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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Even though each person is an individual possessing individual differences in aptitudes, interests, intelligence, social and ethical beliefs, and emotional patterns, the social milieu in which people are reared tend to produce certain commonalities in behavior. Some individuals seem to share certain unique personality characteristics and qualities that tend to go together to form a particular personality type or pattern.

The personality variables which have been recognized and studied by psychologists indicate an increasing interest in identifying these personality types and patterns among individuals. These studies range from Jung's (9) recognition and distinction of the introvertive and extrovertive types of personality to the investigation of those characteristics which have been found to have internal consistency when measured in a variety of statistical ways, such as by factor analysis (3).

More pertinent to the present investigation is that body of literature which reports studies of "radicalism"
and "conservatism" and the relationship of these categories to other personality variables, especially as they are related to conservative and liberal theological positions.

Purpose of the Study

The present investigation was designed to explore the relationship between authoritarianism, rigidity, political-economic conservatism and theological beliefs of two groups of students representing two nationally known theological seminaries. One seminary is noted for its conservative theological standing, the other for its liberal position.

Theoretical Background and Hypotheses

Some of the leading men in the field of human behavior have pointed out the significance of religious beliefs as they influence the function of personality. Gordon W. Allport (2) has stated that when he finds religion present in a patient, he never disturbs it, for, in the long run, it is likely to turn out to be the leading factor in the cure.

Jung (9) maintained that of his thousands of patients over the age of thirty-five all have been people whose problem in the last resort was that of finding a religious outlook on life. In a similar vein, William Sadler (16) makes the observation that the victims of neuroticism and
maladjustment are conspicuous for their failure to acquire an adequate philosophy of life.

In the same line of thought William C. Menninger observed that:

Over the centuries, religion has always been one of the chief supports in adjustment for many people. It has been a source of comfort, reassurance, and hope, and probably always will be. Therefore, in seeking personal supports, in looking for opportunities for group identification, in finding friends, in seeking outlets for constructive community activity, the church and religion stand available to meet their needs for many, many people (13, pp. 360-361).

Many scientists, despite their life interest in material truths, are deeply religious. Many psychiatrists are religious men. Many of these feel that religion and psychiatry are in no way antagonistic; rather they are cooperative. Psychiatry can contribute much to the understanding of the personality. The fact that religion is frequently abused and distorted by sick personalities, even by ministers, is no more reason for the denial or rejection of religion than is the condemnation of any other constructive force or movement because of crackpots who participate in it.

If a person does have a basic need for proper religious orientation, and if this does seem to be a vital factor in his mental well-being, then why is the cure of souls
gravitating more and more into the hands of the psychiatrist and out of the hands of the church and the minister? Allport offers an answer to this seeming paradox.

For one thing people prefer to look for physical causes for their difficulties and the psychiatrist, being a medical man, may find such a cause. If he does then the patient is saved from the necessity of facing up to the realities of his inner nature. A cause in the body is less disturbing than a cause in one's character. The pastor he fears will not sense the possible physical basis for his troubles, but may confuse mental, physical and moral aspects in a manner that will be humiliating. The pastor, he fears, may at unappropriate moments preach or pass moral judgment. Further the vast prestige of modern science mantles the psychiatrist and the patient approaches him with high hopes, thinking no doubt of the spectacular achievements of contemporary medicine. He feels that psychotherapists, unlike the clergy, keep up to date with such discoveries about the human mind as are being made. Finally, he is not uninfluenced by the united front presented by science in contrast to the divided sects of religion (2, p. 78).

Conservatism and Radicalism

A careful review of professional literature indicates there is considerable disagreement concerning the classification of persons as "radical" or "conservative". The existence of a radical or a conservative as a clear-cut kind of individual is even denied by some social scientists. Gurnee (7) supports this point of view, maintaining that at most some persons in
the minority will take a radical position more frequently than others. Breslaw (4), after examining the history of research in the area, concluded that there is no such thing as a radical or a conservative personality. On the other hand, some authorities maintain radicalism and conservatism represent valid classifications of personality adjustment.

Wolfe (18, 19) explains the radical in terms of three factors: thwarted desires, an aggressive, pugnacious temperament unchecked by fear, and the absence of the kind of training which makes the individual attached to things as they are.

According to Wolfe (18), conservatism may be derived from fear of social disapproval, and from concern for the safety of one's own group. It is said that habituation or attachment to things as they are is another major source of conservatism. Opposition to change is based on the belief that change may bring more evils than it can remove.

The conservative is further described as being more susceptible to prestige, sense of order, deficiency in constructive imagination, and a tendency to consider matters with an exaggerated regard for safety and for past experiences. The radical is said to have a keener sensitivity
to the suffering of others, greater flexibility of mind, but less equanimity, balance, and poise because of his more strained relations to society. He is less fearful, since he has less to lose, and his superior constructive imagination and disposition toward change have reduced the number of things which are unfamiliar to him.

Diamond (6) follows this point of view closely. Radicalism, he believes, begins as a personality maladjustment based on any one of a number of causes, particularly vocational difficulty. It produces strong introversion as the individual's attention is focused on his relations to society and may even become extroversion among individuals who participate in social political organizations.

Vaughn (20) considers radicalism an overcompensation for inferiority feelings. According to him, radicalism arises from discontent resulting from the inability to adjust to the environment and the projection of this feeling upon the social system. He substitutes class problems for his own personal problems and instead of attempting to change himself, he tries to alter society.

What might be a somewhat deeper analysis of radicalism-conservatism has been made by Murry (14). He suggests
that the stern father and rebel son theme may be the basis of radicalism. He describes the radical in terms of a need for aggression against the established order. They have inhibited aggression against superiors, and nurturance toward inferiors. Drout and Stagner (11) concluded on the basis of their research study that the outstanding characteristics of radicals was that they considered themselves rejected by their parents. Gurnee maintains that radical views develop both on intellectual and on emotional grounds, and lists as causes "conditionings in childhood, such as oppression by the father, persecution by other children, and the passing on of family opinions" (7, p. 437).

A great many causes of radicalism, ranging from biological characteristics to education are mentioned by some writers. According to Lundberg's (23) view, the radical is a person who, because of factors related to age, recency of immigration, stage of development of the community, education, cultural heritage, temperament, and all the personality characteristics of the individual is not strictly bound by the pressure of the traditional social order. He adds that economic and social insecurity are likely to be found present in the radical.
Hypotheses

From the foregoing review of professional literature and from personal experience and observation, it appears that authoritarianism, rigidity and economic-political conservatism seem to appear together quite often within a given personality pattern. There are also some indications that restricted religious beliefs also seem to show up within this same pattern.

Within the above framework, the following hypotheses were formulated as descriptive of differences that would appear between students representing conservative (C) and liberal (L) theological points of view.

**Hypothesis 1.** Group (C) will show a significantly higher degree of theological conservatism than will Group (L).

**Hypothesis 2.** Group (C) will show a significantly higher degree of authoritarianism than will Group (L).

**Hypothesis 3.** Group (C) will show a significantly higher degree of political-economic conservatism than will Group (L).

**Hypothesis 4.** Group (C) will show a significantly higher degree of rigidity than will Group (L).
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CHAPTER II

RELATED STUDIES

According to Kitay (14), the earliest attempts to discover factors distinguishing between radicals and conservatives proceeded within a psychological framework which emphasized individual differences based upon inherent characteristics. Psychophysical functions were investigated particularly, but within recent years the trend has been toward probing the social relations of the individual, especially parent-child relations. Psychoanalytic interpretations are being applied to these relationships with increasing frequency.

Emphasis upon the broader aspects of personality appears in the work of Breslaw (2), Drout and Stagner (15), and Murphy and Likert (19). Concerning this type of approach Goldstein (10) has said that the great desire to unify authoritarianism theoretically seems mistaken. The authoritarian syndrome is probably a conglomerate which cannot be entirely explained on the basis of an elaborately unified theory.
Somewhat by way of contrast to the above, Campbell and McCandless (6) reported evidence for the existence of a general factor which tends to unify most, if not all attitudes toward those of other ethnic groups. They provided evidence that the California F Scale correlates substantially with a variety of prejudice measures, including ethnocentrism and xenophobia.

How well does the California F Scale lend itself to the measurement of prejudice? Flowerman (8) made a study of the validity of the F Scale as a measure of ethnic prejudice for groups geographically removed from those on which the original validity studies were conducted. He found correlations ranging from .30 to .60 between the F Scale and prejudice. The subjects were Protestant and Roman Catholic men and women in Minneapolis, St. Paul and Baltimore. The author concluded that the results did tend to support the use of the F Scale as a measurement of prejudice.

Other research illustrates the seeming connection or similarity between a high authoritarian score and political attitudes. At the time of the 1952 national political conventions, Milton (16) hypothesized that individuals who preferred MacArthur for President of the United States would
obtain higher scores on the California F. Scale than those who preferred other presidential candidates. To test the contention, he administered the F Scale and a questionnaire concerning presidential choices to 390 students at the University of Tennessee. In line with his hypothesis he found that those students who favored MacArthur had significantly higher F Scale scores than those who favored other candidates. In addition, he found that a significant number of the students favoring either Taft or MacArthur were in the upper twenty-five per cent of the F Scale scores.

In a similar study Gump (11) noticed that newspaper comments in opposition to Truman's dismissal of MacArthur seemed to follow the antidemocratic trends as defined in The Authoritarian Personality. He tested the proposition that high F Scale scores would favor MacArthur and that the low scores would tend to favor Truman's action. The statement "MacArthur should have been dismissed," was added to the F Scale which was ministered to a sample of 405 students at the University of Colorado. The results showed that those favoring MacArthur had significantly higher F Scale scores than did those favoring Truman's action. This study, as well as the preceding one, is based on the assumption or premise
that students with relatively high authoritarian tendencies will be attracted to authoritarian symbols.

Brown (3, 4, 5) reports a study of the relationship between rigidity and authoritarianism. He concluded that it might be necessary to arouse some anxiety over achievement before authoritarian subjects would perform rigidity on the Einstellung arithmetic problems test, which is a measure of rigidity, and McClelland's projective measure of need for achievement to provide an index to anxiety over achievement to a group of college students.

As expected, there was a greater correlation between the score on the Einstellung problems and the F Scale score in the group that was ego involved than in the group that was relaxed. It is interesting to note that in the group that received an ego involving orientation, both authoritarianism and rigidity were associated with anxiety over achievement, while in the relaxed group moderate anxiety scores were associated with high F Scale scores, but not with greater rigidity in problem solving. It was suggested that these results indicate that the rigidity which is associated with authoritarianism is a kind of defense mechanism which is perceived as warding off personal failures.
Another interesting study concerning the relationship between rigidity and authoritarianism was conducted by Jones (13). He compared the relationship between the Necker Cube fluctuation and the F Scale performance. Drawings of the Necker Cube were presented to two groups of Naval Aviation Cadets. One group was given a set toward reversal, while a second group was given a set against reversal. Then F Scale scores were compared with the number of reversals reported by each cadet.

The results showed that the authoritarians are intolerant of fluctuation, while the nonauthoritarians are not so disposed. He concluded that since the F Scale is a measure of authoritarian attitudes, an empirical relationship between the F Scale and a perceptual variable speaks strongly for a personal base to authoritarian attitudes.

Is the authoritarian neurotic? Mosling (18) suggests that the concept of the authoritarian personality can have utility only when it is devoid of what he considers value judgments. Despite the fact that some observers have viewed the authoritarian as remote, Mosling refers to four studies which have failed to demonstrate that the authoritarian is significantly different from the equalitarian with respect
to neuroticism. Of particular interest is a study which Mosling made with Courtney and Green (7) in which they failed to find a significant correlation between the F Scale and the Rotter Incomplete Sentence Test.

Stotsky (20) has presented evidence that although existing data seem to show that there is not a relationship between neuroticism and the F Scale scores, yet students in psychology classes are learning a neurotic stereotype of the authoritarian.

Is there a relationship between the frequency with which individuals attend church, hold to rigid religious beliefs and their tendency to be authoritarian? Stouffer (21) studied over 6,000 persons throughout the United States and implied in his conclusions that the frequency with which people attended church and held to rigid religious beliefs was related to intolerance.

Adorno (1) considers commitment to superstitious beliefs an actual authoritarian characteristic. In the design and construction of a measure of anti-democratic potential several items of the scale refer either directly or indirectly to religious tenets or beliefs and a positive response to these items presupposes a tendency toward authoritarianism.
But in a study made by Frymier (9) there did not seem to be any statistically significant relationship between the regularity of church attendance and the score made on the F Scale. He studied high school groups in Alabama, Florida, and Michigan. Although the study did seem to reject the concept of a positive relationship between authoritarianism and regularity of church attendance, yet an analysis of the results did tend to show some relationship between responses to the F Scale and variations in cultural situations. Frymier concluded that these variations may be the result of differences in community size, opportunities for ideological exposure, or other factors.

One of the early investigations into differences between religious radicals and conservatives was conducted by Howells (12), who adapted an approach used a few years earlier by Moore (17) compared radicals and conservatives. The emphasis was put upon differences in psychophysical abilities and relatively simple mental functions that could be measured in the psychological laboratory. A large number of tests measuring sensory discrimination and sensorimotor functions were employed. Finding no large or very significant differences on these tests, he concluded that the
observed differences in religious attitudes could not be explained on the basis of differences in the elementary equipment of men. However, examination of personal and background factors resulted in some interesting findings. Radicals were superior to conservatives in college grades, in knowledge of high school subjects at college entrance, in intelligence test scores, and in learning ability on maze tests.

The researches of Woodward (23) and of Symington (22) represent a definite trend away from the examination of psychophysical and other isolated mental functions toward the investigation of environmental factors in the lives of individuals. Woodward (23) attempted to determine the relationship of religious instruction and other religious influences, emotional and behavioral patterns, and parent-child relations to the adult religious life. He discovered that childhood religious background and training had the highest correlation with adult religiousness; that emotional and behavioral patterns had a lower correlation with religiousness; and that parent-child relations had the lowest correlation. No single factor was found predominant in influencing the adult religious pattern.
Using the Y.M.C.A. Test of Religious Thinking as his measure of religiousness, Symington selected religious liberals and conservatives for comparison on intelligence test scores, personality tests, factors in their personal and social backgrounds, and religious habits. The major findings from this study were as follows:

1. Those who considered their parents liberal obtained much higher scores in liberal belief than those who considered their parents conservatives.
2. The influence of the Sunday School corresponded to the conservatism or liberalism of the community in which it existed.
3. The bookish type of person was more likely to be liberal.
4. Intelligence and liberalism were positively related (22, p. 51).

The summarized results of the tests indicated that liberals are more self-reliant in their judgments, face the facts more squarely, are more experimental, more reasonable in relation to others, are less emotional, more adult, more mature, more upstanding in their ways of facing life's problems and of dealing with other people. It was also concluded that religious liberals were more independent, more democratic, and likely to be more socially useful. As a result of their independence in religious thinking they placed greater stress upon self-integration in their behavior and thinking.
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Subjects

This research project was conducted near a large metropolitan area. In this area there are located a number of theological seminaries. Two of these ministerial training schools offered outstanding examples of two very different theological positions. One is a well-known liberal seminary and the other is a well-known conservative seminary. These two schools are considered to be classic examples of the two positions.

There were forty-seven students in the conservative group tested. Most of these students were in their middle or late twenties and came from widely scattered points over the United States. All were second-year graduate students in a four-year course of study which led to the degree of Master of Theology. In the liberal group, there were seventy-five students taking part, most of whom were members of the second-year graduate class. They were enrolled in a three-year course of study leading to the degree of Bachelor of Divinity. The conservative seminary is interdenominational,
having thirty different denominations represented in its student body. The liberal seminary is an officially endorsed and sponsored ministerial training school of a single protestant denomination. The great majority of its students are members of that church.

Description of Instruments

The two student groups mentioned above were given three different tests. One of the instruments yields two different scores. In all, four measurements were obtained. These were in relation to authoritarianism, rigidity, political-economic conservatism and theological conservatism.

For the measure of authoritarianism, the California F Scale, Form 60 was used. The California F Scale, Form 60 is a revision of the F Scale, Form 78. The nineteen items from the F Scale, Form 78 that ranked highest in order of goodness were retained in the revised form in the new scale. Statistical differentiating power of the item was the main basis of selection. The reliability of the scale is a considerable improvement over that obtained from Form 78 (.87 as compared with .74).
The political-economic conservative score was obtained from the California P.E.C. Scale, Form 60. In Form 60 the P.E.C. Scale was shortened to fourteen items, and numerous changes were made in content and wording. The average reliability of .70 is substantially the same as that of .73 for Form 78 and indicates that the changes in wording and content did not improve this property of the scale.

For the measurement of rigidity the Inventory of Beliefs was employed. The theoretical background for the construction of this inventory is that opinions can be used as indicators of basic personality structure.

Educators have increasingly asked what should characterize the product of general education? It is suggested that the generally educated man or woman can be phrased psychologically in such terms as independent, understanding, and adaptable. In contrast to these are persons whose responses are defensive, confirming, resistant, stereotyped, and rigid. This inventory was designed to distinguish between these two kinds of people.

All the reliability studies of the Inventory of Beliefs tend to show that the instrument is sufficiently stable to warrant use for the purpose of either group or individual
measurement. The thirty reliability studies referred to in the manual yield coefficients ranging from .68 to .95 with a median $r$ of .86.

Theological conservatism was measured by an inventory especially designed for this problem. This inventory was constructed because no other instrument available seemed entirely appropriate. This instrument was designed to measure a person's technical response to Systematic Theology. The language of the inventory is somewhat technical and probably would not be well understood by anyone other than those acquainted with the technical language of Systematic Theology.

In the process of constructing this inventory several outstanding reference works on Systematic Theology were consulted. The field of Systematic Theology was divided into six major sections. In each major section ten key questions were worked out covering the major points in that section. Sixty key issues were raised, and three different responses were made available. One response would be the traditional conservative answer, the other a typical liberal answer. The third response was marked "reject", for those who were unable to accept, as such, either of the other two
answers on that particular item. Final wording was determined after several sessions of consultation with faculty members in each seminary.

In constructing this inventory, the principal aim was to select items which would differentiate between those who believe and those who reject traditional fundamental Christian dogma.

Practical validity of the inventory was assumed to be demonstrated by its ability to distinguish between the two groups as reported in the results of the study. No other attempt was made to demonstrate the validity or reliability of the inventory.

Collection of Data

The tests were administered one week apart, and at about the same hour of the day. Both groups took the tests during what would normally be a regular class hour. All three tests were taken at one sitting. Both groups were asked to participate on a voluntary basis and were told beforehand that the battery of tests would be given. They were told by their professor that they did not have to participate and that no penalty would be imposed. The tests were administered
in the same order, and the same instructions were given to both groups. They both were told that the administration would not see the results.
CHAPTER IV

EXAMINATION OF FINDINGS

In Chapter One, four hypotheses were presented. In order to test these hypotheses the $t$ test of related groups was used to test the significance of the differences between means. In Table I the conservative group will be identified as Group (C) and the liberal group as Group (L).

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF SEMINARY STUDENTS IN REGARD TO THEOLOGICAL BELIEFS, AUTHORITARIANISM, POLITICAL-ECONOMIC CONSERVATISM AND RIGIDITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theological Inventory</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58.8510</td>
<td>50.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18.1184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California P Scale</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>124.1277</td>
<td>7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>87.4079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California P.E.C. Scale</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47.5532</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40.1447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of Beliefs</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61.0426</td>
<td>12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>89.1873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a table of $t$ values it was observed that a $t$ of 2.5758 with an $n$ of 26 or more has a probability rating of
.01 which is considered highly significant (2, p. 477). The lowest $t$-value listed in Table I far exceeds the requirements for an evaluation of being highly significant since the larger $t$-value the greater is the significance.

The difference in the two groups was greatest for theological beliefs. This difference is not surprising in view of the fact that these groups are best distinguished by their own outward claim of theological position. This was the primary criterion whereby the selection of these particular two groups was made.

The vast difference seen in the two groups in this respect seemed to be best explained by the fact that conservatives view the Bible as being a final revelation from God. It is an objective standard of truth that is constant and relative in its divine essence. Their conscience-felt responsibility is to conserve and maintain this truth in its historic literal sense.

The second greatest difference found was in the area of rigidity as measured by the Inventory of Beliefs. Exactly why this group as a whole showed a high degree of rigidity cannot be determined from this study alone. It was the
primary purpose of this study to demonstrate that rigidity and conservative theological beliefs do seem to be found together in the make up of personality. It may be that the acceptance of a final, unchanging body of truth produces a type of mental set that lends itself to an over-all attitude of resistance to change which pervades the entire personality and attitudes toward life.

The third greatest difference was in the area of authoritarianism. This characteristic seems in a sense greatly related to rigidity. The conservative may tend to become a real or pseudo-authoritarian because he views the Bible as an authority that stands above all the thinking of the minds of men. The conservative feels that the Bible has been invested to him for proclamation. When he speaks forth the truth of the scriptures, he reflects an inflexible authority that is characteristic of the authoritarian person.

The liberal does not view the Bible as an unerring, authoritative, final statement of truth. He feels that the Bible can be accepted or rejected in part as it is compared to and measured by the thinking of men. He is left without an authoritative statement of truth as such.
The least, but still highly significant difference comes by comparing these two groups in relation to political-economic conservatism. This may be partly explained by the fact that there are only fourteen items to this scale, and also that this scale admittedly does have relatively low reliability value (1, p. 164). Also to be considered is the widespread economic background differences in these two groups. The political-economic views are probably much more influenced by the social and economic background factors than by their own peculiar theological beliefs.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was designed to investigate the relationship between authoritarianism, rigidity, political-economic conservatism and theological beliefs. The subjects were two groups of theological students, forty-seven of whom attended a seminary noted for its conservative theological position and seventy-five of whom attended a seminary noted for its liberal theological position.

The students were given a battery of three tests which yielded a total of four scores. For the measurement of authoritarianism, the California F. Scale, Form 60 was used. This same instrument contains a political-economic scale which provided a measurement of liberalism-conservativism in that area. The Inventory of Beliefs was employed as an assessment of rigidity and theological beliefs were measured by an original instrument designed for the present investigation.
Both groups were in their second year of theological training. In each group, the number coming from the South or North was in about equal numbers. No information was available as to the economic or sociological level of their individual home backgrounds. The tests were administered one week apart at about the same hour of the day with all three tests being taken at one sitting and taken in the same order.

The specific hypotheses tested were:

1. Group (C) will show a significantly higher degree of theological conservatism than will Group (L).

2. Group (C) will show a significantly higher degree of authoritarianism than will Group (L).

3. Group (C) will show a significantly higher degree of political-economic conservatism than will Group (L).

4. Group (C) will show a significantly higher degree of rigidity than will Group (L).

Conclusions

A high degree of difference between these two groups was found, as measured by the instruments used. As to degrees of divergence the difference in theological beliefs
was the greatest. The least difference was found in the area of political-economic views. The second greatest difference was rigidity and next was authoritarianism. It would seem from these results that the type of rigidity as measured by the **Inventory of Beliefs** is more closely related to a strong conservative theological position than is authoritarianism as reflected in the items on the California F Scale.

**Recommendations**

The results of this study have raised certain questions which should be investigated in the future and especially with selected portions of the population as was used here. Further issues that need to be considered are as follows:

1. How early in life were these particular views and attitudes formed?

2. What relationship might exist between these attitudes and the attitude of the individual's parents?

3. What kind of relationship exists between the economic and sociological level of the childhood home and present beliefs and attitudes?
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