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In this study, I combined the personality and social-indicator approaches of authoritarianism to determine if these separate approaches reflect similar constructs, and also examined whether economic distress increases authoritarianism and its internal coherence. The writer, in contrast with the time-series designs used in previous social-indicator studies, controlled for extraneous historical events by sampling individuals within the same time period.

One hundred and sixty-one employed and 41 unemployed adult manufacturing workers completed a ninety-five-item questionnaire. The questionnaire contained a short version of the right-wing authoritarianism scale (RWA), items reflecting the social indicators of authoritarianism, and both objective (family income, employment status) and subjective (worry about the economy, worry about personal finances) indices of economic distress.
The results established that the social-indicator and personality measures of authoritarianism are strongly correlated. Economic distress had only small and inconsistent correlations with higher authoritarianism, but all measures of distress were related with greater internal consistency of authoritarianism on both the social-indicator and personality measures.
Chapter I

Introduction to the Study of Authoritarianism

The Fascist movements of the 1930’s and 1940’s prompted social scientists to examine the psychological reasons for support for nondemocratic forms of government. The theoretical model in Fromm’s *Escape from Freedom* (1941) was the earliest effort to explain authoritarianism as the root of this support. In general, authoritarianism was characterized by desires to suppress out-groups, extreme ethnocentrism, and anti-democratic tendencies. To Fromm, authoritarianism was in part a reaction to a society having greater freedom than it was ready to absorb.

Two major empirical approaches have explored the nature of authoritarianism. The first empirical research conducted on authoritarianism was the "individual personality" approach pioneered by T. W. Adorno and his colleagues (known as the Berkeley group) in the 1940’s. The Berkeley group viewed authoritarianism as a stable personality characteristic, and thus introduced the title *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950). The second empirical approach was the "societal-indicator" approach, pioneered by Stephen Sales in the early 1970’s. Sales assumed, like Fromm (1941), that authoritarianism was also a societal reaction to economic and social distress. Therefore, the amount of authoritarianism in society at a given time was determined
by the level of this distress (Sales, 1972, 1973).

Each approach has had a productive history, but the two have not been combined within a single study. As a consequence, authoritarianism as measured by these approaches may not have been describing the same construct. In the present study, I explored the impact of economic distress on the authoritarian syndrome by combining the individual personality and societal indicator approaches.
Chapter II

The Personality Approach to Authoritarianism

The Original Authoritarianism Scale (F-Scale)

Through clinical studies of ethnocentric persons, Adorno and the Berkeley group described the authoritarian syndrome as consisting of nine components. These components were (a) conventionalism: a rigid adherence to conventional, middle class values; (b) authoritarian submission: a submissive, uncritical attitude toward the idealized moral authorities of the in-group; (c) authoritarian aggression: the tendency to be on the lookout for, and to condemn, reject, and punish people who violate conventional values; (d) anti-intraception: opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tender-minded; (e) superstition and stereotypy: the belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate; the disposition to think in rigid categories; (f) power and toughness: a preoccupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension; identification with power figures; overemphasis upon the conventionalized attributes of the ego; exaggerated assertion of strength and "toughness"; (g) destructiveness and cynicism: generalized hostility, vilification of the human race; (h) projectivity: the disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outward of unconscious emotional impulses; and (i) sex: exaggerated concern with sexual "goings-on" (Adorno
et al., 1950, pp. 248-250).

The authoritarianism scale, also called the Fascism (F) Scale, was developed to measure this nine-component model. The original scale was administered to several different populations, and weak items were replaced. This process was repeated several times, creating a series of revised versions of the Fascism scale.

The split-half reliability of the final F scale ranged between .85 and .91. The within-cluster, inter-item correlations were similar to the between-cluster, inter-item correlations (between .11 and .24). The similarity of the within-cluster and between cluster inter-item correlations indicated that these nine components are not separate entities but descriptors of a single syndrome. Despite these low inter-item and inter-cluster correlations, all of the items were significantly correlated with the whole scale (Adorno et al., 1950).

The original F scale has predicted potential Fascism and right-wing ideology in many studies (Meloen, Hagendoorn, Raaijmakers, and Visser, 1988). However, actual support for fascist groups has been difficult to examine due to their rarity in the Western world since the end of World War II. The short-lived existence of the "Centrumpartij" (Center Party) in the Netherlands provided a rare opportunity to examine support for real fascism (Meloen et al., 1988). The F scale was able to significantly differentiate between
those persons who supported the "Centrumpartij" and those who did not. This relationship between actual support for a fascist group and the F Scale scores provided strong support for the construct of authoritarianism.

Nevertheless, the model of the Berkeley group has been criticized for being too vague theoretically to hold up psychometrically (Altemeyer, 1981). For one thing, the list of nine components contains more than nine components and led to very perplexing definitions. For example, the clumping of superstition and stereotypy seems unnecessary. Psychometrically, the original F Scale items were all worded positively (agreement with an item was scored as authoritarian), which could lead a subject with an acquiescence response set to falsely score high in authoritarianism. This bias in the original F Scale may have produced artificially high inter-cluster and inter-item correlations (Altemeyer, 1981), and also may have inflated the F Scale’s correlations with other positively worded scales.

Altemeyer’s Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale

Several newer authoritarianism scales addressed the problems of lack of balance and low inter-item correlations that hampered the original Fascism scale. The best one of these, based on tests of comparative validity, is Altemeyer’s Right-Wing Authoritarian Scale (RWA; Altemeyer, 1981). Altemeyer (1981) used a series of attitudinal and
experimental studies to simplify and more clearly define the processes of authoritarianism. To Altemeyer, authoritarianism was the co-variation of three attitude clusters: (a) authoritarian submission: a high degree of submission to the authorities who are perceived to be established and legitimate, (b) conventionalism: a high degree of adherence to the social conventions which are endorsed by society and the authorities, and (c) authoritarian aggression: a general aggressiveness which is perceived to be sanctioned by the established authorities and directed against various persons (Altemeyer, 1981, p. 148).

The RWA Scale was produced through eight extensive item analyses compiled on many samples over several years. The validation of the RWA Scale involved nearly a thousand students taking six scales of authoritarianism: the original F Scale by Adorno et al. (1950), the Dogmatism Scale by Rokeach (1960), the Conservatism Scale by Wilson and Patterson (1968), the Balanced F Scale by Lee and Warr (1969), the Authoritarianism-Rebellion Scale by Kohn (1972), and the RWA Scale by Altemeyer (1981). The RWA consistently had better predictive validity in controlled laboratory settings than the scales mentioned above. For instance, the RWA had significantly higher correlations than the other scales with the proposed punishment of law breakers and with the actual punishment of peers in a Milgram-type obedience
situation (Altemeyer, 1981; Milgram, 1963). The RWA reliably predicted attitudes that are consistent with authoritarianism more strongly than the other scales, including the acceptance of governmental abuses, acceptance of laws on a moral basis, and aggression against out groups (Altemeyer, 1981). This scale was also found to be the most psychometrically sound of the above scales with the highest inter-item correlations and an alpha reliability of .88 (Altemeyer, 1981).

Altemeyer's use of a three-component model conflicts with the original nine-component model, yet Altemeyer's scale appears to reflect almost all of the original components of authoritarianism. For example, Altemeyer's item 26 (Item 89, Appendix), "There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps" (Altemeyer, 1988), clearly taps both 'conventionalism' from his model and also 'exaggerated concern for sexual goings-on' from the original model. Item 27 (Item 91, Appendix) "It is best to treat dissenters with leniency and an open mind, since new ideas are the lifeblood of progressive change" (Altemeyer, 1988) seems to tap both 'conventionalism' and 'authoritarian aggression' from his model and also 'stereotypy' from the original model.

Cross-cultural studies have provided significant support for the authoritarian syndrome as measured by the RWA. In the former Soviet Union, a Russian translation of the RWA correlated with prejudices against nine out groups,
mean $r = .53$. (McFarland, Ageyev, & Abalakina, M., 1993). The translated RWA was correlated positively with support for Russian army control of the Baltic nations, $r = .41$ (authoritarian aggression), and negatively with Russian progressivism, $r = -.38$ (conventionalism), and support for reformist leaders such as Russian President Yeltsin, $r = -.42$ (conventionalism) (McFarland, Ageyev, & Abalakina-Papp, 1992).

Russian-American cross-cultural comparisons have demonstrated the strong link between authoritarianism and conventionalism. In Russia, the RWA correlated .69 with pro-communism beliefs; in a comparable American sample, the RWA correlated .71 with pro-American, anti-communist beliefs (McFarland et al., 1992). Authoritarianism has also been correlated with norm-specific views on social justice in both the former Soviet Union and the United States. In Russia, the correlations between the RWA and the belief in the distribution of goods and services on the basis of equality was .36; in America the comparable correlation was -.36. In America, the belief in laissez-fair individualism was correlated .22 with the RWA; in Russia, the comparable correlation was .34. These relationships have supported the RWA’s ability to predict the acceptance of conventional norms and the rejection of unconventional norms, even when these norms were opposite in different cultures (McFarland et al., 1993).
Social Distress and the Internal Consistency of Authoritarianism

Altemeyer has suggested that during periods of social calm authoritarianism remains latent in many people with moderate authoritarianism. This hypothesis suggests that the coherence (i.e. internal consistency) of authoritarianism increases (or "glues") with social distress and decreases (or "unglues") with social calm (Altemeyer, 1988). For persons with moderate levels of authoritarianism, social or economic threat brings latent authoritarianism to the foreground of their personalities. As a consequence, the correlations among RWA items and the behaviors which reflect authoritarianism should increase during times of social or economic distress and decrease in times of calm or prosperity.

In support of this hypothesis, Altemeyer found that the mean inter-item correlations for the RWA scale on student samples dropped from .25 in 1973 to .15 in the years 1984 through 1987. This reduction in inter-item correlations may represent this "ungluing" of the authoritarian syndrome due to the increasing social calm in North America following the end of the Vietnam conflict (Altemeyer, 1988). Also, in 1989 RWA items were "glued" together more for Russian adults (mean inter-item correlation of .27) with the deep Russian social distress than for North American adults (mean inter-item correlation of .22) with America's relative social calm.
(McFarland, et al., 1993). However, this support was post hoc rather than predicted, and may have been caused by other historical changes or events.
Chapter III
The Social Indicator Approach

The Work of Stephen Sales

Social upheaval and economic distress have been linked theoretically to increased authoritarianism since Fromm (1941). Stephen Sales (1972, 1973) believed that in order to show that social distress can evoke increased authoritarianism, it must be shown that social distress could affect social indices which represent each of the authoritarian syndrome’s components. If these indices change together as a correlate of economic distress, then they apparently reflect a common syndrome, and the theoretical link between social distress and the societal levels of authoritarianism would be supported. In 1972, Sales applied this theory to the empirical study of authoritarianism by examining changes in select societal indices of authoritarianism during times of high and low social distress (Sales, 1972).

In his first study, Sales (1972, Study 1) hypothesized that increased economic distress would increase conversion rates to authoritarian churches. Sales used the 1920-1929 time frame (the roaring 1920’s) as a period of prosperity and the following 1930-1939 time frame (the Great Depression) a period of economic distress. His selection of churches was limited to those with broad national representation (to control for regionally specific factors).
and to those with annual data on conversion rates. The level of authoritarianism in a church was determined by observing the organizations’ characteristics along the components of authoritarianism as defined by Adorno, et al. (1950). Churches were classified as highly authoritarian which “demand absolute obedience, . . . condemn disbelievers, . . . emphasize mystical aspects of religion, . . . apply a literal interpretation of scripture, . . . strong concern about ‘sin’ (including sexuality), . . . believe that there is only ‘one true church’” (p. 422). High authoritarian churches were identified as the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, the Roman Catholic Church, the Southern Baptist Convention, and the Seventh-day Adventist Church; low authoritarian churches were the Congregational Christian Church, the Northern Baptist Convention, the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and the Protestant Episcopal Church. Using this time series-societal indicator method, Sales discovered that conversion rates to high authoritarian churches increased during times of distress and decreased during times of prosperity. Oppositely, conversion rates to low authoritarian churches decreased during times of distress and increased during periods of prosperity (Sales, 1972).

A confirmatory study was done in Seattle (Sales, 1972, Study 2). Seattle’s economy at that time was tied to the highly unstable aerospace industry. Sales used the Seattle
area unemployment rates to determine good years (1962, 1965, and 1966) and bad years (1961, 1964, 1969 and 1970). In general, he found further support that during times of increased distress people do tend to convert to high authoritarian churches rather than to low authoritarian churches (Sales, 1972).

In 1973, Sales developed an array of social indicators (See Table 1, p. 32) to represent all nine components of the authoritarian syndrome. He chose 1920-1939 (before and during the Great Depression) and 1964-1970 (before and during the Vietnamese conflict and domestic social upheaval) as the time frames to examine the shift from good to bad times.

All of Sales’ authoritarian indices presented in Table 1 increased during shifts from good to bad times. Since these components co-varied, the results supported both the presence of a syndrome and the theoretical link between social distress and authoritarianism (Sales, 1973).

Later Studies of Social Distress and Indices of Authoritarianism

McCann and Stewin (1990) developed the Social, Economic and Political Threat (SEPT) index. This SEPT index was developed by having history professors rank the amount of threat in each of the years from 1920 to 1986. The SEPT index supported the Sales (1972) work on conversion rates to authoritarian churches, with the SEPT correlating between
.72 and .45 for conversion rates to various authoritarian churches and between .72 and .59 for conversion to nonauthoritarian churches. Also, the SEPT index for the same years was correlated with the indices that Sales (1973) had selected for superstition (number of publications with superstition in the title), $r = .53$, anti-intraception (number of publications with psychoanalysis or mental healing in the title, reverse scored), $r = .47$, and power and toughness (number of comics with powerful leading characters), $r = .67$ (McCann and Stewin, 1990).

Since Sales (1972, 1973) had examined primarily shifts from good times to bad times, Doty, Peterson, and Winter (1991) investigated whether authoritarian indices would decrease during shifts from bad to good times. They also wanted to know if the authoritarian indices would change as a result of less severe economic and social threats than the periods used by Sales (Sales had used the Great Depression and the Vietnamese conflict for his bad times). Doty et al. used Sales’ statistical indicators (i.e. personal income) to identify periods of bad (1978 to 1982) and good times (1983 to 1987). They used some of Sales’s original social indicators, modified others, and replaced still others as identified in Table 1.

The threat-authoritarianism link was generally supported, as thirteen of the twenty authoritarian indices decreased as time periods shifted from bad to good, while
only two of the indicators increased. However, the indices of authoritarian aggression did not significantly decrease with the moderate reductions in threat. Also, Doty et al.'s work supported only four of the eleven original Sales measures. The social context and meaning of these measures may have changed, rendering them outdated. And perhaps the smaller degree of social distress used by Doty et al. could not produce as striking effects as those found by Sales, who focused on much greater shifts in social distress. The insignificance of the majority of the Sales measures indicates a need to identify and construct social indicators that are as valid across time as possible (Doty et al., 1991).
Chapter IV

Combining the Personality and Social Indicator Approaches

In the present study, this researcher combined the personality and social indicator approaches to authoritarianism. The social indicators reflecting the nine-component model of authoritarianism used by Sales and Doty et al. were translated into survey items and administered together with the RWA. Secondly, I examined whether both the social indicators and the RWA varied as a function of economic distress. For this study, economic distress was defined by two objective and three subjective indices. Objectively, unemployed persons were presumed to be in high economic distress when compared to those gainfully employed, and participants with lower family income presumably face higher economic distress. Subjectively, economic concern was measured by three indices: (a) worry about personal finances (e.g., "I worry about money a lot."), (b) worry about the local and national economy, (e.g., "I am satisfied with the way the local economy is doing," reverse scored), and (c) optimism about one’s personal job security (e.g., "Fear that you would lose your job due to plant layoffs or closings," reverse scored). This last index was administered only to employed workers.

This combined approach represents an attempt to address five issues. One problem with the times-series, social-indicator approach is that it cannot show whether or not the
social indices or their documented shifts occur within individuals with consistency—that is, while Sales showed that during stressful times both authoritarian churches and boxing grew in popularity, his data could not show whether preference for authoritarian churches and enjoying boxing were correlated with each other, or whether changes in these indices occurred within the same individuals. The authoritarian syndrome assumes that consistency among the social indices should exist within individuals, but the times-series approach used by Sales (1972, 1973) and Doty et al. (1991) could not confirm that.

Second, a major problem with these time-series designs, particularly when only two time periods are compared, is that historical events or changes other than the economic and social threat may have produced the changes in the indices of authoritarianism. In the present study, I compared participants with different levels of economic distress in the same time period; this procedure effectively controls for extraneous historical events in a way that could not be done with previous time-series designs.

Third, in this study, I examined if the personality and social indicator approaches to authoritarianism were reflecting comparable underlying processes. Sales (1972, 1973), McCann and Stewin (1990), and Doty et al. (1991) did not incorporate any individual authoritarianism scale into their work. The RWA and the social-behavior indices of
authoritarianism should correlate significantly, regardless of the level of threat.

Fourth, consistent with the results of the social-indicator studies, both the RWA scores and the social-behavior indicators should be correlated with the degree of individuals' economic distress.

Lastly, in this study I examined Altemeyer's (1988) hypothesis of whether the social-behavioral indicators and the RWA inter-item correlations "glue" as a function of economic distress and "unglue" when economic distress is low.

Specific Hypotheses

The issues presented above translate into the following specific hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Since the social indicators are presumed to all reflect the same construct of authoritarianism, the survey measures of the social-behavioral indicators should yield either a single factor or a set of positively correlated factors.

Hypothesis 2: Because the social indicators and the RWA are presumed to reflect the same theoretical construct, the RWA should correlate significantly with each social indicator and with the social indicator factor or factors.

Hypothesis 3: As found previously by Sales (1972, 1973), McCann and Stewin (1990), and Doty et al. (1991), social-behavioral indicators of authoritarianism should be
positively correlated with unemployment vs. employment, low vs. high family income, and with the subjective indices of economic distress.

Hypothesis 4: RWA scores should also correlate significantly with unemployment, low income, and with the subjective indices of economic distress.

Hypothesis 5: In keeping with Altemeyer’s (1988) theory of "gluing" of authoritarianism under distress, the correlations among the social indices should be higher for the unemployed, those with low incomes, and for those experiencing high subjective economic distress than for the employed, those with higher incomes, and those feeling less subjective economic distress.

Hypothesis 6: Similarly, the mean inter-item correlations on the RWA should be higher for unemployed persons, those with lower income and for those under greater subjective economic distress.
Chapter V
Method

Participants

The participants were 210 adults (mean age = 37.6) sampled in the summers of 1993 and 1994. The sample consisted of 120 males and 90 females; 190 Caucasians, 18 African-Americans, and 2 Native Americans. Eleven participants had less than a high school education; 86 had completed high school, 18 had vocational training; 56 had some college education, and 36 were college graduates. The participants included 161 individuals employed in manufacturing and 49 unemployed manufacturing workers. Manufacturing workers were selected because of their large numbers and availability, and to provide a coherent sample of comparable individuals. To encourage participation, the participants were placed in a lottery for cash drawings. The first sampling in the summer of 1993 had a cash drawing of $300, and the second sampling in the summer of 1994 had a drawing of $400--each drawing had a single winner.

The Questionnaire

The materials were presented as a 95-item questionnaire (see Appendix, pp. 48-61). A cover page stated that the study was designed as an extensive survey to better understand the beliefs and fears of American workers. Demographic information was collected on the participant’s sex, age, race, geographic residence, time at present job,
family income, highest educational level completed, and employment status. The questionnaire also contained the above-mentioned objective and subjective measures of economic distress, items reflecting the social indicators of authoritarianism, and a short version of the RWA authoritarian measure.

The questionnaire was designed to assess individual behaviors and attitudes reflecting the social indicators along the nine components of the authoritarian syndrome of Adorno et al. (1951). The nine-component model of authoritarianism was selected because it was more consistent with the previous societal-indicator approaches (Sales, 1973; Doty et al., 1991), thus allowing for direct comparisons.

As seen in Table 1, 21 indices were used to reflect the components of authoritarianism and prejudice. The questionnaire contained some items taken directly from Sales (1973) and Doty, et al. (1991). For example, Item 45, "How strongly do you favor the death penalty for people convicted of murder?," assumed to reflect authoritarian aggression, was taken from Doty et al. (1991). Other items were modified from previous works in order to meet the current survey methodology. Item 33, "There is not enough support for the police," was modified from an analysis of archival data on police budgets, also believed to reflect authoritarian aggression (Sales, 1973). Where necessary,
new items were created: For example, Item 37, "It is terrible that TV shows too often suggest that births to single mothers outside of wedlock are o.k.," was used to reflect concern for sexual goings-on. The indice labels used in the factor analysis also are given in Table 1.

The television show and hero power indicators (items 39 and 41), designed to tap concern for power and toughness, were the only items that required the respondents to write their responses. These questions asked participants to list their three favorite television shows and three favorite characters. The responses were rated on a scale from 1 (non power-oriented program or character; e.g., Gilligan) to 3 (very power-oriented program or character; e.g., J.R. Ewing). The scores on an individual’s program and character ratings were separately summed for scores on preference for power-oriented programs and characters; these two were summed for overall preference for television power.

Table 2 (pp. 34-35) shows how the various authoritarian social and economic indicators were computed by the questionnaire item numbers. The items that were summed were significantly correlated or had significant alphas. Differences between items were used for two indices; for instance, as one measure of prejudice, the greater willingness to help hungry American children than Iraqi children was obtained by subtracting item 27 from 28.

A 16-item short-form of the RWA was used, due to the
demanding length of the full questionnaire. The eight positively worded and eight negatively worded items with the highest item-total correlations on the full 30-item scale were selected, based on a sample of 463 Kentucky adults (McFarland et al., 1993). McFarland et al. found that a version as short as 12 (six positive, six negative) items had an alpha of .89 (compared to .92 for the full scale) and correlated .95 with the full scale.

Data Collection

The questionnaires were distributed in packets with a return envelope to ensure privacy and a drawing slip for the cash drawing. The selected samples were located as close to the Bowling Green, KY as feasible. During the summer of 1993, participants received packets that were placed with companies permission at the work site and at state employment services offices by permission of the Kentucky Department of Employment Services. During the summer of 1994, participants received packets in the same fashion as in the summer 1993. Additional distribution methods for the summer of 1994 including passing out packets at a large local union headquarters, having packets distributed by W.K.U. professors who were consulting with private industry, and by arranging extra credit for undergraduate students to have manufacturing workers they knew to complete them. The questionnaires were either returned in the mail or collected from the undergraduate students and the consulting
professors. As soon as each questionnaire was received, the
drawing slip was separated from the questionnaire to
preserve the anonymity of the respondent.

To minimize bias, middle responses were inserted into
questionnaires that had four or less items which had been
left blank. The returned questionnaires that had more than
four omitted responses were discarded. Each questionnaire
was keyed into a SPSS-PC system file for data analysis.
Chapter VI

Results

The sixteen-item RWA generated an alpha of .83 with a mean of 63.3 with 210 cases. The mean item response of 3.9 on the six point scale was identical to that found for Kentucky adults by McFarland et al. (1992).

Hypothesis 1:

The mean inter-item correlation among the 21 social indices was only .07. Principle axis analysis of the 21 social indicators with oblique (oblimin) rotation yielded eight factors. However, TVPOW had many missing responses, reducing the number of complete cases for the factor analysis from 210 to 142. For a more stable factor structure, the factor analysis was repeated eliminating TVPOW.

Principle axis analysis of 20 social indicators with oblimin rotation yielded seven factors (N = 208). In order, the factors appeared to measure Political, Religious and Sexual Conservatism (Factor I), Racial and Anti-Gay Prejudice (Factor II), Boxing and Wrestling Enjoyment (Factor III), Capital Punishment Support (Factor IV), Cynicism (Factor V), Corporal Punishment Support (Factor VI), and Support of Dress Codes (Factor VII). The factor loadings are presented in Table 3 (p. 36).

Salient factor scores were created by summing the standardized scores of the items which loaded above .4 on
each factor. The inter-factor correlations are presented in Table 4 (p. 37). The seven factors were somewhat correlated, with the median of .18. In keeping with hypothesis 1, then, the social indices tended to be correlated and yielded a series of positively correlated factors, but the correlations among the items and factors were very small.

**Hypothesis 2:**

Despite the low internal consistency of the social indicators as a whole, 15 of the 21 individual social indicators correlated significantly with the RWA; the median correlation of the indicators with the RWA was .37, as seen on the right column of Table 3. Also as seen in the bottom row of Table 3, six of the seven factors were significantly related to the RWA, with a median of .33. Only Factor VI, corporal punishment support, failed to correlate with the RWA. These results generally supported hypothesis 2.

Despite the low internal consistency of the social indicators, the z-scores of the social indices were summed to comprise a single index of "social indicators of authoritarianism" (alpha = .66); this cumulative index correlated .70 with RWA. As a single index, the social indices appear to reflect authoritarianism in similar fashion as the RWA. Thus, the same underlying construct appears to have been examined by the RWA and the summed social indices. However, there were exceptions: enjoyment
of boxing and wrestling, belief in astrology, belief in corporal punishment, differential support for punishment for rape, and differential willingness to help American vs. non-American children were not related to the RWA. And contrary to intuition, preference for powerful dogs was related to lower authoritarianism.

Hypothesis 3:

On the whole, the social indicators had only small correlations with employment status, income, or the subjective indices of economic concern. These correlations, presented in Table 5 (p. 38), offer only limited support for hypothesis 3.

As seen in Table 5, persons with higher income were less likely to enjoy boxing and wrestling, believe in astrology or divine guidance, or favor differential punishment for rape, but were more likely to support dress codes and the teaching of only "good" American history, and to oppose sex on television. Unemployed persons were more likely to enjoy boxing and wrestling, engage in self reflection, but oppose the teaching of only "good" American history. Those worried about the economy were more likely to favor capital punishment, differential punishment for rape, and oppose obscene art. Those employed people that were not optimistic about their futures were more likely to support capital punishment, differential punishment for rape, and corporal punishment of children. On the whole,
these correlations were weak, but all remained significant when RWA was controlled, suggesting that the impacts of these economic indicators on these social indicators are direct rather than due merely to their correlations with RWA.

**Hypothesis 4:**

Hypothesis 4 was supported for only one of the five indices of economic distress. As shown at the top row of Table 5, the RWA was uncorrelated with income, employment status, optimism or worry about personal finances. It was, however, slightly correlated with worry about the economy, $r = .20$, $p < .01$.

**Hypothesis 5:**

Table 6 (p. 39) presents the mean inter-item correlations, alphas, and the first unrotated factor eigenvalues and percents of variance of the social indices for all economic distress measures comparing individuals at high and low levels of distress. For employment and income, respectively, high economic distress was defined as unemployment and as an annual family income of less than $30,000. Those responses above the means of the subjective indices were regarded as high in economic distress. For all five indices, those high in economic distress displayed greater "gluing" among the social indices than those low in distress, offering strong support for hypothesis 5.
Hypothesis 6:
While economic stress appears to have little effect on mean levels of authoritarianism (with either the RWA or the social indicators), the level of distress had striking effects upon the internal consistency of the RWA, supporting hypothesis 6. These effects of distress are presented in the first two columns of Table 6. For all five indices of economic distress, those higher in stress displayed greater mean inter-item correlations and internal consistencies on the RWA than those low in distress, supporting hypothesis 6.
Chapter VII

Discussion

This study represents an attempt to combine the personality and social-indicator approaches to the study of authoritarianism; the attempt was somewhat successful. In keeping with hypothesis 1, the social indices tended to be correlated and yielded a series of correlated factors, but the correlations among the social indice items and factors were small. In support of hypothesis 2, the majority of the factors were correlated with RWA, and the cumulative index of the social indicators was strongly correlated with the RWA. The personality and social-indicator measures of authoritarianism appear to reflect the same construct.

Little support was found for hypothesis 3 and 4, in that the social indicators had only small correlations with employment status, income, or the subjective indices of economic concern; also the RWA was uncorrelated with income and employment status. Those participants high in economic distress, regardless of which index of distress was used, displayed higher internal consistency or greater "gluing" among the social indices than those low in distress, offering strong support for hypothesis 5. The level of distress also had striking effects upon the internal consistency of the RWA, supporting hypothesis 6.

What do these results suggest relative to the five issues investigated in this study (pp. 14-15)? The first
issue was whether the various social indices or their documented shifts correlate within individuals, something which could not be shown in the earlier time-series studies. The results of this study suggest that these indices are only weakly related to one another, since the median correlation among them was only .07, and a principal axis analysis yielded seven factors. Further, the median correlation among the seven factors was only .18. A few indices, such as preference for powerful dogs, were either unrelated or negatively correlated to the other indices.

The second issue was whether the shifts in the social indices found in previous studies were validly attributed to economic and social distress. This issue was investigated here by examining whether individuals differing in economic distress within the same time period show differences in the social indicators which parallel the differences in the social indices found between periods of social distress and social calm. This study found some, but limited, evidence that economic distress influences the social indicators (refer to table 5). The correlations between economic distress and the social indicators of authoritarianism were for the most part weak and sometimes contrary to expectation: individuals who were unemployed were more rather than less likely to engage in self-reflection and were less rather than more likely to want to teach only "good" history.
The contrary-to-expectation results, and their differences from times-series results, have convenient post-hoc explanations: when there is limited unemployment, unemployed individuals may well engage self-reflection (i.e., self-blame), whereas during periods of general unemployment people may be more prone to blame society and shun self-reflection. But in summary, taken as a whole, the results of the present study offer only weak support for concluding that the changes in the social indicators are due to economic distress.

The third issue was whether the previously separate approaches to authoritarianism (personality and social indicator) reflect the same construct. The strong correlations between both the individual social indicators and the summed social-indicator index with the RWA indicate that they are, indeed, strongly related. These strong relationships support the concept that the two approaches largely reflect the same construct.

The fourth issue concerned whether the RWA and social indicators are correlated with economic distress. Only concern for the economy was significantly correlated with the RWA. The lack of differences in overall authoritarian measures as a function of the level of economic distress found in the present study (refer to table 5) may indicate that the ways in which economic distress relates to authoritarianism are further from being understood than
assumed by previous studies.

Why were the correlations found in this study between the social indices and the levels of distress so weak in contrast to the dramatic effects found in previous social indicator studies? First, the previous studies had much larger samples that were often nation wide. The obscenely large n's used in these studies (200,000,000+) made the statistical tests very powerful. The small, often insignificant, correlations found in the present study might have produced dramatic effects if extended to the entire population of the country. For example, the correlation between censorship and concern for the local and national economy was a nonsignificant .14; if this relationship were applied to the entire population, concern for the economy could have a large impact upon the number of school books censored which was measured in the time-series studies. Second, the social indices of distress in past studies were used in time periods of much more severe distress than sampled in this study. Using the above example, if the concern for the economy that would be present during a depression the possible increases in support for censorship could be dramatic. The previous studies sampled indices and tied them to individuals while the present study sampled individuals and their responses to indices.

The fifth issue concerned whether authoritarianism is latent ("unglued") during social calm and coheres ("glues")
under economic distress. Economic distress as measured in this study had clear and striking effects on the internal consistencies of both the RWA and social indicators (refer to table 6). Looking at the inter-item correlations for the RWA and social indicators, the "gluing" and "ungluing" of the RWA did occur; the authoritarian measures do exhibit a more pronounced coherence under high distress. Even when samples were taken in a period of relative social calm (as in this study), authoritarianism appears to be latent for those with little economic distress but quite coherent for those with economic anxieties. These differences were further supported by the differences found in the economic variable of optimism, in which only employed participants were considered. These differences provide tremendous support for Altemeyer's theory about the internal consistency of authoritarianism. If participant-level differences in economic distress affected the internal consistencies of authoritarianism measures, perhaps more society-wide distress would be needed to affect overall scores.

Further Refinements:

The comparison of only employed to unemployed participants may have limited this study. The index of employment status was more restricted than initially envisioned. The relationships between employment statuses and authoritarianism could be examined more thoroughly if
other employment statuses could be sampled. Those facing layoffs would represent another level of objective economic distress. The initial plan for this study called for sampling manufacturing workers facing such layoffs. Their inclusion could shed additional light onto the effects of employment on authoritarianism. Yet despite many requests to companies, companies preparing to layoff workers were unwilling to allow entree to survey their employees.

The weak correlations between the social indicators are reminiscent of the low internal consistencies of early personality measures of authoritarianism. The previous studies derived many of these social indicators solely from intuition, and as this study has shown, several of these intuitive selections were inappropriate. Future studies should attempt to select indices with clearer theoretical grounding and more firmly establish empirical support before using them in either questionnaires or time-series studies.

The previous studies of social indicators were not presented in questionnaire format; thus the wording and presentation of the social indicators should be reviewed for clarity and validity. The reworking of the social indicators may enhance their statistical power (e.g., inter-item correlations and correlations with economic distress). These reworked items may be able to more specifically examine if societal-wide changes occur within individuals or within groups of individuals.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritarianism Component</th>
<th>Measures of Sales, 1973</th>
<th>Measures of Doty, 1991</th>
<th>Measures used in Present Study (Factor Label)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power and Toughness</td>
<td>1. Number of championship heavyweight fights</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2 from Sales</td>
<td>1. Watching boxing, wrestling on television (BOXWRES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Number of powerful comic book heroes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Preference for power in TV shows and Heroes (TVPOW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>1. Rated cynicism of magazine articles</td>
<td>1. Perceived dishonesty in public institutions</td>
<td>1. Perceived dishonesty in public institutions (CYN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superstition</td>
<td>1. Number of astrology books published</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2 from Sales</td>
<td>1. Belief in astrology (ASTR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ratio of astrology/astronomy articles</td>
<td>3. Belief in astrology reported in polls.</td>
<td>2. Belief in &quot;divine guidance.&quot; (DIV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Submission</td>
<td>1. Number of loyalty oaths passed</td>
<td>1. Attempts to censor school</td>
<td>1. Support for school censorship (CEN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Growth of <em>Christian Beacon</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Preference for conservative churches (CHURCH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism Component</td>
<td>Measures of Component Sales, 1973</td>
<td>Measures of Doty, 1991</td>
<td>Measures used in Present Study (Factor Label)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Interruption</td>
<td>1. Number of articles on psychotherapy</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2 from Sales</td>
<td>1. Interest in psychology, psychotherapy (PSYCHOTH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Number of books on psychotherapy</td>
<td>3. Membership in APA &quot;intraceptive&quot; divisions</td>
<td>2. Index of &quot;self-reflection&quot; (SELFREFL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Aggression</td>
<td>1. Proportion of city and state budgets for police</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2 from Sales</td>
<td>1. Support for larger police budgets (POLBUD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Capital punishment support</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Capital punishment support (CAPPUN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Corporal punishment support (CHILDPUN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for Sex</td>
<td>1. Ratio of sentence lengths rapists/other crimes</td>
<td>1. Sentence lengths rape vs. manslaughter</td>
<td>1. Punishment for rapists vs. criminals in general (RAPE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Proportion of pornographic films with sexual violence</td>
<td>2. Opposition to TV sex (TVSEX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Opposition to obscene art (OBSART)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritarianism Component</th>
<th>Measures of Sales, 1973</th>
<th>Measures of Doty, 1991</th>
<th>Measures used in Present Study (Factor Label)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventionalism</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>1. Vote for conservative vs. liberal House incumbents</td>
<td>1. Support for dress codes (DRESSCODE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Support for teaching only &quot;good&quot; American events (GOODUS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice</td>
<td>(none)</td>
<td>1. Number of anti-Semitic incidents</td>
<td>1. Opposition to interracial dating, marriage (RACEPRE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ku Klux Klan Activity</td>
<td>2. Opposition to &quot;gay rights&quot; (GAYRTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Survey data on racial prejudice among high school seniors</td>
<td>3. Differential willingness to help hungry Americans (HELP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Component/ Indicator</td>
<td>Measures Used in Present Study</td>
<td>Calculations (by Item #) &amp; r or Alpha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power and Toughness</td>
<td>Watching boxing, wrestling on television. Preference for powerful dogs. Preference for power in TV shows and Heroes.</td>
<td>(39+41) 26 (29+30) Alpha = .75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>Perceived dishonesty in public institutions.</td>
<td>(74+...+79) Alpha = .73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superstition</td>
<td>Belief in astrology. Belief in &quot;divine guidance.&quot;</td>
<td>43 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Submission</td>
<td>Support for school censorship. Preference for Conservative Churches.</td>
<td>48 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Intraception</td>
<td>Interest in psychology, psychotherapy. Index of &quot;self-reflection.&quot;</td>
<td>(54+55) r = .27 (56+57) r = .11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Aggression</td>
<td>Support for larger police budgets. Capital punishment (68+69+70) Alpha = .74 support. Corporal punishment (62+63) r = .20 support.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns for Sexual Goings on</td>
<td>Punishment for rapists vs. criminals in general. Opposition to TV sex. (64+66+67)r = .47 Opposition to obscene art. 65</td>
<td>(69-61) r = .54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventionalism</td>
<td>Support for dress codes. Support for teaching only &quot;good&quot; American events.</td>
<td>50 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Component/ Social Indicator</td>
<td>Measures Used in Present Study (by Item #) &amp; r or Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prejudice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition to interracial dating, marriage.</td>
<td>(47+49) r = .45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition to &quot;gay rights.&quot;</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential willingness to help hungry Americans.</td>
<td>(27-28) r = .03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optimism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal job security</td>
<td>(17+...+22) Alpha = .69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with national economy.</td>
<td>32,33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with local economy.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern over personal finances now and in the future.</td>
<td>(35+38) r = .11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Personal and Family Salary</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Factor Structure of Social Indices and Their Correlations with RWA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Indicators:</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOXWRES</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOG</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVPOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYN</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTR</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHOTH</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELPREFL</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLBUD</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPPUN</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDPUN</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPE</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVSEX</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSART</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRESSCODE</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODUS</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACEPRE</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAYRTS</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELP</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor r with RWA

| Factor r | .69 | .43 | .17 | .33 | .33 | -.09| .48 |

Factor Titles:
I -- Political, Sexual and Religious Conservatism
II -- Racial and Anti-Gay Prejudice
III -- Boxing and Wrestling Enjoyment
IV -- Capital Punishment Support
V -- Cynicism
VI -- Corporal Punishment Support
VII -- Support of Dress Codes

+P < .05  *P < .01  **P < .001
Table 4

Correlations Among the Seven Factors of Social Indices of Authoritarianism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .01  **p < .001
Table 5

Correlations of Income, Employment, Worry about Personal Finances and Local and National Economy, and Optimism with RWA and Social Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS:</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORRY ABOUT:</th>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>UNEMPLOYED</th>
<th>PERSONAL FINANCES</th>
<th>LOCAL &amp; NATIONAL ECONOMY</th>
<th>OPTIMISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORRY ABOUT:</td>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>BOXWRES</td>
<td>DOG</td>
<td>TVPOW</td>
<td>CYN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOYED</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL FINANCES</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL &amp; NATIONAL ECONOMY</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTIMISM</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RWA</th>
<th>BOXWRES</th>
<th>DOG</th>
<th>TVPOW</th>
<th>CYN</th>
<th>ASTR</th>
<th>DIV</th>
<th>CEN</th>
<th>CHURCH</th>
<th>PSY-</th>
<th>CHOTH</th>
<th>SELF-</th>
<th>POLBUD</th>
<th>CAPPUN</th>
<th>CHILD-</th>
<th>RAPE</th>
<th>TVSEX</th>
<th>OBSART</th>
<th>DRESS-</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>GOODUS</th>
<th>RACEPRE</th>
<th>GAYRTS</th>
<th>HELP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations in parentheses are partial correlations controlling for RWA. * p < .01  **p < .001
Table 6

Level of Concern in Economic Variables and Internal Consistencies of the RWA and Social Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RWA</th>
<th>Social Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Item</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $30,000</td>
<td>.27b</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than $30,000</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>.22a</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worry about Personal Finances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.19b</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worry about Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.19b</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism about Personal Finances (Employed Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10, t-test for significant difference between correlation means

*b p < .001, t-test for significant difference between correlation means
Appendix
BELIEFS AND CONCERNS OF AMERICAN WORKERS

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

The purpose of this study is to better understand the concerns, beliefs, and fears of American workers. We ask for your help by answering the 95 questions in the attached survey. It should take less than one hour to complete. You may complete it in the privacy of your own home. The survey is completely confidential. Your individual answers will not be shared with anyone and will not effect your employment in any way.

This study is conducted by Dr. Sam McFarland and Mr. Kenneth Hinton of Western Kentucky University. If you have questions while completing this survey you may call Dr. McFarland at (502) 745-2081. The results of this study will be available by calling Dr. McFarland.

If you cannot take part, please do not take a copy of the survey. Our resources for this study are limited.

We thank you for your participation.

Sam McFarland and Kenneth Hinton
SURVEY OF WORKER CONCERNS AND BELIEFS

Dear Ladies and gentlemen:

Please read each of the following questions and circle the letter by the answer that best reflects your concerns and beliefs. It is important that you answer every question. Please mail the completed survey within four days in the return envelop.

1. I was born in:
   a. A rural area.
   b. A small town (like Scottsville, KY; Hartsville, TN).
   c. A moderate size town (like Bowling Green, KY; Murfreesboro, TN).
   d. A large city (like Nashville, Louisville).

2. I am:
   a. Male       b. Female

3. My race or ethnic group is:
   a. White, caucasian  c. Asiatic  e. Other
   b. Black  d. Native American (please write)

4. My highest education completed was:
   a. Less than high school  c. Vocational School  e. College
   b. High school  d. Some College graduate or more

5. My age is: _________

6. I am:

7. How many children do you have? ______.

8. How many people in your immediate family live with you, not counting yourself? _________

9. I now live in (City, county if rural, and state): ____________________________

10. My personal annual salary is:
    a. Less than $10,000  c. $20,000 - $29,999  e. $40,000 - $49,999
    b. $10,000 - $19,999  d. $30,000 - $39,999  f. More than $50,000

11. The annual income of my family (including all wage earners) is:
    a. Less than $10,000  c. $20,000 - $29,999  e. $40,000 - $49,999
    b. $10,000 - $19,999  d. $30,000 - $39,999  f. More than $50,000
12. I am currently
a. employed, full-time  
b. employed, part-time  
c. laid off, unemployed
If employed, have you been unemployed in the last year?  
a. yes  
b. no

13. My spouse (leave blank if unmarried) is currently
a. employed, full-time  
b. employed, part-time  
c. laid off, unemployed
If your spouse is employed, has he/she been unemployed in the last year?  
a. yes  
b. no

If you are currently unemployed, skip to Question 23.

14. I have worked for ________________ (company) for ____ years.

15. Please briefly describe your current job:

16. How long have you held your current position?: ________________________________

Using the following scale, think about the future how and likely is it that each of these events might actually occur to you in your current job. (please circle the best number)

0 = Not at all likely to happen
1 = Unlikely, but possibly will happen
2 = Somewhat likely to happen
3 = Probably will happen
4 = Certain to happen

0 1 2 3 4  
17. Lose your job due to layoffs or plant closings.
0 1 2 3 4  
18. The company will reduce your working hours.
0 1 2 3 4  
19. The company will offer you increased overtime work.
0 1 2 3 4  
20. You will be laid off temporarily or for indefinite periods.
0 1 2 3 4  
21. The company will try to reduce your salary or benefits.
0 1 2 3 4  
22. You will be satisfied with your job.

If you are currently employed, please skip to Question 26.
23. I am currently unemployed because:
   a. laid off due to cutbacks by my employer.
   b. medical reasons.
   c. quit due to personal reasons.
   d. fired by the company.

24. How long have you been unemployed? ____________________

25. From 1 (very depressed) to 7 (very optimistic), how do you feel about your likelihood of finding a good job in the near future. (Please circle the best answer).

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   (very depressed) (very optimistic)

All Respondents answer the following items.

26. On the scale below from 1 (small lap dog) to 7 (large powerful dog), what kind of dog would you get if you could get any dog you wanted?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   (small lap dog) (medium size dog) (powerful dog)

On the scale below from 1 (no chance) to 7 (extremely good chance), indicate how willing you are to give money to aid hungry or sick children:

27. In the United States
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   (no chance) (extremely good chance)

28. In Iraq
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   (no chance) (extremely good chance)

29. Please list below your three favorite TV shows (including reruns)?

   1. ____________________ 2. ____________________
   3. ____________________

30. Who are your three favorite TV heros or characters (including reruns)?

   1. ____________________ 2. ____________________
   3. ____________________

31. If you were to join a church today, on a scale of 1 (very conservative church) to 7 (very liberal church), what kind of church would you join?

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
   (Very Conservative Church) (Very Liberal Church)
Please use the scale below to respond to each of the following statements:

-3 = I strongly disagree with this statement.
-2 = I moderately disagree with this statement.
-1 = I slightly disagree with this statement.
0 = I have no opinion about this statement.
+1 = I slightly agree with this statement.
+2 = I moderately agree with this statement.
+3 = I strongly agree with this statement.

32. Overall, I am very dissatisfied with the way things are in the U.S. at this time.
33. I am not satisfied with the way the federal government is handling the economy.
34. I am financially worse off now than I was a year ago.
35. I am confident that I will be financially secure for the future.
36. My personal debt has become more manageable in the last year.
37. I am satisfied with the way our local economy is doing.
38. I worry about money a lot.
39. I frequently watch boxing on television.
40. I would help harass a group that advocated unpatriotic beliefs.
41. I frequently watch wrestling on television.
42. I pray often and turn to divine guidance to guide my life.
43. I read my horoscope and believe it effects my life.
44. Using the values of our forefathers, such as hard work, honesty and faith, we can make this country great again.
Please use the scale below to respond to each of the following statements:

-3 = I strongly disagree with this statement.
-2 = I moderately disagree with this statement.
-1 = I slightly disagree with this statement.
0 = I have no opinion about this statement.
+1 = I slightly agree with this statement.
+2 = I moderately agree with this statement.
+3 = I strongly agree with this statement.

45. I encourage continuing debate on important issues even after the government has decided on a policy.

46. I encourage my co-workers to make comments and objections even if I am their superior.

47. If I had a daughter, I would strongly oppose her marrying outside her race.

48. I support school boards censoring books that are read in the public schools.

49. Despite their increasing numbers, I would not want to be social friends with an interracial couple.

50. I support codes for dress and hair for students and faculty in the public schools.

51. I would vote against a “gay-rights” amendment to my state constitution.

52. School history teachers should present the bad qualities of the founding fathers and any evil deeds of American government in their classes.

53. I oppose the government censoring art even if it is supported with tax dollars.
Please use the scale below to respond to each of the following statements:

-3 = I strongly disagree with this statement.
-2 = I moderately disagree with this statement.
-1 = I slightly disagree with this statement.
 0 = I have no opinion about this statement.
+1 = I slightly agree with this statement.
+2 = I moderately agree with this statement.
+3 = I strongly agree with this statement.

54. Psychological therapy is usually a waste of time and it would be very unlikely that I would go to a psychologist with my personal problems.

55. I agree with the use of psychological testing in job placement.

56. I spend my time in busy activities rather than spend time in thought and self-reflection.

57. I reflect on my own feelings and beliefs a lot.

58. I support spending much less on national defense.

59. I support spending much more on social services (health care for poor, etc.).

60. With all our crime and drugs, I support strengthening our police and law enforcement agencies.

61. If I were on a jury, I would give the maximum sentences to convicted criminals.

62. I oppose the physical punishment in the public schools.

63. If I were the parent of an unruly child, I would use harsh discipline to punish and control that child.
Please indicate how much you favor or oppose the following opinions by using the following scale.

+3 = Strongly oppose  
+2 = Moderately oppose  
+1 = Oppose somewhat  
0 = No opinion  
-1 = Favor somewhat  
-2 = Moderately favor  
-3 = Strongly favor

64. It is terrible that t.v. shows too often suggest that sexual relations between teenagers are o.k.

65. I would be willing to go to an exhibit of obscene or sacrilegious art.

66. It is terrible that t.v. shows too often suggest that births to single mothers outside of wedlock are o.k.

67. It is terrible that t.v. shows too often suggest that extra-martial affairs are o.k.
Please indicate how much you favor or oppose the following opinions by using the following scale.

+3 = Strongly oppose
+2 = Moderately oppose
+1 = Oppose somewhat
0 = No opinion
-1 = Favor somewhat
-2 = Moderately favor
-3 = Strongly favor

How strongly do you favor the death penalty for people convicted of…

-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 68. Murder

-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 69. Rape

-3 -2 -1 0 +1 +2 +3 70. Drug dealers not convicted of murder

Please answer the following questions using this scale.

-2 = Decreased a lot
-1 = Decreased a little
0 = Unchanged
+1 = Increased a little
+2 = Increased a lot

-2 -1 0 +1 +2 71. Has your church attendance increased or decreased in the last year for reasons other than health?

-2 -1 0 +1 +2 72. Has your religious faith increased or decreased during the last year?

-2 -1 0 +1 +2 73. Has you ability to trust the government to do what is right increased or decreased in the last year?
Now we'd like you to make some ratings of how honest and moral the people are who run the following organizations. While using the following scale, indicate to what extent are there problems of dishonesty and immorality in the leadership of . . .

0 = Not at all
1 = Slight
2 = Moderate
3 = Considerable
4 = Great
5 = No opinion

0 1 2 3 4 5 74. Large Corporations
0 1 2 3 4 5 75. Congress
0 1 2 3 4 5 76. Police and law enforcement
0 1 2 3 4 5 77. Presidency
0 1 2 3 4 5 78. Colleges and universities
0 1 2 3 4 5 79. Religious organizations

Please use the following scale in giving your response to each statement:

-3 = I strongly disagree with this statement.
-2 = I moderately disagree with this statement.
-1 = I slightly disagree with this statement.
+1 = I slightly agree with this statement.
+2 = I moderately agree with this statement.
+3 = I strongly agree with this statement.

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 80. It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rabble-rousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people’s minds.

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 81. It would be best for everyone if the proper authorities censored magazines and movies to keep trashy material away from the youth.

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 82. There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual intercourse.

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 83. The facts on crime, sexual immorality, and the recent public disorders all show we have to crack down harder on deviant groups and troublemakers if we are going to save our moral standards and preserve law and order.
Please use the following scale in giving your response to each statement:

-3 = 1 strongly disagree with this statement.
-2 = 1 moderately disagree with this statement.
-1 = 1 slightly disagree with this statement.
+1 = 1 slightly agree with this statement.
+2 = 1 moderately agree with this statement.
+3 = 1 strongly agree with this statement.

84. There is nothing immoral or sick about somebody's being a homosexual.
85. It is important to protect fully the rights of radicals and deviants.
86. "Free speech" means that people should even be allowed to make speeches and write books urging the overthrow of the government.
87. Some of the worst people in our country nowadays are those who do not respect our flag, our leaders, and the normal way things are supposed to be done.
88. In these troubled times laws have to be enforced without mercy, especially when dealing with the agitators and revolutionaries who are stirring things up.
89. Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.
Please use the following scale in giving your response to each statement:

-3 = I strongly disagree with this statement.
-2 = I moderately disagree with this statement.
-1 = I slightly disagree with this statement.
+1 = I slightly agree with this statement.
+2 = I moderately agree with this statement.
+3 = I strongly agree with this statement.

90. If a child starts becoming unconventional and disrespectful of authority, it is his parents’ duty to get him back to the normal way.

91. There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps.

92. The real keys to the “good life” are obedience, discipline, and sticking to the straight and narrow.

93. It is best to treat dissenters with leniency and an open mind, since new ideas are the lifeblood of progressive change.

94. The biggest threat to our freedom comes from the Communists and their kind, who are out to destroy religion, ridicule patriotism, corrupt the youth, and in general undermine our whole way of life.

95. Students in high school and university must be encouraged to challenge their parents’ ways, confront established authorities, and in general criticize the customs and traditions of our society.
Please be sure you have answered every question. Thank you for your participation.