficulties of obtaining data from student samples, which would enable the selection of items that discriminate between prejudiced and tolerant individuals, were largely overcome.

The items selected for the final form of the scale are presented below together with the total sample means and D.P's obtained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>D.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26*</td>
<td>I would not object if a close member of my family married an African.</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Congo is indicative of the basic immaturity of the African.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The coloured immigrants have come to sponge off the British.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31*</td>
<td>Australia's &quot;Whites only&quot; immigration policy is a denial of human rights.</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>People who call for full equality are those who have no real knowledge of Africans.</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Disagreement indicates prejudice.
1. For all the items, the higher mean the higher the prejudice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Why try to have social integration - we don't like them and they don't like us.</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20*</td>
<td>I would have an African as a close friend.</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Whatever is said against her, South Africa still remains an island of sanity amidst the blood and turmoil of the rest of Africa.</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10*</td>
<td>Africans in Rhodesia should be given full equality.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Coloured immigrants in Britain show a preference for living in over-crowded houses with few hygienic facilities.</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9*</td>
<td>Europeans have a lot to learn from African cultures.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Japanese have proven themselves to be ruthless and cruel.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Civil Rights demonstrators in the United States are demanding too much too soon.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>African employees have to be continually supervised.</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Events in the United States have shown there is a need to keep the races apart.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Africans tend to be over-emotional.</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Indo-Pakistani conflict indicates that these people can't live together, let alone with Europeans.</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16*</td>
<td>For each incident of inhumanity which has recently occurred in Africa, a counterpart can be found in Europe.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25*</td>
<td>American Negroes should be satisfied with nothing less than full equality.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>It is unfair that British Universities should accommodate students from the new Commonwealth countries and so deny places to British students.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>In spite of what some claim, the Africans do have a different and more pronounced body odour.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Disagreement indicates prejudice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>D.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The Negroes in the United States have indicated their complete disregard for life and property.</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22*</td>
<td>What happened in the Congo can't be used to generalize about all of Africa.</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Africans tend to have stronger sexual urges than white people.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29*</td>
<td>There is no evidence to support the view that any one race is inherently superior in intelligence to any other race.</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>Many of Africa's problems were created by the former Colonial rulers.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5*</td>
<td>Africans do not get a chance to show their capabilities because they are usually forced to take unskilled jobs.</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Repatriation of coloured immigrants would be a step in the direction of solving many of Britain's problems.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24*</td>
<td>Parents should make a point of discouraging any racial prejudice in their children.</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13*</td>
<td>There is little difference between the attitude of superiority which sanctioned slavery and that which upholds opinions about Africans today.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As prejudice is indicated by agreement in seventeen of the items and by disagreement in thirteen of the items, the scale is free from response set criticisms. Sixteen of the items refer to either Africa or Africans, four each to Britain and the United States, two to Asians, one to Australia, and three were of a general nature. This diversity would appear to commend the scale for cross-cultural usage.

* Disagreement indicates prejudice.
1. The wording of this item was altered after the results were obtained and previously read: "The attitude of superiority which sanctioned slavery is different only in degree from that which upholds racialist opinions about Africans today."
The reliability and validity of the prejudice scale:

The Spearman-Brown split-half reliability of the scale was found to be .95.

Indications of the scale's validity were obtained by comparisons of its performance with that of the Adorno et al E Scale. The Berkeley investigators report that Form 45 of the F Scale correlates on the average, .73 with the E Scale. Rokeach (1960) found an average correlation of .62 between these scales and correlations of between .31 and .55 for the E and Dogmatism Scales. Similar to these results, the prejudice scale constructed here, correlated .62 with the F Scale and .28 with the Dogmatism Scale.

It was to be expected that prejudice means would increase from left to right along the political continuum. Table A below compares the results from student supporters of the various political parties in the United Kingdom, as obtained by Rokeach (1960) using the E Scale, and by the prejudice scale constructed during the pilot study.

Table A: E Scale and prejudice scale means obtained by the supporters of the British political parties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>E Scale* Mean</th>
<th>Prejudice Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>109.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attleeites</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevanites</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table A, for both scales, means increased along the political continuum from left to right. The indications are that the prejudice scale is both a reliable and valid measure of racial prejudice. It appeared to be at least as good a measure as the E Scale.

The procedures followed in the testing of the prejudice scale's reliability and validity during the pilot study were repeated with the data obtained from the British and South African samples and are presented later in chapter 12.

The prejudice sub-scales:

The items of the prejudice scale were divided into sub-scales measuring stereotyped and discriminatory attitudes. It must be stressed that cognizance was not taken of the difference between prejudice and discrimination in the construction of the prejudice scale. Although the scale was only thus sub-divided after the results had been obtained, this was done independently of the results, as is outlined in the procedure followed.

Lapiere (1934), in his now famous study, demonstrated that prejudice need not manifest itself into discrimination. Accompanied by a Chinese student he visited two hundred and fifty hotels and restaurants in the United States. They were refused service only once. Yet in response to a questionnaire, over 90 per cent of these establishments stated that they would refuse service to Chinese. Simpson and Yinger (1958), emphasize the distinction between prejudice "an attitude, a tendency to respond or a symbolic response" - and discrimination - "the differential treatment of individuals considered to belong to a particular group." (p. 19) They go on to point out that most frequently prejudice and discrimination are mutually re-
inforcing. Nevertheless, they stress that both can exist without the one, and that either may or may not be among the causes of the other.

The method employed in the construction of the sub-scales was to present each of the prejudice scale items, typed separately on a card, to judges who were required to sort them into piles of prejudice and discrimination. These classifications were defined in the following instructions presented to the judges:

On the cards are statements concerning minority groups. You are asked to sort as many as you are able into either a prejudice or discrimination category. The distinction between the two is that prejudice is an attitude while discrimination is a behaviour. Prejudice may or may not manifest itself into discrimination. Obviously, the statements are not in themselves overt behaviour; what you are asked to consider is whether the statement has only adverse connotations or whether, in addition, it has implied discriminatory consequences.

Example: Pat people have no self control. (prejudice)
Additional taxation ought to be imposed on fat people. (discrimination.)

N.B.
1. You are not required to necessarily have an equal number of cards in each category.
2. Try to classify as many as you can.
3. Consider the statements as adverse comment on the group, that is, some statements are worded so that agreement indicates hostility, and others worded so that disagreement indicates hostility. All the statements are to be considered in their hostile form.
4. There are no right or wrong classifications.

In all seven judges sorted the statements. The criterion for inclusion in a sub-scale was agreement six times out of seven. There was unanimous agreement with four prejudice and six discrimination statements. Seven additional statements met the criterion for the former sub-scale, and four for the latter. In order to obtain an equal number of statements in each sub-scale, one of the prejudice statements, in which a judge dissented, was randomly eliminated.
Thus the final sub-scales contained ten statements in each. The sub-scales were labelled prejudice attitude to distinguish it from the total scale and discrimination attitude, so as to emphasize that responses to a questionnaire and not actual discriminatory behaviour was being measured.

The items included in each sub-scale are presented below.

**Prejudice Attitude:**

No.

2 Many of Africa's problems were created by the former Colonial rulers.

4 The Congo is indicative of the basic immaturity of the African.

7 In spite of what some claim, the Africans do have a different and more pronounced body odour.

9 Europeans have a lot to learn from African cultures.

11 The Japanese have proven themselves to be ruthless and cruel.

12 Africans tend to have stronger sexual urges than white people.

16 For each incident of inhumanity which has recently occurred in Africa, a counterpart can be found in Europe.

19 Africans tend to be over-emotional.

22 What happened in the Congo can't be used to generalize about all of Africa.

29 There is no evidence to support the view that any one race is inherently superior in intelligence to any other race.

**Discrimination Attitude:**

10 Africans in Rhodesia should be given full equality.

14 African employees have to be continually supervised.

15 It is unfair that British Universities should accommodate students from the new Commonwealth countries and so deny places to British students.

20 I would have an African as a close friend.

24 Parents should make a point of discouraging any racial prejudice in their children.
Discrimination Attitude (Contd.):

25 American Negroes should be satisfied with nothing less than full equality.

26 I would not object if a close member of my family married an African.

27 Repatriation of coloured immigrants would be a step in the direction of solving many of Britain's problems.

30 Events in the United States have shown there is a need to keep the races apart.

31 Australia's "whites only" immigration policy is a denial of human rights.

The questionnaire:

The results obtained from the sub-scales are dealt with later in the appropriate chapters. The discussion now considers the correlational data obtained from the measures used in the pilot study. The questionnaire was made up of the following scales:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale:</th>
<th>Reference:</th>
<th>No. of items:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anomie</td>
<td>Srole (1956)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Pettigrew (1958)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism</td>
<td>Rokeach (1960)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eysenck Personality Inventory (E.P.I.):</td>
<td>Eysenck and Eysenck (1964)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Scale</td>
<td>Adorno et al (1950)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intolerance of Ambiguity</td>
<td>Budner (1962)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice</td>
<td>Constructed in the present study.</td>
<td>60 (original)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 (revised)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigidity</td>
<td>Zelen and Levitt (1954)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation results obtained between these measures are presented below in table B.
Table B: Inter-scale correlation coefficients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Anomie</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.19+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dogmatism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19+</td>
<td>.21+</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extraversion</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21+</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Neuroticism</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. F Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Intolerance of Ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Prejudice</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Rigidity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = .01  
+ p = .05

The results obtained for each of the scales are discussed in turn. Where the hypotheses dealt with have already been discussed in the previous review of the literature, to avoid repetition, these are not expanded upon here.

The Anomie Scale

The Anomie Scale correlated significantly with dogmatism, prejudice and F. These were in accordance with the predictions made for the scale by Srole (1956). As the scale consisted of only five items it does not have a bearing on the length of the questionnaire. Accordingly, the Anomie Scale was included in the final form.

1. The results are for the revised 30 item scale and not for the original 60 items.
The Conformity Scale:

The Pettigrew Social Conformity Scale correlated significantly with dogmatism, P, intolerance of ambiguity, prejudice and rigidity. Eysenck's (1964) assertion that extraverts would be responsive to conformity pressures was not borne out by the minimal correlation obtained between conformity and extraversion.

An inspection of the Conformity Scale statements suggests an affinity between these and authoritarianism. For example, Adorno et al's postulate of adherence to middle class conventionalism being a defining characteristic of the authoritarian is evident in the Conformity Scale item; "Adherence to convention produces the best kind of citizen" (Pettigrew 1958, p. 33). A correspondence between Conformity and Dogmatism may also be detected; "A group cannot expect to maintain its identity unless its members all think and feel in very much the same way" (Conformity), and "A group which tolerates too much difference of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long" (Dogmatism).

The correlations obtained between the conformity and authoritarian scales may be explained by at least some of the items measuring the same dimension. For these and for reasons outlined when the prejudice and F Scale results are dealt with, it was decided to exclude the Conformity Scale from further use in the present research.

The Dogmatism Scale:

The Dogmatism scale was found to correlate significantly with P, conformity, anomie, prejudice, neuroticism, and extraversion. Negligible results were obtained with the remaining two scales; intolerance of ambiguity and rigidity.

The Dogmatism-F Scale correlation was within the expected range reported by Rokeach (1960). Among the extreme dogmatic scorers
In the sample there was a tendency towards right-wing authoritarianism. Individuals who scored at an extreme of one scale tended to score at the similar extreme of the other scale. These results may reflect the right-wing bias in the sample. The Dogmatism Scale's affinity to right-wing authoritarianism was also investigated with politically affiliated groups.

Of the political groups tested, the Conservatives (N=67) and Labourites (N=31) scored highest on the Dogmatism Scale, respectively, 152.6 and 152.7. In that these Right of Centre, and Left of Centre groups, scored similarly on the scale, support is provided for Rokeach's contention that the Dogmatism Scale is relatively free of political content.

Rokeach predicted a high score by Communists, however, they obtained the lowest mean of all the groups tested (141.8). The Communists' (N=5) result was thus in contradiction to Rokeach's findings. As Rokeach undertook his research in 1954, changes since in the Communist world may have influenced the results. A sample of five subjects was obviously insufficient to enable conclusions to be drawn. In view of Rokeach's Communist sample also being inadequately sized (N=13), the conflicting results obtained stress the urgent need for further investigation. It was decided to sample a larger number of Communists in the later research.

The sample was predominantly Protestant in religious affiliation, and thus no adequate test was able to be provided for Rokeach's contention that Catholics would tend to be closed-minded. Nevertheless, some indications for Rokeachean theory were able to be obtained from the eight Catholic respondents in the sample. The hypothesis was supported as the Catholics obtained a relatively high dogmatism
mean (155.9). However, all eight Catholics attended church once a week, and the results obtained - the Protestants who attended regularly were as dogmatic as the Catholics - suggest that regularity of church attendance may be the crucial factor rather than religious denomination. The results pointed to the need for further investigation with greater numbers of Catholic respondents.

The correlations obtained between dogmatism and prejudice clearly indicate the latter to be more closely related to F than to dogmatism. The findings thus supported the view that the Dogmatism Scale is relatively free of the racial prejudice factor.

Closed systems, Rokeach contended, were formed in proportion to which loneliness, isolation and helplessness, were felt. The Dogmatism-Anomie correlation provided strong substantiation for this hypothesis.

In view of the association frequently reported between dogmatism and anxiety, the former was expected to correlate significantly with neuroticism. The .21 correlation obtained confirms the hypothesis; however, a closer relationship may have been predicted. Further, no tendency was observed for the most closed-minded respondents to score high on the neuroticism scale.

The Dogmatism Scale obtained a low, but significant positive correlation with extraversion. This result may be indicative of Eysenck's claim that extraverts were susceptible to conformity pressures and the similar characteristic hypothesized by Rokeach for the closed-minded. Further investigation, however, is required.

The relationship between dogmatism, extraversion and neuroticism is not clarified by the data obtained. The thirty most introverted subjects in the sample, and hence, according to Eysenck, those most likely to manifest anxiety, showed no clear relationship with either dogmatism or neuroticism. Predictions, based on conformity pressures,
would be framed in terms of closed-mindedness being manifested by extraverts, but if anxiety were considered, expectations would be in terms of neurotic introverts scoring high on the Dogmatism Scale. Clarification of the relationship is required.

**Dogmatism and political concern:**

The respondents in the sample who claimed no political preference (N=14) scored relatively low on the Dogmatism Scale (144.7). Further, of Rokeach's samples, only the Communists were actively committed to politics. This suggested the hypothesis that closed-mindedness is a reflection of political concern rather than of general authoritarianism. In terms of Rokeachian theory, a measure of political concern should correlate minimally with the Dogmatism Scale. A five item political concern (P-c) Scale was constructed specifically to test these assertions.

The P-c scale consists of the following items:

(1) Politics is not something separate, but pervades almost all aspects of life.

(2) I seldom attempt to keep up to date on current events in the world.

(3) There are very few world issues with which I feel any involvement.

(4) In the long run it is local and not general political issues which are of relevance.

(5) Students should not involve themselves in political affairs.

The items were scored on a seven-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. With the exception of the first item, where agreement indicates high political concern, in the remaining four items, political concern is reflected by disagreement. A high score on the scale indicates high political concern. No opportunity availed itself for the pre-testing of the items as the scale was constructed after the completion of the pilot study.
The Neuroticism Scale:

The neuroticism scale was included in the battery of tests in order to examine its relationship with authoritarianism and prejudice.

Neuroticism was found to correlate significantly only with Dogmatism (.21) and Rigidity (-.17). The scale correlated negligibly with P, thus indicating that Rokeach's concept of authoritarianism is discriminably different from that conceived by Adorno et al. The opposite directions in which neuroticism was related to dogmatism and rigidity demonstrates, in support of Rokeach, the difference between dogmatism and rigidity.

Dowling (1955) predicted that neuroticism would tend to be displayed by individuals scoring at both extremes of the prejudice scale, while those whose scores were distributed around the mean would tend to be normal. A slight trend was observed in the data which suggested that Dowling's hypothesis warranted further investigation.

The Intolerance of Ambiguity and Rigidity Scales:

Contrary to expectations, minimal associations were reported between the Dogmatism Scale and both Intolerance of Ambiguity and Rigidity. These results may be indicative of the former's independence of these variables, thus supporting Rokeachian theory, but may also be indicative of both the Intolerance of Ambiguity and Rigidity Scales' lack of validity. Ladd (1967) found that dogmatism correlated significantly with Budner's Intolerance of Ambiguity Scale but not with the Gough-Sanford Rigidity Scale. Rokeach (1960), however, reports the latter to correlate between .35 and .55 with his measure.
Budner's (1962) Intolerance of Ambiguity Scale correlated significantly with $F$, conformity and rigidity, the highest coefficient (.29) being obtained with the Conformity measure. The low magnitude of the correlations obtained suggests that intolerance of ambiguity may not be a crucial factor in the investigation. In view of the desirability of limiting the length of the questionnaire, the Intolerance of Ambiguity Scale was omitted from further research. Contrary to expectations, the Rigidity Scale was not found to relate significantly to $F$, Dogmatism or prejudice. Support was found for Eysenck's contention that introverts would tend to be rigid; the Rigidity Scale correlated -.39 with extraversion. The results indicated the advisability of substituting Zelen and Levitt's (1954) Rigidity Scale with the more frequently used Gough-Sanford measure. As this latter measure was employed in the original dogmatism research, its utilization in the present study would facilitate comparisons with Rokeach's work.

**The Extraversion Scale:**

The Extraversion Scale of the E.P.I. was included in the research to investigate its relationship with prejudice and conformity.

Extraversion correlated, in accordance with Eysenck's (1964) predictions, significantly with prejudice. However, the correlation of .23 obtained was lower than may have been expected. Further, a comparison of the highest and lowest prejudice scorers did not indicate a trend towards extraversion for the former or introversion for the latter.

**Extraversion and Social Conformity:**

Eysenck postulated that extraverts would tend to conform, while introverts would tend to be relatively independent of group pressures.
An attempt was made, in the theoretical framework of the pilot study, to relate Eysenck's formulations concerning conformity with those suggested by Pettigrew dealing with conformity, authoritarianism and prejudice. Pettigrew (1958, 1959) showed that the greater prevalence of prejudice in South Africa and the American South could not be explained by authoritarianism; these samples were found to obtain F Scale scores comparable with those obtained in less racially antagonistic areas. Thus while the relationship between prejudice and \( F \) is well established, the institutionalization of prejudice in a society does not necessarily imply a concomitantly higher incidence of authoritarianism as compared to societies where prejudice is less normative. Pettigrew explained the higher incidence of prejudice in the American South and in South Africa to conformity to race norms; non-authoritarians in these areas, Pettigrew claimed, were prejudiced. Pettigrew, however, did not explain the reason for some non-authoritarians being prejudiced, while others were tolerant, although both were exposed to similar societal influences.

The hypotheses formulated for the present research suggest that in South Africa non-authoritarians who are prejudiced will tend to be extraverted, while those who were tolerant would tend to be of the introverted personality type. Conversely, in Britain, on the assumption that the prevailing normative pressures would tend to favour racial tolerance, it was hypothesized that racially tolerant - high \( F \) Scale scorers, that is, individuals not scoring on the prejudice scale in accordance with their personality predisposition, would be conforming to group pressures and would thus tend to be extraverted. These hypotheses also provide an explanation for the relatively low relationship between prejudice and extraversion; in Britain, group
opinion would induce overlap, resulting in both extraverts and introverts being tolerant, while in South Africa, socialization would result in some introverts being conditioned towards prejudice.

The hypotheses thus predict a close relationship between extraversion and conformity. The results, however, show the two variables to be unrelated. Further, the correlation of .62 between F and prejudice indicates that in the pilot study sample, drawn in Scotland, authoritarians tended to be prejudiced. No support was able to be obtained for the postulated authoritarian-tolerant-extraverted syndrome. Ambiguity in the race norms in the United Kingdom, however, may have influenced the results, and thus the hypotheses were not adequately subjected to test. In the absence of means of determining individual perception of the race norms conclusions must be tenuous; in the event of perception being in terms of intolerant norms for some individuals and in terms of tolerance for others, relationships are not easily detected in the data. The hypotheses are more amenable for testing in the South African milieu where the bulk of white population is dedicated to racial segregation.

While the hypotheses remained to be fully tested during the South African stage of the research, their failure to materialize in the preliminary investigation, prompted a further, critical examination of Pettigrew's hypotheses. The outcome was that alternative suggestions were proposed in explanation of Pettigrew's findings. This critical review of Pettigrew's research altered the emphasis of the present study; whereas previously the aim was to extend Pettigrew's hypotheses to explain the reasons for conformity, attention was now given to refuting these hypotheses.

The constructors of the Dogmatism and Extraversion Scales have both postulated that high scorers on each of their measures would manifest conformity. Pettigrew's explanation of his prejudice and F Scale data was in terms of conformity. Thus, conformity, in the theoretical framework which guided the pilot study and determined the selection of the scales to be used, was to be the link between these variables - dogmatism, extraversion, prejudice and F. Since the hypotheses remained to be tested under South African conditions, these measures were retained in the questionnaire. However, the re-formulation of the hypotheses resulted in these concepts being relatively unrelated in the theoretical framework. On the one hand, F was related to prejudice, to be investigated under the different social conditions prevailing in Britain and South Africa, while on the other hand, postulates made by Rokeach and Eysenck for the Dogmatism and Extraversion Scales, respectively, were merely to be examined, with relatively little theoretical connection between the various concepts. Thus, in the event of Pettigrew's hypotheses being refuted by the data, the unity achieved for the research by the concept of social conformity, would disappear. As was anticipated, this did in fact occur, and is indicated later in the results chapter.
CHAPTER 11

THE SAMPLE SELECTION AND QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTRATION

The British sample:

In the pilot study, in spite of an attempt to select individuals thought likely to score high on the prejudice scale, the mean obtained indicated that the sample was relatively tolerant. Only 20 per cent of the sample scored over the scale's theoretical mean. This experience suggested that, for the British part of the project, in order to include in the sample the extremes of attitudes, either a very large random sample was required or the sample needed to be drawn from groups in the student population known to adhere to the various political and social positions essential for the testing of the research hypotheses. For practical reasons the latter procedure was adopted. Further, the research interest was to investigate the personality dynamics of racial prejudice, and not to estimate, from representative samples, the probability of the level of prejudice likely to be exhibited by students in Britain and South Africa.

As the pilot survey had already been undertaken with student society membership at Edinburgh University, to avoid duplication, student societies at one of the main Colleges of London University were contacted. However, due to a lack of co-operation, a sample of students at a single institution, covering the whole spectrum of political and social attitudes was not obtainable. Instead, it was necessary to sample students at various institutions.

The major requirement was to obtain a sample of individuals who were likely to be racially prejudiced. The Student Representative Council of a small college in London, almost alone among such student
bodies at British Universities, reacted favourably to the raising of tuition fees for foreign students. On the assumption that this action may have been indicative of a general right-wing atmosphere at the college, the students there were sampled.

The questionnaire was administered in the students' common room on three consecutive occasions during April 1967. All students present in the common room were requested to complete a questionnaire. The precise number of refusals was unknown as some who refused on one occasion, agreed on a subsequent request. The number of refusals did not appear to be great. During testing the respondents were repeatedly requested not to discuss their responses, and generally co-operation was obtained. Comparisons of completed questionnaires suggested that collusion had not taken place.

The students sampled did not appear to be unrepresentative of the whole student body as varied reasons were given for being present in the common room. These included, waiting for lectures to begin; being en route to and from the library; arranging for sporting activities or nothing else in particular to do.

Similar to the procedure adopted throughout the study, only British citizens of obvious European decent were included in the sample. In all, 60 students were sampled which constituted, roughly, 13.5 per cent of the total student body at the college. Of these sixty respondents, 57 contributed to the British sample, 1 to the S.A. (in Br.) sample (dealt with later in the discussion), and 2 were discarded.

Students from a Catholic-run Teacher's Training College in London were tested in May 1967. The selection of this sample was based on the belief that the college had a liberal tradition which
was indicated by discussions with the staff and by the relatively large proportion of foreign students at the college. Further, it was necessary to obtain Catholic respondents in the sample to test Hokeach's assertion that adherence to Catholicism tends to produce closed-mindedness. The experience from the pilot study suggested that in order to obtain Catholic respondents it was necessary to specifically sample known Catholic groups. However, admission to the College was not based on religious grounds and only about half the sample professed to be Catholic.

The questionnaire was administered during a lecture period given over to this purpose, and accordingly testing conditions were ideal. The responses obtained from foreign students were not included in the sample. In all, about 74 per cent of the student body were sampled. 53 completed questionnaires were obtained of which 27 were included in the final British sample. In addition, nuns who were students at the College were also tested. 15 completed questionnaires were obtained which was almost 70 per cent of nuns studying at the college. These constituted the sample of nuns.

To augment numbers, science students in the Psychology Department of the University of Edinburgh were administered the questionnaire in November 1967. These were completed by the respondents at home, and roughly 60 per cent were returned. In all 31 students cooperated, of which 30 were included in the final British sample.

The South African sample:

The South African section of the project was undertaken in August 1967. Lack of co-operation from student societies necessitated a random sample of students at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg being selected. The sample excluded part-timers and
medical students. The respondents were contacted by letter, requesting them to attend during specified times for the administration of the questionnaire. A poor response necessitated questionnaires being mailed. The return rate was over 71 per cent. 134 completed questionnaires were obtained of which 114 were used in the South African sample.

The sample was over represented in the Arts Faculty; roughly 49 per cent of the sample, as opposed to 36 per cent of the University were registered in this Faculty. (These figures are all approximations.) Over representation also occurred for the Science Faculty which contributed 24 per cent of the sample while constituting 18 per cent of the total population. Engineering and Commerce were under represented; respectively 14 and 6 per cent of the sample compared to 20 and 16 per cent in each of these Faculties.

The possible effects of this sample bias would tend to produce decreased means on the measures of intolerance. Research has indicated that individuals reading for degrees in the Social Sciences or Arts (both are combined at the University) tend to be more tolerant than those registered in other faculties (Kelly et al 1956). The proportion of Progressive Party\(^1\) supporters in the sample points to the validity of the above conclusion - almost 42 per cent of the sample indicated a preference for the Progressive Party in contrast to the 1966 South African General Election where it received only 3.1 per cent of the votes cast. (Horrell 1966, p. 6.)

The British and South African samples compared:

While the South African sample thus contained a possible bias towards racial tolerance, the policy of selecting potential politically

\(^1\) The Progressive Party platform is a qualified franchise for Africans as opposed to the exclusively white franchise adopted by the National and United Parties.
right-wing respondents in the British sample, may have resulted in a bias in the opposite direction. Over 41 per cent of the British sample indicated a preference for the Conservative Party which may be atypical of British University students.

In so far as these biases existed and influenced the results, they would act to lessen the differences between the samples on the prejudice and authoritarian measures used in the study. As the aim of the research was to compare personality variables of racially tolerant and intolerant individuals under British and South African environmental conditions, and not to demonstrate that the South Africans were more prejudiced, it was desirable to obtain large numbers of individuals in both samples with comparable prejudice scores. Thus, the possible biases in the sample are not seen as detracting from the research. Indeed, as will be shown later in the results chapter, in spite of the deliberate attempt to obtain a predominantly right-wing British sample, and the unintentional possibility that liberal elements were over represented in the South African sample, the latter scored far in excess of the former on the prejudice scale. At the prejudiced extreme of the scale, the scores of 17.5 per cent of the South African sample had no counterpart in the British sample.

It is stressed that no claims whatsoever are made as to the samples being representative. Where generalizations are made from the data these are not intended to apply to British or alternatively to South African university students as a whole, but are merely put forward as hypotheses for further research in the personality study of racial prejudice.

In all 124 subjects were obtained in the British study and 134 in the South African. In order to control for the influences of age, students over 30 years were dropped from the samples. The average
The age of the final British sample was 20.9 years and of the South African, 20.5 years.

From the literature, indications have been obtained that women may show greater social distance than men, (Pettigrew 1958, Van den Berghe 1962), and therefore, the proportion of the sexes represented in each sample was equalized. There were 70 males and 44 females in each of the two samples. Socio-economic status, as indicated by father's occupation showed the samples to be comparable; both appeared to be, with very few exceptions, children of the middle classes. It was decided to have an equal number of respondents in each sample which necessitated the random exclusion of a few questionnaires in the South African sample. Each sample, finally, contained 114 respondents.

The Communist sample:

The British and South African samples were the main groups in the study. Additional, secondary samples, were also selected. The sample of nuns has already been discussed. Student Communists were also sampled in Britain. Student members of the Young Communist League were mailed questionnaires. 35 usable questionnaires were returned which amounted to a 65 per cent response rate.

The S.A. (in Br.) sample:

A sample of Southern African students, both South African and Rhodesian, who were studying at British universities were also obtained. As in the rest of the study, only white respondents were included in the sample. This part of the survey was conducted entirely by post. South Africans and Rhodesians at the University of Cambridge were sent questionnaires, of whom 36 co-operated (74 per cent response). In addition, 23 Rhodesians at other universities
were sampled (82 per cent response), and 5 South African respondents obtained from the other samples were also included. Of these 64 respondents, 61 were in used in the final sample - from hence referred to as the S.A. (in Br.) sample.

**Differences in the questionnaire administration:**

As has been noted, different procedures were utilized in the questionnaire administration, the least ideal of which was the mailing technique. No evidence was obtained to suggest that the results were uniformly influenced by the method used. For example, questionnaires were mailed to the Communist, S.A. (in Br.) and partially, to the South African samples. The results obtained for all these showed vast differences within and between the samples. In the mailed questionnaires some safeguards were inserted against frivolous replies. The respondents were requested to note the time taken to complete the questionnaire. A varied response was obtained, comparable with the times taken under supervision, which suggests that the questionnaires were completed at one sitting as had been instructed. The respondents were requested to comment on the questionnaire and in no instance was an indication obtained from these that the task was undertaken in anything than a serious manner.

The samples and the number of respondents in each are given below:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rans</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Questionnaire:

The questionnaire consisted of nine scales as is indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Theoretical Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anomie</td>
<td>Srole (1956)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism</td>
<td>Rokeach (1960)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40-280</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion (E.P.I.)</td>
<td>Eysenck and Eysenck (1964)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0-24</td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Scale</td>
<td>Adorno et al (1950)</td>
<td>27*</td>
<td>27-169</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie (E.P.I.)</td>
<td>Eysenck and Eysenck (1964)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism (E.P.I.)</td>
<td>Eysenck and Eysenck (1964)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0-24</td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political concern</td>
<td>Constructed for the present research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice discrimination</td>
<td>Constructed for the present research</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30-210</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10-70</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10-70</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigidity (Gough)</td>
<td>As cited in Rokeach (1960)</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>21-147</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Items here excluded from the original scale.

It must be noted that the prejudice sub-scales - discrimination attitude and prejudice attitude, are included in the items of the total prejudice scale. All the scales with the exception of those in the E.P.I., were scored on a seven point scale, the scoring system of the E.P.I. being a two point scale. In all the scales a high score indicates the description of the scale; for example, a dogmatic individual is one who scores high on the Dogmatism Scale.

Of the twenty-nine F Scale items, Forms 45 and 40, listed by Adorno et al (1950, p. 255-257), two items were omitted from the
present research. These were item numbers 22 and 35. The Gough-Sanford Rigidity Scale, presented in "The Open and Closed Mind" (1960, p. 418), was used in the research. Omitted from the scale was the item, "I never miss going to church", as it was thought that it is possible to be both rigid and an atheist.

In the event of a respondent scoring 5 or above on the Lie Scale, no further use was made of his Extraversion and Neuroticism scale results.

Various biographical and sociological data was also obtained from the questionnaire: date of birth; country of birth; sex; father's occupation; faculty; religious affiliation; and political preference. Information was also obtained on attitudes towards discipline; both the respondent's own experience and the discipline intended to be administered. This data was obtained from the following questions:

Would you describe the discipline you experienced as a child as being:
Very restrictive
Restrictive
Permissive
Very Permissive.

Do you (or do you intend to) discipline your children:
Much more strictly than your parents did
Slightly more strictly than your parents did
Slightly less strictly than your parents did
Much less strictly than your parents did.

The results obtained are presented in the following chapter.
PART 3

THE RESULTS
CHAPTER 12

THE RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE PREJUDICE SCALE

The fulfillment of the present research into racial prejudice depends largely on the validity of the prejudice scale constructed. The scale purports to measure racial prejudice and only in so far as this is achieved are the racial prejudice hypotheses adequately subjected to test. The results and discussion which reflect on the reliability and validity of the prejudice scale are presented in this chapter.

The reliability of the measure was obtained by the split-half correlation method. The scale items were selected by Likert's (1932) method of discriminatory powers (D.P.'s). As pre-testing was only able to be undertaken with British samples it was vital to establish the validity of the scale under South African conditions. The validity of the scale was able to be ascertained from the prejudice means obtained by the various political and religious groups tested. The vast literature in the field enables predictions to be made; prejudice means are expected to increase from Left to Right along the political dimension and among religious affiliation groups; the order is expected to be Catholics highest, followed by Protestants, Jews and nonbelievers. It has further been repeatedly established that racial prejudice is closely related to the F Scale, and accordingly, the association between the present scale and authoritarianism enables the validity of the former to be indicated.

1. Described in Chapter 10.
Reliability:

Spearman-Brown split-half reliabilities of the prejudice scale were calculated for all the samples tested. The results obtained are presented below in Table 1.

Table 1: Split-half reliability coefficients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilot study</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuns</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the reliability coefficient obtained during the pilot study tended to be reproduced in the samples tested during the main research. The reliability of the scale ranged from .90 to .95. The prejudice scale is thus found to be reliable under both British and South African environmental conditions.

Discriminatory powers:

During the pilot study, items for the prejudice scale were selected by means of the discriminatory powers (D.P.) method: the greater the mean difference between prejudiced and tolerant groups, the better the item measures racial prejudice. D.P.'s were also calculated for the British and South African samples. The total sample means, the highly prejudiced group means (the highest 25 per cent of the sample on the prejudice scale), the non-prejudiced group means (the lowest 25 per cent), and the D.P.'s for each of the scale items are presented below in Table 2.
Table 2: Item means and Discriminatory Powers (D.P.'s) for the British and South African samples on the prejudice scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>British sample Mean</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>D.P.</th>
<th>South African sample Mean</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>D.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The contents of the items are presented in Chapter 10.
Marked differences are apparent in the size of the D.P.'s achieved by the British and South African samples. Generally, the D.P.'s obtained for the South African sample indicate that the items satisfactorily discriminate between prejudiced and non-prejudiced individuals. Similar conclusions, however, are not able to be drawn from the British data. In the South African data there are six items with D.P.'s over 4.0 and thirteen over 3.0. In contrast, the British results show only two items with D.P.'s over 3.0 and at the other extreme, eleven items obtain D.P.'s of between 2.0 and 1.0.

An explanation of the results may be found in the fact that the range which constitutes the cutting points for the high quartile in the South African sample was between 4.73 and 5.97 per item, while the equivalent British group had a range of 3.80 to 4.90. The means obtained by the high prejudiced groups indicate that the South Africans exceed the British on all except two of the items. On the other hand, the tolerant groups in both samples tended to obtain roughly comparable item means. The relatively low D.P.'s found for the British sample are thus attributed to insufficient highly prejudiced individuals being represented rather than to inadequacies of the prejudice scale items. Support for this conclusion is found in the item means obtained by the total samples. The South African sample mean on the prejudice scale was 3.7 per item and the individual item means tended towards the 4.0 ideal cited by Levinson (Adorno et al 1950) to indicate representation in the sample of both prejudice extremes. On the other hand, the prejudice mean for the British sample was 3.0. Accordingly, the differences obtained by the South Africans are greater than those obtained by the British sample.
The British results are thus attributed to the restricted range of prejudice scores in the sample rather than to a lack in the scale's validity. Had the items been invalid this would have tended to be revealed in both samples, particularly as the items were selected originally from data gathered in the United Kingdom. Further supporting evidence is obtained from the correlations presented below in table 3.

Table 3: Correlation coefficients of the rank order of excellence of D.P.'s obtained for the prejudice scale items in the Pilot Study, British and South African samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Pilot</th>
<th>British</th>
<th>S. African</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilot¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p = .01  
* p = .05

In spite of the differences between the samples in the size of D.P.'s, the correlations of the rank order of excellence obtained for the three samples are all significant. That the highest correlation coefficient was obtained between the pilot study and the South African samples, seems to indicate that the pattern of results depended more on adequate representation of extreme groups than on cultural influences. This result adds vindication to the cross-cultural use of the scale. However, cultural variations are evident and these may be illustrated by reference to some of the item results where the samples markedly differed.

1. The wording of item 13 was altered after the pilot study results were obtained and thus, the correlations involving this sample may have been deflated.
Cultural influences:

In the South African data only two items failed to achieve D.P.'s of over 2.0. Item 2 which reads: "Many of Africa's problems were created by the former Colonial rulers", appears to have been ambiguously interpreted by the South African respondents. Whereas it was intended to imply that the new African states inherited problems from the Colonial powers on independence, it appears, in retrospect from the results, that the item may have been interpreted as independence having been granted prematurely thereby creating problems for South Africa.

The British sample obtained a mean of 3.85 compared to the South African mean of 3.17 for item 11 which reads: "The Japanese have proven themselves to be ruthless and cruel." The relatively low South African mean may be explained by the suggestion that the highly prejudiced subjects were conforming to the South African Government's policy of granting 'white status' to Japanese.

The D.P.'s obtained by the British sample are higher than those obtained by the South African sample in only four cases - the two mentioned above, and two which specifically referred to Britain. This may indicate that these items lacked relevance for the South Africans, although, in two other items which also mentioned Britain, the D.P.'s obtained by the South Africans were higher.

Item 24 - "Parents should make a point of discouraging any racial prejudice in their children" - obtained the lowest mean of all the items in both samples. This appears to indicate that the item requires rewording so that a greater number of respondents will disagree.
Item 22 - "What happened in the Congo can't be used to generalize about all of Africa" - was interpreted by a subject in the Communist sample who disagreed with the item, not in terms of chaos as intended, but in terms of American intervention in the Congo.

In all three samples (including the Pilot Study) four items (no.'s 2, 22, 24 and 27) obtained D.P.'s which were among the ten lowest in each of the samples. It is suggested that in the event of further study these items be eliminated from the scale, in addition to others which may have cultural bias.

Prejudice and political preference:

Prejudice means are expected to increase from Left to Right along the political dimension. The results obtained from the various political groups in the British and South African samples are presented below in tables 4a and 4b.

Table 4a: Prejudice Scale means for political preference groups in the British sample (including the Communist sample).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Preference</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Prejudice Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conservatives</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Liberal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Labour</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communist</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference between means*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 v 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; one tailed probabilities.

1. Because so few in number, the Liberals were not statistically compared with the other groups.
Table 4b: Prejudice Scale means for political preference groups in the South African sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Preference</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Prejudice Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. National</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>144.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. United</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>135.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Progressive</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference between means*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; one tailed probabilities.

The group of Conservative Party supporters in the British sample, scored significantly higher on the prejudice scale than did the Labourites who, in turn, were significantly more prejudiced than the Communist sample. The Liberals, too few in number for statistical comparison, scored in between the Conservatives and Labour supporters. The prejudice scale thus reflects the ideological positions of the British political parties as represented in the sample tested.

Noteworthy from the results is the relatively small standard deviation obtained by the Communists on the prejudice scale. Bourne, in a Communist Party pamphlet on racialism writes:

"The Communist Party has always opposed racialism and racial discrimination in all its forms, including discrimination by colour as regards immigration into Britain." (p.11)

In Rokeach's (1956) study, the Communists obtained the smallest standard deviation on the Ethnocentrism scale; 4.2 compared to 7.9 for the next least divergent group, the Liberals.
In the South African data, the supporters of the National and United Parties scored at the prejudiced extreme of the scale. Both parties are unambiguously constituted on a racialist platform which has been reflected in their supporters' performance on the prejudice scale. The Nationalists obtained a mean of 144.2 which is well above the theoretical scale mean of 120.0, and is clearly higher than the Progressives (89.5), and the most prejudiced British group, the Conservatives (99.7). The National Party prejudice score is symptomatic of the extremity of racial hostility in South Africa. The difference between the two samples is apparent when the Nationalists' mean is compared to the highest score (147) obtained by any one individual in the British sample.

That the prejudice scale was able to discriminate between the different politically orientated groups, particularly between the Labourites and Communists in the British data, and between the National and United Parties among the South Africans, contributes strong evidence for the scale's validity. The difference between the National and United groups is significant on the prejudice scale, but not on the F, Dogmatism or Rigidity Scales.

The South African Progressive Party, in terms of British politics, roughly corresponds to the Liberal Party's position on the Right-Left spectrum. The approximation is revealed in the data for the prejudice scale where, respectively, means of 89.5 and 83.9 were obtained. This appears to add vindication to the cross-cultural use of the scale.

In conclusion, the significant differences obtained in both samples are in accordance with predictions. The political preference data therefore provide firm evidence of the prejudice scale's validity.
Prejudice and religious affiliation:

The rank order of prejudice means for religious affiliation groups is expected to be Catholics followed by Protestants scoring high, and at the lower extreme, Jews scoring above nonbelievers. The results obtained for the British and South African samples are presented below in tables 5a and 5b.

Table 5a: Prejudice scale means for religious affiliation groups in the British sample (including the sample of Nuns).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Prejudice mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Protestants</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Catholics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nonbelievers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nuns</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference between means*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 v 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; one tailed probabilities.
Table 5b: Prejudice Scale means for religious affiliation groups in the South African sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Prejudice Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Protestants</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>125.1</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Catholic¹</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>111.9</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jews</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nonbelievers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difference between means*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
<td>.00003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 4</td>
<td>.00007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 v 4</td>
<td>.4640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; one tailed probabilities.

The prejudice results from the religious groups do not appear to contribute additional confidence of the scale's validity. The Catholics in the British sample scored lowest on prejudice (and on F and dogmatism) of the groups tested. Also contrary to expectations, the religious nonbelievers scored relatively high. This group's heterogeneity in regard to racial issues, as indicated by their standard deviation (28.2), may account for this result. Nevertheless, both groups scored contrary to the findings usually reported in the literature.

In the South African sample, the Catholics scored lower on prejudice (and F) than did the Protestants. These results may have been influenced by the small number of Catholics in the sample, or perhaps may be indicative of the minority status of Roman Catholicism. 

¹ Not statistically compared.
in South Africa. Furthermore, Argyle (1958) points out that although Catholics most often score higher than Protestants, the differences are usually slight, and the positions are at times interchanged. In accordance with expectations, the Jews and nonbelievers scored relatively low on prejudice. This data confirms the findings from American studies and supports Pettigrew's (1961) view of patterns of prejudice replicating each other in Western countries.

Correlates of prejudice:

The prejudice scale is expected to perform, in relation to the other measures used in the research, as is indicated below in the hypotheses for the correlation coefficients:

a. Significant positive correlations are expected between prejudice and the Adorno et al (1950) F Scale.

b. Although Rokeach (1960) claims that the Dogmatism Scale is relatively free of the prejudice dimension, Dogmatism incorporates the right-wing authoritarianism of the F Scale, and, thereby, is expected to relate positively with prejudice. However, it is anticipated that this association will not reach the level attained by the F Scale correlation.

c. In view of the relationship between rigidity and authoritarianism, rigidity is expected to correlate positively with prejudice.

d. Eysenck (1954) postulated that extraversion would be positively related to racial prejudice. This relationship, however, is expected to be more apparent for the British than for the South African sample; introverts may condition to the South African race norms.

e. A negligible correlation is predicted between prejudice and neuroticism.

f. Prejudice is expected to correlate positively with anomie.

g. No predictions are made for the relationship between prejudice and the political concern scale.

The results obtained are presented below in table 6.
Table 6: Correlation coefficients for the prejudice scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Dog.</th>
<th>Rig.</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>An.</th>
<th>P=.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>-.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rums</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p = .01
* p = .05

Prejudice and F correlated significantly in all the samples except for the student nuns; the significant correlations ranged from .48 to .68. Adorno and his associates report an average correlation of .73 between the F and E Scales. Later research, however, has tended to find reduced correlations; Rokeach (1960) reports an average correlation of .62 between F and E. Although the prejudice scale was constructed independently of the F Scale it appears to be almost as closely related to F as is the E Scale.

These results thus strongly point to the validity of the prejudice scale.

Prejudice and dogmatism correlated significantly only in the British and South African samples. The prejudice-rigidity results were also only significant for these two samples. Prejudice is thus most clearly associated with the right-wing authoritarianism measured by the F Scale.

1. The key to the abbreviations is: F = F Scale; Dog. = Dogmatism; Rig. = Rigidity; E = Extraversioin; N = Neuroticism; An. = Anomie; and P=.05 = Political concern.
Prejudice correlated significantly with extraversion only in the British sample; however, a larger coefficient may have been expected. Although a significant result was expected for the South African sample, the results can be viewed as confirming expectations.\(^1\)

In the Communist data, prejudice and neuroticism were negatively related. The minimal results obtained for the other samples were in accordance with expectations.

Significant results were obtained for the correlations between prejudice and anomie for the three main samples and thus the predictions are confirmed.

In all the samples, except for the nuns, it was found that the greater the prejudice the less the political concern.

Conclusions:

Overall, from the results, it may be concluded that the prejudice scale proved to be a valid measure under both British and South African environmental conditions. The hypotheses tested during the study which involve the prejudice scale are therefore less subjected to qualification of the scale's ability to adequately measure racial prejudice.

---

1. These and the other correlation results are dealt with in greater detail in the ensuing chapters.
CHAPTER 12

THE PREJUDICE AND F SCALE RESULTS

The results are presented in seven sections as is outlined below.

1. Attitudes towards discipline. The responses obtained from the British and South African samples are compared on their description of the discipline they experienced and on the discipline they intend to administer in the future.

2. The total sample comparisons. F Scale means and the distribution of F Scale scores are presented, followed by the means obtained on the prejudice scale and its sub-scales.

3. The F Scale group comparisons. Prejudice and prejudice sub-scale means are compared for low, middle and high range F Scale groups. In the low range, a comparison is also made between British and Communist respondents matched on the F Scale. Finally, South African political preference groups are compared.

4. Suppressed prejudice. F Scale means of the low range prejudice groups are investigated. Extremely low and moderately low prejudiced groups from the British sample, matched on the F Scale, are then compared for dogmatism, extraversion, and neuroticism.

5. The prejudice sub-scale correlations. The prejudice attitude and discrimination attitude sub-scales are correlated with all the other measures used in the research.

6. The extraversion results. The Extraversion Scale's relationships with prejudice, F and dogmatism are investigated.

7. The political concern scale. Correlations and means obtained for the political concern scale are presented.

1. Attitudes toward discipline:

The respondents were asked to describe the discipline they experienced as children, and the discipline they intended to use in relation to their own children. Four choice-points were provided. However, in the results obtained, the responses needed to be dichotomized as, in both the British and South African samples, the middle categories were overwhelming selected. Thus, 'very restrictive' and 'restrictive' were considered as one category, as were 'very permissive' and 'permissive'.

QHAPTKB
In the comparison of British and South African samples no predictions are made for the 'discipline questions', and thus the null hypothesis of no difference between the samples is tested. The results are presented below in tables 7a to 7d.

**Table 7a:** Description of the discipline experienced by the British and South African samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>British</th>
<th>S. African</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 2.966\]

\[p = .10\]

**Table 7b:** Description of the discipline intended to be, or presently, administered to respondents' (in the British and South African samples) own children in relation to the discipline they themselves had experienced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description: In relation to own experience.</th>
<th>British</th>
<th>S. African</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More restriction</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less restriction</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 2.582\]

\[p = .20\]

*One respondent, in each sample, was not able to be classified.*
Table 7c: Restrictive discipline experienced in relation to discipline intended to be, or presently, administered to own children for the British and South African samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description: In relation to own experience.</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British</td>
<td>S. African</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More restriction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less restriction</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 2.894\]  
\[p = .10\]

Table 7d: Permissive discipline experienced in relation to discipline intended to be, or presently, administered to own children for the British and South African samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description: In relation to own experience.</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British</td>
<td>S. African</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More restriction</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less restriction</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 4.654\]  
\[p = .05\]

From tables 7a–7d, a trend towards restriction is discernible in the South African sample. In all four instances a majority of the British sample indicated a preference for less restriction. However, only in the final comparison did the difference between the two samples reach a reliable level of significance.

2. The total sample comparisons:

The F Scale:

The predictions (hypothesis 2)\(^1\) made for the F Scale mean differences are as follows:

1. The results for Hypothesis 1 (the correlational data) was presented in the previous chapter.
Mean differences on the F Scale, between the British, South African, and S.A. (in Br.) samples, will, in all three comparisons, fail to reach an acceptable level of significance.

Table 8a: F Scale means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F Scale Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. British</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. South African</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nuns</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communists</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference between means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 2</td>
<td>1.5100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
<td>1.0759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 3</td>
<td>2.2293*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = .05

Thus, contrary to expectations, the South African sample scored significantly higher on the F Scale than did the S.A. (in Br.) sample. In accordance with prediction no statistically reliable difference was found between the British and South African samples on the F Scale. The differences, however, approached significance, indicating a tendency towards greater authoritarianism on the part of the South African sample.

In order to further investigate authoritarianism, the British and South African samples were classified into low, middle, and high range F Scale scorers, and these distributions were compared. No predictions were formulated.

1. These samples were not statistically compared.
Table 8b: Distribution of F Scale scores for the British and South African samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F Scale group</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>British N.</th>
<th>South African N.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>27-60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>61-107</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>106 and above</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
X^2 = 6.2108
\]

The indication, in the F Scale mean comparison, that the South African sample tends toward greater authoritarianism, is confirmed by the findings reported in table 8b. A greater number of South African respondents score on or above the F Scale's theoretical mean of 106.

The prejudice scale:

The hypotheses formulated for the prejudice scale mean differences are as follows:

(a) The South African sample will score significantly higher than the British sample on the total prejudice scale.

(b) The total prejudice scale mean obtained by the S.A. (in Br.) sample will fall between the means obtained by the other two samples.
Table 9: Prejudice scale means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Prejudice mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. British</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. South African</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nuns</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communists</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference between means</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 2</td>
<td>4.9216**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
<td>1.5016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 3</td>
<td>2.7715*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p = .01$
** $p = .001$

The hypotheses are thus confirmed by the data obtained in Table 9. Highly significant differences were found between the South African and British samples on the prejudice scales. The South Africans were also found to be significantly more prejudiced than the S.A. (in Br.) sample.

The prejudice sub-scales:

The expectations for the prejudice sub-scales are presented below:

(a) The South African sample will score significantly higher on the discrimination attitude sub-scale than the British sample.

(b) The South African sample will score significantly higher on the discrimination attitude sub-scale than the S.A. (in Br.) sample.

(c) The S.A. (in Br.) sample will score significantly higher on the discrimination attitude sub-scale than the British sample.

(d) Relative to the discrimination attitude results, the difference between the South African and the British samples on the prejudice attitude sub-scale is expected to be less evident, although the South African sample will still score significantly higher.
(b) The British sample will score relatively higher on prejudice attitude than on discrimination attitude.

(c) The prejudice attitude sub-scale mean obtained by the S.A. (in Br.) sample will fall between the means obtained by the other two samples; the difference in both comparisons failing to reach significance.

The results obtained are presented below in table 10.

Table 10: Discrimination attitude and prejudice attitude means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Prejudice attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. British</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. South African</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference between samples</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 2</td>
<td>6.8867*</td>
<td>1.5113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
<td>0.7465</td>
<td>0.7331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 3</td>
<td>4.9295*</td>
<td>0.4918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = .001

In accordance with the hypotheses, the South African sample scored, on the discrimination attitude sub-scale, significantly higher than both the British and S.A. (in Br.) samples. The expected difference on this sub-scale between the British and S.A. (in Br.) samples, however, did not materialize.

The prejudice attitude sub-scale results indicate that the predicted difference between the British and South African samples was unjustified. The findings for the S.A. (in Br.) sample fulfil the prejudiced attitude sub-scale hypotheses. Unlike the South African sample, both the British and S.A. (in Br.) samples scored relatively higher on prejudiced attitude than on the discrimination sub-scales.
3. The F Scale group comparisons:

The low range F Scale groups:

Pettigrew (1958) suggests that prejudice is expressed by non-authoritarians in areas of heightened racial tensions. Pettigrew would thus predict that non-authoritarians in the South African sample would be more prejudiced than non-authoritarians in the British sample. The present hypotheses challenge Pettigrew's assumption:

(6) Non-authoritarians will be responsive only to normative pressures which are in accordance with their personality predisposition. Thus, when F Scale scores are controlled, non-authoritarians in the British, South African and S.A. (in Br.) samples will all score equally low on the total prejudice scale, and on both the sub-scales discrimination attitude and prejudice attitude.

The criterion selected to indicate non-authoritarianism was a score of 80 or under on the F Scale, that is, a score of under 3.0 per item. The results obtained are presented below in tables 1la and 1lb.

Table 1la: Prejudice scale means for the low range (27-80) F Scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Prejudice Scale Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. British</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. South African</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference between means:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 2</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>.5962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>.8258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>.8026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; two-tailed probabilities.

1. In these and later comparisons of F Scale groups no significant F Scale mean differences were found. Nevertheless, as the results may have been influenced by peculiarities in the distribution of F Scale scores occurring in the various samples, prejudice means were also tabulated for all the groups matched on F. For the low, middle, and high range matched F Scale groups, the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test, yielded similar results to those achieved by the unmatched but equal range comparisons.
Table 11b: Discrimination attitude and prejudice attitude sub-scale means for the low range (27-80) F Scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Discrimination Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Prejudice attitude Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. British</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. South African</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 2</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.5962</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.0970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>.6966</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>.8966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 3</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.2542</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.0628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; two-tailed probabilities.

The results shown in table 11a support the present hypotheses; no significant differences were found in the prejudice means obtained by the groups of all three samples. No substantiation is thus provided for Pettigrew's assertions.

The discrimination attitude results, as indicated in table 11b, provide further evidence for non-authoritarian tolerance in all three groups; the mean differences in the three comparisons failed to reach significance.

In support of the hypotheses all the groups scored statistically similarly on the prejudice attitude sub-scale. However, a tendency for greater tolerance is observable among the South African non-authoritarians.

The hypothesis that non-authoritarians are responsive only to pressures which are in accordance with their personality predisposition is further tested with the Communist sample.
When F Scale scores are controlled, non-authoritarians in the British sample will score significantly higher on the total prejudice scale than the Communist sample.

Respondents in the British and Communist samples were matched on the F Scale and compared on prejudice. The results are presented below in table 11c.

**Table 11c: Prejudice scale means for the British and Communist samples matched on the F Scale.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Prejudice Scale Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>p.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks Test; two-tailed probability.

The results in table 11c show the Communists to be significantly less prejudiced than the British group; hypothesis 7 is thus supported by the data obtained.

**The middle range F Scale groups:**

Middle range F Scale scorers were defined as those respondents who obtained a F Scale mean of between 81 and 107, equivalent to a score per item of between 3.0 and 3.9. The hypotheses formulated are as follows:

(8a) When F Scale scores are controlled, moderate authoritarians in the South African sample will score significantly higher than their British sample counterparts on the total prejudice scale, and on the discrimination attitude sub-scale. No significant differences are predicted on the prejudice attitude sub-scale.

(b) The South African and S.A. (in Br.) groups are expected to differ significantly on the total prejudice scale, and, in particular, on the discrimination attitude sub-scale; the South Africans scoring higher in both cases. No significant difference is predicted on the prejudice attitude sub-scale.

(c) The British and S.A. (in Br.) groups are expected to score similarly on the total prejudice scale and on the prejudice attitude sub-scale. It is predicted that the S.A. (in Br.) group will score higher than the British group on the discrimination attitude sub-scale.
The results obtained are shown below in tables 12a and 12b.

### Table 12a: Prejudice scale means for the middle range (61-107) F Scale groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Prejudice Scale Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. British</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. South African</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>111.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference between means*</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 2</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.00006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.0042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 3</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.1868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; two-tailed probabilities.

### Table 12b: Discrimination attitude and prejudice attitude sub-scale means for the middle range (61-107) F Scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Discrimination Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Prejudice attitude Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. British</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. South African</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference between means*</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p*</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 2</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>.00006</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.0602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.0366</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.0392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 3</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>.7040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; two-tailed probabilities.

Significant differences between the South Africans and British groups were forecast on the total prejudice scale and on discrimination attitude but not on the prejudice attitude sub-scale. Substantiation
is provided by the results obtained; however, it will be noted from table 12b that the mean difference on prejudice attitude approaches significance (.08).

It was expected that the middle F Scale range South African group would score significantly higher than the S.A. (in Br.) group on the total prejudice scale; the results shown in table 12a do not support this prediction. As is indicated in table 12b, the South African-S.A. (in Br.) comparisons on the sub-scales confirm the hypotheses; while a significant difference occurred on discrimination, statistically similar means were obtained on prejudice attitude.

The S.A. (in Br.) group scored significantly higher than the British moderate authoritarian group on the total prejudice scale and on discrimination attitude. On prejudice attitude the groups are statistically similar. The total prejudice scale results are contrary to expectations. The prejudice attitude difference, while substantiating the hypothesis, approaches significance.

The high range F Scale groups:

High range F Scale scorers were defined as those respondents who obtained an F Scale mean of 108 or above, equivalent to a score per item of 4.0 or above. The hypotheses formulated are as follows:

(9a) When F Scale scores are controlled, authoritarians in the South African sample will score significantly higher than the equivalent British group, on the total prejudice scale, and on both the sub-scales; differences on the latter will be most marked on the discrimination attitude sub-scale.

(b) The South African group will score higher than the equivalent S.A. (in Br.) group on the total prejudice scale. (However, over-identification with racist ideology may cause the difference to be less prominent.) The South Africans are expected to score higher on discrimination attitude; but on prejudice attitude the difference is not expected to reach significance.
(c) The British group will score similarly on the total prejudice scale to the S.A. (in Br.) group. (Over-identification with racist ideology for the latter group, may cause a difference to occur.) The S.A. (in Br.) group is expected to score significantly higher on discrimination attitude, but on prejudice attitude the difference is not expected to reach significance.

The results for the authoritarian groups are presented below in tables 13a and 13b.

**Table 13a:** Prejudice scale means for the high range (108 or above) F Scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Prejudice Scale Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. British</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>109.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. South African</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>137.8</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>119.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference between means*</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 2</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.2380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 3</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.0208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann–Whitney U Test; two-tailed probabilities.

**Table 13b:** Discrimination attitude and prejudice attitude sub-scale means for the high range (108 or above) F Scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Discrimination Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Prejudice attitude Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. British</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. South African</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference between means*</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p*</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 2</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>.00006</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.1556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.3682</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.9640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 3</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.0024</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.1902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann–Whitney U Test; two-tailed probabilities.
The hypotheses for the authoritarian groups on the total prejudice scale are supported by the data. The South Africans scored significantly higher than both the British and S.A. (in Br.) authoritarians; while the latter groups obtained statistically similar means.

The qualification that authoritarians in the S.A. (in Br.) sample may over-identify with racist ideology is shown to be unjustified; the S.A. (in Br.) and British groups scored similarly throughout. Thus, contrary to expectations, the S.A. (in Br.) group did not favour discrimination significantly more than did the British authoritarians.

Discrimination attitude, in support of the hypotheses, significantly distinguished between the South African and British groups, and between the South African and S.A. (in Br.) groups.

No significant differences were obtained between the groups on the prejudice attitude sub-scale; a significant mean difference, however, was predicted for the South African-British comparison.

The South African political preference groups:

Pettigrew (1958, 1959) compared the prejudice and F Scale means of various groups deemed to be either conforming or non-conforming within the context of the cultural norms prevailing in the society. Pettigrew suggested that the former groups would score higher on prejudice but not on authoritarianism. The hypotheses here differ from Pettigrew's in the interpretation of the results. It is suggested that in intolerant regions both groups will score high on prejudice and F, while the conformist groups will merely be more extreme in their racial attitudes.

Of the comparisons in Pettigrew's (1958) South African study only
the political preference groups were able to be tested here. The predictions made are as follows:

(10) The supporters of the National and United Parties in the South African sample will score equally high on the F Scale and on the prejudice attitude sub-scale. Although both groups are expected to score at the intolerant extreme of the total prejudice scale and the discrimination attitude sub-scale, the Nationalists are expected to score significantly higher on both measures.

The results are presented below in table 14.

Table 14: Means obtained for supporters of the South African National and United Parties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Party Preference</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>F Scale</th>
<th>Prejudice Scale</th>
<th>Prejudice attitude</th>
<th>Discrimination attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Mean S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>110.8 21.4</td>
<td>144.2 22.0</td>
<td>43.3 7.3</td>
<td>51.5 6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>113.5 19.1</td>
<td>135.6 20.8</td>
<td>42.5 6.8</td>
<td>47.9 8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>.5620</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.0970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>.7114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann–Whitney U Test; two-tailed probabilities.

1. Pettigrew (1958) compared those born in Africa with those born elsewhere; manual and non-manually employed fathers; and Afrikaans and English speakers. Pettigrew's sample consisted overwhelmingly of English speakers born in Africa, and also, to a large extent, was of non-manual origin. The characteristics revealed in the present South African sample correspond to those found by Pettigrew. However, Pettigrew's sample numbers 627 compared to the 114 selected here. The result was that insufficient respondents were represented in the minority categories and thus, Pettigrew's comparisons were unable to be re-tested here. Further, the present political preference data differs from those obtained by Pettigrew in that his comparison was between supporters of the National Party and all other parties while the present analysis is between the National and United Parties. Since the Pettigrew research the United Party has split, its 'left-wing' forming the Progressive Party. The Progressive Party results on F and prejudice, because they are so widely different from the two right-wing groups, are presented later in the discussion where they are of more relevance.
As is shown in table 14, the two groups obtained statistically similar means on all the measures; differences approaching significance, however, were obtained on the prejudice scale and on the discrimination sub-scale. Thus, in support of Pettigrew’s data, the Nationalists tended towards greater prejudice although the United Party group scored marginally higher on F. Nevertheless, the results may indicate the present hypotheses rather than the social conformity explanation; non-conformity to South African race norms is not demonstrated in the extreme United Party prejudice mean.

4. Suppressed prejudice:

During the discussion of the social influences of racial prejudice it was indicated that prejudice may be suppressed in response to perceived norms of racial tolerance in the environment. This was further examined by comparing low prejudice groups within the various samples on the F Scale. No predictions were made because of the exploratory nature of the investigation. The criterion for low prejudice was a score of 89 or less (or under 3.0 per item) on the prejudice scale. The results obtained are presented below in table 15a.

Table 15a: F Scale means for the low range (30-89) prejudice scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F Scale Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. British</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. South African</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between means*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.0068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.0258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>.4966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; two-tailed probabilities.
As indicated in table 15a, the racially tolerant British group obtained a significantly higher F Scale mean than did either the South African or S.A. (in Br.) groups. Previously, (in table 11a above), it was shown that low F Scale groups from these samples did not differ significantly when compared on the prejudice scale. An explanation may be provided for these results by merely pointing to the fact that there were 29 British respondents in the category low F Scale scorer compared to 56 who were classified as low on the prejudice scale. This discrepancy in numbers did not occur in either the South African or S.A. (in Br.) classifications.

To gain some insight into the higher F Scale mean obtained by the tolerant British group, comparisons were made between extremely low (score of 59 or below), and moderately low (score of between 60 and 89) prejudice scale groups. The results obtained are presented below in tables 15b and 15c, where, again, no predictions were made.

Table 15b: F Scale means for the extremely low range (30-59) prejudice scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>F Scale Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. British</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. South African</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between means*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>p*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; two-tailed probabilities.

1. No statistical comparisons were undertaken with this group because of the small sample size.
Table 15c: F Scale means for the moderately low range (60-89) prejudice scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>F Scale Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. British</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. South African</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference between means*</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 2</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.5418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 3</td>
<td>123**</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann Whitney U Test; two-tailed probabilities.
** U value.

The results from tables 15b and 15c indicate that it is in the extremely low range prejudice groups that the British sample most differs in authoritarianism from the South Africans. These results may be interpreted in terms of the suppressed prejudice hypotheses; the British respondents, contrary to their personality predisposition, scored extremely low on the prejudice scale because they suppressed prejudice in response to perceived norms of racial tolerance in Britain.

The speculative nature of the above interpretation demanded further investigation. Respondents in the British sample's extremely low and moderately low prejudice groups were matched on the F Scale and compared on the other personality variables contained in the questionnaire. The rationale of the Dogmatism Scale comparison was based on Rokeach's (1960) contention that conformity is a characteristic of the closed minded personality. Thus, if the F Scale mean of the British extremely low prejudice group is explained in terms of conformity to tolerant race norms, this may be reflected in the
group's obtaining a significantly higher Dogmatism Scale mean than the moderately low prejudiced respondents.

Eysenck (1954) suggests that extraverts will be more susceptible to conformity pressures than will introverts, and thus, it is predicted that the extremely low group will score significantly higher on the extraversion scale than will the moderately low group.

A further hypothesis tested with the extreme and moderate groups is the suggestion by Dowling (1954) that extremely tolerant individuals will tend to be neurotic.

Matched on the F Scale, fourteen paired respondents were obtained from the British extremely low and moderately low prejudice groups. The results are presented below in table 15d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prejudice Scale groups</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Dogmatism Mean S.D.</th>
<th>Extraversion Mean S.D.</th>
<th>Neuroticism Mean S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely low</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>145.1 22.7</td>
<td>11.6 5.2</td>
<td>14.5 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately low</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>140.8 21.8</td>
<td>12.3 4.2</td>
<td>11.3 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>N.S. 32</td>
<td>N.S. 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N equalled 11 for the extraversion and neuroticism comparisons because of the Lie Scale results.
** Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test.

The results obtained in table 15d indicate no significant differences and thus, the hypotheses based on Rokeach, Eysenck, and Dowling are not substantiated. The dogmatism mean difference, however, is in the predicted direction. Although, in the total British sample, prejudice correlated .30 with Dogmatism (table 6), greater dogmatism was found for the lower prejudiced group. Thus, although the results failed to reach significance, a trend in support
of Rokeach is observed. Similarly for the neuroticism results, the mean difference is in the predicted direction. No indication of the hypothesis is obtained from the extraversion data.

5. The prejudice sub-scale correlations:

The prejudice sub-scales were correlated with each other and with the other measures used in the study. The results predicted are as follows:

(a) Prejudice attitude and discrimination attitude are expected to correlate substantially in both the British and South African samples.

(b) Both the sub-scales are expected to correlate substantially with the total prejudice scale in both the British and South African samples.

(c) In the British sample, a higher correlation is expected between prejudice attitude and the F Scale than between discrimination attitude and F. No differences are expected in the South African data.

(d) Because of Rokeach's assertion that conformity is a characteristic of closed mindedness, it is predicted that the Dogmatism Scale will correlate higher with prejudice attitude than with discrimination attitude for the British sample. Some dogmatic individuals will endorse discrimination while others, because of conformity to tolerant norms, will reject discrimination. In the South African sample dogmatism is expected to correlate equally with both sub-scales.

(e) No predictions are formulated for the relationship between rigidity and the sub-scales.

(f) Because of Eysenck's assertion that conformity is a characteristic of the extraverted personality type, it is predicted that the Extraversion Scale will correlate higher with prejudice attitude than with discrimination attitude for the British sample. In the South African sample extraversion is expected to correlate equally with both discrimination and prejudice attitudes.

(g) No predictions are formulated for the relationship between either the Neuroticism or Anomie Scales and the sub-scales.

(h) In the British sample, the political concern scale is expected to correlate higher with discrimination attitude than with prejudice attitude. No differences are expected for the South African data.
The results obtained are presented below in Table 16.

Table 16: Correlation coefficients for the prejudice attitude (P-a) and discrimination attitude (D-a) sub-scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>British</th>
<th>South African</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-a sub-scale</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.85**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-a sub-scale</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.85**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice</td>
<td>0.88**</td>
<td>0.92**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Scale</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigidity</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomie</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Concern</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
<td>-0.58**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p = .01
* p = .05

As is indicated in Table 16, prejudice attitude and discrimination attitude correlated highly in both samples. The relatively higher coefficient obtained in the South African data may be attributed to either a greater range of scores or to a greater dependency of the two variables in the South African culture.

In support of prediction (b), both sub-scales correlated very significantly with the total prejudice scale in the British and the South African data.

In the British sample, the P Scale correlated .44 with prejudice attitude and .41 with discrimination attitude. The expectation that a higher coefficient would be obtained for the former did not materialize in the data. The South African results show equally substantial correlations for both sub-scales.
Support is obtained for prediction (d); as expected, dogmatism correlated higher with prejudice attitude (.33) than with discrimination (.21) in the British sample. In the South African sample no differences occurred in the correlations obtained.

Rigidity related minimally with both measures in the British sample, but correlated highly with both in the South African sample.

In support of Rysenckian theory, extraversion correlated significantly only with prejudice attitude in the British data. Negligible correlations were obtained for both sub-scales in the South African sample.

Comparable correlations were obtained for the sub-scales in relation to both neuroticism and anomie; in the British and South African samples no evidence was obtained of an association with neuroticism while anomie correlated significantly throughout.

Prediction (h) appears to be substantiated by the results; in the British data political concern correlated -.32 with prejudice attitude compared to -.51 with the discrimination sub-scale. The South African correlations were, respectively, -.53 and -.58.

### 6. The extraversion results:

A positive correlation is predicted between, on the one hand, the Extraversion Scale, and on the other, prejudice, the F Scale, and dogmatism. Prejudice and F are expected to correlate higher with extraversion in the British data than in the South African. The results obtained are presented below in table 17a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Prejudice</th>
<th>F Scale</th>
<th>Dogmatism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p = .05
Extraversion correlated significantly with prejudice and F only in the British sample. No evidence was obtained of a relationship between extraversion and dogmatism.

Thus, some evidence is obtained in support of Eysenck’s contention that prejudiced and authoritarian individuals will tend to be extraverted. The correlations obtained, however, may have been expected to be higher. While prejudice and extraversion were expected to be associated in the British sample, it was predicted that conditioning to intolerant race norms would result in both introverted and extraverted prejudiced individuals in the South African sample. Thus, a lower correlation was predicted for the South Africans.

However, the complete absence of an association (r=-0.05) required further examination of the South African data. The distribution of prejudice and extraversion scores for the South African sample are presented below in Table 17b. It is expected that tolerant individuals will tend towards introversion while prejudiced individuals will be both extraverted and introverted.

Table 17b: The distribution of prejudice and extraversion scores in the South African sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraversion Scores</th>
<th>Prejudice Scores</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 10 (Introversion)</td>
<td>under 60</td>
<td>60-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 10 (Introversion)</td>
<td>tolerante</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and over (Extraversion)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 17, no relationship is able to be detected between prejudice and extraversion. Contrary to expectation, low prejudice scorers did not tend towards introversion.
7. The Political concern scale:

The political concern scale was constructed to test the suggestion that a high score on the Dogmatism Scale is a reflection of political concern. A positive correlation is thus predicted between the Dogmatism Scale and the five item political concern (P-c) scale.

The P-c correlations are presented below in table 18. No predictions are made for the relationship between P-c and the other measures used in the research; the results are presented in order to investigate the correlates of the P-c Scale and is of an exploratory nature.

Table 18: Correlation coefficients for the political concern scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Prej.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Dog.</th>
<th>Rig.</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>An.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>-.46*</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African</td>
<td>-.58*</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>-.54*</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>-.71*</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuns</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = .01
+ p = .05

From table 18, P-c and dogmatism correlated significantly only for the South African sample; the result, however, was in the opposite direction to that predicted by the hypothesis. With the exception only of the Communist sample, the apparent trend is for political concern to be associated with open mindedness. The hypothesis, thus, is not supported by the data obtained.

1. Key to the abbreviations: Prej. = prejudice; F = F Scale; Dog. = Dogmatism; Rig. = Rigidity; E = Extraversion; N = Neuroticism; An. = Anomie.
Political concern correlated very significantly with the prejudice scale for all the samples except the nurses. It appears that racial tolerance is related to high political concern; although to a lesser degree, P-c correlated significantly with the P Scale.

In the British and South African samples, P-c correlated significantly with rigidity and anomie. The only other significant result obtained was between P-c and neuroticism in the Communist sample; the higher the political concern the higher the neuroticism. In all the samples, extraversion was found to be unrelated to P-c.

The sample means obtained on the P-c scale are presented below in Table 19. The Communists, being the only sample selected specifically for their political commitment, are expected to score high on the P-c scale. No hypotheses were formulated in expectation of the P-c means for the other samples, and therefore, statistical comparison was not undertaken.

Table 19: Political concern scale means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Political Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results shown in Table 19 indicate that all the samples scored relatively high on the P-c scale; the possible range is from 5-35.

In accordance with expectation, the Communist sample was found to be highly politically concerned.

---

1. In the next chapter, results are presented which statistically compare Communists and Conservatives on the P-c scale.
The results presented here are: 1. the Dogmatism Scale correlations which are compared with those obtained for the F Scale; 2. the religious affiliation data; 3. the scale means for the political preference groups; 4. Communist and Conservatives, classified according to Dogmatism Scale scores, are compared on all the other measures used in the research; 5. sub-scales of the Dogmatism Scale, derived from the Communist and Conservative samples, are dealt with; and finally, 6. the dogmatism means obtained from extreme neurotic groups are presented.

1. The correlation coefficients:

High positive correlations between dogmatism and the F Scale are predicted. Dogmatism is also expected to correlate significantly with rigidity, anomie, neuroticism, and prejudice. Social conformity being common to both the constructs of dogmatism and Eysenck's (1954) extraversion, it is hypothesized that the two measures will correlate significantly.

The dogmatism correlations are presented below in table 20a. The F Scale correlations are presented in table 20b; these are compared to the correlations obtained for the Dogmatism Scale.
Table 20a: Correlation coefficients for the Dogmatism Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>F.1</th>
<th>Prej.</th>
<th>Rig.</th>
<th>E.</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>An.</th>
<th>F-c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.22+</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuns</td>
<td>.78*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = .01  
+ p = .05

Table 20b: Correlation coefficients for the F Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.23+</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>-.24+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>-.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A. (in Br.)</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.40+</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.44+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuns</td>
<td>.78*</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = .01  
+ p = .05

The Dogmatism and F Scales are shown to be highly related; the correlations were significant with the exception only of the Communist sample.

The prejudice and F Scales correlated significantly with the exception of the sample of nuns. In contrast, dogmatism correlated significantly with prejudice only in the British and South African samples.

Rigidity correlated significantly with dogmatism in the British, South African and S.A. (in Br.) samples, and significantly with F in

1. Key to the abbreviations: F. = F Scale; Prej. = Prejudice; Rig. = Rigidity; E. = Extraversion; N. = Neuroticism; An. = Anomie; F-c. = Political concern; and Dog. = Dogmatism.
the British, South African and Communist samples. With the exception of the S.A. (in Br.) sample, rigidity related closer to the F Scale than to dogmatism.

Extraversion correlated minimally with dogmatism throughout; social conformity thus does not appear to provide a link between extraversion and dogmatism. Extraversion and F correlated significantly only in the British sample.

Slight, but significant correlations were obtained between dogmatism and neuroticism in both the British and South African samples. No relationship between F and neuroticism was found in the results.¹

Dogmatism correlated significantly with anomie in all the samples except for the nuns. These correlations tended to be higher than those obtained between F and anomie. Particularly noteworthy is the Communist data; anomie correlated .56 with dogmatism and .07 with the F Scale for this sample.

Dogmatism correlated significantly with P-c only in the South African sample. In contrast, the F Scale and P-c correlated highly in all the samples; with the exception of the nuns these were all significant.

In conclusion, the Dogmatism Scale tended to obtain correlations which were in accordance with expectations. Although highly related to the F Scale, the open-closed dimension appears to be discernibly different from the Adorno et al concept of authoritarianism. The Dogmatism Scale is also shown to be different from the Rigidity Scale.

¹ Similarly, Rigidity appears to be unrelated to neuroticism; rigidity correlated -.07 with neuroticism in the British sample; .19 in the South African; .02 in the S.A. (in Br.) sample; -.02 for the Communists and -.12 for the nuns.
2. Religious affiliation:

Rokeach predicts that Catholicism's requirement of "strict adherence to doctrine" will result in high dogmatism scores being obtained by Catholic respondents. The results for the British sample are presented below in Table 21a.

Table 21a: Means for religious affiliation groups in the British sample (including the sample of Nuns).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious affiliation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Dogmatism Mean S.D.</th>
<th>F Scale Mean S.D.</th>
<th>Rigidity Mean S.D.</th>
<th>Prejudice Mean S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Protestant</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>146.4 19.6</td>
<td>96.9 15.6</td>
<td>82.5 14.3</td>
<td>96.3 24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Catholic</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>138.0 34.5</td>
<td>84.2 31.3</td>
<td>78.3 20.2</td>
<td>72.3 21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No religion</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>144.4 22.7</td>
<td>89.1 17.2</td>
<td>77.7 17.4</td>
<td>69.2 28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nuns</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>163.6 21.1</td>
<td>101.5 15.7</td>
<td>86.9 15.5</td>
<td>79.2 17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference between means* |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 2</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.0174</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.0088</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.3783</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.0082</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.0721</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.1335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 4</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.0052</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.1641</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.0873</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 3</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.2033</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>.3594</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.4325</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.0089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 v 4</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.0066</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.0087</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.0571</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.0485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; one tailed probabilities.

Table 21a indicates that the nuns scored significantly higher on the Dogmatism Scale than did the other three groups. Thus the nuns were significantly more dogmatic but less prejudiced than the Protestants. Significant differences did not occur between these two groups on F or

1. One respondent (Jewish) was excluded from the analysis of results. Due to incomplete responses, the N for the Dogmatism Scale was as follows: Protestants, N=60; Catholics, N=16; No religion, N=34. Further, the N for the Nuns on the F Scale = 14.
rigidity. These results provide support for Rokeach's contentions. The nuns were also found to be more dogmatic, authoritarian, and rigid but less racially intolerant than the religious nonbelievers.

The Catholic group scored lowest of all the groups on the Dogmatism Scale. However, because of the possible 'liberal' bias in the selection of the Catholic respondents, these results do not provide strong evidence in contradiction to Rokeach. Further, in support of Rokeach, the Protestants, while not being significantly higher than the Catholics on dogmatism, were significantly more authoritarian and prejudiced.

The data for the South African religious groups are presented below in table 21b.

Table 21b: Means for religious affiliation groups in the South African sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious affiliation</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Dogmatism Mean S.D.</th>
<th>F Scale Mean S.D.</th>
<th>Rigidity Mean S.D.</th>
<th>Prejudice Mean S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Protestant</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>155.4  25.4</td>
<td>104.6  23.0</td>
<td>90.1    13.7</td>
<td>125.1   29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Catholic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>144.0  22.6</td>
<td>98.6   12.0</td>
<td>83.4    11.7</td>
<td>111.9   41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jewish</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>141.7  23.0</td>
<td>86.0   23.4</td>
<td>61.7    20.6</td>
<td>85.1    29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No religion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>132.1  34.2</td>
<td>78.6   25.2</td>
<td>72.6    21.5</td>
<td>83.4    32.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference between means:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.0158</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.0023</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.0359</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 4</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.0104</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.0013</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.0009</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 v 4</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>.1711</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>.1660</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.0858</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.4840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; one-tailed probabilities.

1. Dealt with in chapter 11 where the sample selection is discussed.
2. Two respondents (Greek Orthodox) were excluded from the analysis of results.
3. Because so few in number, the Catholics were not statistically compared to the other groups.
The results in table 21b show that the Protestants scored significantly higher than both the Jews and the no religion group on all four measures. No statistical differences were found between the Jews and nonbelievers. The Catholic group, although not statistically compared with the other groups, appeared to score relatively low on the Dogmatism Scale.

Catholic and non-Catholic respondents in the British sample drawn from the Catholic College were compared on the Dogmatism and Anomie Scales. The expectation was that the Catholics would be subjected to greater conformity pressures than would the non-Catholic students at the College, and thus would score higher on the Dogmatism Scale. On the other hand, the non-Catholics, because they were less integrated into the College sub-culture would score high on the Anomie Scale. The results are presented below in table 22.

Table 22: Dogmatism and Anomie Scale means for the Catholic and non-Catholic respondents in the British sample drawn from the Catholic sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Dogmatism Mean S.D.</th>
<th>Anomie Mean S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>133.1 32.1</td>
<td>12.0 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>135.8 23.8</td>
<td>16.0 4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference between means*</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; one-tailed probabilities.

The Dogmatism mean difference indicated in table 22, while not significant, is moreover in the opposite direction to that predicted. Both groups scored relatively low on the Dogmatism Scale. As predicted, the non-Catholics scored significantly higher on the Anomie Scale than the Catholics.
3. **Political preference:**

F. Scale and prejudice means are expected to increase from Left to Right along the political dimension. Communists and Conservatives are expected to score high on the Dogmatism Scale while Liberals and Labourites are expected to score low on dogmatism. The Dogmatism scale, unlike the F Scale, is thus expected to be relatively free of political content. The results are presented below in Table 23a.

**Table 23a:** Means for the political preference groups in the British sample (including the sample of Communists).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Preference</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Dogmatism Mean S.D.</th>
<th>F Scale Mean S.D.</th>
<th>Rigidity Mean S.D.</th>
<th>Prejudice Mean S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>148.5 22.6</td>
<td>98.5 19.6</td>
<td>83.0 16.8</td>
<td>99.7 25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal²</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>144.8 19.3</td>
<td>98.1 13.3</td>
<td>74.0 12.3</td>
<td>83.9 23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>132.1 22.7</td>
<td>79.8 15.2</td>
<td>77.7 19.4</td>
<td>64.2 17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communist</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>147.8 25.3</td>
<td>61.4 16.1</td>
<td>76.4 12.7</td>
<td>46.9 12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Difference between means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.0129</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.0016</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>.1614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 4</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>.3300</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.0136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 v 4</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.0336</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>.3974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; one-tailed probabilities.

1. Of the 114 subjects in the British sample, only 72 were used in the analysis of results. 36 of the remainder indicated no political preference. As this may indicate either, apathy, dissatisfaction with the existing political parties, or political extremism of either Right or Left, the results obtained from the 'none' group were not tabulated. Five other respondents indicated a preference for the Scottish National Party, and one respondent failed to answer the question on political preference. Due to incomplete responses by a few respondents on some of the scales, the N in these cases differs slightly from that indicated in Table 23a. Corrected these read: Conservatives, N=45 on the Dogmatism Scale; Labour, N=14 for the Dogmatism Scale; and Communists, N=35 for the F Scale.

2. Because so few in number, the Liberals were not statistically compared with the other groups.
In support of the hypotheses, the Conservatives while being significantly more authoritarian, rigid and prejudiced than the Communists, did not score statistically different from them on the Dogmatism Scale. The Conservatives were found to score significantly higher than the Labourites on all the measures except rigidity. The Communists scored significantly higher than the Labour group on the Dogmatism Scale, while the latter were significantly higher on F and prejudice. Thus, the Dogmatism Scale, and to some extent the Rigidity Scale, are shown to be relatively free of the political dimension while prejudice and F Scale means increased with an increase in right-wing orientation.

The South African sample results are presented below in table 23b.

Table 23b: Means for the political preference groups in the South African sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Preference</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Dogmatism Mean S.D.</th>
<th>F Scale Mean S.D.</th>
<th>Rigidity Mean S.D.</th>
<th>Prejudice Mean S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>164.0 22.2</td>
<td>110.6 21.4</td>
<td>95.2 16.4</td>
<td>144.2 22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>159.2 28.4</td>
<td>113.5 19.1</td>
<td>92.7 13.9</td>
<td>135.6 20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>143.6 22.8</td>
<td>88.7 19.7</td>
<td>82.2 17.3</td>
<td>89.5 28.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference between means*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p*</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p*</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p*</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 v 2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.4562</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>.2810</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>.3859</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.0485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 v 3</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.0010</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.00016</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.0019</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>.00003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 v 3</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.0162</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.00003</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.0049</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.00003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; one-tailed probabilities.

1. 19 respondents of the South African sample were excluded from the classification. Three of these indicated support for the Liberal Party, and 16 were classified as having no political preference.
From table 23b, the National and United Party groups significantly differed from each other only on the prejudice scale. Both these groups scored relatively high on all four measures. The Progressives throughout, scored significantly lower than both the National and United Party supporters.

Authoritarian aspects in the South African culture, it is predicted, will result in the South African sample scoring significantly higher on the Dogmatism Scale than the British sample. The results are presented below in table 24.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Dogmatism Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>144.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>1.3386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>149.0</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is indicated in table 24, the Dogmatism Scale mean difference between the British and South African samples failed to reach an acceptable level of significance.

A. The Communist and Conservative group comparisons:

In order to test Rokeach's contention that the Dogmatism Scale is a measure of general authoritarianism, Communist and Conservative Party supporters in the British sample were compared on all the measures used in the research.

The Dogmatism Group classifications were as follows: the low group, a dogmatism score of 139 or below; the middle group, a score of between 140 and 158; the high group, a score of 159 or above.

The dogmatism means obtained by the various groups were: low group, Communists 123.7 and Conservatives 123.6; Middle group, Communists 146.3 and Conservatives 147.7; and the high group means were, respectively, 178.5 and 170.9. None of these differences reached significance at the 5 per cent level.
The F Scale:

It is predicted that the Communists, irrespective of Dogmatism Scale classification will score low on the F Scale, while F Scale means will increase with an increase in dogmatism for the Conservative sample. The results are presented below in tables 25a and 25b.

Table 25a: F Scale means for the Communist and Conservative samples, classified according to Dogmatism Scale scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Range</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between means</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; one-tailed probabilities.

Table 25b: F Scale mean differences within the Communist and Conservative Dogmatism Scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Groups</th>
<th>Communist U</th>
<th>Conservative U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p.*</td>
<td>p.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low v Middle</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low v High</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle v High</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; two-tailed probabilities.
**One-tailed probabilities.

Thus, in accordance with prediction, the Communists tended to score relatively low on the F Scale while the Conservatives tended to score relatively high. The low range Communist group scored significantly lower than the middle and high range Communists. These results were contrary to expectations and may be accounted for by the extremely low F Scale score of the open minded rather than by authoritarianism being indicated in the middle or high range Communists groups.
It was also expected that the low dogmatism group in the conservative sample would score lower on the F Scale than the middle range group, but as is shown in table 25b, this result did not materialize in the data obtained.

The Prejudice Scale:

The expectations for the various groups on the prejudice scale are similar to those formulated for the F Scale; the Communists to be tolerant throughout, while prejudice means are expected to increase with an increase in dogmatism for the Conservatives. The results are presented below in tables 26a and 26b.

Table 26a: Prejudice scale means for the Communist and Conservative samples classified according to Dogmatism scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Range</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; one-tailed probabilities.

Table 26b: Prejudice scale mean differences within the Communist and Conservative Dogmatism Scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Groups</th>
<th>Communist U.</th>
<th>p.*</th>
<th>Conservative U.</th>
<th>p.**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low v Middle</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low v High</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle v High</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test, two-tailed probabilities.
** one-tailed probabilities.

From tables 26a and 26b, the Communists, irrespective of dogmatism classification, tended to score at the tolerant extreme of the prejudice dimension, while the Conservatives tended to obtain relatively high prejudice means. Prejudice, however, was not found to increase with an increase in dogmatism for the Conservative sample.
The Rigidity Scale:

The rigidity results are presented below in tables 27a and 27b. No differences are predicted for the between sample low, middle and high group comparisons. Rokeach asserts that dogmatism and rigidity are discernibly different and thus rigidity is not expected to increase with an increase in dogmatism for the within sample comparisons.

Table 27a: Rigidity scale means for the Communist and Conservative samples, classified according to Dogmatism Scale scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Range Groups</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Mean S.D. Difference between means*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>p.</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low v Middle</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low v High</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle v High</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test, two-tailed probabilities.

From table 27a, the closed minded Conservatives scored significantly higher than the Communist group. The differences between the low and middle range groups were not significant.

As is shown in table 27b, the three Communist groups scored similarly on rigidity. Among the Conservatives, the closed minded scored significantly higher than both the low and middle range groups. Thus, the Dogmatic Conservatives were the only group to score differently on the Rigidity Scale.
The Extraversion Scale:

The extraversion results are presented below in tables 28a and 28b. Extraversion is expected to be independent of the Right-Left continuum, and thus no differences are predicted for the between Communist and Conservative comparisons. Social conformity is predicted to be a common characteristic of both the extraverted and the dogmatic individual and thus, it is expected that extraversion will increase with an increase in dogmatism for both samples.

Table 28a: Extraversion scale means for the Communist and Conservative samples, classified according to Dogmatism Scale scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Range</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between means* p.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test, two-tailed probabilities.

Table 28b: Extraversion scale mean differences within the Communist and Conservative Dogmatism Scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Groups</th>
<th>Communist</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>p.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low v Middle</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low v High</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle v High</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test, one-tailed probabilities.

Table 28a shows that extraversion is independent of political preference; no significant differences resulted from the Communist-Conservative comparisons.

From table 28b, the closed minded Conservatives were significantly more extraverted than their middle range group. However, the open and closed Conservative groups did not statistically differ and thus,
it cannot be concluded that extraversion increases with an increase in closed mindedness. Furthermore, no differences were obtained for the within Communist group comparisons.

**The Neuroticism Scale:**

Neuroticism is expected to be independent of political ideology and thus, no differences are predicted for the Communist-Conservative comparisons. Neuroticism is expected to increase with an increase in dogmatism. For both samples, it is predicted that the greater the dogmatism, the greater the neuroticism. The results are presented below in tables 29a and 29b.

**Table 29a:** Neuroticism scale means for the Communist and Conservative samples classified according to Dogmatism Scale scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Range</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>U 68.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between means</td>
<td>p N.S.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test, two-tailed probabilities.

**Table 29b:** Neuroticism scale mean differences within the Communist and Conservative Dogmatism Scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Groups</th>
<th>Communist U</th>
<th>Conservative U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low v Middle</td>
<td>55 N.S.</td>
<td>33 .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low v High</td>
<td>29.5 .05</td>
<td>45 .025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle v High</td>
<td>23.5 .05</td>
<td>112 N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test, one-tailed probabilities.

The open groups in both samples scored low on the Neuroticism Scale. In the middle range, the Conservatives scored significantly higher than the Communists and in the high range, the groups did not significantly differ.
The closed minded Communists, as is indicated in Table 29b, were significantly more neurotic than both the low and middle range Communist groups. Among the Conservatives, the open minded scored significantly lower than both the middle and high range groups.

The Anomie Scale:

Anomie is not expected to be related to political preference and thus, no differences are predicted for the between sample comparisons. Anomie is expected to increase with an increase in dogmatism and thus, controlling for political ideology, it is predicted that, for both samples, the greater the dogmatism, the greater the anomie. The results are presented below in Tables 30a and 30b.

Table 30a: Anomie scale means for the Communist and Conservative samples, classified according to Dogmatism Scale scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Range</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between means*</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test, two-tailed probabilities.

Table 30b: Anomie scale mean differences within the Communist and Conservative Dogmatism Scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Groups</th>
<th>Communist U p*</th>
<th>Conservative U p*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low v Middle</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low v High</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle v High</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test, one-tailed probabilities.

The results in Table 30a show that anomie is independent of political ideology; no significant differences were obtained between the Communist and Conservative groups although the mean difference in the open minded comparison approached significance.
Among the Communists, the open group scored significantly lower than both the middle and high range groups. For the Conservative groups, anomie increased significantly with an increase in dogmatism.

The Political Concern (P-c) Scale:

In so far as political concern is related to racial prejudice and the latter related to political ideology, it is predicted that the various Communist groups will each score significantly higher than their Conservative dogmatism group counterparts. It is expected that the Communists, irrespective of dogmatism classification, will score relatively high on the P-c scale, while all the Conservative groups will score relatively low. The results are presented below in tables 31a and 31b.

Table 31a: Political concern scale means for the Communist and Conservative samples, classified according to Dogmatism Scale scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Groups</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between means*</td>
<td>p.</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test, one-tailed probabilities.

Table 31b: Political concern scale mean differences within the Communist and Conservative Dogmatism Scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Groups</th>
<th>Communist U</th>
<th>Conservative U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low v Middle</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low v High</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle v High</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p.*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low v Middle</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low v High</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle v High</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test, two-tailed probabilities.

As is indicated in tables 31a and 31b, P-c relates to the Right-Left dimension but is independent of dogmatism. The results refute
the suggestion that the Dogmatism Scale is a measure of political concern rather than of general authoritarianism.

5. The Dogmatism sub-scales:

In the investigation of the Dogmatism Scale as a measure of general authoritarianism, the means obtained by the Communists and Conservatives on each of the scale's items were compared. The aim was to determine whether or not political ideology affected the pattern of results; did the open minded Communists and Conservatives score equally low on all the Dogmatism Scale items, and the closed minded equally high on all the items? An attempt was made to form sub-scales of items: items on which Conservatives tended to score high; items on which Communists tended to score high; and items where both groups scored similarly.

Communist and Conservative means were compared on each item, and rough indications of the differences were obtained by chi square. The data was grouped into six categories: from strongly agree to strongly disagree with the item; and also, into two categories, classified according to merely whether or not agreement or disagreement was registered for the item. Discrepancies, however, occurred in the results obtained from the $2 \times 6$ and the $2 \times 2$ contingency tables. As the investigation was of a preliminary nature, and because the scales formed would, in any event, need to be substantiated with other Communist and Conservative samples, it was decided not to utilize more sophisticated techniques in order to determine the mean differences. Rather, only those items which appeared to indicate clear differences between the Communists and Conservatives were used, and where doubt arose, items were discarded. Similarly, only items on which the two samples obviously did not differ were used for the general dogmatism sub-scale. The Dogmatism sub-scales formed were:
Dogmatism of the political left containing 5 items; Dogmatism of the political right containing 6 items; and an 18 item sub-scale of general dogmatism. Thus, 29 items were used in the sub-scales, and 11 were discarded. The items and the means obtained by the Communist and Conservative samples are listed below in tables 32a, 32b and 32c.

**Table 32a:** Items constituting the dogmatism of the Left (DL) sub-scale, and the means obtained by the Communist and Conservative samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Scale Items:</th>
<th>Comm. mean</th>
<th>Cons. mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 32b:** Items constituting the Dogmatism of the Right (DR) sub-scale, and the means obtained by the Communist and Conservative samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Scale Items:</th>
<th>Comm. mean</th>
<th>Cons. mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group who tolerates too much difference of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The items are from Rokeach (1960, p. 73-80).
Dogmatism Scale Items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comm. mean</th>
<th>Conserv. mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people don't give a &quot;damn&quot; for others.</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32c: Items constituting the general dogmatism (DG) subscales, and the means obtained by the Communists and Conservatives.

Dogmatism Scale Items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comm. mean</th>
<th>Conserv. mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even though freedom of speech for all is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The present is all too often full of unhappiness. The future that counts.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble &quot;all or nothing at all&quot;.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty &quot;winky-washy&quot; sort of person.</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dogmatism Scale Items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Scale Items</th>
<th>Comm. mean</th>
<th>Conserv. mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The validity of the sub-scales:

The validity of the sub-scales were tested with data obtained during the pilot study of the present research. However, because the sample contained too few Communists, Conservatives were compared to 'left-wingers', which definition included Communists and members of the Anti-Apartheid Society and the Council for Peace in Vietnam. For the non-Communists an additional criterion was stipulated; these individuals were only characterized as left-wing if, for political preference, the Conservative, Liberal or Scottish National Parties were not indicated.

A low and high Dogmatism Scale group was obtained for the left-wingers and these were matched on the Dogmatism Scale with Conservative

1. See chapter 10 for the selection of the pilot study sample. It is noted that the pilot study was undertaken prior to the formation at Edinburgh University of the more militant Vietnam groups.
Party supporters. Nine pairs of respondents were obtained in each of the two groups. The highest individual score in either of the low groups was a dogmatism mean of 143 and the lowest in the high groups was a score of 152.

The Dogmatism means obtained for the left-wing groups were 126.7 for the low range and 158.9 for the high range. The former roughly corresponds to the Communist low group mean (123.7) of the present sample; however, the middle range and high range Communists scored, respectively, 148.3 and 178.5. These differences detract from the attempt to provide validation of the sub-scales.

The DL sub-scale:

It is predicted that the left-wing groups will tend to score high on the DL sub-scale, and Conservatives will tend to score low. In the comparison of left-wingers and Conservatives, whether open or closed minded, the left-wing groups are expected to score significantly higher on DL.

DL being a measure of left-wing authoritarianism, the left-wing group means are expected to increase with an increase in total dogmatism. No significant differences are predicted for the within Conservative sample comparisons.

The results are presented below in tables 33a and 33b.

Table 33a: DL sub-scale means for the left-wing and Conservative groups, (pilot study sample), matched on the Dogmatism Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Range</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Difference between means*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Conv.</td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test, one-tailed probabilities.
Table 35b: DL sub-scale mean differences within the left-wing and Conservative (pilot study sample) matched Dogmatism Scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism groups</th>
<th>Left-wing</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low v High</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>p.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U test, one-tailed probability.  **two-tailed probability.

Table 35a indicates that the low groups, contrary to expectations, did not obtain significantly different DL means; the difference, however, was in the predicted direction. In support of the hypotheses, the closed-minded left-wing groups scored significantly higher than the closed minded Conservatives.

As predicted, the left-wing groups significantly differed from each other. A significant difference, however, was also recorded for the Conservatives.

Although the postulates were not all confirmed, the findings tend to support the validity of the DL sub-scale: the closed minded Conservatives obtained a DL mean (18.9) which was only marginally higher than that obtained by the open minded left-wing group (18.4).

The DR sub-scale:

The DR sub-scale predictions, in relation to those for the DL sub-scale, reverse the expectations for the Conservatives and left-wing groups: the Conservatives are expected to score significantly higher in both the open and closed minded comparisons.

DR means are expected to increase with an increase in dogmatism group classification for the Conservatives, while the left-wing groups are not expected to significantly differ from each other.

The results are presented below in tables 34a and 34b.
Table 34a: DR sub-scale means for the left-wing and Conservative groups, (pilot study sample), matched on the Dogmatism Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Range</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Conserv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between means</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test, one-tailed probabilities.

Table 34b: DR sub-scale mean differences within the left-wing and Conservative (pilot study sample) matched Dogmatism Scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism groups</th>
<th>Left-wing</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low v High</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>p*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test, two-tailed probability.
** One-tailed probability.

Although in the predicted direction, the DR mean difference between the open minded groups did not reach significance. Among the closed minded, the Conservatives, in accordance with prediction, scored significantly higher than the left-wing group.

In support of the hypotheses, the open and closed left-wing groups did not significantly differ while for the Conservatives, the closed minded group scored significantly higher on the DR sub-scale.

Strong indications of the DR sub-scale's validity is provided by the 21.8 mean obtained by the open minded Conservatives compared to the mean of 20.9 obtained by the closed minded left-wingers.

The DG sub-scale:

The DG sub-scale, unlike the DL and DR sub-scales, is expected to be independent of political ideology. Significant differences are not predicted for the between sample comparisons.
For both the left-wingers and Conservatives, DG will increase significantly with an increase in total dogmatism.

The DG results are presented below in tables 35a and 35b.

### Table 35a: DG sub-scale means for the left-wing and Conservative groups, (pilot study sample), matched on the Dogmatism Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism Range</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between means*</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test, two-tailed probabilities.

### Table 35b: DG sub-scale mean differences within the left-wing and Conservative (pilot study sample) matched Dogmatism Scale groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism groups</th>
<th>Left-wing U</th>
<th>P*</th>
<th>Conservative U</th>
<th>P*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low v High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test, one-tailed probabilities.

The expectations for the DG sub-scale are confirmed by the results obtained in both tables 35a and 35b.

### Conclusions:

All the hypotheses formulated for the Dogmatism sub-scales were not substantiated by the data obtained. The inadequacies of the samples, both in size and in the classification of the left-wing groups, may provide an explanation. Nevertheless, a definite trend is observed for left-wingers to score high on DL and for Conservatives to score low, and vice versa for the DR sub-scale. The DG sub-scale provides evidence that at least eighteen items of the Dogmatism Scale are free of political content.
The findings from the pilot study samples are considered to provide sufficient confirmation of validity, albeit tentative, to warrant further investigation of the sub-scales.

The Dogmatism sub-scale correlations:

The sub-scales were correlated with the F, Neuroticism and Rigidity Scales for both the Communists and Conservatives in the British sample.

The F Scale as a measure of right-wing authoritarianism is expected to correlate minimally with DL and substantially with DR. Neuroticism and rigidity, being factors reported to be related to dogmatism, were correlated with the sub-scales in order to investigate any differences between the two samples; does a high dogmatism score for a Communist mean the same as a high score for a Conservative?

The results are presented below in tables 36a and 36b.

Table 36a: Dogmatism sub-scale correlation coefficients for the Communist sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Dogmatism</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = .05

Table 36b: Dogmatism sub-scale correlation coefficients for the Conservative sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Dogmatism</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.54**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = .05
** p = .01

For the Communist sample, F was found to correlate significantly with DR. The negligible correlation obtained between F and DL was negative. The Communist results thus substantiate the hypotheses.
For the Conservatives, the size of the correlation with F appears to be a function of the number of items - and hence the range - in the scale.

Neuroticism correlated significantly only with DL in the Communist sample. The Conservative correlations were minimal.

Rigidity does not appear to be related to dogmatism in the Communist sample; non-significant results were obtained throughout. Rigidity correlated highly with all the measures in the Conservative sample. As for the F Scale, the rigidity correlations appear to increase with an increase in the number of items in the scale.

6. Dogmatism means for extreme neurotic groups:

In view of the relatively low correlations obtained between dogmatism and neuroticism, dogmatism was investigated among extremely high and low Neuroticism Scale scorers in both the British and South African samples. The high neuroticism scorers are expected to score significantly higher on dogmatism than the low neurotic scorers.

In the British sample, a score of 15 or above was the criterion for the high neuroticism group, and a score of 8 or below for the low group. The results are presented below in table 37a.

Table 37a: Dogmatism means for high and low scorers on the Neuroticism Scale in the British sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism Mean</td>
<td>150.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p*</td>
<td>.0071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; One-tailed probability.
In support of the hypothesis, the results in table 37a show that the high neuroticism group is significantly more closed minded than the low scoring group.

Eysenck (1964) postulates that anxiety is a manifestation of the introverted personality type. In order to relate the present findings to Rokeach's concern with anxiety, the neuroticism groups are classified according to the extraversion-introversion dimension. A score of 13 or above on the Extraversion Scale denotes extravert, and a score of 12 or below denotes introvert. For the neurotic group the introverts are expected to be more dogmatic than the extraverts, while for the non-neurotic group, no statistical difference is expected. The results are presented below in table 37b.

Table 37b: Dogmatism means for the high and low scorers on the Neuroticism Scale in the British sample, classified according to the extraversion (E) - introversion (I) dimension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Neuroticism</th>
<th>Low Neuroticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism Mean</td>
<td>150.1</td>
<td>152.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>N.S.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; one-tailed probability.
** two-tailed probability.

Thus, contrary to expectation, the introverted neurotic group did not score significantly higher on the Dogmatism Scale than did the extraverted group.

The South African sample results are presented below in tables 37c and 37d. For this sample a score of 14 or above denotes high neuroticism and a score of 7 or below denotes low neuroticism. Extraversion is signified by a score of 13 or above and introversion by a score of 12 or below.
Table 37c: Dogmatism means for high and low scorers on the Neuroticism Scale in the South African sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism</td>
<td>151.1</td>
<td>133.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P*</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; one-tailed probability.

Table 37d: Dogmatism means for the high and low scorers on the Neuroticism Scale in the South African sample, classified according to the extraversion (E)-introversion (I) dimension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Neuroticism</th>
<th>Low Neuroticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism</td>
<td>144.5</td>
<td>155.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>N.S.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>N.S.*</td>
<td>N.S.**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mann-Whitney U Test; one-tailed probability.

The results in table 37c support the hypothesis: closed-mindedness was found to be significantly related to neuroticism. The results in table 37d, although not significant, are in the predicted direction. The neurotic introverts tended towards closed mindedness, while, among the low neurotic groups, the introverted scored lower than the extraverted. The analysis was hampered by the arbitrary nature of the extraversion-introversion classifications; there were too few respondents in the groups to allow for any greater precision.

The results presented here are discussed below in Chapter 17.
PART 4

THE DISCUSSION OF RESULTS
CHAPTER 15

THE DISCUSSION OF THE PREJUDICE
AND F SCALE RESULTS

The Adorno et al (1950) theory of personality predisposition towards racial prejudice was subjected to test in the present study with samples drawn in Britain and South Africa. Pettigrew's (1958, 1959) hypotheses, and those formulated here, attempt to accommodate the theory of authoritarianism within the contexts of tolerant and intolerant social environments. The research results are discussed in terms of the Adorno et al, the Pettigrew, and the present hypotheses.

The questions raised in the discussion appear in the text in the following sequence:

1. **Differences in authoritarianism**: The extent to which authoritarianism is revealed in the British and South African samples in terms of F Scale means and the attitudes towards discipline data.

2. **The F Scale as a predictor of prejudice**: Adorno et al’s postulates of manifest and latent prejudice are dealt with in relation to the prejudice mean differences obtained.

3. **The interdependence of authoritarianism and social conformity**: Pettigrew’s hypothesis of prejudiced non-authoritarians is contrasted, in the light of the results, with the present postulates.

4. **Interpretations of the authoritarian results**: Hypotheses on the influence of personality and social factors in racial prejudice are derived from the results.

5. **The suppressed prejudice hypotheses**: Hypotheses are put forward concerning prejudice being suppressed in tolerant areas.

6. **Extraversion, social conformity and prejudice**: The results are considered in terms of the Eysenckian extraversion-introversion dimension.

7. **Discrimination attitude and prejudice attitude**: The implications of the sub-scale results are dealt with more fully.
1. **Differences in authoritarianism**

To investigate the relationship between F and prejudice, it is necessary first to ascertain the degree of authoritarianism pertaining to each of the samples. Although a tendency towards greater authoritarianism on the part of the South African sample was observed, the mean F Scale difference between the British and South African samples only approached significance and thus a conclusion of no statistical difference on the F Scale must be drawn (table 8a). A significant difference in the respective samples' F Scale distributions was obtained (table 8b). Of the respondents in each sample, when classified as high, medium and low scorers on the F Scale, a greater number of the South Africans than the British scored on or above the theoretical scale mean of 106. A chi square analysis showed this difference to be significant at the 5 per cent level of probability.

The South African sample's tendency towards greater authoritarianism, although not strongly supported in the data, must not be overlooked, particularly in view of the discrepancies which occurred between the sampling procedures. It will be recalled that while the South African sample was randomly selected, (although it may have contained a 'liberal' bias), the British sample deliberately contained some right-wing biases. In so far as method of selection influenced the results, it would have been in the direction of inflating the British sample's F Scale mean, thereby reducing the differences when compared to the South African sample.

---

1. The sample selection is dealt with in chapter 11.
Attitudes towards Discipline:

Further indications of authoritarianism were obtained from the attitudes toward discipline data. The crudeness of the measure allows only for tentative trends to be discerned. The results indicate a trend of restrictive disciplinary measures being preferred by the South African sample, while the British sample appear to favour permissiveness.

The description of the discipline experienced by the respondents did not yield significant differences between the samples (table 7a). Among the British sample, 50 respondents viewed their parents' discipline as restrictive and 64 as permissive. The opposite trend was evident in the South African data. The respondents were also required to relate the discipline they had experienced to the discipline they intended to use with their own children (table 7b). The British sample tended towards less (N=59) as opposed to more restriction (N=44). The South Africans were almost equally divided between the two alternatives. Again the difference between the samples was not significant. Controlling for discipline experienced, those who reported restriction tended in both samples towards greater permissiveness for their own children (table 7c). Although not statistically different, the tendency towards less restriction was most prominent in the British sample. Finally, for those who reported permissiveness at home, the British sample opted almost equally for the two alternatives of more and of less restriction for their own children (table 7d). The South African sample were overwhelmingly for greater restriction. This difference between the samples reached significance.

Because of the subjective nature of the 'discipline' questions, caution is required in the interpretation of the results. If
restrictive disciplinary practices may be related to the Adorno et al definition of authoritarianism, the results point to a tendency of greater authoritarianism for the South African sample compared to the British. The significant result may suggest that authoritarianism is on the increase in South Africa. The limitations of the present samples preclude generalizations, but further research may investigate the hypothesis that the increase, in recent years, of authoritarian government in South Africa has led to changes, within the generations, of authoritarian outlook in the family situation. Those of the South African sample who described their home as permissive tended towards greater restriction in the future; this perhaps indicates conformity to greater authoritarianism in the environment.

The conclusion drawn, however, is that while a tendency towards greater authoritarianism may be detected in the South African sample, the results obtained replicate Pettigrew's earlier findings of F Scale means being comparable in samples tested from tolerant and intolerant regions.

Differences in Prejudice:

The difference in authoritarianism between the samples may only provide a partial explanation of the prejudice scale results. The F Scale data, clearly, are insufficient to account for the large prejudice difference that occurred. While the F Scale mean difference only approached significance, the mean difference on the prejudice scale was highly significant (table 9). The South African sample scored far in excess of the means obtained by the British sample on the total prejudice scale and on the discrimination sub-scale. Although indicating a tendency towards greater South
African intolerance, the prejudice attitude sub-scale comparison (table 10) did not yield a statistically reliable difference between the samples.

The British and S.A. (in Br.) samples were found to be statistically similar on P, prejudice and both sub-scales. The South Africans scored significantly higher on P, prejudice and the discrimination attitude sub-scale than the S.A. (in Br.) sample; but on prejudice attitude no significant difference appeared.

The total sample results were largely in accordance with the predictions of the research hypotheses, based on Pettigrew's earlier findings. These results indicated that authoritarianism on its own does not provide an explanation for the greater racial hostility expressed by the South African sample. Furthermore, the differences in racial attitudes appear to be centred on discriminatory practices which are more readily acceptable to the South African than to the British or S.A. (in Br.) samples. The frequency with which racial stereotypy is endorsed suggests that these attitudes are of roughly equal potency for all three samples.

2. The F Scale as a predictor of prejudice:

Adorno and his co-workers would have predicted that the higher prejudice mean obtained by the South African sample would be accompanied by an equally high F Scale mean. The failure of this prediction to be fulfilled in the research, however, does not necessarily invalidate the use of the scale in intolerant regions. It is necessary to re-examine the original claims made for the F Scale, prior to an assessment of its limitations.

An aim for the F Scale during its construction was to provide a measure of prejudice without mention of a minority group. This clearly has not been achieved in the results. Were the F Scale
the only measure of intolerance used in the study a conclusion of no difference between the British and South African samples would have been erroneously drawn. For the samples tested, the F Scale did not function as a substitute measure of racial prejudice.

The additional function ascribed to the F Scale - to obtain an estimate of anti-democratic tendencies at the personality level - has been repeatedly established in the literature, and obtained further vindication in the present study. Strong evidence was provided by the highly significant correlations obtained between F and prejudice in the three samples; .46 for the British; .67 for the South African; and .68 for the S.A. (in Br.) sample. The relatively lower association found between the two variables in the British sample may be accounted for by a restricted range of prejudice scores.

These results cannot be attributed to the operation of response set, as the prejudice scale contained both positive and negatively worded statements. Thus, irrespective of whether testing occurred within the British or South African contexts, authoritarians tended towards prejudice and non-authoritarians tended towards tolerance. In this general sense, the F Scale was a predictor of prejudice. The correlations imply that a respondent scoring at one extreme of the F Scale could, with a fair amount of accuracy, be assigned to a concomitant position on the prejudice scale. The F Scale is thus able to predict the direction in which race attitudes are likely to be followed, but its predictive power lacks precision. From the F Scale results obtained, similar prejudice means were forecast for the British and South African samples, and the data thus indicates

1. To be discussed when the hypothesis of prejudice being suppressed in response to perceived norms of racial tolerance is dealt with.
the scale's inability to provide an accurate estimate of the level of prejudice likely to occur under different social conditions.

Manifest and Latent prejudice:

It appears that essential to an evaluation of the instrument is a distinction between the F Scale as a general and as a precise predictor of prejudice. This distinction does not appear to have been fully appreciated in the literature (Fettigrew 1958, 1959). Some confusion between the functions performed by the F Scale still persists, and stems directly from the contradictory aims in the scale's design. The F Scale was intended simultaneously to measure both manifest and latent prejudice. The failure of the scale to provide a substitute measure of race prejudice is not seen as detracting from the utility of the scale; on the contrary, it gives recognition of the F Scale as a measure of personality predisposition towards prejudice, which may either be manifested or remain latent. To function as a prejudice scale, it would only measure the manifest. Thus, to the extent in which the F Scale measures manifest as well as latent prejudice, it cannot be expected to provide a precise estimate of overt race prejudice.

The environmental conditions prevailing in Britain and South Africa, suggest the probability of prejudice, to some extent, remaining latent under the relatively tolerant British conditions, while in South Africa, where racism receives normative sanction, minimal societal restraint would be placed on the individual expression of prejudice.

The sub-scale results point to the plausibility of this argument. Stereotyped beliefs of non-white inferiority appear to be commonly held by the respondents in the samples tested; this points to the
prevalence of such attitudes in both the United Kingdom and South Africa. These attitudes appear to be fully manifested in both societies, and the prejudice attitude sub-scale means obtained by the samples can be accounted for by the F Scale results.

On the other hand, authoritarianism failed to account for the degree to which discriminatory practices are favourably viewed by the South African as compared to the British and S.A. (in Br.) samples. These results reflect differences between the two countries in official attitudes toward the sanction of racial discrimination. A postulate of discriminatory attitudes remaining latent in response to societal values in Britain suggests an explanation of these results, and further, allows for a reconciliation of the illogicalities involved in assuming a position of opposition to racial discrimination while simultaneously holding prejudiced attitudes.

Thus, the prejudice scale mean difference obtained may be explained in terms of the South African potential towards prejudice being fully manifested, while a portion of the British sample's potential remain latent. The means per item obtained for the F and prejudice scales, are respectively, 3.4 and 3.0 for the British sample and 3.6 and 3.7 for the South African sample. Although means from different scales are not directly comparable, and the results obtained may merely reflect built-in instrument bias, they do, nevertheless, accord with the rationale of latent prejudice developed by Adorno and his associates. This question is returned to later in the discussion when the hypothesis of the suppression of prejudice is dealt with.

It is suggested that the F Scale be regarded as a measure of both manifest and latent prejudice. The degree to which prejudice remains
latent appears to depend on the degree of normative restraint prevailing in the society. Thus, if the degree to which prejudice is manifested varies according to the social situation, differences in prejudice but not in authoritarianism, may be expected from cross-cultural comparisons where national norms of racial hostility vary.

3. The interdependence of authoritarianism and social conformity:

Although the concept of latent prejudice corresponds to the reality of the situations existing in Britain and South Africa, in the absence of techniques other than the F Scale to detect latent prejudice, Pettigrew's conclusion of heightened prejudice for the South African sample must be accepted. Agreement is also reached with Pettigrew's view of authoritarianism being equally important as a determinant of race prejudice in areas of both racial tolerance and intolerance. The present interpretation deviates from Pettigrew's postulates in that the results here are attributed to both personality and social factors, and no attempt is made to distinguish between the two factors: authoritarianism and social conformity are thought of as being interdependent. This avoids contradictions apparent in Pettigrew's postulates.

Personality cannot be equally important in all regions, if in some of these, socio-cultural factors supersede personality as the crucial determinant of prejudice. In both Pettigrew's and the present study, conflicting results were obtained in that, on the one hand, authoritarianism was unable to account for the differences in racism expressed by the samples; and on the other, the correlational data indicated that prejudice and F were related in roughly comparable magnitudes in all the samples, thus pointing to the importance of personality in both regions.
The relationship between authoritarianism, stereotypy and discrimination:

The sub-scale results further complicate interpretation. If stereotypy, but not discrimination can be accounted for by authoritarianism, the prejudice attitude sub-scale can be expected to correlate higher with F than will the discrimination attitude sub-scale. This deduction, however, was not borne out by the results obtained. The F Scale was found to correlate .67 with prejudice attitude and .66 with discrimination attitude for the South African sample, and respectively, .44 and .41 for the British sample (table 16). Clearly, both sub-scales were closely related to authoritarianism in the South African and British samples.

Furthermore, the distinction between stereotyped attitudes and discrimination must not be over-drawn as is indicated by the extent in which the sub-scales were found to relate to each other. A correlation of .85 between the sub-scales was obtained in the South African data, and .67 in the British. These results confirm the belief that prejudice and discrimination are usually mutually reinforcing (Simpson and Yinger 1958, Henderson 1960).

Prejudice attitude, in view of the obtained statistically similar sample means, may be accounted for by authoritarianism. However, in Pettigrew's terms, the heightened discrimination attitude mean of the South African sample is explained by social conformity. In contradiction the close association reported between the two variables of racism, and the similar correlations found for both with the F Scale, suggest that a distinction between authoritarianism and conformity as the respective causal factors of each type of racial bigotry has but tenuous foundations in the data.
Pettigrew's explanation of heightened prejudice in South Africa:

The anomalies in the sub-scale results, Pettigrew explains merely by recourse to differences in social conditions. The argument followed is that the South African score is an expression of conformity to officially sanctioned discrimination, and that conformity occurs irrespective of authoritarian predisposition. This explanation, however, is inadequate on a number of grounds: it does not contribute much to the knowledge in the field; a social survey is not required to demonstrate that discrimination is widely favoured by white South Africans; no recognition is provided for the distinction between manifest and latent prejudice - the F Scale's failure to replicate a measure of racial prejudice was taken by Pettigrew to indicate its secondary importance in areas of racial intolerance; conformity to norms of racial tolerance was not considered; the relationship between conformity and personality was not investigated although they appear to be associated; the relationship between discrimination and personality, again was not dealt with; for example, no consideration was given to the behaviour of those individuals who, in spite of intolerant norms, do not condone racism; finally, Pettigrew made no attempt to substantiate his hypothesis of prejudiced non-authoritarians in intolerant areas, the existence of which was merely assumed from the data. In short, Pettigrew failed to take full account of the results he obtained. Thus, although the present results replicate those obtained by Pettigrew, they are interpreted differently.

Non-authoritarian conformity to intolerant race-norms:

Pettigrew attributed the heightened prejudice in the South African sample to prejudice being expressed by non-authoritarians. In
contradiction, the present postulate was that non-authoritarians would tend to be tolerant irrespective of sociocultural influences. It was suggested that low F Scale scorers would conform only to societal pressures which were in accordance with their personality structure.

No evidence was obtained in the data to support Pettigrew's hypothesis, while substantiation was provided for the formulations of the present study. Low F Scale scorers in the British, South African and S.A. (in Br.) samples were all found to score statistically similar on the prejudice scale (table 11a). The prejudice mean difference obtained between the total samples could thus not be attributed to greater prejudice among non-authoritarians in the South African sample. The results obtained confirm the Adorno et al findings that individuals low on the F Scale tend to score low on prejudice, and indicate the applicability of this generalization for the samples tested; that is, irrespective of whether the race norms are geared towards intolerance as in South Africa, or whether the racial climate is comparatively less hostile as in the United Kingdom.

The prejudice sub-scale results provide additional substantiation of the present hypotheses (table 11b). In spite of the differences in status accorded to discrimination in the two countries, (as indeed was shown in the over-all sample means on the sub-scale), non-authoritarians in the three samples equalled each other in their rejection of discriminatory practices. Thus, the low F Scale scorers, in at least their responses to an attitude measure, do not conform to the consensus of white South African opinion which favours racial discrimination.

It was predicted that the low F Scale scorers would obtain statistically similar means on the prejudice attitude sub-scale.
However, the South Africans scored lower than the British group; the difference approached significance. A post hoc explanation is that the problem of race relations is more acute in South Africa than it is in Britain. South Africans opposed to racial segregation have needed, because of the existing system, to articulate their attitudes. Thus, they may be more aware of derogatory connotations in racial stereotypy than had they been in the British environment where race is a less vital issue. Whatever the explanation, the mean difference obtained is in the opposite direction to that which would have been predicted by Pettigrew.

A further comparison was between low F Scale scorers from the British sample, matched on F, with respondents from the Communist sample (table 11c). The Communists obtained a significantly lower prejudice mean than did the British group. The explanation for these results is in terms of the non-authoritarian personality predisposition of the Communists gaining reinforcement from the anti-racialist doctrine of the Communist Party. Further research may reveal that individuals who are attracted to Marxist ideology are extremely tolerant, and thus the explanation of the results obtained would be in these terms. However, in the absence of such verification, the interpretation made is that of non-authoritarian responsiveness only to norms which concur with their personality predisposition. Thus, it is suggested, Communist group pressures induce extreme tolerance, while in the South African sample it was indicated that non-authoritarians remain immune to the intolerance of the society.

Authoritarian conformity to intolerant race norms:

Pettigrew's attempt to account for the heightened prejudice in South Africa in terms of prejudiced non-authoritarians is not supported
by the data. The present hypotheses suggest that the difference in prejudice between the British and South African samples are explainable by South African authoritarians being more prejudiced than their British F Scale counterparts; confirmation is obtained from the results of both the middle and high range F Scale groups.

For the middle range, the South Africans scored significantly higher than the British on the prejudice scale and on both the subscales. These results reflect the general tendency on the part of the British moderate authoritarian group towards the tolerant extreme of the racial prejudice continuum (tables 12a and 12b).

For the high F Scale range comparison the groups did not differ significantly on the prejudice attitude sub-scale, although on the other two measures the South Africans scored very significantly higher (tables 13a and 13b).

The results for the S.A. (in Br.) sample show that their middle range group scored significantly higher than the equivalent British group on all three measures, while they differed significantly from the South Africans only on discrimination (tables 12a and 12b).

For the high groups, the S.A. (in Br.) - British comparison did not yield any significant differences. In contrast the South Africans scored statistically higher than the S.A. (in Br.) authoritarians on total prejudice and discrimination (tables 13a and 13b).

The predictions made for the S.A. (in Br.) sample failed fully to materialize; the middle range tending to score higher than anticipated, and the authoritarian group lower. The hypotheses for the S.A. (in Br.) sample are not considered crucial for the study and their non-substantiation is not seen as detracting from the central postulates for the main samples. In the absence of previous research the
predictions for this sample were of necessity problematic. The virtue of the sample lies in its association with both societies and, although to be viewed with caution, it allows for further interpretations to be made of the findings.

4. Interpretations of the authoritarian results:

The interpretation offered of the British and South African sample results is that personality potential towards bigotry received substantially more reinforcement, and was thus more fully realised, in the South African sample (middle and high range) than in the British. Pettigrew's explanation was in terms of a greater number of prejudiced South Africans, while the exposition here emphasizes the greater intensity of prejudice in South Africa. A representative white South African sample would be required to substantiate that there are more prejudiced people there than elsewhere. What the present study demonstrates is that, of those likely to be prejudiced in Britain and South Africa (controlling for F) individuals from the latter society tend to be more prejudiced.

A feature of the results is that the extremity of prejudice expressed appears to be related to both social and personality factors, which discounts Pettigrew's emphasis on the former.

Cultural influences:

The importance of the social context is revealed in a comparison of the prejudice mean obtained by the British sample's high F Scale group (109.1) with that obtained by the South African middle range group (111.2). Further, the former group scored 34.7 on the discrimination sub-scale, while the latter scored 39.0. Thus, in spite of differences in F Scale classification, the South African group scored higher than the British group; that is, the difference in
prejudice was in the opposite direction to that which would have been predicted from the F Scale scores. Sociocultural influences are thus clearly indicated in these results, a conclusion which gains substantiation from the prejudice attitude data. These are in accordance with authoritarian expectations. The high F British group scored 38.7, while the middle F South African group scored 35.3.

**Personality influences:**

While the comparison of British authoritarian with South African middle range groups points to the crucial role of the environment in the formation of racist attitudes, the importance of personality becomes apparent when, controlling for societal background, different F Scale groups within each sample are compared. For example, when the middle range and high F Scale groups in the South African sample are contrasted, the extremity of the latter clearly indicates the vital role played by personality.

**The South African political preference groups:**

Pettigrew (1958) provided examples of various pairs of groups, one of which was thought to exemplify adherence to the norms. Of these, only the political group comparison was able to be replicated here. The data obtained confirm Pettigrew's findings; supporters of the Nationalist Party, although not more authoritarian, tended towards greater prejudice, compared to the supporters of the United Party (table 14). However, the prejudice mean obtained by the latter (135.6) can hardly be termed non-conformist. Indeed, they scored significantly higher on both prejudice and F than the supporters of the Progressive Party. Further, while the two right-wing groups tended to differ on discrimination, the difference on prejudice attitude is clearly not significant. Rather than, as in Pettigrew's
solution, suggest that both groups conform to stereotypy, but that only the Nationalists conform to the South African norm of discrimination, it is more plausible to suggest that discrimination is more clearly incorporated in the National Party ideology, and thus its adherents receive greater reinforcement for holding discriminatory beliefs than do supporters of the United Party.

Another aspect of this data is that within the South African sample similar differences are revealed to those obtained from the between sample comparisons. The sub-scale differences between the National and United Party groups are similar to those obtained between the South African and British samples; verification is thus provided for Pettigrew's (1961) conclusion of similar patterns of prejudice existing in various Western countries.

Race norms:

The results obtained suggest that the cultural norms which operate on the members of a society influence the expression of prejudice, and that these pressures appear to be influential only within the framework of the individual personality structure. No attempt was made to investigate the manner in which personality itself is moulded by the culture, not because this aspect was regarded as irrelevant, but, on the contrary, because it was beyond the scope of the present investigation.

It is difficult to ascertain the direction in which social norms operate; whether they act to reinforce or to inhibit the expression of racist attitudes. The study was not intended to provide statistical data on the precise nature of race norms, nor on the extent and direction of the pressures exerted on the individual. The study of race norms per se is obviously a herculean task, well beyond the
modest pretentions of this project. It must be emphasized that, in the discussion, cultural influences are diagnosed in the light of the data obtained. Particular caution is thus required in the interpretations offered of those hypotheses not substantiated by the results. Nevertheless, in spite of these limitations, an attempt is made to relate the findings to the racial problems which plague present day society.

Whereas F Scale scores alone do not provide sufficient information to predict accurately the degree of prejudice likely to occur together with knowledge of the cultural environment, a greater precision is achieved in prediction.

**Responsiveness to normative pressures:**

From the results, it can be postulated that an individual scoring low on the F Scale will also score low on prejudice, whether stereotyped belief or discrimination, and that, irrespective of whether he is exposed to an environment of extreme racial intolerance, as exists in South Africa, or whether he is from the relatively more tolerant British milieu. This appears to indicate that non-authoritarians do not conform to the demands of an authoritarian society. On the other hand, the Communist sample results indicate that where the group norms reject racial prejudice non-authoritarians will be responsive to group opinion.

The results from the authoritarian groups appear to indicate societial influence in directions of both tolerance and intolerance. That authoritarians are responsive to norms of racial equality accords with the theoretical definition of the authoritarian personality. Adorno and his associates considered that conventionalism was one of the hallmarks of the authoritarian, and thus it could be expected that
a high scoring individual would conform to conventional values, even if these were in contradiction to his personality predisposition. Middle range and high F scale scorers in the South African sample appeared to respond to norms of racial intolerance while similarly disposed individuals in the British sample seemed to be influenced in the opposite direction.

The moderate authoritarians:

The mean prejudice difference between the British sample's middle and low F Scale groups is relatively small (11.7) compared to the difference similarly obtained in the South African sample (38.2). This may indicate that forces operating on individuals within the British middle group act to inhibit the expression of prejudice; while, on the other hand, reinforcement provided by the South African culture may have moved this sample's middle range F Scale group in the opposite direction, causing their prejudice mean to be inflated. The South African middle range group, it will be recalled, scored marginally higher on the prejudice scale than did the British authoritariam group.

For the British sample, social norms acted to reduce overt prejudice. However, for the Southern African within the British culture, the norms did not appear to have a substantial inhibitory effect. The middle range F group in the S.A. (in Br.) sample did not statistically differ from the South African group on the total prejudice scale, and thus appears to have been functioning at a level of prejudice in Britain, close to that which may be expected from them in their home environment. An explanation may be offered in that the S.A. (in Br.) middle F group approximated the British high F group on the prejudice scale; respectively, 105.3 compared to 109.1.
Thus, a level of prejudice corresponding to their own racial attitudes already existed in Britain, and the S.A. (in Br.) middle group could therefore identify with the attitudes held by the British authoritarian student without feeling pressure to alter their own outlook.

Evidence for the moderate authoritarian individual in the S.A. (in Br.) sample being responsive to British norms is obtained from the discrimination results. On the discrimination attitude sub-scale, the South Africans scored significantly higher than the expatriate group, who in turn, scored significantly higher than the middle F group in the British sample. These results may be indicative of the S.A. (in Br.) group responding, at least to some extent, to the more tolerant British view concerning discrimination, but, overall, maintaining their attitudes of white supremacy.

The prejudice scores of the moderately authoritarian individuals in the samples extend over a large range: from fairly tolerant for the British group to intolerant for the South African group. If it can be assumed that over a whole population F Scale scores are normally distributed (in which case the bulk of the people would be middle range scorers) these results have significant implications for race relations. The data indicate that the middle range scorer is susceptible to normative influences. The official sanctioning of racialist programmes, it is suggested, would have the effect of altering the attitudes of the mildly authoritarian individual toward the intolerant end of the prejudice dimension.

The extreme authoritarian:

The high authoritarian scorer in the South African sample appears to give vent to prejudice far in excess of his British counterpart,
which indicates that reinforcement was received from the system of Apartheid. Differences in race norms between the samples appear to centre on discrimination, the sub-scale having sharply distinguished between the samples. None of the authoritarian groups statistically differ on prejudice attitude, and thus the British authoritarian is shown to maintain a stereotyped version of non-whites similar in extremity to that held by his South African F Scale equivalent. This result is particularly noteworthy in view of the large differences obtained on the discrimination measure.

The explanation offered for the S.A. (in Br.) high F Scale group results is that the Southern African authoritarian in Britain encounters opposition to his extreme racism, and in response adjusts his overt prejudice to the existing permissible extreme in the adopted culture. Hence no differences were obtained between the high groups in the S.A. (in Br.) and British samples. Suggestive evidence is provided by the difference in prejudice means obtained by this sample's high and middle F Scale groups - 14.5 compared to 26.6 for the South African sample comparison. Thus the relative closeness of the prejudice means obtained by these S.A. (in Br.) groups may indicate that the authoritarians were responsive to environmental pressures in Britain, resulting in overt prejudice being inhibited. However, the small sample size of the S.A. (in Br.) high F Scale group (N=12) must detract from the confidence placed in these hypotheses.

5. The suppressed prejudice hypotheses:

The hypotheses formulated for the present research were guided by the Pettigrew studies which aimed at providing an explanation of the heightened prejudice existing in South Africa and the American South. Accordingly, the suggestions here are in terms of social reinforcement in South Africa, while the possibility of prejudice
being suppressed in the British sample is relatively neglected in the postulates. Conformity to intolerant norms leading to prejudice being exaggerated beyond the level indicated by personality predisposition, is intended to provide the explanation, rather than the opposite which is conformity to tolerant norms. Further justification for concentrating attention on the heightened prejudice expressed in intolerant regions, is the probable built-in instrument bias of the F Scale: the original authoritarian research was undertaken in the relatively tolerant social climate of California and the F Scale was constructed on its ability to discriminate between prejudiced and tolerant subjects. While the hypotheses explaining the heightened prejudice of the South African sample are generally supported by the data, indications were also obtained to suggest that prejudice is suppressed in the British sample.

The correlation between F and prejudice was lower for the British than for the other two samples. While the restricted range of prejudice scores provides an explanation, the relative paucity of high prejudice scorers in the British sample may be indicative of suppressed prejudice; 16.7 per cent of the British sample scored above the theoretical mean of the prejudice scale, compared to 45.6 per cent of the South African sample. Further, while no British respondent achieved a prejudice score of 5.0 per item, 17.5 per cent of the South Africans scored 5.0 or beyond. These results, however, may be partially accounted for by the tendency towards greater authoritarianism on the part of the South African sample. Particularly relevant here is the significant difference revealed in the F Scale distributions; a greater number of South Africans were classified as high F Scale scorers.
A further indication of suppression is that, compared to their discrimination attitude scores, the British and S.A. (in Br.) samples obtain relatively higher means on the prejudice attitude sub-scale; the opposite trend was evident in the South African data. This pattern was consistent for all the F Scale sub-group comparisons. The implication suggested by these results is that the endorsement of discriminatory practices is not supported by British society, and was thus not favourably viewed by the respondents tested in the United Kingdom. Detracting from these deductions were the sub-scale correlations with the F Scale. Prejudice attitude did not appear to be more closely related to authoritarianism than was discrimination attitude in the British sample.

Strong suggestions of the occurrence of suppression was obtained from the British sample middle range F Scale group who, unlike the South African group, tended towards the tolerant extreme of the prejudice continuum. The S.A. (in Br.) authoritarian group also appeared to obtain deflated prejudice means. The sample of student nuns scored relatively high on the F Scale (105.5 compared to the South African sample mean of 97.1), yet they scored relatively low on the prejudice scale (79.2 compared to the British sample mean of 90.1). The suggestion is that the nuns were responding to norms of multi-racial Christian fellowship.

These results emphasize the complex nature of the relationship between prejudice and authoritarianism, and stress the need for further research into the relationship between normative and situational determinants of racism and personality structure. The concept of latent prejudice requires greater validation and precision of measurement than that provided by the F Scale.
Suppressed prejudice in the low prejudice group comparisons:

The comparison of low F Scale scorers yielded no differences on the prejudice scale, indicating a similar relationship between prejudice and authoritarianism at the low extreme of the tolerance dimension for samples drawn in different societies. However, when low prejudice groups were compared, the British sample scored significantly higher on the F Scale than did the South African and S.A. (in Br.) groups (table 15a). Whatever else these results indicate, they leave no doubt as to the complexity of the association and demonstrate, as was pointed out by Adorno and his associates (p.224), that a one to one relationship between prejudice and authoritarianism does not exist.

The mechanics of the results are revealed in the comparative sizes of the low F and prejudice groups. These, respectively, were in the British sample 29 and 56, in the South African sample, 28 and 32, and 21 for both the low F and prejudice scale groups in the S.A. (in Br.) sample. Thus, in the British sample, the number of respondents who met the criterion of low prejudice scorer was almost double the number who achieved this classification on the F Scale. This discrepancy was not apparent in the other two samples. Accordingly, the British group scored significantly higher on the F Scale than did the other two groups. An explanation is thus also provided for the relatively low prejudice mean obtained by the British middle range F group.

The low prejudice scale groups, when divided into extreme and moderately low scorers reveal that it is the former which contribute to the sample mean difference (tables 15b and 15c). The extremely tolerant British group obtained a F Scale mean (80.1), not very different in magnitude from that obtained by the moderately low groups in the British (86.2) and the South African (79.1) samples.
The British extreme and moderately low prejudice scorers were matched on the P Scale (table 15d). Fourteen pairs of respondents were compared on dogmatism, extraversion, and neuroticism; none of which yielded a statistically significant difference. Rokeach (1960) postulated that conformity was a characteristic of the closed-minded individual. If the extremely low prejudice group results are due to conformity to perceived norms of racial tolerance, a higher dogmatism mean will be expected from this group compared to the moderately low group. The former scored 145.1 on the Dogmatism Scale, and the latter 140.8. Although in the predicted direction, the mean difference did not reach significance. Eysenck (1964) suggested that extraverts would tend to conform; however, the extraversion-introversion dimension did not discriminate between the groups. Dowling (1955) hypothesized that extremely tolerant individuals would tend to be neurotic. Although not significant, a trend was observed in this direction; the extremely low group scored 14.5 on the neuroticism scale compared to a score of 11.3 for the moderately low prejudice group.

The extremely tolerant South African group appeared to express prejudice in accordance with personality predisposition while the British group may have suppressed the expression of overt prejudice. However, from the comparison of the low and moderate British groups, no substantiation was able to be obtained for the postulate that prejudice was suppressed in response to perceived norms of racial tolerance in the United Kingdom.

Far greater verification than has been obtained in this study is required before the suppression of prejudice hypothesis can be accepted. The data have indicated the possible fruitfulness of further research.
in this area. An initial inquiry may attempt to ascertain the mechanism by which prejudice is not fully articulated; it is uncertain whether this occurs as a result of repression, or of suppression.¹

6. Extraversion, social conformity and prejudice:

Eysenck's (1964) suggestion that extraverts are more susceptible to pressures of social conformity than are introverts was to be tested in terms of Pettigrew's postulate concerning prejudiced non-authoritarians in South Africa; low F Scale scorers who were prejudiced would tend towards extraversion while those who were tolerant would tend towards introversion. The data obtained, however, does not support the intolerant non-authoritarian hypothesis. As the phenomenon is not demonstrated by the data, the extraversion explanation of it becomes redundant within the present context.

Further attempts to link social conformity with extraversion proved unsuccessful. A group in the British sample who scored lower on prejudice than would have been predicted from their F Scale mean - interpreted as conformity to tolerant norms - were not distinguished by the Extraversion Scale (table 15d).

Social conformity being common to both the theories of Dogmatism and Extraversion, it was suggested that the two measures would positively correlate; however, no evidence of a relationship was obtained (table 17a). Further, extraversion did not increase with an increase in dogmatism for either the Communist or Conservative samples (table 28b).

¹ English and English (1958) in their dictionary of psychological terms offer the following definitions (abbreviated here):
Repression: "The exclusion of specific psychological activities or contents from conscious awareness by a process of which the individual is not directly aware." (p. 458)
Suppression: "A form of self-control by which impulses or tendencies to action are kept from overt expression. A conscious exclusion of disapproved desires." (p. 536)
In the British sample, slight but significantly positive correlations were obtained between extraversion and both prejudice (.22) and the F Scale (.23). These results confirm the pilot study data; extraversion correlated .23 with prejudice and .21 with F, both being significant.

Extraversion correlated .25 with prejudice attitude and .12 with discrimination attitude in the British sample. These results may be accounted for by non-discriminatory norms in Britain to which extraverts conform. Thus, these extraverts did not endorse discrimination although they held attitudes of racial stereotypy. This interpretation is, however, speculative and further testing is required.

In the South African sample the extraversion correlations were negligible; minimal correlations were obtained for the total prejudice scale and for both the sub-scales. Extraversion was thus not found to relate to prejudice in the South African sample. A possible explanation is that in South Africa prejudiced individuals are both extraverted (conformity) and introverted (conditionability) while tolerant individuals tend to be introverted. However, on closer examination of the data, no evidence was obtained to suggest a relationship between prejudice and extraversion (table 17b); tolerant individuals did not tend towards introversion.

The difference between the correlations in the British and South African samples suggests that the relationship between prejudice and extraversion is influenced by the social environment. The present study points to the possible relevance of extraversion as a variable in the study of racial prejudice. Further research is required to isolate the nature of this relationship; the evidence uncovered indicates the crucial role of the environment.
7. Discrimination attitude and prejudice attitude

Finally, the implications of the prejudice sub-scale results are discussed. Implicit in Pettigrew's theorizing was a distinction between the 'racist' American South and South Africa and the 'liberal' American North. On this basis, the United Kingdom would be classified in the latter category. This distinction between societies appears to be required by Pettigrew's hypotheses; a racist society produces conformity to its race norms, while for less racially orientated societies the norms are either tolerant or neutral and therefore individuals express racial attitudes in accordance with their personality predisposition. For the present study it was postulated that common to both the British and South African cultures was an under-current of white superiority - black inferiority. Thus, while Pettigrew suggested that a qualitative difference existed between the racial climates of Britain and South Africa, the postulate here was that the difference was only one of degree.

The sub-scale results obtained appear to support the present orientation. It would seem that the race norms existing in Britain and South Africa are best regarded as differing in degree rather than as representing opposite extremes of the tolerant-intolerant dimension. Pettigrew's framework does not provide an explanation for the statistically similar prejudice attitude means obtained by the British and South African samples. Stereotyped attitudes of black inferiority are found to pertain to both the samples tested.

Thus, the groups appear to differ, not in their experience of prejudiced sentiment, but in the actual implementation of these ideas in the form of discriminatory practices. The British sample, unlike the South African, scored higher on prejudice attitude than on the discrimination sub-scale.
suggested that the prevailing race norms in Britain and South Africa, although differently placed in extremity, are considered in terms of a single dimension of intolerance, rather than in terms of a dichotomy between a racist and non-racist society.

The political concern scale's relationship with the prejudice sub-scales is dealt with in the next chapter.
The prejudice attitude and discrimination attitude sub-scales were found to correlate closely in both samples (table 116). The higher correlation found for the South African sample may be explained by both a greater range of scores and by the greater interdependency of the two forms of racism in the South African environment. That the British sample's stereotypy was not translated into the endorsement of discriminatory practices appears to hinge on the lack of official sanction accorded to discrimination in this country. However, the transition from belief in non-European inferiority, to belief in discrimination, may be easily transversed. From the results obtained it may be predicted that, were racial discrimination to be officially condoned, these changes would rapidly be reflected in race attitudes generally, and would lead to further deterioration in existing race relations. Indications of this may be discerned in the Gallup Poll which reported that 74 per cent of the British Nation supported Enoch Powell's views on the restriction of coloured immigration into Britain.

The postulate that British society contains elements of culturally sanctioned racist beliefs, allows for an explanation of the prejudice sub-scale results obtained. The racist outlook of the two samples tested were found to be similar; the discrimination responses differed because it is the situation not the basic rationale in the two countries that is different. In these terms an explanation may be offered for the Gallup Poll findings: the racism already existed and, given the respectability of Powell's status as a Member of Parliament, it was able to be easily translated into discriminatory sentiment in response to a perceived threat to white superiority.

In the British data, the Dogmatism Scale appears to be more closely related to prejudice attitude than to discrimination - the correlations obtained were .33 and .21, respectively (table 16). Correlations of equal magnitude were obtained in the South African data. Rokeach (1960) suggested that conformity characterized the closed minded individual. The relatively lower dogmatism-discrimination correlation found for the British sample may indicate that discrimination was both endorsed and rejected by closed minded individuals: endorsed because of authoritarianism or rejected because of conformity to the official disfavour accorded to discrimination in Britain.

As for the dogmatism correlations, a similar interpretation may be derived from the extraversion results. Extraversion was found to be significantly related only to prejudice attitude in the British data. Thus, while extraversion is related to prejudice generally, this relationship may have been blurred in the discrimination sub-scale correlation by extraverts both endorsing and rejecting discrimination. The occurrence of the latter accords with Eysenck's (1954) postulate that extraverts would be unduly responsive to conformity pressures.

The interpretations offered for both the dogmatism and extraversion correlations require further investigation. Nevertheless, the results obtained throughout the research appear to suggest the accumulative probability that racialism was widely prevalent in the British sample, but was subjected to restraint by official commitment to multi-racialism. This influence was in the other direction for the South African sample, and accounts for the differences obtained between the sample means. There is no reason to believe that the British sample tested here were a-typically prejudiced, indeed, the subsequent advent of 'Powellism' indicates the opposite. It is
The five items which constitute the political concern (P-c) scale were formulated for the present research. As these items were not pre-tested and because of the few items in the scale, the reliability and validity of the measure is open to question. Indications of validity obtained from the results are discussed followed by the relationship between the scale and the open-closed dimension. Finally, an attempt is made to interpret the close association found between political concern and racial prejudice.

The validity of the P-c scale:

The theoretical mean of the scale is 20.0 which was exceeded by all the samples. The means obtained ranged from 24.5 for the South African sample to 32.5 for the Communists (table 19). A relatively high degree of political concern may have been expected from student populations; however, the results obtained may indicate that the items require rewording so that a greater number of individuals will respond negatively. That the Communist sample scored extremely high - the maximum mean possible is 33.0 - is perhaps indicative of the scale's validity. The Communist sample was the only group tested who were selected specifically because of their commitment to a political ideology.

In the British and South African samples, anomie was found to correlate significantly with P-c; -.40 and -.30, respectively (table 19). Feelings of anomie are expected to be associated with a lack of political concern and thus, these results contribute evidence for the P-c scale's validity. However detracting from this con-
clusion are the minimal correlations obtained between the two measures in the remaining samples.

Another indication of the scale's validity is its relationship with the prejudice sub-scales. In both the British and South African samples, the political concern scale correlated higher with discrimination attitude than with prejudice attitude (table 16). Racial prejudice overtly enters the political sphere when officially implemented in the form of discriminatory practices. Further, the differences in the sub-scale correlations are most marked in the British data which correspond to the reality of the situations existing in the two countries. The distinction between prejudice and discrimination is less valid in the racially segregated South African society where both complement each other, and both have political connotations. These results are dealt with more fully later in the discussion.

**Political concern and dogmatism**

The purpose of construction was to test the Dogmatism Scale's independence of political concern. Of the samples tested by Rokeach, only the Communists were politically committed, and thus the relatively high dogmatism mean obtained by them may have been due to this factor rather than to authoritarianism. As a measure of general authoritarianism, Rokeach's scale needed to be content free of both ideology and political concern.

The findings indicate that the Dogmatism Scale mean obtained by the Communist sample cannot be attributed to political concern. The open-minded group of Communists were found to score relatively high on the P-c scale (31.9) which was not statistically different from the P-c mean obtained by the closed-minded Communists (33.2). Neither
did the within group comparison of the Conservative sample reveal any significant differences on the P-o scale. Thus, for these samples, dogmatism was found to be independent of the P-o measure.

In both the British and South African samples no evidence was obtained to suggest that dogmatism was a function of political concern. Indeed, dogmatism and P-o were found to correlate negatively, the coefficient for the South African sample (-.27) being significant. Closed mindedness is thus shown to be associated with low political concern which is in opposition to the criticisms levelled against Rokeach. Only in the sample of nuns did the contention obtain any support; a positive correlation was obtained between dogmatism and P-o, however, the correlations of .48 failed to reach significance.

For the Communist - Conservative comparisons, in each of the dogmatism range groups, the Communists scored significantly higher on the P-o scale. While this result was to be expected as the Conservatives were not a politically organized group, it may be a reflection of a relationship between the scale and political ideology. Other results obtained, however, suggest that the scale may be relatively free of ideological content; the nuns, who were classifiable, on the basis of their F Scale mean, as right-wing, scored relatively high. The open-minded Conservatives also scored relatively high; they obtained a P-o mean of 26.1 which was marginally higher than that obtained by the total British sample (25.4).

Political concern and prejudice:

The P-o scale appears to be associated with political ideology to the degree in which the latter is related to racial prejudice. The correlations indicate that the scale is primarily related to prejudice. It was found that the greater the prejudice, the less the
political concern. This relationship held for all five samples tested, although the correlation was not significant for the nuns (−.38). For the rest, the correlations ranged from −.46 for the British sample to −.71 for the Communists.

The P-c prejudice scale correlations were not fortuitous as substantial associations were recorded for all the samples. Nor can the results be attributed to response set as the items were worded in different directions: four negatively and one positively. Prejudice, on the other hand, is indicated by agreement in seventeen items and by disagreement in thirteen others. The response set argument is further discounted as the P-c items were dispersed amongst the other scales of the questionnaire; within the F, Rigidity, and Anomie Scales.

In that the initial aim in the design of the P-c scale was to investigate dogmatism, an element of serendipity is involved in the prejudice findings. Although conclusions at this stage are premature, the development of the scale may provide a further dimension in the study of racial prejudice.

The scale does not appear to be merely a variation of the F Scale's measure of authoritarianism. In all the samples, P-c correlated higher with prejudice than it did with F. Further, relatively high P-c means were obtained by groups who scored high on F (the nuns and open minded Conservatives).

The content of the P-c items do not readily conform to the definition of authoritarianism provided either by Adorno and his associates or by Rokeach. This is apparent from an examination of the P-c items, and to facilitate clarity, these are again presented:

1. Politics is not something separate, but pervades almost all aspects of life.
(2) I seldom attempt to keep up to date on current events in the world.

(3) There are few world issues with which I feel any involvement.

(4) In the long run it is local and not general political issues which are of relevance.

(5) Students should not involve themselves in political affairs. The $P_c$ scale does not appear to be an extension of the right-wing authoritarianism measured by the $F$ Scale.

A surprising feature of the results was that, in spite of the few items and lack of pre-testing, the $P_c$ scale proved to be almost as good a predictor of racial prejudice as the $F$ Scale. In the British sample, prejudice was found to correlate almost as highly with $P_c$ as it did with $F$: -.46 and .48 respectively. These contrasted with the lower $P_c$ and $F$ correlation of -.24 (table 18). For the samples of Communists and nuns, prejudice correlated higher with $P_c$ than with $F$.

The $P_c$ correlations with the prejudice sub-scales indicated that, for the British sample, it was primarily related to discrimination. In the British sample, $P_c$ correlated -.46 with the total prejudice scale; -.51 with discrimination attitude and -.32 with prejudice attitude. The correlations for the South African sample were, respectively, -.56; -.58; and -.53. Thus in the British data, the $P_c$ scale, in the prediction of discriminatory attitudes, provided a better measure than the $F$ Scale.

Interpretations of the $P_c$ and prejudice results:

There were no a priori grounds on which to predict that racial intolerance would be associated with: a belief in the importance of politics; an interest in current events; a feeling of involvement in world affairs; general political questions to be thought more
significant than bread and butter issues; and a favourable attitude towards student participation in politics. Post hoc explanations can only be offered of the results obtained. These are considered below for the Communist, South African and British samples.

A close association between anti-racialism and political concern for the Communist sample may be explained in terms of the Marxist view of racism. Marx and Lenin saw racism as a manifestation of capitalist exploitation of the non-European peoples of the world. Racism was also the means by which the ruling classes were able to divide the workers in the industrial countries, diverting their attention from the 'class struggle'. As such, a sample of Communists in a capitalistic country may have been expected to associate political issues with racialism; the Communist sample were found to score extremely low on prejudice and extremely high on P-c, which was reflected in the -.71 correlation obtained between prejudice and P-c for this sample.

Race is the essence of politics in South Africa. It would thus be expected that those in favour of, and those in opposition to, racial segregation would both score high on the P-c scale. The correlation of -.58 between P-c and prejudice indicates that, for the South African sample, political concern is related to racial tolerance. Perhaps the overwhelming support given to the Government by white South Africans provides those in favour of the status quo with political security, resulting in diminished political interest. Alternatively, the relative political isolation of South Africa, as witnessed by the annual United Nations condemnation of Apartheid, may generate an inward looking attitude.

The data obtained from the British sample indicate that the political structures in the United Kingdom were perceived as being
related to racial issues. In explanation of the high negative correlation found between P-c and discrimination the following hypothesis is suggested: where the structures of society are such that the lower strata, whether nationally or internationally in the form of colonies, is occupied by a group deemed racially inferior by the dominant values, there is little need to enforce the status quo by legislation, or indeed to support the implementation of such action. Thus, opposition to discrimination assumes political significance while endorsement of the status quo does not require similar activity; the minority already suffers from discriminatory disabilities.

The British and South African samples, while concurring in their stereotyped attitudes of non-whites differ in the support given to the application of this prejudice in the form of discriminatory practices. In South Africa, stereotypy and discrimination merge and both have political consequences. In the United Kingdom, only discrimination has political connotations because, it is here assumed, racial stereotypy is widely prevalent in British culture and is therefore more readily acceptable than is discrimination; thus P-c correlated higher with discrimination than with prejudice attitude in the British sample while no differences occurred in the South African data.

In conclusion it is postulated that prejudiced individuals do not manifest high political concern as a means of safeguarding their interests because the need for political involvement is decreased by the prevalence in Britain of prejudiced attitudes and of unofficial racial discrimination.

The arguments are interpretations from the results and may or may not be verified by further research. No claims whatsoever are made for the substantiation here of these hypotheses.
Theoretical implications of the relationship between P-c and prejudice:

The discussion so far has attempted to provide an explanation of the results obtained. The aim here is to explore the area of behaviour actually measured by the P-c scale.

The lack of political concern for prejudiced individuals may point to generally misanthropic attitudes. The literature indicates a relationship between prejudice and misanthropy. Sullivan and Adelson (1954) suggest that glorification of the ingroup and rejection of the outgroup do not exist for many prejudiced individuals; both the ingroup and the outgroup are rejected in a misanthropic view of the world. Rosenberg (1956) relates misanthropy to political ideology, finding that the misanthropist tends to express many authoritarian ideas. Rokeach (1961) suggests that the authoritarian over-idealises the ingroup only when there is fear of retaliation, but is capable of expressing negative feelings about the ingroup no less than towards various outgroups.

The relationship between prejudice and misanthropy may be related to the concepts of Adorno and his associates. The underlying theory in the construction of the F Scale was to formulate items around nine variables thought to be central personality trends of authoritarianism. Of one of these variables, "anti-intraception", Adorno et al (1950) write:

"The extremely anti-intraceptive individual is afraid of thinking about human phenomena because he might, as it were, think the wrong thoughts; he is afraid of genuine feeling because his emotions might get out of control." (p. 235)

From their discussion of the concept, as is illustrated in the above quotation, two aspects of intraception are indicated; these may be labelled as a generalized as opposed to a limited outlook on humanity,
and as a desire for self-insight as opposed to a denial of one's emotions. Murray (1938), who originally introduced the concept of intraception, suggests that some intraceptive individuals tend to participate in progressive movements, speak against abuse and propose reforms (p.222). This outlook and its opposite appear to correspond to the distinction between a broad and a limited perspective of life.

In the final form of the P Scale, the anti-intraceptive variable contributes four items (numbers 9, 31, 37 and 41). With the possible exception of the last, these are concerned with the denial of individual emotions. Adorno and his associates thus did not develop the concept of intraception in regard to attitudes toward humanity as a whole.

It is suggested that concern for political events which have no immediate or obvious connection with the individual's own welfare, appears, logically to relate to ingroup-outgroup attitudes. Thus an isolationist interest in oneself which perhaps extends to the ingroup, relates to hostility towards the coloured outgroup; whereas, a view that the self-interest of the ingroup depends on the collective welfare of all humanity relates to racial tolerance.

It does appear that the P-e scale has measured an aspect of ingroup-outgroupness. Intriguing, however, is the relationship between political interest per se and racial prejudice. It is plausible to argue that political concern should have also been related to political activity in the interests of the ingroup. A nineteenth century imperialist, for instance, may have been expected to be interested in political developments both at home and abroad. The reasons for generalized anti-intraception being closely related to racial prejudice are, as Adorno et al (1950) suggest, "probably highly complex" (p.235) and may only be speculated upon here.
It is suggested that further research may indicate that those individuals who endorse white supremacy may show increased political concern in the event of a perceived threat to the status quo. When the aspirations of the minority group rise beyond the limitations defined for it by the dominant group, the existing power structure feels threatened and, in the case of coloured minorities, white supremacy comes to be enforced by discriminatory legislation. South Africa provides the prime example of the concept of white supremacy finding justification for its validity only through racial subjugation. 'Powellism' in Britain illustrates embryonic apartheid in response to a perceived threat to white supremacy. It must be noted that the samples were tested prior to the advent of 'Powellism'. Further research may reveal a curvilinear relationship between prejudice and P-c.

Although the postulate of increased political concern by prejudiced individuals may result in a reduced correlation between P-c and prejudice, it does not invalidate the suggestion that P-c is a measure of intracception; the concern would still be generated solely by self-interest.

The scale constructed here deals with awareness in the political sphere; it is suggested that the P-c scale may be only one variable of a larger dimension which is related to prejudice. 'A broad as opposed to a limited perspective of life' may provide a more adequate definition of the dimension than does 'political concern'. It is suggested that qualitative differences in individuals' perception of their world may be measurable and related to prejudice. It is not behaviour but motivation for behaviour that is to be measured. In these terms, the political self-interest of the racial bigot will be accommodated within the concept.
The hypothesis suggested is that the relationship between prejudice and misanthropy extends to a relationship between prejudice and a perspective of life which is limited to the individual's own self interest rather than to a perception of the self in relation to the collective well-being of his fellows. Further research is required to develop the P-o scale and to investigate its possible wider implications.
CHAPTER 17

THE DIMENSIONS OF DOGMATISM

The chapter is devoted to an investigation of the variables related to dogmatism. The examination involves the correlation coefficients and the data obtained from the political preference and religious affiliation groups. The initial concern is with the distinction between the Dogmatism, F and Rigidity Scales. The discussion then proceeds to consider the relationship between dogmatism and neuroticism, followed by expectations of dogmatism in the South African sample. Although implicit throughout, the question of the Dogmatism Scale's ability to measure general authoritarianism is held in abeyance until late in the discussion. At this latter point religious dogmatism is considered but the main emphasis is on the results obtained from the Communist and Conservative samples.

The Dogmatism Scale as an authoritarian measure:

By demonstrating that Dogmatism is closely related to the F Scale, Rokeach showed that authoritarianism is an area of behaviour measured by the Dogmatism Scale. Further confirmation is provided by the correlations between Dogmatism and F obtained here; the two scales related very significantly and, with the exception of the Communist sample, Dogmatism was found to correlate higher with F than with any of the other measures used in the study (table 20a).

The correlational data demonstrate conclusively that the Dogmatism Scale measures authoritarianism while the data from the Communist and Conservative group comparison show that Rokeach's instrument is not a duplicate measure of the F Scale (tables 25a and 25b). Among the Conservatives, the closed minded group scored significantly higher on
than the middle range and open minded groups. In a sample which is politically right of centre an increase in general authoritarianism is expected to result in an increase in right-wing authoritarianism. On the other hand, similar increases in F are not anticipated for groups on the left; although there were differences on F within the Communist sample - the open minded group scored exceptionally low - all the Communist groups, irrespective of the level of dogmatism, were non-authoritarian if classified solely on the F Scale results. All the Communist groups scored significantly lower on the F Scale than did the comparable Conservative groups. Depending on the degree of dogmatism, the Conservatives tended to be moderate to high authoritarian on the F Scale. The closed minded Communist group obtained a F Scale mean of 65.6 compared to the open minded Conservative mean of 89.3.

F Scale scores increased significantly from Left to Right along the political dimension; Conservatives scored higher than Labourites who, in turn, were more authoritarian than the Communists (table 23a). On the Dogmatism Scale Communists and Conservatives were not found to be statistically different. Both these groups were significantly more closed minded than the supporters of the Labour Party. The Dogmatism Scale thus appears to be relatively independent of political content while the F Scale clearly measures authoritarianism of the Right.

These findings replicate those of Rokeach obtained from an inadequately sized communist sample.

**Dogmatism and racial prejudice:**

Rokeach presented his scale as being relatively free of the racial prejudice dimension. In Rokeach's research, the Adorno et al Ethnocentrism Scale (E Scale) was utilized. The F Scale items were selected on their ability to discriminate between high and low E scorers, and therefore, predictions based not on theory but solely on this
built-in instrument bias) suggest a closer relationship between F and E than between dogmatism and E. Validation needs to be obtained with prejudice measures free of F Scale bias; the present prejudice scale was constructed independently of the F Scale.

In all the samples (except the nuns) prejudice and F correlated significantly. In contrast, only the British and South African samples yielded significant correlations between dogmatism and prejudice (tables 20a and 20b).

The prejudice means obtained by the British sample’s political preference groups replicated the rank order obtained for the F Scale, while the Communists, who were extremely low on prejudice, scored relatively high on dogmatism. The closed minded group of Communists scored perceptibly lower on prejudice (47.7) than did the open minded Conservatives (97.0) (table 26a).

The results indicate that the Dogmatism Scale is relatively independent of racial prejudice. Those on the political left, irrespective of dogmatism, tend towards racial tolerance. The Dogmatism Scale also correlated negatively with prejudice (-.11) for the Communist sample. Racial prejudice thus has an affinity with the political right. Open minded individuals on the right of the political centre were found to tend towards racial intolerance. Some logical difficulties may arise for Rokeach in attempting to explain the phenomenon of the open minded racial bigot.

The results obtained point to the different functions of the Dogmatism and F Scales; Rokeach believes prejudice to be a manifestation of belief incongruencies rather than, as the Californian investigators hold, a reaction to ethnic or racial differences. Clearly, the F Scale is the pertinent measure in the present study of racial prejudice.
Differences between dogmatism and rigidity:

Rokeach claims that dogmatism and rigidity are discriminally different.

The correlations obtained between rigidity and the two measures of authoritarianism - dogmatism and F - indicate that right-wing authoritarianism is more clearly related to rigidity than is closed mindedness (tables 20a and 20b). In both the British and South African samples, F was found to be more closely related to rigidity than was dogmatism. In the Communist sample rigidity correlated significantly with F but not with dogmatism. In the S.A. (in Br.) sample, however, rigidity correlated significantly only with dogmatism.

The correlation results emphasize the problematic nature of the relationship between rigidity and authoritarianism and show that the measures of Rigidity, F and Dogmatism are all discriminally different. Further evidence is provided by the political preference data (table 23a).

The results from the British political groups show that the rank order of the size of rigidity means differed from the order obtained by both the Dogmatism and F Scales. The Liberals, Labourites and Communists obtained rigidity means ranging from 74.0 to 77.7. The Conservatives, as on the other measures of intolerance, obtained the highest rigidity mean of all the groups tested. Whereas the Conservatives differed significantly from the Labourites on dogmatism, the mean difference between these groups on rigidity was not statistically significant. The Conservatives proved to be significantly more rigid than the Communists.

The religious affiliation data also showed anomalies between rigidity and dogmatism means; the nuns were significantly more closed
minded than each of the groups tested, while on rigidity, no sta-
tistical differences were obtained (table 21a). In the South African
data, the Jews and nonbelievers were alike on the Dogmatism Scale
but, on rigidity, the difference between them approached significance
(p=.08).

Rigidity as a manifestation of extreme right-wing authoritar-
ianism:

The results so far dealt with testify to the complex nature of
the relationship between rigidity and the Dogmatism and F Scales. In
an attempt to further illustrate that dogmatism is not the equivalent
of rigidity, evidence is provided to suggest that rigidity is related
to the extreme right of the political spectrum.

In the Communist-Conservative comparisons, rigidity means, with
the exception of the closed minded Conservatives, tended to fall just
below the scale's theoretical mean (table 27a). Thus, the Communists,
irrespective of the level of dogmatism scored similarly on rigidity,
as did the low and middle range Conservative groups. From the
results obtained, dogmatism and rigidity appear to be relatively in-
dependent for groups other than those more extremely Right than the
political right of centre. The closed minded Conservatives who,
from their F Scale mean (110.5), appear to be on the extreme right-
wing, scored high on the rigidity scale.

The correlation between rigidity and dogmatism obtained by the
Communists (.17) contrasts with the coefficient obtained by the
Conservatives (.59) (table 36b). The correlations obtained between
the Rigidity Scale and the Dogmatism Sub-scales were all negligible for
the Communist sample and thus rigidity appears to be unrelated to
closed mindedness of the Left. On the other hand, for the Conser-
vative sample, all three sub-scales correlated significantly with
rigidity. The expectation that rigidity relates particularly to the DR sub-scale, however, is not supported by the data. A high correlation was predicted because the DR sub-scale purports to measure right-wing authoritarianism; however, the size of the correlations increased with an increase in the number of items measuring dogmatism and thus reflect the influence of range.

The contention that rigidity is related to authoritarianism of the extreme right is corroborated by the data obtained from the other political and religious groups tested. Groups which emulate the mean of 90.7 obtained by the closed minded Conservatives on rigidity all scored above 100.0 on the F Scale: these are, in order of F Scale means: the National Party supporters (rigidity mean of 95.2); the United Party group (92.7); the South African Protestants (90.1); and the nuns (86.9). Further, those groups which scored within the F Scale range of 80-99 ranged from 74.0 to 83.4 on rigidity, while those groups below 80 on F ranged from 72.6 to 78.3 on rigidity.

Evident from the above data is the restricted range obtained by the various groups on the rigidity scale; the possible score was from 21 to 147. Some doubt must be cast on the scale’s ability to discriminate between low and moderately rigid scorers and the results may be suggestive of the Gough-Sanford Rigidity Scale’s lack of validity. Thus qualified, the results, nevertheless, may indicate an association between F and rigidity which becomes most marked for high authoritarians. The ambiguous association between rigidity and low and middle range F Scale scorers blurs the correlation between the two variables and may explain the conflicting results reported in the literature. A postulate for further investigation is that rigidity is only related to extreme authoritarianism of the Right.
The results clearly show that the Dogmatism Scale is discernibly different from the Gough-Sanford Rigidity Scale.

**Dogmatism and Neuroticism:**

While anxiety has only been ambiguously associated with the F Scale, Rokeach and his associates have demonstrated that it is positively related to dogmatism. This relationship with anxiety distinguishes the Dogmatism Scale from previous measures of intolerance.

In the present study a slight but significantly positive correlation was obtained between dogmatism and neuroticism for the British (.22) and the South African samples (.27). The correlation coefficient for the Communist sample (.30) failed to reach significance and in the S.A. (in Br.) and student nun samples, the scales related negligibly. The correlations between F and neuroticism, and between rigidity and neuroticism, were in both instances, minimal throughout.

The literature reports substantial correlations between dogmatism and anxiety and thus the association with neuroticism may have been expected to be higher. Nevertheless, the data provide some substantiation of the earlier findings. Dogmatism was found to be the only measure, of those used in the study, which related to neuroticism.

Norman (1966) suggests that the relationship between dogmatism and anxiety results from contradiction between the individual dogmatic personality and his open environment. It was thus predicted that dogmatism and neuroticism would correlate higher in the British than in the South African sample; the hypothesis however is not confirmed.

In view of the relatively low correlations obtained, analyses were undertaken with extreme neuroticism scorers. In both the British
and South African samples neuroticism was clearly shown to be associated with tendencies towards closed mindedness (tables 37a and 37c). Those classified as neurotics scored significantly higher on dogmatism than did the non-neurotic respondents.

**Dogmatism and anxiety:**

In order to bring the data in line with Rokeach's concern with anxiety, neurotic and non-neurotic respondents were classified according to the extraversion dimension; Eysenck (1964) considers anxiety to be a manifestation of the introverted neurotic.

Among the British high neurotics, extraverts and introverts scored similarly on dogmatism (table 37b). The South African difference, although not significant, showed a trend in the predicted direction; the introverts tended to score higher than the extraverts: 155.7 and 144.5 respectively (table 37d). Noteworthy from the South African results is the opposite trend for the non-neurotic respondents; although not significantly different, the extraverts scored 135.1 as opposed to 128.1 for the introverts. It must be noted that because of too few subjects the criterion for extraversion-introversion was unsatisfactory; those falling above or below the total sample mean were classified, respectively, as extraverts or introverts. In spite of this limitation some indications are provided in support of both Rokeach and Eysenck.

**Social conformity, dogmatism and extraversion:**

Rokeach and Eysenck claim a positive correlation between their concepts and social conformity. In the event that both closed minded and extraverted individuals are particularly susceptible to external pressures it is predicted that dogmatic persons will tend to be of the extraverted personality type.
The correlations between dogmatism and extraversion were found to be minimal throughout. Further, extraversion did not significantly distinguish between the various dogmatism range groups in the Communist and Conservative samples (table 28a). Thus, no link was able to be detected between dogmatism and extraversion in the present findings. It is concluded that the extraversion dimension is not a relevant variable in the study of closed mindedness.

Dogmatism and Anomie:

Closed mindedness, Rokeach suggests, is related in proportion to the degree to which an individual is made to feel alone, isolated and helpless. This assertion was also subjected to test by means of Srole’s (1956) Anomie Scale; it is predicted that dogmatism and anomie are positively related.

Dogmatism and anomie were found to correlate positively throughout and the results were highly significant in all the samples except for the nuns. Anomie was found to correlate, although again with an exception - the British sample - more closely with dogmatism than with F, and minimally throughout with rigidity.

With both the Communists and Conservatives anomie tended to increase with the increase in dogmatism (table 30a). Thus, the feelings of isolation and helplessness, hypothesized by Rokeach to be characteristic of the closed minded individual are indicated by the anomie results and appear to apply irrespective of ideological position.

Dogmatism and political concern:

The proposition that high scores on the Dogmatism Scale reflect political involvement rather than closed mindedness was tested with the political concern (P-c) scale constructed during the present research.
The correlations obtained suggest that political concern is related to racial prejudice rather than to dogmatism.

The various Communist groups did not differ from each other on the P-c scale, and nor did the Conservatives when similarly compared. Although not significant, a trend of decreased political concern with an increase in dogmatism is observable in the Conservative sample (tables 31a and 31b). Thus there is no evidence to support the view that dogmatism is merely a reflection of political involvement or awareness; on the contrary, the opposite of the criticism levelled against Rokeach is indicated in the results.

**Dogmatism in South Africa:**

In the South African sample, the means obtained by the supporters of the National Party on the Dogmatism and the F scales were, perhaps, lower than may have been expected (tables 14 and 24). The authoritarian nature of the right-wing National Party Government in South Africa has been noted earlier in this presentation. For example, the Unesco report on Apartheid (1967) points out that the method by which the system is strengthened is the destruction of the opposition. Pressures to conform are evidenced in the increasing acceptance by the bulk of the white population of racist ideology: in the 1966 General Election 126 of the 166 parliamentary seats were gained by the National Party. (Horrell 1967, p. 6). Rokeach's, "need to ward off threat", is evident in the observation that South African white nationalism contains a rationale of "dominate or be dominated" (Van Rensburg 1962). Indeed, the Nationalist ideology appears to contain, in some degree, all the defining characteristics of closed-mindedness, and as such, it may have been predicted that the National Party group in the sample would score well beyond the theoretical mean (160.00 or 4.00 per item) of the scale.
The Nationalists were found to score 4.8 per item on the prejudice scale; 4.1 on F; and 4.1 on the Dogmatism Scale. The Conservatives, the most right-wing political group in the British sample, scored, respectively, 3.3, 3.6 and 3.7. Predictably, the South African group far exceeded the right of centre Conservatives on the prejudice scale; however, similar expectations are not as clearly indicated on the authoritarian measures. Means have been reported in the literature greater than those found for the Nationalists. Cohn and Carsch (1954) report an F Scale mean of 5.26 per item for a group of German workers. On the Dogmatism Scale, the Nationalists did not score as high as some of the American student samples cited by Alter and White (1966).

Although the above may cast some doubt on the Dogmatism and F Scales' ability to discriminate between moderately high and extreme authoritarians, and on the relevance of social pressures as a determining factor in the creation of closed-mindedness, the means obtained by the Nationalist sample were the highest obtained during the study. The objections raised are thus qualified.

The proportion of religious non-believers in the samples provides another, if somewhat indirect, yardstick for social conformity. In the South African sample, 12.3 per cent of the respondents indicated no religious belief compared to 30.7 per cent of the British sample who were similarly disposed. This may reflect on the existence of greater conformity within the South African sample compared to the British. On this basis, in addition to those mentioned above, the South African sample may have been expected to score higher on both the Dogmatism and F Scales than the British sample. The findings showed that in neither case did the mean difference between the samples reach an acceptable level of significance (table 24).
Strict adherence to doctrine:

The evidence so far reviewed tends to support the claims made by Rokeach for the Dogmatism Scale. What has been demonstrated is that the Dogmatism Scale functions differently from the F Scale; however, the addition of Rokeach's measure in the field of authoritarian study provides an advancement only in so far as it can be established that it is an alternative improvement on the Californian instrument. The fundamental issue is the assertion that the F Scale measures right-wing authoritarianism while the Dogmatism Scale is a measure of general authoritarianism.

Validation of the Dogmatism Scale's ability to measure general authoritarianism was based largely on the assertion that strict adherence to doctrine is a defining characteristic of the closed minded individual. Rokeach hypothesized that the greater the group pressure towards commitment the greater is the likelihood that high dogmatism scores will be obtained. The adherents of authoritarian sub-groups were compared to the members of less demanding institutions. The argument in favour of substantiation centres on the data that Rokeach obtained from Communist respondents. The enquiry here attempts a close examination of the data for both religious and political groups.

Religious Dogmatism:

Rokeach claims that Catholicism provided an example of an institution which required of its members strict adherence to doctrine, and, that such adherence would tend to produce aspects of closed mindedness. The British Catholics, however, scored lower on dogmatism than any of the other religious affiliation groups in the sample; which may merely reflect the liberal bias in the sample selection. Nevertheless, some substantiation was provided for Rokeach in that the Catholics,

1. See chapter 11 for the sample selection.
while scoring significantly lower on F than the Protestants, were not statistically different from them on the Dogmatism Scale (table 21a). The Catholics in the South African sample were too few in number for their data to be subjected to statistical test. The dogmatism mean that they obtained appeared to be relatively low (144.0).

The student nuns were roughly comparable to the British Protestant group on F, but were significantly higher on Dogmatism. The student nuns' dogmatism mean of 163.6 (4.1 per item) was the highest obtained in the British sample. While these results provide substantiation for Rokeach, similar objections to those previously raised in respect of the Nationalists' score, apply to the dogmatism mean achieved by the nuns. Rokeachsian theory suggests that strict adherence will lead to dogmatism for lay Catholics. It is therefore not unreasonable to expect that a monastic sample will score at the closed-minded extreme of the dogmatism dimension. In fact, the results obtained label the nuns as only a moderately closed-minded group.

A further test of the hypothesis is provided by a comparison of Catholic and non-Catholic respondents drawn from the Catholic College sample. As the staff of this college are predominantly nuns it is feasible to suggest that greater pressure to conform is exerted on the Catholic than on the non-Catholic students, and thus, leads to increased dogmatism for the former.

Evidence of conformity is provided by the prejudice and F Scale data. The lay and the clerical respondents in this sample tended to score relatively higher on F than on prejudice. The nuns are classifiable, from their performance on these scales, as a right-wing, racially tolerant group. A sub-cultural norm of racial tolerance
appears to have existed at the college which resulted in personality potential towards prejudice not being fully manifested. Further, the Catholics were found to score significantly lower on the Anomie Scale than did the non-Catholics, which suggests that the latter group may have been less integrated into the college sub-culture (table 22).

The evidence quoted above appears to suggest an accumulative probability of sub-cultural pressures being exerted at the college. The dogmatism comparison between lay Catholics and non-Catholics, however, did not reveal a significant difference between the two groups, nor was the difference that did occur in the predicted direction; both groups scored relatively low, the non-Catholics scoring marginally higher than the Catholics, 135.8 as opposed to 133.4 (table 22).

**Strict adherence to Communist doctrine:**

Communism, Rokeach suggested, required of its members strict adherence to doctrine. Communists would therefore be expected to score high on the Dogmatism Scale. The Communist sample tested here, however, tended towards the open minded side of the continuum. They scored 147.8, which is well below the theoretical scale mean. Studies of student samples, quoted by Alter and White (1966) indicate that compared to at least some American student populations, the Communist sample cannot be classified as closed minded.

More pertinent perhaps, is the fact that the Communists were not found to be higher than the Conservative group. The comparison was not between organized groups on the extremes of right and left of the political dimension. On the contrary, while this was true of the Communist sample whose respondents had a common left-wing ideology, the selection of the Conservatives was based on a broader and less well
defined yardstick. The criterion for inclusion in the former sample was student membership of the Young Communist League. The Conservatives, on the other hand, were grouped together merely on the responses given to the question, "which of the British political parties do you favour?" A preference for the Conservative Party, was therefore not necessarily indicative of party membership or of an ideological position more extreme than Right of Centre.

Rokeachian theory, would therefore predict a high score only for the Communist sample. A scale purported to be free of ideological content prevents similar a priori predictions being made for the Conservatives. The results, however, show the Communist and Conservative samples to be roughly comparable on the Dogmatism Scale, the former scoring marginally lower. The combined Dogmatism Scale data of the British and Communist samples, if trichotomized into low, middle and high scorers, show the Communist scores to resemble a normal distribution; in percentages, 26.5, 44.1 and 29.4 of the Communist scores fell into the three categories from low to high. The Conservative distribution was, respectively, 13.3, 57.8 and 28.9 per cent.

The Communists were thus found to score lower than predicted which suggests either that strict adherence to doctrine is not a function of closed-mindedness or that Communism does not require conformity of its student members. In either case - Rokeach's research also being founded on student samples - the rationale on which Rokeach based his predictions is questioned.

**Dogmatism and Ideological Content:**

Relative to the means obtained by the other political groups in the British sample, the Communists and Conservatives score high on the Dogmatism Scale. An interpretation, from this data, of high dogmatism
scores salvages the Communist predictions but, in so doing, casts aspersions on the content free nature of the scale. That the Conservatives equalled the Communists' score is explicable only in terms of the scale containing ideological content biased towards the political right. Alternatively, dogmatism may have a greater affinity with right-wing than with left-wing ideology, in which case, the concept of general authoritarianism to be measured in terms of structure is itself questioned.

Rokeach chooses to perceive the results in terms of inflated Conservative scores rather than low Communist results. However, the data appears to suggest both interpretations; the Communists resemble a normal distribution while the Conservatives show a tendency towards the closed minded pole of the dimension.

Rokeach admits to the possibility of the scale being biased towards the Right. He suggests that for the extreme right-wing, content and structure are both authoritarian, but there are "inherent conflicts between Marxist ideological content and structure" (1960, p. 129). This may explain the greater propensity towards authoritarianism of the Right, however, the contradiction between Marxist theory and practice provides an example of the coexistence of logically contradictory beliefs within the belief system, and thus, in Rokeachean terms, should result in closed mindedness.

In that dogmatism means increased from Left of Centre to Right of Centre - the Labourites were found to be significantly less dogmatic than the Conservatives - the scale appears to have ideological content biased towards the political right-wing. A further conclusion that may be drawn is that Communism has not been demonstrated to induce aspects of dogmatic thinking among its adherents. Rokeach's pre-
dictions are thus not fulfilled in the data. Even had these materialized, prediction does not necessarily imply validation. This point is illustrated by the Rigidity Scale results obtained by the British political preference groups.

Prediction and validity:

The Communist group's rigidity mean, similar to their performance on the Dogmatism Scale, was relatively high compared to their prejudice and P Scale results (table 23a). Following Rokeachian logic, from the results obtained, the prejudice and P Scales indicate the Conservatives and Liberals to be the most authoritarian, and the Labourites and Communists the least. On the Dogmatism Scale it is the Conservatives and Communists who score highest and the Liberals and Labourites the most open-minded. However, if the results from the Rigidity Scale are considered a different pattern again emerges. The rank order of the size of means place the Conservatives, followed by Labour, as the highest scorers, while the Liberals and Communists score lowest. The theoretical justification for these results could be construed in terms of the Conservative and Labour Parties having a virtual monopoly of parliamentary power, and therefore may be seen as colluding to maintain the status quo. Thus it may be argued, they are authoritarian, while the Liberals and Communists form minority groups which are most open to change.

It is not suggested that the Rigidity Scale is a measure of general authoritarianism, nor is the above particularly viable, either theoretically or empirically - rank order of means were considered, not significant differences - but rather, the argument was formulated merely as an illustration of prediction not necessarily implying validation. It is thus stressed that prediction may be based on a fallacious premise, the results being attributable to other, uncontrolled
factors. Equally, the failure of predictions to be fulfilled need not negate the premise, but may merely require additional explanation. Although the Communist sample did not score as high as may have been expected, the Dogmatism scale is not necessarily invalidated.

Substantiation of the Dogmatism Scale as a measure of general authoritarianism depends largely on the demonstration that a high score by Conservatives and Communists indicates that both are authoritarian. By virtue of the high F Scale score found for the dogmatic Conservatives and by the close relationship between F and dogmatism revealed in the correlations obtained for the Conservative sample, it may be concluded that closed mindedness among Conservatives is a reflection of authoritarianism. A similar conclusion for the closed minded Communists is plausible, but requires greater substantiation than is offered by Rokeach. It is suggested here that the basis on which Rokeach made his predictions for the Communists is not supported by the data. "Strict adherence to doctrine" as a determining factor of closed mindedness is not confirmed by the data. Thus, close scrutiny is required prior to a confident acceptance of Rokeach's conclusions.

The validity of the Dogmatism sub-scales:

The sub-scales derived from Rokeach's measure were constructed to test the proposition that right- and left-wing respondents reveal different attitudes on the Dogmatism Scale. The validity of the sub-scales was tested with matched dogmatism groups of left-wingers and Conservatives drawn from the pilot study sample (tables 33 to 35).

The DL sub-scale purports to measure left-wing dogmatism; the DR sub-scale, right-wing dogmatism; and the DG sub-scale, general dogmatism.
The predictions made for the DL sub-scale and the results obtained were as follows: it was expected that the left-wing groups would score significantly higher than the Conservatives in both the low and middle dogmatism ranges; however, only the latter prediction is substantiated in the data. It was predicted that, while the Conservative groups would not statistically differ, the closed minded left-wingers would score significantly higher than their open-minded co-ideologists; again only the latter prediction is substantiated. Although the predictions are not fully fulfilled in the data, the validity of the DL sub-scale finds support in the fact that the closed minded Conservative's DL mean (18.9) is only marginally higher than the mean (18.4) obtained by the open minded left-wing group.

The predictions made for the DR sub-scale were in the reverse of those made for the DL sub-scale; Conservatives were expected to score significantly higher than the left-wingers in both the group comparisons; the Conservative within group comparison was expected to yield a significant difference while the Communist groups were expected to obtain statistically similar means.

The mean difference between the open minded groups, although in the predicted direction, failed to reach an acceptable level of significance; the other hypotheses are substantiated. Noteworthy from the results is the higher DR mean (21.8) obtained by the open minded Conservatives in relation to the mean (20.9) obtained by the closed minded left-wingers.

The DG sub-scale performed in accordance with Rokeachean prediction; means increased significantly for both groups with an increase in total dogmatism and for the between group comparisons DG was found to be independent of political ideology.
Firm conclusions are hampered by the small sample size and the possible ambiguity pertaining to the classification of the left-wing groups. Nevertheless, some evidence is obtained to show that DL is a measure of left-wing dogmatism while DR is a measure of right-wing dogmatism. The results indicate that the Dogmatism Scale may not be as content free as is claimed by Rokeach. Thus, the left-wing and Conservative samples appear to have arrived at their respective means, at least partially, via different items. The eighteen DG items are free of ideological content; nevertheless, the eleven items of the combined DL and DR sub-scales (that is, over 25 per cent of the Dogmatism Scale items) have been indicated to function differently for left-wingers and for Conservatives.

The indications of the sub-scales' validity were considered sufficient to warrant further investigation. Accordingly, the sub-scale data obtained from the main samples' Conservative and Communist groups were subjected to further test.

The Dogmatism sub-scales in relation to the F Scale:

For the Communist sample, F correlated significantly only with DR (.40); F correlated .32 with the total Dogmatism Scale and .33 with DG (table 36a). The F-DL correlation was negative (-.11). The data thus indicate that for the Communists DR relates to authoritarianism of the Right while DL is associated with left-wing attitudes.

The Conservative correlations with F were: .72 for the total Dogmatism Scale; .35 for DL; .44 for DR and .63 for DG. The relatively low DL correlation further suggests that the sub-scale measures left-wing dogmatism. The correlations, however, appear to have increased as a function of the number of items in the scale. The DR correlation is surprisingly low; for a Right of Centre sample a
scale measuring right-wing dogmatism may have been expected to relate more closely to F.

**Dogmatism of the Left as a manifestation of neuroticism:**

DL and neuroticism correlated .44 in the Communist sample in contrast to the correlation of -.13 obtained for the Conservatives. The significance of the Communist DL result is further emphasised by the negligible correlations obtained between neuroticism and DR (.11) and between neuroticism and BC (.14). Neuroticism correlated minimally with the dogmatism measures in the Conservative sample.

For the group mean comparisons the Communist open minded and middle range groups scored low on the neuroticism scale. A similar distinction was only achieved by the open minded Conservatives; the moderately dogmatic Conservatives scored marginally higher than the closed minded group. Although, among the closed minded groups, the Communists and Conservatives were not found to score significantly different on neuroticism, the latter variable was most clearly associated with dogmatism among the Communists. The dogmatic Communists scored on neuroticism highest of all the groups tested, and highly neurotic subjects in this sample tend also to be dogmatic. A similar trend is not observable among the Conservatives.

A hypothesis that may be derived from the results is that neurotics among the Communist sample agree strongly with items which are interpreted as reflecting Marxist ideology. This may be due to a need to belong, causing over-identification with the group. Corroboration is suggested by the high correlation obtained between dogmatism and anomie (.56) for the Communist sample.

An implication of the results is that high dogmatism scores by politically left orientated individuals is a reflection of neuroticism.
Whether or not this is also an indication of authoritarianism still requires to be ascertained. The F Scale findings, previously discussed, suggest that the Dogmatism Scale functions as a measure of authoritarianism for the Conservatives, while similar evidence is only obtained for the DA-F correlations in the Communist sample. Closer study of group membership and dogmatism is required; however, even if only tentative, a hypothesis of qualitative differences between closed minded Communists and Conservatives is suggested by the data.

**Personality variables of closed minded Communists and Conservatives:**

Closed minded Communists and Conservatives were found to differ significantly on F, prejudice, rigidity and political concern; these measures are shown to reflect ideological position rather than dogmatism.

Significant differences were not obtained on neuroticism, extraversion and anomie. However, high scorers in the two samples were found to be alike, essentially, only on anomie; neuroticism appears to be related to dogmatism of the Left but only ambiguously to dogmatism of the Right; and the Conservatives (although not statistically different) tended more clearly than the Communists towards the extraverted extreme of the dimension. Thus little evidence is found for the contention that closed minded individuals, irrespective of political affiliation, display similar personality characteristics.

**Suggestions for further research:**

Two alternative paths are suggested for authoritarian research.

Rokeach's claims for the Dogmatism Scale have been partially vindicated in that it was shown that, on at least eighteen items (the DG sub-scale), Communists and Conservatives score similarly. If Rokeach's assertion, that authoritarianism may be measured by structure rather than by content, is followed, an attempt needs to be made to eliminate the
content bias indicated in the DL and DR items. Attention would also need to be given to the DC-rigidity correlations in order to explain the differences obtained for the samples; .20 for the Communists and .54 for the Conservatives. Explanation needs also to be provided for an illogicality arising from the results; the phenomenon of the open-minded racial bigot (the low dogmatic Conservative group).

On the other hand, the DL and DR data may be suggestive of dogmatism being qualitatively different for the right- and left-wing respondents and thus investigation is required into various forms of authoritarianism. In this instance, the F Scale as a measure of a specific type of authoritarianism may be vindicated, and the authors faulted merely because they did not construct measures other than for right-wing authoritarians.

Perhaps the solution lies between the Adorno et al. and Rokeach's conceptions of the problem. Further, extensive research into both areas is urgently required.
Social and personality variables of race prejudice:

The F Scale-prejudice findings confirm the importance of both the social and the personality factors of race prejudice. The influence of the social environment is clearly illustrated in the relatively high prejudice mean obtained by the South African sample. Although authoritarianism could not account for the difference in prejudice between the British and South African samples, in both the F Scale positively related to prejudice. High F Scale scorers, whether from tolerant or intolerant regions, tend towards prejudice, and low F Scale scorers tend towards tolerance; thus the F Scale may be applied with samples drawn in both Britain and South Africa. Knowledge of both the social environment and the personality predisposition of the respondent allows for greater precision in the prediction of prejudice.

The data obtained reject Pettigrew's hypothesis of prejudiced non-authoritarians in the South African sample and instead, account for the total sample mean difference by the extreme prejudice of the South African authoritarian. In comparisons of both middle and high range F Scale scorers, the South Africans were higher on prejudice than the equivalent British groups, while in the low F group comparisons, statistically similar means were obtained. Thus, contrary to Pettigrew's analysis, personality and conformity to race norms are shown to be closely related; social influences appear to function only within the framework of the individual personality.
Implications for the reduction of prejudice and for future race relations in Britain are implicit in the interrelated questions: can conformity to tolerant norms be induced among individuals inclined towards prejudice, and to what extent are the race norms in Britain tolerant?

Noteworthy from the results, is the wide range of prejudice scores obtained by the various middle range F Scale groups. It is particularly among the middle range F Scale scorers - perhaps the bulk of the population - that the social environment may act, either to suppress prejudice, or to provide reinforcement for its full manifestation. The results indicate that the middle range British group was responsive to tolerant norms while the South Africans were influenced in the opposite direction. The mildly authoritarian South Africans expressed prejudice at a level roughly equal to that expressed by the highly authoritarian British group. These results suggest that the British environment provides a moderating influence on overt prejudice.

The evidence supports the contention that under the influence of tolerant race norms, authoritarians will, to some degree, tend to suppress prejudice. Moderate authoritarians in the British sample and authoritarians in both the British and S.A. (in Br.) sample appear to have conformed to tolerant British race norms. Further support is obtained for the suppressed prejudice hypothesis from the low prejudice scorers in the British sample; they tended to score relatively higher on F than on prejudice. Thus, whether or not personality predisposition towards prejudice will be fully manifested seems to depend on the prevailing race norms.

Observers of race relations in Britain have viewed the situation as being balanced between racial harmony and racial strife (Foot 1965).
There tends to be agreement that multi-racial co-operation can only be achieved if the leadership - the political, trade union, clerical and the various mass media - are dedicated towards this end. The Bow Group of Young Conservatives call on the "leaders in all walks of life" to prevent the adoption of a racialist outlook in Britain (Lenton et al 1966, p. 8). Implicit in the results obtained here is the vital role of official policy in the determination of racial attitudes. Generally, authoritarians cannot be expected to be racially tolerant but, under the influence of tolerant norms, their prejudice may be reduced.

The adoption of officially sanctioned racialist programmes will thus not only provide encouragement to those already racially bigoted but may also turn the moderate authoritarian away from tolerance towards the prejudiced extreme of the continuum. The existing problems in race relations will obviously not be solved solely by legislation; what the findings do indicate is that legislation could lessen the extremity of racial hostility by officially defining the limits of prejudice permissible. A concerted effort is required from the leadership in the country to oppose racism so that the present level may be decreased.

The evidence obtained in Britain suggests that social influences function as a damper only on extreme prejudice and that the British environment appears able to accommodate a degree of prejudiced opinion. While the middle range F Scale scorer in the British sample appears to suppress prejudice, no such indication is obtained from the equivalent group in the S.A. (in Br.) sample who scored similarly to the South Africans. Among the authoritarians, however, both the British and S.A. (in Br.) groups scored significantly lower on prejudice.
than the South African. Thus, the Southern Africans in Britain performed, on the prejudice scale, at a level close to that obtained by the British authoritarian, which may indicate that this is the uppermost extreme permissible in the environment. Added confirmation is provided by the fact that the expatriates, in both the middle and high range comparisons, differed most from the South Africans on discrimination; it appears that in response to British norms they changed their attitudes towards discrimination.

That Britain is a tolerant society receives only qualified support from the data. Little evidence was obtained to show that the British environment had any ameliorating effect on the racial stereotypes held by the S.A. (in Br.) sample. Moreover, the British and South African samples, although widely differing on discrimination, obtained statistically similar means on the prejudice attitude subscale. Unlike the South Africans, the British sample scored relatively higher on prejudice attitude than on discrimination. Indications that in Britain stereotypic is culturally supported and therefore widely accepted, while discrimination arouses political controversy, is further obtained from the prejudice sub-scale correlations with political concern; the P-o scale correlated higher with discrimination than with prejudice attitude in the British sample while for the South African no differences were obtained. Lastly, in the British sample, prejudice attitude correlated higher with both dogmatism and extraversion than did discrimination. The lower discrimination coefficients are interpreted as being a result of some dogmatists and extraverts endorsing discrimination while others conformed to British norms. No conformity pressures were experienced in relation to prejudice attitude.

1. Conformity is said to be characteristic of both the closed minded and extraverted individual.
The accumulative evidence leads to the conclusion that racial stereotypy is present in British society, while discrimination is culturally disfavoured. The results, however, suggest that stereotyped attitudes may easily find expression in endorsement of discrimination; the two prejudice sub-scales were found to correlate highly. That stereotypy was not translated into discrimination in the British sample reflects official disfavour of discriminatory practices. Where official policy rests on racist sentiment both attitudes of stereotypy and discrimination must receive encouragement; the restriction of immigration, based on a criterion of colour, as in the case of the Kenya Asians, provides an example. Attempting to solve existing problems of race relations by limiting the number of the minority group reinforces stereotypy by the implication that it is the mere presence of coloured people which causes racialism. Obviously, in the absence of coloured people, there could not be colour discrimination, but by their deliberate exclusion, stereotypy would be reinforced. The literature indicates that stereotypy is relatively independent of contact with, and the numbers of, the minority group.

In recent years ambiguity has marked race relations in Britain. The restriction of immigration, largely to limit the entry of coloured peoples (Foot 1965), coupled with the respectability accorded racialism particularly by Enoch Powell, must, it is suggested, have provided reinforcement for stereotyped beliefs. On the other hand, discrimination has been enacted against. The vital role of the environment in influencing racial attitudes and the prevalence of racial stereotypy, as indicated in the present study, lead to the conclusion that such laws are important counters to the spread of racialist ideology. However, unless racialism is vigorously opposed
in all spheres of life, the belief in black inferiority will continue to vitiate British culture and the danger that these attitudes may be transformed into discriminatory practices will continue to be ever-present.

**Latent prejudice:**

The evidence produced during this study has pointed to the existence of suppressed prejudice in response to tolerant norms. Adorno et al (1950) presented the F Scale as a measure of both manifest and latent prejudice, and it is suggested the latter concept be further investigated.

The F Scale has been much used, tested, lauded and criticized, but relatively little attempt has been made to develop the theory which gave rise to the construction of the Scale. The concept of latent prejudice may provide an explanation for the re-occurring outbursts of racial hostility of which the anti-semitism in Nazi Germany is one example and less extremely, in this country, the massive support given to the views expressed by Enoch Powell. It is suggested that racial hostility does not spontaneously occur, but rather that it already exists, becoming overt when given political direction and respectability.

Latent prejudice needs to be isolated so as to investigate its correlates, both personality and social. The factors which determine the latency or manifestation of prejudice are not as yet fully understood. In this respect closer attention ought also to be given to the distinction between stereotypy and discrimination. It is suggested that research be undertaken into the construction of an instrument which measures only latent prejudice. Greater precision of measurement is required than is presently afforded by the F Scale.
The personality variables related to prejudice:

In the study of racial prejudice and discrimination, the findings indicate that, irrespective of the social environment, the F Scale remains the pertinent research instrument. Prejudice is clearly more closely associated with F than with the Dogmatism Scale; the latter appears to relate to ethnic prejudice only in so far as it relates to authoritarianism of the Right.

Prejudice and F are not perfectly correlated as is indicated in the occurrence of the phenomenon of the tolerant authoritarian; the sample of nuns are classifiable, from their results, as a tolerant right-wing group. This anomaly may be accounted for by conformity to tolerant race norms; Adorno et al write of authoritarian conformity to conventionalism. Similar difficulties arising for the Dogmatism Scale are not as easily explained; conformity is a characteristic of the closed minded individual. In the present study, the group of open minded Conservatives scored relatively high on prejudice. It is suggested that the phenomenon of the open minded racial bigot is a contradiction in terms and further research is required in explanation.

The Gough-Sanford Rigidity Scale used in the present study did not appear to contribute additional information, in relation to prejudice, to that obtained from the F Scale. The relationship between rigidity on the one hand, and prejudice, F and Dogmatism, on the other, appears to be complex. A partial explanation of the ambiguous results obtained may be found in the Rigidity Scale's possible lack of validity. In all the groups tested a restrictive range of rigidity means were obtained which may be suggestive of the scale's inability to distinguish between low and moderately low rigidity scorers. Further
validation is required of this extensively used scale. However, what did emerge from the data is that rigidity may only be related to authoritarianism of the extreme Right. Since student samples are most frequently tested, this hypothesis may at least partially account for the ambiguity in the literature of the relationship between rigidity and authoritarianism.

Slight but significant correlations were obtained between prejudice and extraversion in the British and pilot study samples. No evidence of a relationship was obtained in the South African data which reflects the influence of the social environment. In view of the fact that Pettigrew's hypotheses were not substantiated, the relationship between extraversion and social conformity to intolerant norms was not tested. Conformity was also unable to be established as a link between extraversion and dogmatism; the two measures correlated negligibly throughout. Nevertheless, the correlational data in the British sample indicates that, by controlling for social environment, the further investigation of the relationship between prejudice and extraversion may prove fruitful.

Prejudice correlated negligibly with neuroticism which indicates that neurosis is unrelated to the prejudice dimension.

The five item P-c scale constructed here is still in a preliminary stage of development. However, in spite of inadequate standardization, the results indicate that political concern may provide an additional dimension in the study of racial prejudice. The F Scale's ability to predict prejudice is almost equalled by the P-c scale and in one instance is surpassed; in the British sample, discrimination correlated higher with P-c than with the F Scale. The evidence obtained indicates that the P-c scale is not merely a version of authoritarianism.
Further investigation is required; regarding the sophistication of the P-c scale and into the causes of the relationship with prejudice. During the discussion of the P-c results it was suggested that political concern may measure intrasection in regard to humanity. It is postulated that P-c may be a factor within a larger dimension termed 'broad as opposed to limited outlook on life'.

It is suggested that an attempt be made to relate prejudice to spheres of concern other than political. Investigation might proceed, for instance, into attitudes towards family, group membership (trade union for example), employment, education, religion, the state, and so forth. In each instant the hypothesis is that the prejudiced individual will have a self-centred view rather than a perception of the self in relation to the collective well-being.

The Dogmatism Scale:

The Dogmatism, F and Rigidity Scales, while highly inter-correlated, are shown to be discernibly different measures; the Dogmatism Scale, although it measures authoritarianism, is not a duplicate of the P Scale. These of Rokeach's contentions, are conclusively supported by the data obtained.

Among the measures of intolerance used, only the Dogmatism Scale related significantly to neuroticism. Further, anomie appears to be more characteristic of closed mindedness than of authoritarianism (P). This data provides evidence in support of Rokeach's theoretical concepts; the closed minded individual manifests both anxiety and feelings of aloneness. The results also show that dogmatism is not a reflection of political concern.

In replication of Rokeach's findings, Conservatives and Communists scored similarly on the Dogmatism Scale although the Conservatives scored significantly higher on the F Scale. The predictions made by
Rokeach were based on the assumption that the demands made by Catholicism and Communism - "strict adherence to doctrine" - lead to closed mindedness. In support here, the sample of nuns scored relatively high on the Dogmatism Scale. However, Catholic and non-Catholic respondents, at a Catholic institution, were found to score similarly. Further, the National Party supporters in the South African sample, although scoring just above the Dogmatism Scale's theoretical mean, in terms of Rokeachian theory, may have been expected to score higher than they did; the National Party embodies in its ideology almost all the characteristics of closed mindedness. Nor did the intolerance of South African society appear to produce extreme dogmatism; the British and South African samples obtained statistically similar means.

The Communist sample mean, although relatively high compared to the dogmatism scores obtained by the other British political preference groups, did not attain the level predicted by Rokeach. The Communist scores tended to resemble a normal distribution and their group mean was well below the scale's theoretical mean. The prediction of high dogmatism scores by Communists is therefore not fulfilled in the data. Little evidence is obtained to support the contention that "strict adherence to doctrine" leads to closed mindedness. It is suggested that, in order adequately to test Rokeach's postulate, the existence of "strict adherence to doctrine" be more stringently ascertained; its presence needs to be statistically determined rather than assumed.

The Communists and Conservatives scored similarly on dogmatism; however, on a scale free of political content, there were no a priori reasons to predict that the Right of Centre Conservatives would score
as high as the Communists, or higher than the Labourites. That this did occur suggests that the Dogmatism Scale contains content bias towards the political right. The Conservative results indicate that in a comparison of groups on opposite extremes of the political dimension, Fascists would score higher than Communists. Rokeach explains the possible right-wing bias of the scale by the suggestion that content and structure are both authoritarian for the extreme Right. This points to the general difficulty in attempting to separate content from structure; for the extreme Right it appears to be impossible. The results indicate that such difficulties apply also, in some degree, to Right of Centre Conservatives. The interrelationship between content and structure is also implied in the prejudice results; is it possible to believe in racial prejudice in an open-minded manner?

Further, some indications were obtained, using respondents from the pilot study sample, showing that left- and right-wingers reached their respective dogmatism means via different items. Political content appears present in at least eleven of the forty Dogmatism Scale items while eighteen are free of ideological bias. Those on the Left of the political spectrum tended to endorse, while those on the Right tended to reject, the sentiments expressed in five Dogmatism Scale items (the DL sub-scale) and the Right endorsed, while the Left rejected, the six items of the DR sub-scale. Thus, in over 25 percent of the Dogmatism Scale items, content rather than structure appears to have been measured. Rokeach is thus shown to be only partially successful in his attempt to construct a content-free measure of authoritarianism.

The Dogmatism Scale purports to measure general authoritarianism. While authoritarianism of various political persuasions may contain
common elements, the evidence here suggests that the attitudes of the Left and Right are not synonymous. Of the measures used in the study, closed minded Communists and Conservatives were shown to be essentially alike only on anomie. They significantly differed on F, prejudice, rigidity and political concern.

The results showed that dogmatism of the Right were rigid while this did not hold for the Communists. The DG sub-scale, although free of ideological content, correlated significantly with rigidity for the Conservatives, but minimally for the Communist sample. Although the Conservatives and Communists responded similarly on DG, their scores may be open to different interpretation.

Dogmatism is clearly related to neuroticism in the Communist sample but among the Conservatives, the middle range group scored marginally higher on the Neuroticism Scale than did the closed minded. Further, neuroticism correlated significantly with DL in the Communist data while negligible correlations were obtained throughout for the Conservatives.

As a counter to Rokeach's assertion that the Dogmatism Scale measures general authoritarianism it is postulated that high Dogmatism for the Left is an indication of neuroticism, while for the Right, a high Dogmatism Scale score indicates authoritarianism and rigidity.

In conclusion, it is suggested that the validity of the Dogmatism scale requires further substantiation before it may be considered an alternative improvement on the F Scale in authoritarian research. The findings in both Britain and South Africa show that the Dogmatism Scale does not provide a replacement for F in the study of racial prejudice.
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