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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between religion and prejudice is not clear. Some investigators report that people who acknowledge church membership tend to be less tolerant than those who do not (Rosenblith, 1949; Turberville & Hyde, 1946; Brown & Lowe, 1951; Jough, 1951).

Other investigators have found either slight differences or no differences between the attitudes of members of different religions (Parry, 1949; Harlan, 1942; Bettelheim & Janowitz, 1950). Most of these studies only relate attitudes to church membership because information secured is about the subject's religious preference which cannot indicate his religiosity.

O'Reilly & O'Reilly (1954) found important differences in acceptance of orthodox religious beliefs among people who acknowledged membership in the Catholic Church. They concluded that a mere statement of religious preference or membership is not a sufficient criterion to use when investigating attitudes towards minorities.

The present study is concerned with the attitudes of members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormons) and how they are related to certain minority groups.

Problem

The O'Reilly & O'Reilly (1954) study of religious beliefs and attitudes towards minorities prompted the author to make a replication
among the Mormons. His study was to determine if orthodoxy among a ran-
dom sample of the Mormon Church shows a significant relationship in pre-
judice toward Jews, Negroes, and Spanish Americans. The purpose of the
study was to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a significant positive relationship between orthodoxy
   and prejudice towards minority groups?

2. When comparing high and low intelligence group level, how
   strong is the relationship to orthodoxy and to prejudice?

3. How do boys compare with girls with regard to the strength of
   the relationship between orthodoxy and prejudice?

Delimitations

The sample is limited to students enrolled at the Church of Jesus
Christ of Latter-day Saints Seminary at Safford, Arizona.

No attempt was made to classify the students according to their
age or to the economic, educational or social level of their parents.
Only one student taking the various scales was a non-Mormon.

Definition of Terms

Orthodoxy. In the present study this is defined as adherence or
conforming to the principles and doctrines of the Church of Jesus Christ
of Latter-day Saints.

Mormons. A common name applied to members of the Church of Jesus
Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Minority Groups. Jews, Negroes, and Spanish Americans are the
minority groups referred to in the present study.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

"If the Tiber overflows into the city, if the Nile does not flow into the countryside, if the heavens remain unmoved, if the earth quakes, if there is famine or pestilence, at once the cry goes up: to the lions with the Christians!" This remark by Tertullian (Ackerman & Jahoda, 1950) points out in a small way that prejudice has been one of the major problems of society since early time. It has been said that "prejudice is one of the problems of our times for which everyone has a theory but no one an answer" (Bettelheim & Janowitz, 1950).

To cover adequately the problem with which this paper is concerned is to deal with five major areas: the psychology of prejudice, the types of measurements of attitudes, studies about attitudes toward minority groups, orthodoxy and religious attitudes, and orthodoxy as it relates to prejudice toward minority groups.

The Psychology of Prejudice

"Prejudice is commonly regarded as a feeling of dislike against a specific group" (Adorno, Frankel-Brunswick, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950, p. 102). Webster defines prejudice as preconceived judgment or opinion; unreasonable predilection or objection; especially, an opinion or leaning adverse to anything without just grounds or before sufficient knowledge (Bettelheim, 1953, p. 4). Allport (1954, p. 9) states racial prejudice in very flat terms, "Ethnic prejudice is an antipathy based
upon faulty and an inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole or toward an individual because he is a member of that group." At another time (1952) he said it was a "symptom of the authoritarian personality whose early childhood has predisposed him to prejudiced behavior."

When do prejudices start their development within the personality? Young (1930) says it is a common assumption among uninformed people to think that prejudices against races, religions, and divergent groups are innate. Physiology and psychology give no support to any such theory. Trager & Yarrow (1952) feel that they start at an early age to develop attitudes toward different racial and religious groups. Allport & Kramer (1946) specify they first develop during the school years between the ages of 6 and 16, and especially in the age range 12 to 16.

Jahoda, Deutsch & Cook (1951) mention some of the factors that engender prejudices and place them in three groups: (1) irrational, emotional reactions; (2) cultural conflict; and (3) conflict of interest. These are usually closely intermingled. Chein (1946) classifies prejudices in four types: (1) informational, where prejudice is associated with misinformation, unsound premises or faulty ways of thinking; (2) conformity, where prejudice is associated with the need to conform with the social norms; (3) status, where prejudice is associated with material advantage or gains in ego status; and (4) emotional, where prejudice is associated with other psychological needs of the person. Bettelheim & Janowitz (1950) point out that "personality structure alone, cannot entirely explain why people set out to discriminate against particular ethnic groups, or why they are more discriminating of one group
than another." They feel that defensive needs of the individual, the economic and social structure of the community, and the ethnic realities of the moment must also be taken into account.

Bayton (1946) discusses personality and prejudice by saying that in many instances prejudice leads the individual to feelings of superiority, and sometimes the desire for social acceptance may lead to the acquisition of prejudice.

There have been numerous studies done in the area of prejudice. From the point of view of literature the series on prejudice sponsored by the American Jewish Committee (Adorno et al., 1950; Bettelheim & Janowitz, 1950; Ackerman & Jahoda, 1950; Massing, 1950; Lowenthal & Guterman, 1950) is the most extensive.

Ackerman & Jahoda (1950) found that depressed patients are rarely prejudiced. Zeligs (1953) indicated that children not knowing much about certain races or nationalities had few favorable concepts of them. In earlier studies Zeligs (1937, 1950) discovered that children's concepts mirrored the concepts of their elders and the patterns and stereotypes of their social environment. This is confirmed also by Allport & Kramer (1946), Jahoda & Others (1951), and Saenger (1953). Ackerman & Jahoda (1950), on the contrary, found that anti-Semitic attitudes are not necessarily dependent on the existence of such attitudes in the family.

There seems to be some disagreement as to how prejudice is inculcated in the personality of children. Allport & Kramer (1946) and Rosenblith (1949) agree that the more equal-status contacts, the less prejudice. Sherif & Cantril (1947) emphasize that the individual usually acquires his prejudice against a minority group, not primarily from
contact with this minority group, but chiefly from contact with the pre-
vailing attitude toward this minority group. Newcombe (1950) has a sim-
ilar view that a person's behavior is often influenced more by his moti-
vated relationship to a group than by his actual membership in it.

Bettelheim & Janowitz (1950) in their study of personality and
prejudice among war veterans stated that intolerance is always an out-
let for hostility and that the person who has not been able to develop
a well-integrated personality will have a hostile discharge of tension.
He will be intolerant of those groups against whom hostility may safely
be directed, including ethnic minorities. Bayton (1946) refers to this
discharge of tension as displacement. He called it the transference of
an emotion from one object to another. In other words, our aggressions
toward one person are sometimes displaced to other people.

Harlan (1942) and Levinson & Sanford (1944) noted a direct rela-
tion between income of parents and prejudice.

How can we overcome prejudice and what is the result of those
who continue to maintain it? Saenger (1953) and Trager & Yarrow (1952)
agree that teachers are in a key position as "gate-keepers" in the pro-
cess of social change. In a large measure they determine, personally,
the kinds of values and attitudes which will be communicated to chil-
dren, day after day and year after year. One of the major keys to make
people happier is to educate them to be tolerant. Mackenzie (1945)
lists seven ways to educate people in this regard: (1) control your
voice and gestures when speaking of people of other races or creeds so
as not to make them disparaging; (2) through words and music, teach
children to identify themselves with children all over the world;
(3) take every chance to show you do not believe in segregation; (4) don't call people of other races and nationalities by their current derogatory diminutives; (5) have children face their prejudices at an early age; (6) association is important, especially with children, they must know people of other races; not just know about them; and (7) study more about other peoples' customs, history, etc., to try and understand them. Baruch (1946) suggests we use radio, motion pictures, and the press to circulate true and positive information about minority groups.

Prejudice hurts everyone including discriminator and victim. It causes waste in human resources and talent, it lowers standards, leads to juvenile delinquency and crime, weakens our position as a nation, effects our personality, and can lead to severe personal disintegration and emotional disturbance on the part of the discriminator (Bettelheim, 1953). "It warps the personality of the one holding it. The prejudiced person becomes small and mean, and the kindlier and cooperative side of his nature becomes dwarfed. It is impossible for him to get along with a wide variety of people, or to mix well with anyone who is different from himself" (Mackenzie, 1945).

Measurements of Attitudes

The measurement of attitudes logically falls into five categories: questionnaires and interviews, the socio-metric methods, scaling attitudes, projective methods, and disguised objective tests of social attitudes (Jahoda & Others, 1951).

The main concern of this paper is to review the scaling of attitudes and the use of projective methods as they both deal with the study
of orthodoxy and prejudice toward minority groups.

The purposes of questionnaires which form attitude scales is to summarize in a score or scale position, the individual's responses to a number of carefully standardized items. The separate items or questions in attitudinal scales are usually not of interest in themselves; rather the interest is in the total score which results for each individual from the combination of his responses to the various items. . . In selecting items for inclusion in a scale two criteria are commonly used. First, the items must elicit responses that are psychologically related to the attitude being measured . . . a second criterion requires that the items differentiate among the people who at different points along the dimension being measured (Jahoda & Others, 1951, pp. 135-187).

Bogardus was one of the first to concern himself with the standardization of an attitude scale (Christie & Jahoda, 1954). This led to the establishment of his familiar social distance scale (Bogardus, 1933). This latter scale has become a classic technique in the measuring of attitudes toward ethnic groups. It is composed of a number of items selected so as to provide a measure of the degree of social acceptability of any nationality group. The individual's attitude is measured by the closeness of relationship that he is willing to accept. The social-distance scale is simple to administer and score, is widely used in the measurement of ethnic attitudes, but is not so simple to interpret. It has been criticized for ignoring the problem of equality of intervals between the various steps of the scale. Geis (1949) explained how Bogardus stressed that social distance reflects attitudes towards groups
and not toward individuals. Malelu (1954) using a typical Bogardus
social distance form found that social awareness of foreign students is
substantially greater at Brigham Young University and Utah State Univer-
sity than at the University of Utah.

The next development in the measure of attitudes seems to have
been when Cattell extended the psychophysical methods to stimuli other
than simple sensory values (Thurstone & Chave, 1929). He applied the
psychophysical procedures with some variations to the measurement of
estimated degrees of eminence of scientific men. Thurstone (1923) was
the first to see the fruitful possibilities of these psychophysical meth-
ods for the measurement of attitudes. In essence it consists of arranging
a series of opinions relevant to a given attitude object, ranging all
the way from most favorable to most unfavorable, in equally spaced inter-
vals, along a continuum. The average scale value endorsed by a subject
thus becomes a measure of his attitude with reference to the attitude
object. Scales have been constructed dealing with attitudes toward war,
toward the Church, toward capital punishment, etc. There have been
several limitations to Thurstone-type scales: the amount of work in-
volved in constructing them; the dependence of the scale values upon the
opinion of the judges; and the fact that different attitudinal patterns
may be expressed in the same score.

Likert (1932) modified the Thurstone technique in an attempt to
simplify the scale construction by dispensing with the judges. He made
the assumption that attitudes are distributed normally. On this assump-
tion, he measured attitudes using standard deviation units. Between
scale values obtained by this method and that of arbitrarily assigning numerical values from 1 to 5 to the various alternative responses, he obtained a correlation of 0.99. He also reported higher coefficients of reliability by this method than by the Thurstone method of scoring. Equating the number of items used, he obtained higher coefficients of correlation for ten different attitude scales and every group measured. Likert's method has been criticised on the ground that it makes the doubtful assumption of normality of distribution and also because scales constructed without the use of judges correlated only 0.65 to 0.71 with scales using the Thurstone technique of construction (Remmers, 1954).

Another modification of the Thurstone method is that of Remmers generalized or master scale method (Remmers, 1954). It can be used to measure attitudes toward any group. Although many of the specific scales derived from the generalized scales have satisfactory reliabilities, there is considerable doubt they measure the same things as scales developed for a specific purpose (Jahoda & Others, 1951). The essential difference from the Thurstone method is that the opinions which constitute the scale are incomplete sentences without subject, this being supplied at the time of measurement, so that attitudes toward any one of a large group of attitude objects can validly be measured on a single scale. Scoring is like the Thurstone method.

Two other methods of scaling of attitudes should be mentioned briefly. The Scale-Discrimination Technique of Edwards & Kilpatrick (1948) combines some of the merits of the Thurstone and Likert techniques and meets the criterion of reproducibility inherent in the Guttman
scaling method.

The Scale Analysis or Scalogram Method developed by Guttman (Jahoda & Others, 1951) has been applied profitably in public-opinion studies in Israel as well as in the U. S. Army. It has as one of its main purposes the determination of whether the attitude or characteristic being studied is actually scalable or can be placed on a continuum to measure its intensity. Some of the criticisms of this method are the lack of clear meaning of basic concepts, the cumbersome of administration and the awkwardness of analysis to test hypothesis of approximate scalability.

One of the main limitations of any attitude scale is that responses of the individual are very limited.

An indirect method using projective techniques, has in recent years come to be an essential tool to the clinical psychologist, is still rather exploratory and tentative in attitudinal measurement. By projective techniques attitudes are inferred through interpretations of various types of stimuli or behavior situations. The term "projective techniques" implies a field on unstructured material on which the individual can project his personal way of seeing life, his meanings, significances, patterns, or feelings. Such methods differ from standardized tests in that they do not seek so much to interpret individuals in terms of cultural norms as to describe the specific dynamic organization within a particular individual. A criticism of projective techniques is the difficulty in applying statistical measures of reliability and validity and they also require highly trained people to administer and analyze them (Remmers, 1954). Trager & Karrow (1952) list some of the advantages to projective techniques as avoiding the social taboo against
probing the area of racial and religious attitudes in young children, 
that it offers promise of revealing attitudes and emotions as well as the 
factual content of the child's awareness of groups, facilitates the ex-
pression of needs, fears, and conflicts, and it permits the projection 
of hostile feelings which could not be expressed openly on direct ques-
tions.

The Projective Methods fall into four major techniques, the ver-
bal, the pictorial, the play, and the psychodrama. The verbal technique 
utilizes word association wherein the subject responds to a selected 
list of key words or phrases. There have been many experiments using 
the pictorial technique. Proshansky (1943) used the TAT in a study of 
attitudes. Radke, Trager, & Davis (1949) used the Social Episodes 
Test to measure attitudes toward racial and religious groups. Fromme 
(1941) used political cartoons to stimulate discussion and to obtain in-
sights into political attitudes. Rosensweig (1945) used cartoon-like 
drawings to assess reactions to frustration. Many others such as Horo-
witz & Horowitz (1938) Helgerson (1943) and Brown (1947) have used this 
method to project attitudes of people. Much criticism has been given 
against the use of the above methods for measuring attitudes because of 
their lack of standardization (Levitt, 1956). Among the better known 
types of projective technique is that of play therapy, in which the child 
is allowed to express his conflicts, guilt feelings, aggression, or other 
motivations or attitudes through spontaneous creation of clay, finger 
paints, dough, or mud. In the same way, he may use dolls or small toys 
to represent emotionalized persons or situations and thus work through 
emotional stresses, which could be verbalized only with prolonged and
Another technique is that of psychodrama, wherein the individual expresses his feelings and attitudes by acting them out (Remmers, 1954, pp. 12-13).

The use of measurements of attitude have increasingly been applied in the study of social behavior and in recent years have been used in research in business, government, industry, community interrelations, and in education (Remmers, 1954).

Every measurement of attitudes should be reliable and valid. The commonly accepted usage of reliability among psychologists is the accuracy with which an individual's attitude is measured or the degree of error involved in assigning an individual to a class or in establishing his rank order-position (McNemar, 1946, p. 294). It means that when you repeat a measurement by the same procedure it should give similar results (Jahoda & Others, 1951, p. 93). For a measuring instrument to be valid, the problem is essentially that of supplying evidence that the device used measures or classifies the attitude or opinion it was designed to measure (McNemar, 1946, p. 296). In the words of Jahoda and associates (1951, p. 93) "A measuring instrument is considered to be valid to the extent that it produces relevant information about the object being measured which is free from systematic distortions." McNemar (1946) indicates that validity can be ascertained by a variety of methods: (1) Sometimes verbal behavior can be checked directly against nonverbal overt behavior and a correlation established. (2) Validity can be obtained by comparing known attitudes as inferred from activity or membership in organizations with verbal responses. (3) Presumptive evidence can be secured by learning whether the scale or question
differentiates between groups which on a priori grounds should differ in their opinion about the given issue. (4) The ratings of close acquaintances can be utilized. (5) A new scale can be checked against an older scale for high correlation. (6) Validity can be obtained by following the scale administration by intensive and extensive interviews in order to see whether the first expressed position holds up under cross examination. Cronbach (1949) says there are two basic approaches to validity, logical analysis and empirical analysis. In logical analysis, one attempts to judge precisely what the test measures. In empirical analysis, one attempts to show that the test is correlated with some other variable, and therefore measures the same thing.

Attitude Toward Minorities

The majority of literature on the measuring of attitudes is based on studies toward minority groups. According to Jahoda & Others (1951), from the point of view of measurement, the most extensive analysis of prejudice has been prepared by Kramer (1949). His procedure consisted largely in sorting and classifying all the available items related to prejudice which have been used in opinion polls and questionnaires.

Of the numerous studies in this area, the most prominent deal with anti-Semitism and attitude toward the Negro. The California Group (Adorno & Others, 1950) spent five years on a study which started with anti-Semitism but widened into an exploration of the relation between personality, social discrimination, and political ideology. They demonstrated that there is a close correlation between a number of deep-rooted personality traits, and overt prejudice. The study also succeeded
in producing an instrument for measuring these traits among various strata of the population. The Ethnocentrism Scale is intended to measure the individual's readiness to accept or oppose ethnocentric ideology as a whole. The scale consists of 34 items and comprises three subscales on Negroes, Minorities, and Patriotism. There was a correlation of .30 between the Ethnocentrism scales and the Anti-Semitism Scale by Levinson and Sanford (1944).

Gough (1951a) indicated a tendency for students accepting of parental ideology to have higher anti-Semitism scores. This study yields findings similar to those of Levinson & Sanford (1944) and Frenkel-Brunswik & Sanford (1945). Another study by Gough (1951b) found that the anti-Semitic students were less tolerant of other races and groups such as the Chinese, Italians, Negroes, and Russians as well. He also found that the more prejudiced students came from poorer homes and tend to exhibit characteristic fears, insecurities and doubts which are associated with such backgrounds. This was confirmed in a third study (1951c) where the tendency of higher prejudice scores were associated with greater anti-Semitism, lower intelligence, lower status, and poor academic achievement.

Frenkel-Brunswik & Sanford (1945) from their investigation of anti-Semitism in a group of college women showed that the women who possessed a high degree of anti-Semitism were characterized mainly by their "complete surrender" to the need to be conventional. The major problem in these women was not the anti-Semitism but the excessive need to conform to particular social patterns in order to maintain social acceptance.

It is a common belief that in communities where there are only a
few Jewish individuals or families there is little or no active anti-Semitism. Rosenblith (1949), however, discovered that in an area where Jews and Negroes are very small minorities, the level of prejudice was decidedly higher than in an area where much greater opportunity for equal-status contacts exits. Harlan (1942) in his study of anti-Semitism in the North and South discovered that female subjects were more favorable in their attitudes toward the Jews than males and that subjects from the Northern region were less favorable than subjects from the South. Johnson (1934) and Patrick & Sims (1936) in their studies of the attitudes of college students toward the Negro found, as might be expected, that students who were born outside the South or who had spent most of their lives outside the South were considerably more sympathetic in their feelings toward the Negro than were Southerners. Roberts (1953) found a significant difference in the attitudes of Negro youths toward whites depending on whether they lived primarily in the North or the South. The Negro's attitudes, positive or negative, apparently depend upon the attitude of the whites. Positive reactions on the part of the whites tend to produce positive attitudes in the Negro and visa versa.

Various scales have been developed to measure the attitudes of people toward the Negro (Ash, 1954; Hinckley, 1932; Mac Crone, 1937; and Rosander, 1937). The last three references used Thurstone-type scales.

In a study of race attitudes and opinions of high school students in Provo, Utah, Jeis (1949) found female intolerance toward the Negro and the Indian much higher than males. In the same study, boys were slightly more prejudiced toward the Jews than were the girls. Stember
(1961) found that where identical questions concerning Negroes and Jews could be compared, prejudice toward the Negro was more prevalent, and that merely raising the educational level would not necessarily reduce prejudice against minorities. Lapiere (1928) found practice and verbal behavior inconsistent in his study of Negro discrimination in France and England. Similar findings in southeastern Arizona were discovered by Johnson (1961) in her study of student attitude toward Spanish, Jewish, Negro, Mexican, Spanish American, and American Indian.  

The Harlem race riot of 1943 instigated a research by Clark (1944) who questioned Harlem residents on their attitudes toward group violence. Along similar lines, a study prompted by the Los Angeles "zoot suit" riots was conducted by Humphrey (1945) in Detroit. The purpose of the investigation was to compare the popular stereotype of Mexican-American youths with the social types actually existing. It was concluded that Mexican-American youths, like all others, are molded by the social-cultural forces with which they come into contact. Two other studies of anti-minority prejudice are that of Kingsley & Carbone (1938) who investigated discrimination against the Italian-American and the study of Morgan (1945) toward the Japanese.  

Turberville & Hyde (1946, p. 450) summarized the feelings of many men of science concerning attitudes toward minority groups by the following statement. "Neither the mentality nor personality of people is determined by any racial characteristic such as the shape of the head, color of skin, texture of hair. All experiments and tests show that no one race can be considered inferior or superior to any other race."
Attitudes Toward Religion and Orthodoxy

Orthodoxy means "correct and sound in doctrine; holding the commonly accepted faith" (Richards, 1943, p. 51). Studies of religion and orthodoxy in the attitudes of people have centered about topics such as the question of existence and nature of deity, the role of religion in daily life, degree of religious observance, acceptance of miracles, beliefs in immortality, and the changes in these various beliefs and practices.

"Any parent who wishes to create religious attitudes in children must care enough about it to develop the best religious attitudes himself" (Tibbetts, 1933, p. 122). Religious educators realize that religious attitudes are developed like any other attitudes and therefore, the measurement of attitudes is a distinct field of interest for them.

What are some of the needs and values of religion? Tillich (1953) indicates that interest in religious activities helps to give individuals a certain amount of external and internal security. Whitmer & Kotinsky (1952) believe it to be the core of civilization and the main spring of moral values. Vanderveldt (1951) feels that religion contributes to good mental health because it teaches the meaning of life, provides man with an end, a purpose, a motive, an object in living. When a person knows what he is living for, he can accept his lot with patience and contentment, and consider it as something worthwhile. Kunts (1954) expresses the opinion that inspiring ideals, noble sentiments, wholesome attitudes and sublime values are rooted in religion; he believes these to be the fundamental motivating factors in character. Landis (1955,
well-adjusted person. "Those who are truly religious possess the traits out of which good human adjustment and good family living spring."

One of the first quantitative studies of religious beliefs is that of Leuba (Katz & Allport, 1931) where he found men to be less orthodox than women. This finding is very prevalent in many of the studies in this area (Carter & Strong, 1933; Lundberg, 1926; Carlson, 1934; Allport & Vernon, 1931; Ferguson, 1944; Fichter, 1952; and Vernon, 1950). Maslow (1940) in his study on college women, found that those with high self-esteem tended to be less religious than those with low-esteem. Peterson (1953) found a very slight relationship between sex and expressed religiosity among Brigham Young University students. In the findings of Vernon (1955) there is somewhat of a variance with the commonly held opinion that females tend more to extreme orthodoxy than do males. It was found that the males tend toward the extremes of the continuum, that is, a larger percentage of males were found to be extremely orthodox or extremely unorthodox. Telford (1951) in an experimental study of some factors influencing the social attitudes of college students noted that where the parents and the child differed in church affiliation, the child was less favorable to the church than where they all belonged to the same church. He also concluded that the mother was more important in determining the child's attitude toward the church than was the father.

Orthodoxy has been assumed to be typical of the older years of life (Anderson & Dvorak, 1923-29; Hall & Robinson, 1942; and Sevan & Others, 1949). Ferguson (1944) and Harlan (1942) found no relationship
at all between religionism scores and age. Vernon (1955) and Call (1959) in their studies with Mormon subjects discovered that as age increases orthodoxy decreases. It was found that the most orthodox Mormons were in the 18 and 19 year old ages. An explanation of the above factor, is that the Mormon Church carries on an extensive program for its young people which may serve to keep their activity at a high level. Also at this age there may be a tendency to accept unquestionably the teachings of the Church without much critical evaluation on the part of the individual. At this age the influence of the parents is still of importance (Vernon, 1955).

Various scales of orthodoxy and religion have been formulated. Ferguson (1944) developed a Religionism scale for the measurement of attitudes toward God, evolution, and birth control. His study was rather extensive in that he had over 2500 subjects representing 18 different colleges and universities. He found that Jewish children were more liberal than either Catholic or Protestants. Carlson (1934) had similar results in that Jewish students were most liberal in their attitude on social questions, Protestant students followed next, and Catholic students were the least liberal. Brown & Lowe (1951) constructed an "Inventory of Religious Belief" in their study of Protestant undergraduates. Reliability of the entire scale was .87 by use of the Spearman-Brown formula, and validity was established after comparing replies given to a personal data form with scores on the inventory itself. A significant tendency in the direction of a more liberal religiosity with increasing years in college was found. Catholics, as a group, scored considerably more orthodox than Protestants as a group.
It was also found that the religious person had greater emotional stability than the non-believer. Dudycha (1933) confirmed the above study when he found the often reported result that seniors in college believe in less religious concepts and propositions than do college freshmen. Thurstone & Chave (1928) developed one of the first religious scales called the Attitude Toward the Church. Reliability of the whole test by the Spearman-Brown formula was estimated to be a correlation of .94. They found that Catholics to be most orthodox, then Protestant, and Jews last. Two scales have been developed to measure attitudes toward the Mormon Church (Hardy, 1949; Vernon, 1954-55). The Hardy Scale had a split-half reliability of .95. Evidence for good to excellent validity for the scale was obtained from the several criterion measures, and when they were combined into a composite criterion score, a correlation ratio of .794 was obtained for combined criterion scores against scale scores, indicating a close relationship between the two. A number of correlates of attitudes toward the Church were obtained but little or no relationship was found to exist between attitudes toward the Church and age, sex, and amount of formal education. Since the Vernon Scale of Church Orthodoxy was used in the main study of this paper, it will be discussed in chapter 3.

Some studies have been made in connection with Mormon populations in regard to various attitudes. Bartlett (1952) conducted a study of attitudes of members toward the Church Welfare Program. He found that members who were the most favorable toward the Welfare Program had less income, were the most active in attendance, held a favorable attitude toward the leaders of the Church and had more information about the
program. Lee (1960), using the Tennessee Department of Mental Health Self-Concept Scale to measure self concept and the Allport, Vernon, and Lindsey Study of Values Scale to Measure the religious interest of his subjects, found there was no significant relationship between positive self concept and religious interest. Ellsworth (1958) completed research in factors affecting religious activity. He concluded at the .01 level of confidence that among active members the factor of spiritual experience was significantly more often occurrent than any other single factor. Also significantly more inactive members had the factor of external negative pressure during childhood than did active subjects. Smith (1956) undertook to test the hypothesis that members of the Mormon Church who live among a preponderance of fellow members are more likely to be orthodox in living their religion than are members of the Church who live scattered among a preponderance of non-Mormons. He concluded that "there is no significant differences in orthodoxy of Mormons in cities where they preponderate from cities where they are a small minority."

In a very similar study to the above, Smith (1958, p. 27) discovered that although Mormons are remarkably similar wherever they are found, very different ecological differences do appear both in proportion adjudged by their Bishops to be orthodox in their religion and in responses pertaining to possession in their homes of forbidden "Word of Wisdom" items. This was significant at the .05 level of confidence.
Orthodoxy and Prejudice

There are few studies which specifically show the relationship between religious orthodoxy and prejudice toward minority groups. These are still somewhat vague. Some investigators report that a statement of religious affiliation by a person tends to make him less tolerant than those not professing affiliation. Others have found a slight or no difference between the attitudes of members of different religions.

O'Reilly & O'Reilly (1954) conducted a study concerned with the attitudes toward Jews and Negroes held by Catholic college students, and the relationship between these attitudes and their attitudes toward certain teachings of the Catholic Church. They administered the 52 item Levinson & Sanford Anti-Semitism Scale, a 16 item scale to measure attitude toward the Negro, and a 16 item scale, adapted from one developed by Fichter, to measure the extent to which the subjects agreed with the Catholic Church on certain religious questions. The anti-Negro scale had a split-half reliability of .93 raised to .96, and the religion scale a reliability of .90 raised to .95. When tested with another group, the religion scale had a correlation of .60 with the Thurstone & Chave scale for measuring attitude toward the church. They found that those subjects scoring high on the religion scale also scored high on the anti-Semitism and anti-Negro scales, significant at the .01 level. They concluded that stating religious preference was not adequate criterion when investigating attitudes toward minorities as it didn't explain how orthodox the individual was in his religious convictions. The reliability of the anti-Semitism scale will be discussed in Chapter 3.
Allport and Kramer (1946) found that prejudice was lowest among Jews and those professing no religious affiliation. The highest scores were among Catholics. Those subjects who reported marked or moderate influence of religious training were significantly more prejudiced. Children of college trained parents tended to be freer from prejudice than the children of non-college trained parents.

The investigation by Rosenblith (1949) constituted almost a strict repetition of the Allport & Kramer study (1946) with some additional questions included on other minority groups and whether the subject was a veteran or not. She confirmed at the 5% level of significance most of the Allport & Kramer findings including "prejudice is higher among the Roman Catholics than in any other religious group."

One point of disagreement, however, was in their finding that subjects who reported marked or moderate influence of religious training are significantly more prejudiced. In both cases the Rosenblith groups are almost evenly divided between the more and the less prejudiced.

Adorno & Others (1950) in a social studies series on prejudice sponsored by the American Jewish Committee, noted that subjects who profess to some religious affiliation express more prejudice than those who do not, or the people who reject organized religion are less prejudiced than those who accept it. The factor of religious denominations was not proven to be very significant.

Rather significant results were obtained from the study of Turbeville & Hyde (1946, p. 450) of attitudes toward the Negro among college students in Louisiana. In spite of the fact that one of the cardinal tenets of Christianity is the brotherhood of all mankind, two
groups of largely non-Christians, (consisting of) Jews and non-religious (persons) or other than Protestant or Catholic, were more willing than the "Christians" to practice this prime doctrine of Christianity. It was found that the Jewish group, itself a conscious minority, was the most liberal of all the religious sects, the non-religious or other was the next most liberal, the Protestant next, and the Catholic the least liberal. These same findings are confirmed also by Levinson & Sanford (1944) and Sappenfield (1944).

Summary

An attempt has been made by the writer to give a background of literature for the present research. It has dealt with the research and measurements of attitudes which have been developed in the following areas: psychology of prejudice, the various types of attitude measurement, studies about attitudes toward minority groups, orthodoxy and religious attitudes, and orthodoxy and its relationship with minority groups.

There is still a definite need for continued research as it pertains to orthodoxy and prejudice. Instruments to measure attitudes in this area, as a general rule, lack standardization. The present study is limited in its scope to fulfill the above needs.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

Selection of Sample

The subjects of the study were drawn from the total number of Mormon students enrolled in five classes taught by the writer and two classes of a colleague in the L. D. S. Seminary program at the Safford, Arizona High School. The study sample numbered 149 of a possible 165 students and comprised all those who completed the experimental procedures outlined below. The sample of 149 reflected a cross section of freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors in the seven classes selected in the study. The school is in the southeastern part of the State and has an enrollment between 500 and 550 students. The Safford High School had been integrated with a Negro school and a Spanish American school from outside the district. The impetus for the Negro integration came from a Supreme Court decision regarding segregation as unconstitutional. Although the Spanish American school had not been intentionally segregated, its location in a small town almost totally Spanish American practically made it so. Thus, the present high school has a racially mixed student body with the white students in the majority and Negro, Jewish, and Spanish American students in the minority. Two Spanish American students, members of the Mormon Church, and one non-Mormon were included in the sample.

Instruments

The Vernon Scale of Church Orthodoxy was chosen as the instrument to measure religious orthodoxy as it had the definite advantage of being standardized on members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day
Saints. It was used to measure the extent to which the subjects agreed with the Mormon Church on certain social, moral, and religious questions. The items of the scale were found to have a coefficient of reproducibility of .91 as shown by the pre-test data analysis (Vernon, 1955, p. 325). By the method of dichotomization the items were found to be scalable with a coefficient of reproducibility of .89. A sample of the Vernon Scale of Church Orthodoxy is found in Appendix A.

Scoring on the Vernon Scale was on a three to five point scale. In each statement the items varied so that agreement with some items would indicate orthodoxy, while agreement with others would indicate unorthodoxy. High scores in either case represented an orthodox position. Scores on the twelve items in the scale were computed for each subject, a high score indicating orthodoxy and a low score indicating unorthodoxy.

The Levinson & Sanford Anti-Semitism Scale, designed to measure the attitude of the subjects toward the Jews, was used in this study because of its excellent reliability and validity. The reliability was calculated by the "split-half method of correlating the total scores of each subject on the odd and even items and correcting this value by means of the Spearman-Brown formula. The value obtained was .96 raised to .98" (Levinson & Sanford, 1954, p. 354).

As a preliminary procedure to validate the 52 item scale it was administered to thirteen non-Jewish graduate students and faculty members in the Department of Psychology at the University of California. These subjects were all known liberals who were openly opposed to prejudice. Their low mean score of 86.0 was taken as evidence that the scale had some validity. Other evidence on validity was obtained by comparing the mean scores of subjects grouped according to one significant variable or
another.

The scoring on the Levinson & Sanford Anti-Semitism Scale is not according to the conventional five-point marking system. The argument for the procedure used is that three degrees of agreement and disagreement can be readily distinguished, and that much of the difficulty created by a zero score can be made unnecessary by not having one. As in the scale by Vernon, high scores were an indication of an anti-Semitic attitude while low scores indicated a favorable attitude toward the Jews. A sample of the Levinson & Sanford Anti-Semitism Scale is found in Appendix B.

The Hinckley Scale on Attitude Toward the Negro, edited by L. L. Thurstone, was used in this study because of its shortness, the facility in administering and scoring, and its high reliability and validity. Comparison of three sets of scale values were correlated. The correlation between the scale values of Group I and Group II yielded a Pearson Coefficient of .980. The correlation between the scale values of Group I and Group III was .935.

A comparison of the scale values which the various groups gave to the 32 statements of the final scale was made. Although the statements were chosen because of their scale values in Group I, it is significant that Group II places them in the same rank order in which they were placed by Group I. This means that the scale, which was constructed on the basis of the sortings of Group I, can measure the attitudes of Group II as well as it can the attitudes of Group I. This is very definite evidence in favor of the objective validity of the scale (Hinckley, 1932, p. 293).

This Thurstone-type scale had two forms which could be used. Form A was administered to the subjects. The scale had sixteen items that
the subject marked as to his agreement or disagreement. A plus sign designated the subject's agreement and a zero designated the subject's disagreement. Each item on the scale was given a scale value. A subject's score was the median scale value of all the statements he endorsed. A sample of the Hinckley Scale on Attitude Toward the Negro and its adaptation to measure attitude toward the Spanish American are found in Appendix C and D respectively.

Procedures

The four scales used in the study were administered to the subjects near the end of the school year. The Vernon Scale of Church Orthodoxy and the Hinckley Scale on Attitude Toward the Negro were administered to the seven classes on one day. The following day the Levinson & Sanford Anti-Semitism Scale and an adaptation of the Hinckley scale referred to above, to measure attitudes toward the Spanish American were given.

At the time of each administration a brief explanation was given to the subjects indicating the purpose of the study, its confidential nature, and an explanation of marking instructions. Students were encouraged to be frank and honest in marking the items on each scale.

Each student was assigned a special number so that his identity would be concealed to all except the examiner, whose knowledge of the special numbers was essential in order to obtain IQ scores from the high school. This latter procedure was accomplished after the termination of school when the writer had access to the school files. Intelligence scores were obtained from the Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Test.
Tabulation of raw scores was made and placed on a chart to consolidate the information necessary for statistical analysis. The scoring of each of the scales is discussed below in connection with each of the instruments used.

Statistical Analysis

Following the selection of the sample and administration of each of the scales, statistical analysis was made by the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient, to determine the relationships between (a) intelligence and orthodoxy, (b) intelligence and prejudice toward minority groups, and (c) orthodoxy and prejudice. In addition, the top 27 per cent of the total groups, in terms of intelligence, were compared with the bottom 27 per cent, and boys were compared with girls on each of the same variable, i.e., intelligence, orthodoxy, and prejudice. The significance of differences in each of the latter comparisons was determined by use of t-ratio between means.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

Some of the major questions to be answered in this study concerned: (1) the relationship of IQ to orthodoxy and to prejudice toward minority groups; (2) the strength of the relationship of the above variables among persons of high IQ as compared with the relationship among those of low IQ; (3) the strength of the relationship of the above variables among boys as compared with the relationship among girls. Correlations and t ratios were computed from the data shown in Appendix E.

Table 1 represents the number, means and standard deviation for boys, girls, and total sample on the following variables: IQ, orthodoxy, anti-Semitism, attitude toward the Negro, and attitude toward the Spanish American.

Table 2 shows the correlations and the levels of significance for boys, girls, and total sample between IQ and the variables of orthodoxy, anti-Semitism, attitude toward the Negro and Spanish American with the inter-correlations of the above variables.

From Table 2 it can be pointed out that all correlations were significant at the .05 level of confidence or better with two exceptions. There were no significant relationship for girls between IQ and anti-Semitism and orthodoxy and anti-Semitism.

It may be of interest to note that for boys, girls, and total sample between the variables of IQ and anti-Semitism a negative correlation was found. This indicates that as IQ increases, anti-Semitism
TABLE 1

NUMBER, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS, ON BOYS, GIRLS, AND TOTALS ON VARIABLES OF IQ, ORTHODOXY AND MINORITY GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>Orthodoxy</th>
<th>Anti-Semitism</th>
<th>Attitude toward Negro</th>
<th>Attitude toward Spanish American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys (N=74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>106.01</td>
<td>45.82</td>
<td>189.39</td>
<td>62.77</td>
<td>63.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>60.94</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>10.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls (N=75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>106.91</td>
<td>47.28</td>
<td>168.60</td>
<td>66.41</td>
<td>71.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>56.49</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=149)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>106.46</td>
<td>46.56</td>
<td>178.93</td>
<td>64.62</td>
<td>69.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>59.65</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>9.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

decreases. This was significant for boys and total at the .005 level of confidence.

Among boys, girls, and total sample it is observed that when IQ increases, orthodoxy, prejudice toward the Negro, and prejudice toward the Spanish American also increase, significant at the .05 level of confidence.

As orthodoxy increases among boys, girls, and total, anti-Semitism decreases but prejudice toward the Negro and prejudice toward the Spanish American increase, all significant at the .05 level of confidence or
# Table 2

Correlations and Levels of Significance for Boys, Girls, and Total Between the Variables of IQ, Orthodoxy, and Prejudice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ-Orthodoxy</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ-Anti-Semitism</td>
<td>-.355</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ-Attitude Toward Negro</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ-Attitude Toward Spanish American</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodoxy-Anti-Semitism</td>
<td>-.439</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodoxy-Attitude Toward Negro</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodoxy-Attitude Toward Spanish American</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Semitism-Attitude Toward Negro</td>
<td>-.463</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Semitism-Attitude Toward Spanish American</td>
<td>-.463</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Toward Negro-Attitude Toward Spanish American</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
better.

It is indicated that when anti-Semitism increases prejudice toward the Negro and Spanish American decreases among each group of the sample, significant at the .005 level of confidence.

As prejudice toward the Negro increases, it is noted that so does prejudice toward the Spanish American, significant at the .005 level of confidence.

Table 3 shows the number, means, and standard deviations for the low 27 per cent IQ and the high 27 per cent IQ on the variables of orthodoxy, anti-Semitism, attitude toward the Negro, and attitude toward the Spanish American.

TABLE 3

**NUMBER, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR LOW IQ AND HIGH IQ ON VARIABLES OF ORTHODOXY AND MINORITY GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>Orthodoxy</th>
<th>Anti-Semitism</th>
<th>Attitude toward Negro</th>
<th>Attitude toward Spanish American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low IQ (N=40)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>43.83</td>
<td>200.60</td>
<td>60.63</td>
<td>64.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>66.11</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High IQ (N=40)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>120.15</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>169.15</td>
<td>67.20</td>
<td>73.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>45.42</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 represents the correlations and the level of significance between high and low IQ and orthodoxy, anti-Semitism, attitude toward the Negro and attitude toward the Spanish American.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Low IQ</th>
<th>High IQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ-Orthodoxy</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ-Anti-Semitism</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ-Attitude Toward Negro</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ-Attitude Toward Spanish American</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodoxy-Anti-Semitism</td>
<td>-.359</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodoxy-Attitude Toward Negro</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodoxy-Attitude Toward Spanish American</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Semitism-Attitude Toward Negro</td>
<td>-.307</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Semitism-Attitude Toward Spanish American</td>
<td>-.284</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Toward Negro-Attitude Toward Spanish American</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 indicates no significant relationship between low and high IQ groups and the variables with exception of prejudice toward the Spanish American. As IQ increased in the low IQ group, prejudice toward the Spanish American increased significantly at the .025 level of confidence.

As may be observed, when orthodoxy increases anti-Semitism decreases but prejudice toward the Negro and Spanish American increases, significant at the .025 level of confidence or better except on the low IQ group on prejudice toward the Spanish American.

Significant negative correlations may be noted in both low and high IQ groups between anti-Semitism, prejudice toward the Negro and Spanish American. In other words, as anti-Semitism increases prejudice toward the Negro and Spanish American decreases.

Table 5 shows the number, means, standard deviations, difference of means, t test, and the level of significance between low and high IQ groups on the variable of orthodoxy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF LOW AND HIGH IQ GROUPS ON ORTHODOXY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>tM</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low IQ</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43.83</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High IQ</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>-4.71</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 5 a significant difference at the .005 level of confidence may be observed. Orthodoxy is highest among the high IQ group.

Table 6 represents the number, means, standard deviations, difference of means, t test and the level of significance between low and high IQ groups on the variable of anti-Semitism.

**TABLE 6**

**SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF LOW AND HIGH IQ GROUPS ON ANTI-SEMITISM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low IQ</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>200.60</td>
<td>66.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High IQ</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>169.15</td>
<td>45.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.45</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows a significant difference at the .025 level of confidence between the high and the low IQ groups on anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism is highest among the low IQ group.

Table 7 represents the number, means, standard deviations, difference of means, t test and the level of significance between low and high IQ groups on the variable of attitude toward the Negro.

Table 7 shows a significant difference at the .005 level of confidence between the high and the low IQ groups on attitude toward the Negro. Prejudice toward the Negro is highest among the high IQ group.

Table 8 represents the number, means, standard deviations, differences of means, t test and the level of significance between low and
high IQ groups on the variable of attitude toward the Spanish American.

From Table 8 it can be noted that a significant difference at the .005 level of confidence between the high and low IQ groups on attitude toward the Spanish American. Prejudice toward the Spanish American is highest among the high IQ group.

**TABLE 7**

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF LOW AND HIGH IQ GROUPS ON ATTITUDE TOWARD THE NEGRO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low IQ</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60.68</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High IQ</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67.20</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 8**

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF LOW AND HIGH IQ GROUPS ON ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SPANISH AMERICAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low IQ</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64.93</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High IQ</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>73.08</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 shows the number, means, standard deviations, difference of means, t test and the level of significance between boys and girls on the variable of IQ.

Table 9 indicates no significant difference between boys and girls when IQ is concerned.

**TABLE 9**

**SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF BOYS AND GIRLS WITH IQ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>106.01</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>106.91</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 represents the number, means, standard deviations, difference of means, t test and level of significance between boys and girls on the variable of orthodoxy.

**TABLE 10**

**SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF BOYS AND GIRLS WITH ORTHODOXY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45.82</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>47.23</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is apparent from Table 10 there is no significant difference between boys and girls in regard to orthodoxy.

Table 11 shows the number, mean, standard deviations, difference of means, t test and level of significance between boys and girls on the variable of anti-Semitism.

**TABLE 11**

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF BOYS AND GIRLS WITH ANTI-SEMITISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>189.39</td>
<td>61.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>168.60</td>
<td>56.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 indicates a significant difference at the .025 level of confidence between boys and girls in regard to anti-Semitism. Prejudice toward the Jews seems to be higher among boys than girls.

Table 12 represents the number, means, standard deviations, difference of means, t test and level of significance between boys and girls on the variable of attitude toward the Negro.

Table 12 points out a significant difference at the .025 level of confidence between boys and girls in regard to attitude toward the Negro. Prejudice is highest among the girls.

Table 13 shows the number, means, standard deviations, difference of means, t test and levels of significance between boys and girls on
the variable of attitude toward the Spanish American.

Table 13 indicates there is no significant difference between boys and girls in regard to prejudice toward the Spanish American. This does not say that both groups are not prejudiced toward the Spanish American.

**TABLE 12**

**SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF BOYS AND GIRLS WITH ATTITUDE TOWARD THE NEGRO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>62.77</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66.44</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 13**

**SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS OF BOYS AND GIRLS WITH ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SPANISH AMERICAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DM</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68.14</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71.13</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference 2.99 1.96 NO
Summary of Findings

IQ

In the present study it was found that as IQ increased prejudice toward the Jews decreased, but prejudice toward the Negro and Spanish American increased.

Anti-Semitism scores were found to be highest among the low IQ group. This is confirmed by Gough (1951c) who found greater anti-Semitism associated with lower intelligence, lower status, and poorer academic achievement. Prejudice toward the Negro and Spanish American were highest among the high IQ group. A possible explanation of the findings of the present study would be the socio-economic levels of the groups concerned and also the predominant Mormon culture of the area.

There was no significant difference between boys and girls on IQ. The high IQ group of the total sample tended to be more orthodox than the low IQ group.

Minority Group Prejudice

The study of Stember (1961), in which prejudice toward the Negro was found to be higher than prejudice toward the Jew, was confirmed by the present study.

Geis (1949) concluded that boys are more prejudiced toward the Jews and girls more prejudiced toward the Negro and this was also found to be so by the present study.
Rosenblith (1949) discovered that in an area where Jews are a small minority the level of prejudice was decidedly higher. The present study found no basis for the above.

Gough (1951b) found anti-Semitic students to be intolerant also of other races and groups, but the current research found them more tolerant than students who were not anti-Semitic. However, when prejudice toward the Negro increased so did prejudice toward the Spanish American.

A possible explanation of why the measurements of the present sample indicated less anti-Semitism and more prejudice toward the Negro would be their social-cultural-religious heritage. It was noted in the review of literature that the children's concepts mirrored the concepts of their elders and the patterns and stereotypes of their social environment (Allport & Kramer, 1946; Jahoda & Others, 1951; Saenger, 1953). Prejudice against a minority group results not primarily from contact with it, but chiefly from contact with the prevailing attitude toward the minority group (Sherif & Cantril, 1947).

Orthodoxy and Prejudice

The prevalent concept that women are more orthodox than men (Katz & Allport, 1931; Carter & Strong, 1933; Lundburg, 1926; Carlson, 1934; Allport & Vernon, 1931; Ferguson, 1944; and Fichter, 1952) was not brought out in the present study. No significant difference was found between boys and girls in regard to orthodoxy. Vernon (1955) using a Mormon sample, however, discovered a larger percentage of men to be extremely orthodox or unorthodox than women.
The study of O'Reilly & O'Reilly (1954) concerned with attitudes of Catholic students toward Jews and Negroes, found that those subjects scoring high on the religion scale also scored high on the anti-Semitism and anti-Negro scales. The above was confirmed among the present Mormon sample with regard to prejudice toward the Negro and Spanish American but not confirmed with anti-Semitism.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY

Research of the relationship between orthodoxy and prejudice is not consistent. Some studies report those who acknowledge church membership to be less tolerant than those who do not. Other investigators find either slight differences or no differences among the attitudes of members of different religions. Still others find important differences in acceptance of orthodox religious beliefs and attitudes toward minority groups.

The main questions the study attempted to answer were the following:

1. Is there a significant positive relationship between orthodoxy and prejudice towards minority groups?
2. When comparing high and low intelligence group levels, how strong is the relationship to orthodoxy and to prejudice?
3. How do boys compare with girls with regard to the strength of the relationship between orthodoxy and prejudice?

The Vernon Scale of Church Orthodoxy was used to measure religious orthodoxy; the Levinson & Sanford Anti-Semitism Scale was used to measure attitude toward the Jews; the Hinckley Scale on Attitude Toward the Negro was used to measure anti-Negro feeling; and an adaptation of Hinckley's Scale was used to measure attitude toward the Spanish American.

The sample consisted of 74 boys and 75 girls, representing a cross section of Mormon students enrolled at Safford High School in southeastern Arizona. All subjects were Mormons except one.

Pearson product moment correlations were computed between all variables of the study and t tests were used to discover differences.

Findings

1. There was a significant relationship between orthodoxy and prejudice toward the Negro and the Spanish American but not between
orthodoxy and anti-Semitism.
2. The low IQ group was more anti-Semitic than the high IQ group.
3. Prejudice toward the Negro and the Spanish American was highest among the high IQ group.
4. The high IQ group was more orthodox than the low IQ group.
5. No significant difference was noted between boys and girls on IQ.
6. Boys were more prejudiced toward the Jews while girls were more prejudiced toward the Negro.
7. No significant difference was found between boys and girls in regard to orthodoxy.
8. Other studies seem to indicate that the more orthodox a person is, the more he tends to be prejudiced toward all minority groups. The present study shows this to be the case with attitude toward the Negro and the Spanish American but not so with attitude toward the Jews.

Discussion

Many questions arise in the mind of the writer concerning orthodoxy and prejudice. Why does the orthodox person show higher prejudice toward the Negro and Spanish American? Is it because the social-economic factors influence him more than the Christian principles he espouses? Why does the higher intelligence group show more prejudice toward the Negro and Spanish American? Why do people who believe the constitution to be a heavenly inspired document refrain from accepting its tenets as it relates to prejudice toward minorities? Answers to these questions might possibly be found by further research.

Although the size of the sample and the peculiarities of the geographical area where the study was taken prevent a broad generalization of the Church as a whole, some implications of the findings might be worthy of consideration. The low anti-Semitic feeling by the high IQ
group as pointed out in the findings, might be attributed to the fact that the relatively few Jews who live in the area are in the upper social and economic level, most of whom are businessmen or professional people. This assumption is confirmed by Gough (1951c) who showed low intelligence and low socio-economic status to be associated with high anti-Semitism. Prejudice toward the Negro in the present study might be the result of some of the following factors: (a) the prevailing attitude of the South toward the Negro, (b) the attitude toward skin color, (c) the fact that with few exceptions they are in the lower social economic groups, (d) their occupational level which is predominantly that of field laborers, ranch hands, gardeners, janitors, and some semi-skilled technicians, (e) partial segregation in the area, and (f) the Mormon doctrine that the Negro cannot hold the priesthood.

Recommendations

In light of the current racial strife throughout the country it might perhaps be re-emphasized in the seminaries that even though the Negro cannot hold the priesthood, tolerance should be shown toward them. To clarify the stand of the Church in this regard would be the desired effect. A re-education program of tolerance toward all minorities should be inculcated in homes and schools to promote the Christian principles of this major national issue. Recommendations for future studies might include the administration of the scales used here in other geographical areas and the use of scales to determine prejudice toward other minority groups including other Christian religions. Classification of subjects as to economic, educational and social level would also prove interesting.
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APPENDIX A

THE VERNON SCALE OF CHURCH ORTHODOXY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

INSTRUCTIONS: PLEASE CIRCLE THE ANSWER WHICH APPLIES TO YOU PERSONALLY.

1. Do you usually attend Sacrament meeting?
   - weekly
   - every two weeks
   - monthly
   - on special occasions
   - never
   5* 4 3 2 1

2. If you live with your family, do you participate in family prayer?
   (Do not confuse with blessing on the food)
   - daily
   - weekly
   - monthly
   - irregularly
   - never
   - do not live with family
   6 5 4 3 2 1

3. Do you break the Word of Wisdom with reference to coffee or tea,
   beer or stronger alcoholic beverages, or tobacco?
   - regularly
   - occasionally
   - rarely
   - never
   1 2 3 4

4. Testimony meetings are enjoyable meetings to attend.
   - strongly agree
   - agree
   - undecided
   - disagree
   - strongly disagree
   5 4 3 2 1

5. Following the teachings of the Church will help one get ahead financially.
   - strongly agree
   - agree
   - undecided
   - disagree
   - strongly disagree
   5 4 3 2 1

6. During the year 1962 did you
   - pay a full tithe?
   - pay a part tithe?
   - pay no tithing?
   3 2 1

7. The Church possesses divine authority.
   - strongly agree
   - agree
   - undecided
   - disagree
   - strongly disagree
   5 4 3 2 1

8. The financial contributions asked by the Church are too high.
   - strongly agree
   - agree
   - undecided
   - disagree
   - strongly disagree
   1 2 3 4 5

9. It would be desirable if the bishops could receive a salary for
   their Church work and therefore devote full time to Church work.
   - strongly agree
   - agree
   - undecided
   - disagree
   - strongly disagree
   1 2 3 4 5

10. Do you agree with the present stand of the Church on the Word of
    Wisdom?
    - yes
    - undecided
    - no
    3 2 1
APPENDIX A (continued)

11. Do you agree with the present stand of the Church on the youth programs?
   yes  undecided  no
   3       2        1

12. The present General Authorities are inspired in their decisions with reference to Church matters.
   strongly agree  agree  undecided  disagree  strongly disagree
   5           4       3        2        1

*SCORING AND INTERPRETATION*

Answers on each item were given a numerical value, which was not included on the original scale given to subjects. These values were summed. A high score indicated an orthodox person and a low score indicated an unorthodox person.

For raw scores on orthodoxy see Appendix E.
APPENDIX B

THE LEVINSON AND SANFORD ANTI-SEMITISM SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS: THIS IS AN INVESTIGATION OF GENERAL PUBLIC OPINION CONCERNING JEWISH PEOPLE. THE FOLLOWING ARE STATEMENTS WITH WHICH SOME PEOPLE AGREE AND OTHERS DISAGREE. PLEASE MARK EACH ONE IN THE LEFT MARGIN, ACCORDING TO THE AMOUNT OF YOUR AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT, BY USING THE FOLLOWING SCAL:*

3: firm, strong agreement; undoubtedly true in general.
2: moderate agreement; true in many cases; often true.
1: slight agreement; true in some cases; occasionally.
-1: slight disagreement; more false than true.
-2: moderate disagreement; usually not the case; probably wrong.
-3: strong disagreement; an absolute misconception; false.

1. It would hurt the business of a large concern if it had too many Jewish employees.

2. The Jews should make a sincere effort to rid themselves of their conspicuous and irritating faults, if they really want to stop being persecuted.

3. In order to maintain a nice residential neighborhood it is best to prevent Jews from living in it.

4. War shows up the fact that the Jews are not patriotic nor willing to make sacrifices for their country.

5. The best way to beat the Communist menace in this country is to control the Jewish element which guides it.

6. Jews seem to prefer the most luxurious, extravagant and sensual way of living.

7. Much resentment against Jews stems from their tendency to keep apart and to exclude Gentiles from Jewish social life.

8. Colleges should adopt a quota system by which they limit the number of Jews in fields which have too many Jews now.

9. The Jews must be considered a bad influence on Christian culture and civilization.

10. In order to handle the Jewish problem, Gentiles must meet fire with fire and use the same ruthless tactics with the Jews that the Jews use with Gentiles.
APPENDIX B (continued)

11. The Jewish districts in most cities are results of the clannishness and stick-togetherness of Jews.

12. Jews may have moral standards that they apply in their dealing with each other but with Christians they are unscrupulous, ruthless, and undependable.

13. On the whole, the Jews have probably contributed less to American life than any other group.

14. One thing that has hindered the Jews from establishing their own nation is the fact that they really have no culture of their own; instead, they tend to copy the things that are important to the native citizens of whatever country they are in.

15. A step toward solving the Jewish problem would be to prevent Jews from getting into superior, profitable positions in society, for a while at least.

16. The true Christian can never forgive the Jews for their crucifixion of Christ.

17. Jews go too far in hiding their Jewishness, especially such extremes as changing names, straightening noses, and imitating Christian manners and customs.

18. It is not wise for a Christian to be seen too much with Jews, as he might be taken for a Jew, or be looked down upon by his Christian friends.

19. When Jews create large funds for educational or scientific research it is mainly a desire for fame and public notice rather than a really sincere scientific interest.

20. There is something different and strange about Jews; one never knows what they are thinking or planning, nor what makes them tick.

21. The Jewish problem is so general and deep that one often doubts that democratic methods can ever solve it.

22. A major fault of the Jews is their conceit, overbearing pride, and their idea that they are a chosen race.

23. One of the first steps to be taken in cleaning up the movies and generally improving the situation in Hollywood is to put an end to Jewish domination there.
APPENDIX B (continued)

21. There is little hope of correcting the racial defects of the Jews, since these defects are simply in their blood.

25. One big trouble with Jews is that they are never contented, but always try for the best jobs and the most money.

26. The trouble with letting Jews into a nice neighborhood is that they gradually give it a typical Jewish atmosphere.

27. It is wrong for Jews and Gentiles to intermarry.

28. One trouble with Jewish business men is that they stick together and connive, so that a Gentile doesn't have a fair chance in competition.

29. No matter how Americanized, a Jew may seem to be, there is always something basically Jewish underneath, a loyalty to Jewry and a manner that is never totally changed.

30. Jewish millionaires may do a certain amount to help their own people, but little of their money goes into worthwhile American causes.

31. Most hotels should deny admittance to Jews, as a general rule.

32. The Jews first loyalty is to Jewry rather than to his country.

33. It is best that Jews should have their own fraternities and sororities, since they have their own particular interests and activities which they can best engage in together, just as Christians get along best in all-Christian fraternities.

34. Jewish power and control in money matters is far out of proportion to the number of Jews in the total population.

35. Jewish leaders should encourage Jews to be more inconspicuous, to keep out of professions and activities already over-crowded with Jews, and to keep out of the public notice.

36. I can hardly image myself marrying a Jew.

37. The Jews should give up their un-Christian religion with all its strange customs (kosher diet, special holidays, etc.) and participate actively and sincerely in Christian religion.

38. There is little doubt that Jewish pressure is largely responsible for the U.S. getting into the war with Germany.
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39. The Jews keep too much to themselves, instead of taking the proper interest in community problems and good government.

40. Jews seem to have an aversion to plain hard work; they tend to be a parasitic element in society by finding easy, non-productive jobs.

41. It is sometimes all right to ban Jews from certain apartment houses.

42. Jews tend to remain a foreign element in American society, to preserve their old social standards and to resist the American way of life.

43. Districts containing many Jews always seem to be smelly, dirty, shabby and unattractive.

44. It would be to the best interests of all if the Jews would form their own nation and keep more to themselves.

45. There are too many Jews in the various Federal agencies and bureaus in Washington, and they have too much control over our national policies.

46. Anyone who employs many people should be careful not to hire a large percentage of Jews.

47. One general fault of Jews is their over-aggressiveness, a strong tendency always to display their Jewish looks, manners, and breeding.

48. There are a few exceptions, but in general Jews are pretty much alike.

49. Jews should be more concerned with their personal appearance, and not be so dirty and smelly and unkept.

50. There seems to be some revolutionary streak in the Jewish make-up as shown by the fact that there are so many Jewish Communists and agitators.

51. The Jews should not pry so much into Christian activities and organizations, nor seek so much recognition and prestige from Christians.

52. Jews tend to lower the general standard of living by their willingness to do the most menial work and to live under standards that are far below average.
APPENDIX B (continued)

SCORING AND INTERPRETATION

Answers with positive numbers designated agreement to statements on the scale. Answers with negative numbers designated disagreement to statements on the scale. Numerical values were given to each answer which was summed according to values shown below.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
3 & 7 & 1 = 5 \\
2 & 6 & -1 = 3 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
-2 = 2 \\
-3 = 1 \\
\end{array}
\]

A high score indicated an unfavorable (prejudiced) attitude toward the Jews and a low score indicated a favorable attitude toward the Jews.

For raw scores on anti-Semitism see Appendix E.
APPENDIX C

THE HINCKLEY SCALE OF ATTITUDE TOWARD THE NEGRO

Form A

WRITE YOUR NAME HERE ----------------------------------------------- NUMBER ______

AGE _______ SEX _______ GRADE IN HIGH SCHOOL _______________________

This is a study of attitudes toward the Negro. On this page you will find sixteen statements expressing different attitudes toward the Negro. Put a plus mark (+) if you agree with the statement. Put a (0) zero if you disagree with the statement. If you cannot decide about a statement, you may mark it with a question mark.

This is not an examination. People differ in their opinions about what is right and wrong in this issue. Please indicate your own attitude by a plus mark when you agree and by a zero when you disagree.*

1. The difference between the black and white races is not one of mere degree, but of kind.

2. The educated Negro is less of a burden on the courts and is less likely to become a dependent or a defective than the educated white man.

3. No Negro should hold an office of trust, honor, or profit.

4. The Negro should not be simply the doormat of American civilization.

5. I place the Negro on the same social basis as I would a mule.

6. The Negro should be given the same educational advantages as the white man.

7. I am not at all interested in how the Negro rates socially.

8. Inherently, the Negro and the white man are equal.

9. The inability of the Negroes to develop outstanding leaders dooms them to a low place in society.

10. No Negro has the slightest right to resent, or even question, the illegal killing of one of his race.
APPENDIX C (continued)

11. After you have educated the Negro to the level of the white man, there will still be an impassable gulf between them.

12. The Negro is fully capable of social equality with the white man, but he should not be so recognized until he is better trained.

13. The Negro is by no means fit for social equality with the commonest white people.

14. I would not patronise a hotel that accommodates Negroes.

15. It is possible for the white and Negro races to be brothers in Christ without becoming brothers-in-law.

16. The Negro should have the advantage of all social benefits of the white man but be limited to his own race in the practice thereof.

#SCORING#

A person's score is the median scale value of all the statements he endorses. Below the scale values of the 16 items on the scale are tabulated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale Value</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale Value</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#INTERPRETATION OF SCORES#

The following table enables one to interpret the individual scores as well as the average score of a group of individuals.

0 - 1.9 - Strongly prejudiced against the Negro

2.0 - 3.9 - Prejudiced against the Negro

4.0 - 6.9 - Neutral position

7.0 - 8.9 - Liberal toward the Negro

9.0 - 10.9 - Very liberal toward the Negro

For raw scores on attitude toward the Negro see Appendix E.
APPENDIX D

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SPANISH-AMERICAN

Adaptation of Hinckley Scale Form A

This is a study of attitudes toward the Spanish-American. On this page you will find sixteen statements expressing different attitudes toward the Spanish-American. Put a plus (+) mark if you agree with the statement. Put a zero (0) if you disagree with the statement. If you cannot decide about the statement, you may mark it with a question mark. This is not an examination. People differ in their opinions about what is wrong and right in this issue. Please indicate your own attitude by a plus mark when you agree and by a zero when you disagree.*

1. The difference between the Spanish-American and white races is not one of mere degree, but of kind.

2. The educated Spanish-American is less of a burden on the courts and less likely to become a dependent or a defective than the educated white.

3. No Spanish-American should hold an office of trust, honor or profit.

4. The Spanish-American should not be simply the doormat of American civilization.

5. I place the Spanish-American on the same social basis as I would a mule.

6. The Spanish-American should be given the same educational advantages as the white man.

7. I am not at all interested in how the Spanish-American rates socially.

8. Inherently, the Spanish-American and the white man are equal.

9. The inability of the Spanish-Americans to develop outstanding leaders dooms them to a low place in society.

10. No Spanish-American has the slightest right to resent, or even question, the illegal killing of one of his race.

11. After you have educated the Spanish-American to the level of the white man, there will still be an impassable gulf between them.
12. The Spanish-American is fully capable of social equality with the white man, but he should not be so recognized until he is better trained.

13. The Spanish-American is by no means fit for social equality with the commonest white people.

14. I would not patronize a hotel that accommodates Spanish-Americans.

15. It is possible for the white and Spanish-American races to be brothers in Christ without becoming brothers-in-law.

16. The Spanish-American should have the advantage of all social benefits of the white man but be limited to his own race in the practice thereof.

SCORING

A person's score is the median scale value of all the statements he indorses. Below the scale values of the 16 items on the scale are tabulated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale Value</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale Value</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION OF SCORES

The following table enables one to interpret the individual scores as well as the average score of a group of individuals.

0 - 1.9 - Strongly prejudiced against the Spanish-American

2.0 - 3.9 - Prejudiced against the Spanish-American

4.0 - 6.9 - Neutral position

7.0 - 8.9 - Liberal toward the Spanish-American

9.0 - 10.9 - Very liberal toward the Spanish-American

For raw scores on attitude toward the Spanish American see Appendix E.
APPENDIX E

Raw Scores of the Subjects on the IQ, the Vernon Scale of Church Orthodoxy, the Levinson & Sanford Anti-Semitism Scale, the Hinckley Scale on Attitude Toward the Negro, and the Adaptation of the Hinckley Scale on Attitude Toward the Spanish American

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>O Scale</th>
<th>AS Scale</th>
<th>AN Scale</th>
<th>ASA Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>O Scale</td>
<td>AS Scale</td>
<td>AN Scale</td>
<td>ASA Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>O Scale</th>
<th>AS Scale</th>
<th>AN Scale</th>
<th>ASA Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>O Scale</td>
<td>AS Scale</td>
<td>AN Scale</td>
<td>ASA Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>O Scale</td>
<td>AS Scale</td>
<td>AN Scale</td>
<td>ASA Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>O Scale</th>
<th>AS Scale</th>
<th>AN Scale</th>
<th>ASA Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>O Scale</td>
<td>AS Scale</td>
<td>AN Scale</td>
<td>ASA Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT

Research of the relationship between orthodoxy and prejudice is not clear. Some studies report those who acknowledge church membership to be less tolerant than those who do not. Other investigators find either slight differences or no differences among the attitudes of members of different religions. Still others find important differences in acceptance of orthodox religious beliefs and attitudes toward minority groups.

The main questions the study attempted to answer were the following:

1. Is there a significant positive relationship between orthodoxy and prejudice towards minority groups?

2. When comparing high and low intelligence group level, how strong is the relationship to orthodoxy and to prejudice?

3. How do boys compare with girls with regard to the strength of the relationship between orthodoxy and prejudice?

The subjects consisted of 74 boys and 75 girls, representing a cross section of Mormon students enrolled at Safford High School in southeastern Arizona. All subjects were Mormons except one.

The Vernon Scale of Church Orthodoxy was chosen as the instrument to measure religious orthodoxy as it had the definite advantage of being standardized on members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. It has a coefficient of reproducibility of .89.
The Levinson & Sanford Anti-Semitism Scale was chosen as the measurement of attitude toward the Jews because of its excellent reliability and validity. Items of this scale have a reliability of .96.

The Hinckley Scale on Attitude Toward the Negro and an adaptation of this scale was used to measure attitude toward the Negro and the Spanish American. This above scale was chosen because of its shortness, facility in administration and scoring, and its high reliability and validity. The scale values have a mean reliability of .957.

Pearson product moment correlations were computed between all variables of the study and t tests to discover differences.

The following conclusions were made from the study:

1. There was a significant relationship between orthodoxy and prejudice toward the Negro and the Spanish American but not between orthodoxy and anti-Semitism.

2. The low IQ group was more anti-Semitic than the high IQ group.

3. Prejudice toward the Negro and the Spanish American was highest among the high IQ group.

4. The high IQ group was more orthodox than the low IQ group.

5. No significant difference was noted between boys and girls on IQ.

6. Boys were more prejudiced toward the Jews while girls were more prejudiced toward the Negro.

7. No significant difference was found between boys and girls in regard to orthodoxy.
8. Other studies seem to indicate that the more orthodox a person is the more he tends to be prejudiced toward all minority groups. The present study shows this to be the case with attitude toward the Negro and the Spanish American but not so with attitude toward the Jews.