

379
N81d
No. 452

THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CERTAIN PERSONALITY
VARIABLES AND CONSERVATIVE, MODERATE,
AND LIBERAL THEOLOGICAL BELIEFS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Robert M. ^{Mathias} Oswald, B.A., M.S.

Denton, Texas

December, 1970

© 1971

Robert Matheas Oswald

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

903

Oswald, Robert Matheas, The Relationships Between Certain Personality Variables and Conservative, Moderate, and Liberal Theological Beliefs. Doctor of Philosophy (Counseling and Personnel Administration), December, 1970, 125 pp., 12 tables, bibliography, 88 titles.

The purpose of this study was to determine if seminary students, identified as conservative, moderate, or liberal in theological beliefs, were significantly different on the following personality variables: dogmatism, thinking introversion, theoretical orientation, estheticism, complexity, autonomy, religious orientation, impulse expression, anxiety level, practical outlook, and personal integration. The instrument used to measure theological beliefs was the "Inventory of Theological Beliefs." Dogmatism was measured by the "Rokeach Dogmatism Scale." All other variables were measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory.

The subjects included in this study were male caucasians enrolled as full-time students at any one of three Protestant seminaries located in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. All were seniors expecting to enter the ministry upon graduation from seminary.

In order to test the hypotheses of this study, three groups were selected from an original sample of 203 students.

Scores made on the "Inventory of Theological Beliefs" were arranged in rank order. Those scoring at or above the 75th percentile were identified as Group C (conservative), while those scoring at or below the 25th percentile were identified as Group L (liberal). Individuals whose scores made up the middle 25 per cent of the rank order distribution were identified as Group M (moderate). This yielded a total final sample of 153, with 51 students being placed in each group.

All hypotheses were tested for significance using the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test. A level of .05 was required for rejection of the null hypotheses. The following conclusions were based on the findings obtained in this study:

1. Groups C, M, and L were all below average in the need for independence from authority, with Group C scoring significantly lower on autonomy than Groups M and L.

2. Group L showed greater confidence in science and tended more to use the scientific method in their thinking than did Groups C and M.

3. Group L was more inclined toward reflective thinking and showed interest in a wider range of ideas than did Groups C and M.

4. Groups C and M disliked ambiguous situations. They preferred the security of accepting traditional regulations. Group L was more likely to believe that there is more

than one right answer for most problems.

5. All groups were lower than average in the tendency to freely express natural impulses and to seek gratification in overt actions or in conscious thought. Group L was slightly less inhibited than Groups C and M.

6. Groups C, M, and L were all above average in their personal integration and admitted to few feelings of rebellion and aggression. Personal integration was more positively correlated with conservative religious beliefs.

7. Group L was more anxious than Groups C and M and tended to have a poor opinion of themselves. Groups C and M did not see themselves as often being worried or nervous. The more liberal the religious beliefs, the more anxious was the group.

8. Higher levels of dogmatism were more related to conservative than to liberal religious beliefs. Group M was less dogmatic than Group C, but more dogmatic than Group L.

9. Groups C and M were more traditional than average in religious beliefs and frequently rejected the viewpoints of others. Group L was inclined to show more moderation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purpose of the Study	
Hypotheses	
Definition of Terms	
Assumptions	
Limitations of the Study	
Background and Significance of the Study	
II. SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE	22
Introduction	
Religious Beliefs and Dogmatism	
Religious Beliefs, Intellectual	
Interests, and Freedom to Learn	
Religious Beliefs, Level of Anxiety,	
and Intensity of Emotional	
Disturbance	
Summary	
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	47
Subjects	
Procedures for Collecting the Data	
Treatment of the Data	
Description of the Instruments	
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	64
V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS,	
AND RECOMMENDATIONS	76
Summary	
Findings	
Conclusions	
Implications	
Recommendations for Further Research	

	Page
APPENDIX	90
BIBLIOGRAPHY	105

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Means, Mean Differences, and Range Products for the Variable of Theological Beliefs for Groups C, M, and L	65
II. Means, Mean Differences, and Range Products for the Variable of Dogmatism for Groups C, M, and L	66
III. Means, Mean Differences, and Range Products for the Variable of Thinking Introversion for Groups C, M, and L	66
IV. Means, Mean Differences, and Range Products for the Variable of Theoretical Orientation for Groups C, M, and L	67
V. Means, Mean Differences, and Range Products for the Variable of Aestheticism for Groups C, M, and L	68
VI. Means, Mean Differences, and Range Products for the Variable of Complexity for Groups C, M, and L	69
VII. Means, Mean Differences, and Range Products for the Variable of Autonomy for Groups C, M, and L	70
VIII. Means, Mean Differences, and Range Products for the Variable of Religious Orientation for Groups C, M, and L	71
IX. Means, Mean Differences, and Range Products for the Variable of Impulse Expression for Groups C, M, and L	72
X. Means, Mean Differences, and Range Products for the Variable of Anxiety Level for Groups C, M, and L	72
XI. Means, Mean Differences, and Range Products for the Variable of Practical Outlook for Groups C, M, and L	73

Table	Page
XII. Means, Mean Differences, and Range Products for the Variable of Personal Integration for Groups C, M, and L	74

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since the pioneering work of Freud (17), efforts have been made to examine the relationship between religious beliefs and certain aspects of personality. Freud conceived of religion as an attempt to resolve the father-child conflict, a means of dealing with the terror of nature, and a rationalization for the inequities of fate. Religion was presumed by Freud to be an outgrowth of insecurity, and God, a personification of the father image who ultimately would provide for man's needs and punish him for his wrongdoing. Religious beliefs therefore were considered to be a prime symptom of neurosis and a product of paranoid minds.

Jung emphasized the relationship between religious beliefs and personality in maintaining that, of his thousands of patients over the age of thirty-five, all were people whose problem in the final analysis was that of finding a meaningful religious outlook on life (20). The relationship between religious beliefs and certain personality traits has been emphasized by such writers as Allport (3), May (27), Frankl (16), Adorno (1), and Rokeach (26). The majority of studies reported have dealt with religious beliefs as they are related to dogmatism and authoritarianism (1, 7, 8, 10, (26). The findings have generally demonstrated that the more

conservative one is in his religious beliefs, the more likely he is to be dogmatic. A number of studies have concentrated on the relationship between intellectual curiosity and ability and religious beliefs. The literature indicates that there is a basic conflict between strongly held conservative religious beliefs and openness to intellectual interests and the so-called freedom-to-learn syndrome. According to Hall (18) and Spradlin (30), conservatives are less likely to prefer dealing with abstractions and complex scientific subject matter. They also show lower interest in using the scientific method as a model in their thinking.

Other studies have investigated religious beliefs in relation to flexibility, impulsivity, anxiety, and intensity of emotional disturbance. The conclusion drawn by most writers has been that there is no consistent correlation between these variables and the nature of one's religious beliefs (2, 7, 14, 30). Even though religious beliefs and their relationship to personality variables have been emphasized by some writers, nearly all of the reported studies have compared groups of individuals on the basis of denomination identification and not according to actual religious beliefs (1, 11). Such studies have offered generalizations concerning differences between Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. The data indicated that there was wide variety within each group in personality variables, even though significant differences between the groups were found (1, 26).

These writers merely assumed that religious beliefs were similar among members of the same group and dissimilar among members of different groups. Very few studies have compared groups of individuals concerning actual theological beliefs (1, 11, 15, 30). This may be due to the fact that very few instruments specifically designed to measure theological beliefs, as such, are available. Cline and Richards (11) point out that in the Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook only five tests are listed under a religious heading. Four are tests published by specific denominational groups for use in parochial schools for children. The fifth is a general test of Biblical history and information and not specifically related to personal theological beliefs. Even the few studies which have compared selected personality variables in relation to theological beliefs have done so only in relation to a few isolated beliefs and not a wide sample of various beliefs (17, 19, 26).

It seems that a comparison of groups on the basis of actual religious beliefs and not just denominational membership would provide more definitive findings. Since seminary students are presumably more identified with specific theological beliefs, they should offer a more ideal population for studying the relationship between such beliefs and certain personality variables.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine if a significant relationship existed between certain personality variables and liberal, moderate, or conservative theological beliefs of seminary students.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine whether seminary students, identified as conservative (Group C), moderate (Group M), and liberal (Group L) in theological beliefs were significantly different from each other on the following personality variables: dogmatism, thinking introversion, theoretical orientation, aestheticism, complexity, autonomy, religious orientation, impulse expression, anxiety level, practical outlook, and personal integration.

Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses were formulated as the basis for this study:

I. Significant differences in "dogmatism," as measured by the "Rokeach Dogmatism Scale," will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring highest and Group L scoring lowest.

II. Significant differences in "thinking introversion," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

III. Significant differences in "theoretical orientation," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

IV. Significant differences in "aestheticism," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

V. Significant differences in "complexity," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

VI. Significant differences in "autonomy," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

VII. Significant differences in "religious orientation," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

VIII. Significant differences in "impulse expression," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

IX. Significant differences in "anxiety level," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found

between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

X. Significant differences in "practical outlook," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring highest and Group L scoring lowest.

XI. Significant differences in "personal integration," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

Definition of Terms

1. Group C: Those subjects scoring at or above the 75th percentile on the "Inventory of Theological Beliefs" were known as Group C.

2. Group L: Those subjects scoring at or below the 25th percentile on the "Inventory of Theological Beliefs" were known as Group L.

3. Group M: Those subjects scoring in the middle 25 per cent on the "Inventory of Theological Beliefs" were known as Group M.

4. Thinking introversion:

Persons scoring high on this measure are characterized by a liking for reflective thought and academic activities. They express interests in a broad range of ideas found in a variety of areas, such as literature, art, and philosophy. Their thinking is less dominated by immediate conditions and situations, or by commonly accepted ideas, than that of thinking extroverts (low

scorers). Most extroverts show a preference for overt action and tend to evaluate ideas on the basis of their practical, immediate application, or to entirely reject or avoid dealing with ideas and abstractions (17, p. 4).

5. Theoretical orientation:

This scale measures an interest in, or orientation to, a more restricted range of ideas than is true of TI. High scorers indicate a preference for dealing with theoretical concerns and problems and for using the scientific method in thinking; many are also exhibiting an interest in science and in scientific activities. High scorers are generally logical, analytical, and critical in their approach to problems and situations (17, p. 4).

6. Estheticism:

High scorers endorse statements indicating diverse interests in artistic matters and activities and a high level of sensitivity and response to esthetic stimulation. The content of the statements in this scale extends beyond painting, sculpture, and music, and includes interests in literature and dramatics (17, p. 4).

7. Complexity:

This measure reflects an experimental and flexible orientation rather than a fixed way of viewing and organizing phenomena. High scorers are tolerant of ambiguities and uncertainties; they are fond of novel situations and ideas. Most persons high on this dimension prefer to deal with complexity, as opposed to simplicity, and very high scorers are disposed to seek out and to enjoy diversity and ambiguity (17, p. 4).

8. Autonomy:

The characteristic measured by this scale is composed of liberal, nonauthoritarian thinking and a need for independence. High scorers show a tendency to be independent of authority as traditionally imposed through social institutions. They oppose infringements on the rights of individuals and are tolerant of viewpoints

other than their own; they tend to be realistic, intellectually and politically liberal, and much less judgmental than low scorers (17, p. 4).

9. Religious orientation:

High scorers are skeptical of conventional religious beliefs and practices and tend to reject most of them, especially those that are orthodox or fundamentalistic in nature. Persons scoring around the mean are manifesting a moderate view of religious beliefs and practices; low scorers are manifesting a strong commitment to Judaic-Christian beliefs and tend to be conservative in general and frequently rejecting of other viewpoints (17, p. 4).

10. Impulse Expression:

This scale assesses a general readiness to express impulses and to seek gratification either in conscious thought or in overt action. High scorers have an active imagination, value sensual reactions and feelings; very high scorers have frequent feelings of rebellion and aggression (17, p. 5).

11. Personal integration:

The high scorer admits to few attitudes and behaviors that characterize socially alienated or emotionally disturbed persons. Low scorers often intentionally avoid others and experience feelings of hostility and aggression along with feelings of isolation, loneliness, and rejection (17, p. 5).

12. Anxiety level:

High scorers deny that they have feelings or symptoms of anxiety, and do not admit to being nervous or worried. Low scorers describe themselves as tense and high-strung. They may experience some difficulty in adjusting to their social environment, and they tend to have a poor opinion of themselves (17, p. 5).

13. Practical outlook:

The high scorer on this measure is interested in practical, applied activities and tends to

value material possessions and concrete accomplishments. The criterion most often used to evaluate ideas and things is one of immediate utility. Authoritarianism, conservatism, and non-intellectual interests are very frequent personality components of persons scoring above the average (17, p. 5).

14. Dogmatism: Rokeach defines dogmatism as

. . . a relatively closed cognitive organization of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute authority which, in turn, provide a framework for patterns of intolerance and qualified tolerance toward others (22, p. 3).

15. Authoritarianism: Authoritarianism is characterized by a cluster of personality traits which reflect strong concern for conformity and conventional behavior, by intense loyalty to institutions, patriotism, and often demonstrates unwavering submission to a higher power (1).

Assumptions

It was assumed that the published norms for the Omnibus Personality Inventory were valid for evaluating the mean scores for the groups included in this study.

It was assumed that the "Inventory of Theological Beliefs" is a valid instrument for measuring theological beliefs along a conservative-liberal continuum.

Limitations of the Study

The only subjects included in this study were male senior seminary students who were majoring in theology and preparing for the ministry. All subjects attended one of

three seminaries located in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. The data were collected within a three-week period during the fall semester of 1969.

Generalizations

Conclusions and generalizations drawn from the data are limited to seminary students. Generalizations are not applied to graduate students choosing other majors and attending other types of graduate schools.

Background and Significance of the Study

The literature indicates that religious beliefs have been studied more often in relation to dogmatism than to any other single psychological construct (1, 9, 11, 24). Studies by Adorno (1) and Rokeach (22, 23) indicate that people are more likely to be dogmatic about religious and political beliefs than any other major aspects of the belief system.

Adorno (1) studied level of dogmatism in relation to denominational membership. No significant differences were found among the various Protestant denominations, with the exception of the Unitarian denomination, who scored significantly lower in dogmatism. When all Protestants were placed together in one group and compared with Roman Catholics, no significant difference in dogmatism was found. Protestants and Roman Catholics studied as a single group were found to be significantly more dogmatic than a "none" group, which was composed of individuals who claimed to reject all religion.

Adorno (1) acknowledges the potential weakness in studying dogmatism in relation to religious beliefs that are merely assumed on the basis of denominational membership. He observes that "an interesting project would be to study the specific content of their beliefs in relation to patterns of response on the present scales" (1, p. 211).

This research project attempted to do that very thing by actually measuring specific religious beliefs along a conservative-liberal continuum, rather than merely comparing denominational groups assumed to be either liberal or conservative.

Adorno (1) had hypothesized that the more conservative the religious beliefs, the higher the dogmatism score. However, Roman Catholics, who have been assumed to be more conservative, as a group, did not score significantly higher in dogmatism than did the other groups. Neither were significant differences found among the various major Protestant denominations, even though some are typically thought to be more conservative than others.

The failure to find significant differences may have been due to the assumption that one group was more conservative than another. It seems possible that some individuals within a given denomination were liberal while others were conservative in religious beliefs. Those scoring high could have cancelled out those scoring low, and therefore, the groups may not have been either conservative or liberal as

assumed. This points out the need for a study of dogmatism based on actual measured religious beliefs, rather than just assuming groups to be conservative or liberal on the basis of denominational membership.

Rokeach (26) reviews the Adorno study and criticizes the use of the California F Scale, which he claims measures dogmatism only associated with the conservative end of the belief continuum. Through the construction and use of the "Rokeach Dogmatism Scale," he claims to measure "general" dogmatism, including that on the liberal as well as the conservative side of the continuum. Whereas Adorno (1) assumed that dogmatism is related only to conservative beliefs, Rokeach hypothesized that it is only slightly related to liberalism or conservatism, as such, and may be found on the right, in the center, or on the left of the religious belief continuum.

In research relating to the testing of this hypothesis, Rokeach (26) studied 207 students enrolled in New York colleges. The students were divided into four groups identified as Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and None. The "none" group was composed of students who claimed to reject all religion. No significant difference was found between any of the groups on the variable of dogmatism, as measured by the "Rokeach Dogmatism Scale." According to Rokeach, "The only difference which approached significance (10 per cent level) was between the Catholic and Jewish groups, the former being more

dogmatic" (26, p. 33). Based on these findings, Rokeach concludes that dogmatism is not related to a conservative belief position.

In an earlier study conducted at Michigan State University, Rokeach found Catholic students to be more dogmatic than Protestant students (significant at the .01 level). In the same study, no significant difference was found between the Protestant and "none" groups (26).

In neither of the two studies above did Rokeach actually measure religious beliefs; he assumed, as did Adorno, that beliefs were conservative or liberal according to denominational membership. However, this is an assumption that seems questionable. Rokeach's hypothesis that dogmatism is found equally among liberals as well as conservatives also seems open to doubt. He bases this conclusion upon his failure to find any significant difference in dogmatism between the groups in the New York sample. Such a conclusion can be accepted only if one is willing to accept as fact that these groups were conservative or liberal as assumed, even though their religious beliefs were not actually measured. It is interesting to note that in naming the groups to be compared in his study, Rokeach (26) initially identified them as Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. However, in his analysis of the data, he describes them as conservatives or liberals. It should be pointed out that even though Rokeach contends that dogmatism may be found at any point

along the conservative-liberal continuum, he acknowledges that the combined evidence tends to suggest that dogmatism is more often associated with conservative than with liberal beliefs.

The weight of the evidence presented is that dogmatism, with all that it involves, cuts across specific ideological orientations along the left-to-right continuum. From this is [sic] might appear that dogmatism, whether found on the right, in the center, or on the left is genotypically the same, differing only in superficialities. However, several lines of evidence seem to suggest that dogmatism has a somewhat greater affinity to right-oriented than to left-oriented ideologies. The correlations between dogmatism and conservatism and between opinionation and conservatism, while small or negligible, are consistently positive; the correlations between dogmatism and right opinionation are consistently larger than those with left opinionation. The correlations between dogmatism and ethnocentrism and between opinionation and ethnocentrism are even higher, ranging from .31 to .53 in the former case, and from .20 to .50 in the latter case (26, p. 38).

In a study reported in 1935, Symington (31) examined the religious beliefs of 612 college students in relation to dogmatic thinking. The subjects were identified as either conservative or liberal, based upon answers to a religious questionnaire, rather than upon denominational membership. The questionnaire was composed mainly of questions having to do with attitudes and interests toward common religious practices, such as prayers, reading the Bible, and attending church. There were some items in the questionnaire which dealt specifically with doctrinal beliefs, but they were few in number. The results of this study indicated that liberals

showed a significantly higher tendency to reject dogmatic thinking, while conservatives supported dogmatic thinking and insisted that definite rules of right and wrong behavior be rigidly obeyed.

A number of studies have compared religious liberals and conservatives on intellectual interests, attitudes, and abilities (11, 14, 15, 19, 31). In the early study by Symington (31), he found that liberals were significantly more interested in intellectual affairs than were conservatives. Liberals were judged to be more intelligent and better able to deal with abstractions and highly complicated subject matter. Twenty-three years later, the OPI was used in a study to measure variables similar to those in Symington's study. Religious liberals were found to have greater preference than conservatives for reflective thought and academic activities. Conservatives were significantly more inclined to reject or avoid dealing with ideas or abstractions. Liberals were found to operate within a more flexible intellectual orientation in viewing and organizing phenomena, while conservatives showed less preference for dealing with complex situations involving diversity and ambiguity (19).

Clark (10) made a study of over 3,000 well-educated persons, nearly half of whom were listed in Who's Who. These individuals responded to a questionnaire designed to measure the extent to which they accepted or rejected conservative religious beliefs. The findings indicated that the

majority of them rejected nearly all orthodox beliefs. Leuba (21) published a similar study in which it was reported that the greater proportion of American scientific scholars accepted liberal rather than conservative religious beliefs. Dewey (13) comments on the conflict between intellectual curiosity and conservative beliefs and concludes that this is to be expected. He suggests that the scientific method embodies a natural adversity to viewing truth as a fixed frame of reference. While science doubts, fundamentalist doctrine defends an unchanging body of truth.

Since early in this century a number of researchers have demonstrated interest in comparing religious beliefs and practices in relation to such psychological constructs as level of anxiety and intensity of emotional disturbance. Some studies have attempted to examine religious beliefs in relation to overall mental health, while others have restricted themselves to isolated variables which may be related to mental health (6, 11, 27, 29). This study did not examine the mental health, as such, of the subjects, but did explore the relationship between theological beliefs and the three variables identified in the OPI as "impulse expression," "personal integration," and "anxiety level."

Studies comparing religious beliefs with anxiety level and intensity of emotional disturbance have reported inconsistent findings (6, 11, 27, 29). Some studies have reported lower anxiety levels and less emotional disturbance for those

accepting conservative religious beliefs, while others have reported similar findings concerning religious liberals (15, 19, 27). Some writers conclude that these findings are more a function of family experience and cultural background than of religious beliefs, whether they be liberal or conservative (5, 28).

Why have studies on this topic reported inconsistent findings? One possible answer may come from conclusions drawn by Allport (3). He points out that religious beliefs offer little emotionally stabilizing value unless they are internalized and not just accepted superficially. It has been shown in at least one study that individuals demonstrating clearer, more differentiated beliefs had less anxiety and emotional disturbance. These subjects were described as having a stronger ego structure with less need for projection and repression (11). Nearly all studies have compared individuals only on the basis of denominational membership. Some individuals within a given denomination may have more differentiated and better internalized religious beliefs, while the opposite may be true for others. The variation of these conditions from sample to sample may have, in part, been responsible for the inconsistent findings.

Another reason for the inconsistencies may be that in nearly all the studies that have been made, individuals have been assumed to be liberal or conservative merely on the basis of denominational membership. Seldom have the actual

religious beliefs been measured. It is not clear, therefore, whether these studies have in fact compared religious conservatives and liberals on anxiety and emotional disturbance.

It seems reasonable to assume that research comparing seminary students would provide a more appropriate sample in making such a study. Students majoring in theology and having chosen the ministry as a career, would seem more likely than the average college student to have well differentiated beliefs and a higher level of internalization of these beliefs. This research project attempted to provide a more valid sample for comparing religious conservatives and liberals by actually measuring the content of their theological beliefs.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adorno, T. W. and others, The Authoritarian Personality, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1950.
2. Allen, Donald and Harjit Sandhu, "A Comparative Study of Delinquents and Non-Delinquents: Family Affect, Religion and Personal Income," Social Forces, XLVI (February, 1967), 263-269.
3. Allport, Gordon W., The Individual and His Religion, New York, The MacMillan Company, 1950.
4. _____ and B. M. Kramer, "Some Roots of Prejudice," Journal of Psychology, XXII (July-October, 1946), 9-39.
5. Argyle, Michael, Religious Behavior, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1958.
6. Armstrong, R. C. and others, "Religious Attitudes and Emotional Adjustment," Journal of Psychological Studies, XIII (March, 1964), 35-47.
7. Asch, S. E., Social Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1952.
8. Buros, O. K., The Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook, Highland Park, New Jersey, Gryphon Press, 1959.
9. Chein, L. V., "Personality Traits and Interests of Theological Students," Religious Education, XLVII (January, 1952), 28-32.
10. Clark, W. H., "A Study of Some of the Factors Leading to Achievement and Creativity with Special Reference to Religious Skepticism and Belief," Journal of Social Psychology, XLI (February, 1955), 57-59.
11. Cline, Victor B. and James M. Richards, "A Factor-Analytic Study of Religious Beliefs and Behavior," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, I (June, 1965), 569-578.

12. Crutchfield, Richard S., "Assessment of Persons Through a Quasi Group-Interaction Technique," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, XLVI (October, 1951), 577-588.
13. Dewey, John, A Common Faith, New Haven, Connecticut, Yale University Press, 1934.
14. DeWit, Fred, "The Measurement of Values by Means of Analysis of Judgments," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, 1955.
15. Dreger, R. M., "Some Personality Correlates of Religious Attitudes as Determined by Projective Techniques," Psychological Monographs, LXVI (1952), Whole No. 3.
16. Frankl, Victor, The Doctor and the Soul, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.
17. Freud, Sigmund, The Future of an Illusion, Garden City, New Jersey, Doubleday, 1957.
18. Hall, Calvin S. and Gardner Lindzey, Theories of Personality, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957.
19. Heist, Paul and others, Omnibus Personality Inventory Manual, New York, The Psychological Corporation, 1956.
20. Jung, Carl G., Modern Man in Search of a Soul, New York, Harcourt, Brace and World Company, 1933.
21. Leuba, James H., The Belief in God and Immortality, Boston, Sherman French and Company, 1916.
22. May, Rollo, Existence: A New Dimension in Psychiatry and Psychology, New York, Basic Books, 1958.
23. McGuigan, F. J., Experimental Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1968.
24. Page, F. H., "The Psychology of Religion After Fifty Years," Canadian Journal of Psychology, V (June, 1951), 60-67.
25. Rokeach, Milton, The Open and Closed Mind, New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1960.

26. Rokeach, Milton, "Political and Religious Dogmatism: An Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality," Psychological Monographs, LXX (1956), Whole No. 425.
27. Sanua, Victor D., "Religion, Mental Health and Personality: A Review of Empirical Studies," American Journal of Psychiatry, CXXV (March, 1969), 1203-1213.
28. Schneiders, Alexander, A Personality Dynamics and Mental Health, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.
29. Scott, E. M., "Presumed Correlation Between Religion and Mental Health," Guild of Catholic Psychiatrists Bulletin, VII (January, 1961), 113-121.
30. Spradlin, Bonnie Ann, "Authoritarianism in a Population of Ministers," Dissertation Abstracts, XXX (1969), 2226B.
31. Symington, T. A., Religious Liberals and Conservatives, Contributions to Education, No. 640, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Probably the most useful conception of religious beliefs is that they represent the identification a person has with some organized religious group or religious doctrine (22). In the culture of the west, this usually means Christian attitudes or beliefs, although the Hebrew religion is often included in studies dealing with religious beliefs and behavior.

Strunk (59) points out that several of the great classical psychologists have at some time in their careers demonstrated strong interest in the religious aspect of personality. Such early pioneers as Fechner, Galton, and Wundt all showed keen attention to the relationship between religious beliefs and behavior.

In American psychology this propensity has been even more obvious. William James has been called the "Father of the psychology of religion" on the basis of the classic, The Varieties of Religious Experience (59). G. Stanley Hall, first president of the American Psychological Association founded the American Journal of Religious Psychology and Education (59). In the psychoanalytic school of thought the

concern with religious beliefs and behavior has been even more pronounced. The writings of Freud (19), Rank (41), Adler (1), Jung (27), and Fromm (21) all reflect strong interest in the subject of religion.

Even though certain individual psychologists have reflected interest in the study of religious beliefs and behavior, psychologists as a whole have tended to neglect this aspect of psychological research (39). After reviewing fifty years of published literature in this area of study, Page comments,

The psychological investigation of religion in America beginning about 1900 with Starbuck's studies of conversion and James' famous classic ran a fairly lively course of productive activity during the first quarter century. But since then interest and output have steadily declined until today it would not perhaps be untrue to say that the subject is regarded by many psychologists with almost complete indifference and by some with positive suspicion and even disfavor. Thus one studies tribal ceremonies of primitive cultures, religious delusions of the psychotics, conversion experiences of adolescents, but not the religious behavior of normal adults of our own culture (39, p. 60).

In a review of all the studies in the area of religion reported in the Psychological Abstracts for the quarter century, 1937-1953, Michaels (36) found that only 12 per cent were of an empirical nature. All these studies only averaged less than six publications per year in professional literature.

In reviewing Meissner's Annotated Bibliography in Religion and Psychology (35), McDowell (33) found that the

bulk of the published materials in such journals as Pastoral Psychology, for the decade 1950-1960, was neither empirical nor experimental in nature and consisted in great part of discussion of issues. Thouless' comment two decades earlier is still applicable. "There is a marked poverty of scientific knowledge in the psychology of religion" (61, p. 104).

Cline and Richards (14) point out that only five tests under a religious heading are listed in the Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook (9). Four of these are knowledge tests published by specific denominational groups for use in parochial school systems, while the fifth is a general test of Biblical information which is given a particularly critical and devastating review. A review of the evidence has suggested that significant empirical studies of the psychology of religion are a rarity and that this has not been a popular area of study for psychologists.

Religious Beliefs and Dogmatism

A survey of the literature indicates that religious beliefs have probably been studied more in relation to dogmatism than any other single psychological construct. The development of the construct of dogmatism has its major background in the work of Adorno as reported in The Authoritarian Personality (2). The research reported by Adorno was the outgrowth of a complex and intensive study which culminated in the development of the California F Scale.

Empirical use of this instrument demonstrated that it was valid only for measuring dogmatism associated with a conservative point of view. Adorno considers commitment to religious beliefs to be an actual dogmatic characteristic. In the design and construction of a measure of anti-democratic potential, several items of the California F Scale refer either directly or indirectly to religious tenets or beliefs, and a positive response to these items presupposes a tendency toward dogmatism.

In Adorno's classic research, which was reported in The Authoritarian Personality, subjects indicated their denominational membership. Those who claimed that they rejected religion were asked to indicate "none." When all subjects who professed to some religious affiliation were placed in one group for statistical analysis, their mean score in dogmatism was significantly higher than the mean score of those who claimed no religious affiliation. When the Protestant denominations, as a group, were compared with Roman Catholics, no significant difference in dogmatism was found. Among the Protestant denominations which have been classified as "major," only one group was found to be different in level of dogmatism. This group, identified as Unitarians, scored significantly lower than any other major Protestant denomination. Adorno concludes that this was in keeping with the generally liberal outlook of that group.

The minor Protestant denominations taken together obtained a significantly lower score in dogmatism than did any other religious group, except the Unitarians. Adorno (2) offers the suggestion that belonging to a minor denomination expresses some measure of dissent or nonconformity, or at least some lack of identification with the status quo. This is an attitude which is inconsistent with the dynamics of dogmatism. He also points out that the sample included in the study did not include any religious group drawn from specific geographical areas, such as the so-called Bible Belt, or cities with a heavy concentration of Irish-Catholic population, among whom religious ideology is said to have considerable social importance. He suggests that if research should be carried out in such areas, significant differences in dogmatism would likely be found among various major denominations other than the Unitarian denomination.

Probably the most outstanding theory building and research concerning dogmatism as it relates to extreme religious and political ideologies have been accomplished by Rokeach (43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53). Through extensive research carried out over a period of years, Rokeach has attempted to go beyond Adorno's theory of authoritarianism, which tended to neglect the study of those individuals identifying with the left end of a religious beliefs continuum, and to develop a more general concept of dogmatism.

Rokeach conceptualizes dogmatism as consisting of a structure of closed belief-disbelief systems. He concludes that for the religious dogmatic this way of looking at life serves as a "total ideological defense against threat and at the same time provides a cognitive framework for satisfying one's need to know and to comprehend the world one lives in" (52, p. 5). This kind of dogmatic religious identification helps make it possible to protect oneself against threatening aspects of reality and also helps to give the security or satisfaction of feeling that one understands it (48).

Rokeach (50) observes that the religious dogmatic is disposed to accept closed systems of thinking and believing in proportion to the extent to which he has been made to feel alone and inadequate in the world. This feeling of inadequacy and self-hate leads one to become excessively concerned with a need for power and status. The more dogmatic the religious system of beliefs, the more it provides need satisfaction for a sense of importance, identity, and security. Rokeach concludes that through over-identification with an absolute authority or cause such as a closed system of religious beliefs, an attempt is made to defend self and group against feelings of aloneness, isolation, self-hate, and misanthropy.

In his study of dogmatism, Rokeach (50) asked college students to indicate their denominational membership. In a midwestern sample, Protestants, Roman Catholics, and a "none"

group were compared on level of dogmatism. The Roman Catholics were found to be significantly more dogmatic than either the Protestant or "none" groups. No significant difference was found between the Protestant and "none" groups. In an eastern study, no significant difference was found between any of the four groups--Protestants, Roman Catholics, Jews, and "none." The only difference that approached significance (.10 level) was between Roman Catholics and Jews, with the latter being lower in dogmatism.

Rokeach (50) concludes from these results that dogmatism is not exclusively associated with the conservative end of the religious belief continuum. How he draws such a conclusion, however, is not entirely clear, since the results of the eastern study were inconsistent with those of the mid-western study. It is true that no significant differences were found between any of the denomination groups in the eastern sample, but significant difference in dogmatism was obtained between Roman Catholics and Protestants in the mid-western sample. His data seem to leave open the question as to whether religious conservatives are more dogmatic than liberals.

Dreger (17) studied thirty people from each extreme of liberalism and conservatism out of an initial group of 490. The groups were carefully equated on other variables. Various scores from the Thematic Apperception Test and the Rorschach Ink Blot Test indicated that conservatives had a greater

need for dependence on dogmatic type leaders and were in fact more dogmatic in their thinking than were those scoring as liberals in theological beliefs.

Argyle (5) reviewed the literature concerning dogmatism and theological beliefs and observed that Roman Catholics, who are typically conservative in theological beliefs, were the most dogmatic, while members of the major Protestant bodies were slightly less dogmatic. In research conducted by Chein (11), it was demonstrated that Catholics were more dogmatic than Protestants, while Jews were found to be the least dogmatic.

Allport and Kramer (3), in a study of 437 students, found 71 per cent of Roman Catholics in the most dogmatic half, compared with 62 per cent of Protestants, 22 per cent of Jews, and 27 per cent of those with no religious upbringing. Symington (60) studied 612 college students who were designated as either liberal or conservative in religious beliefs. He found that liberals showed a significantly higher tendency to reject dogmatic thinking, especially when an effort was made to enforce it through the pressure of group opinion. Liberals showed a greater dislike for being told what to do by authoritarian figures. Symington observes that this type of rejection of socialized opinion was seen more specifically in the fact that liberals did not consider so many "things wrong" as did conservatives. On the other hand, conservatives demanded that the rules of

right and wrong actions be observed and that certain creeds be accepted. The liberals resisted the principle of authority being applied to their actions and beliefs.

Religious Beliefs, Intellectual Interests,
and Freedom to Learn

Several studies have pointed to a basic conflict between conservative religious beliefs and intellectual interest and openness (3, 4, 5, 7). According to Symington (60), history has given many examples of religious opinion affecting the advancement of knowledge and education. The prejudices of earlier traditional religious beliefs embarrassed Galileo, Darwin, and others in their respective times. Symington observes that those who hold liberal religious beliefs are more inclined to be sympathetic with the efforts of science to discover new truth. Adherents of conservative religious beliefs, on the other hand, typically complain that science and the pursuit of new knowledge disturb and undermine their religious dogmas (4, 11).

Allport (4) notes that among modern intellectuals the subject of religion is seldom explored. He surmises that this may be because the educated portion of mankind is learning to live with less finality and to distrust embracing formulae of all types.

Dewey (15) discusses the conflict between conservative religious beliefs and intellectual interest and concludes that the scientific method is naturally adverse to a fixed

dogma. He observes that science questions and doubts, while conservative religious doctrines are prescribed as a body of definite beliefs that are to be taught and learned as being absolutely true. Dewey concludes that the scientific-conservative religious conflict ultimately is a conflict between allegiance to a questioning method and allegiance to an irreducible minimum of beliefs so fixed in advance that they cannot be easily modified.

Heist (24) administered the Omnibus Personality Inventory to 7,283 college students in a study which demonstrated that conservative religious beliefs are negatively correlated with openness to intellectual interests and the so-called freedom to learn syndrome. The findings revealed that there were distinct differences between religious liberals and conservatives regarding intellectual interests and attitude toward use of the scientific method. Religious liberals were found to be significantly more characterized by a liking for reflective thought and academic activities. On the other hand, conservatives were more dominated by immediate conditions and tended more to reject or avoid dealing with ideas or abstractions. The liberals indicated a preference for dealing with theoretical concerns and preferred using the scientific method in their thinking. They also tended to be more logical, analytical, and critical in their approach to problem situations. As compared with conservatives, the liberals demonstrated an experimental and

flexible orientation, rather than a fixed way of viewing and organizing phenomena. They showed a preference for dealing with complex situations involving diversity and ambiguity, while the conservatives expressed a desire for greater simplicity.

Symington (60) studied differences found between religious liberals and conservatives in a sample of 612 college students. He reports that liberal religious beliefs were positively related to intelligence quotient. Those who were liberal in their religious beliefs were more advanced in college and found books more entertaining than friends. Further preferences were found for intellectual affairs as compared with social events. Liberals were found to be better able to express themselves in writing and in conversation than were conservatives.

Clark (13) administered questionnaires to approximately 3,000 well-educated persons, nearly half of whom were listed in Who's Who. When they were asked to rate the constructive factors contributing most to their intellectual growth and interests, the chief factors turned out to be "interest and satisfaction in work for its own sake" and "a desire to know and understand for its own sake." The great majority of those questioned reported only slight interest and commitment to orthodox religious beliefs.

Knapp and Goodrich (30) report findings which indicate that only a very few successful scientists come from Roman

Catholic universities where conservative religious beliefs are upheld. On the other hand, a high percentage of successful scientists were graduated from secular American colleges where liberal religious beliefs have been widely held by the faculty.

According to Argyle (5), more intelligent persons are less amenable to social pressure and therefore should be expected to be unorthodox in religious beliefs. He points out that there are few eminent men in religions which discourage inquiry and innovation. Leuba (32) found that the greater proportion of American scientific scholars do not accept traditional religious beliefs. A study made by Fortune magazine (8) also supported Leuba's findings. Both studies found that the more eminent the scholar, the less likely he is to be involved in religious activities.

Roe (42) conducted intensive interviews with sixty-four selected outstanding scientists. It was found that although all but one came from a background of religious affiliation, only three of these men were presently active in church attendance. All individuals in the group no longer accepted traditional religious beliefs and personally showed little concern over religious matters. Stark (57) reviewed similar studies and reports that men with strong religious commitment are seldom scientific in their activities and have not often been major contributors to the on-going scientific quest. Studies by Ellis (18), O'Dea (38), and Kane (28) revealed

that few eminent scholars were present in Catholic schools upholding conservative religious beliefs. Individuals in these schools seldom made any significant contribution to their discipline.

Knapp and Greenbaum (30) traced the collegiate origins of young American scholars. They found that denominational schools, characterized by conservative religious beliefs, contributed proportionately far fewer scholars than did secular schools. Similar results have been reported by Lazarsfield and Thielens (31).

Religious Beliefs, Level of Anxiety, and
Intensity of Emotional Disturbance

Since the beginning of this century much has been written concerning the relationship between religious beliefs, anxiety, and emotional disturbance (13, 27, 38, 62, 64). James' classic book, Varieties of Religious Experience (25), suggests many implications regarding the significance of religious beliefs in relation to emotional stability.

Another classic example of this kind of observation is seen in the often-quoted statement of Jung.

I should like to call attention to the following facts. During the past thirty years, people from all the civilized countries of the earth have consulted me. I have treated many hundreds of patients, the larger number being Protestants, a smaller number of Jews, and not more than five or six believing Catholics. Among all my patients in the second half of life . . . there has not been one whose problem in the last resort was not that of finding a religious outlook on life. It is safe to say that every one of them fell

ill because he had lost that which the living religions of every age have given to their followers, and none of them has been really healed who did not regain his religious outlook (27, p. 264).

The assumption concerning the positive relationship between religious beliefs and low levels of anxiety combined with emotional stability, seems to be based on the conclusion that religion, above everything else, is capable of supplying values, beliefs, and practices which give meaning and stability to human life (26, 58, 63). Numerous studies have, however, failed to yield any consistent results in support of this assumption (5, 26, 58, 60, 62, 63, 64). Some studies have reported lower anxiety levels for those holding conservative religious beliefs, while other studies have found religious liberals to have lower anxiety levels (6, 14, 54, 56). The combined evidence indicates that a low level of anxiety and emotional stability are more a function of family experience and cultural background and less a function of religious beliefs, whether they be conservative or liberal (5, 55). The exception is found consistently only with those individuals demonstrating clearer, more differentiated beliefs, regardless of whether they be religious, irreligious, conservative, or liberal. Such subjects were found to have a stronger ego structure with less anxiety and less need for projection and repression (5).

Argyle (5) concludes that there is little evidence to support the hypothesis that religious beliefs, as such, ever

cause emotional instability or prevent such disorders. Funk (21) administered a scale of religious beliefs and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale to a group of college students. The subjects were representative of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. Anxiety was found to be unrelated to orthodoxy, religious preference, belief in a philosophy of life not founded on religion, or hostility to religion. However, high scores on the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale were found to be characteristic of students who had expressed religious doubts and felt guilty about living up to expectations of their religious teachings. Ranck (40) administered an extensive battery of tests to 800 theological students in schools across the United States representing the entire continuum from conservative to liberal. The results indicate that low level of anxiety and emotional stability were not related to any particular religious ideology, as measured by the Bell Inventory and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Instead, beliefs and psychological adjustment were found to be primarily cultural phenomena reflecting individual family background.

McGrath (34) used the semantic differential type of questionnaire to measure the anxiety and emotional disturbance of three groups of students who were members of religious organizations on a college campus. The results indicated that Catholics had the lowest emotional disturbance scores, the Unitarians had the highest, and the Baptist group scored in the middle of the range.

A well-designed research study of the relationship between religious beliefs and emotional disturbance was conducted by Armstrong (6). The sample included normal men and women and a group of psychotic subjects. The group including normal subjects was composed of Catholics, Protestants, and Unitarians. The assumption that the subjects were representative of the conservative-liberal religious beliefs continuum was made. Each subject was asked to select adjectives to rate himself as he saw himself and then to rate himself as he wished he were. The discrepancy between the actual self and ideal self was not found to be significantly different for any of the three groups.

Wilson (66) studied the relationship between strongly held religious beliefs and fear and anxiety. Religiousness was found to be positively correlated with both fear and anxiety. A small but reliable tendency for non-religious persons to score lower on fear and anxiety was reported. Webster (65) reports a study made of 191 students in Protestant seminaries in the United States, Australia, and New Zealand. The findings, based on scores made on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, indicated that the religiously conservative students scored higher on emotional disturbance. The total religious population, liberal and conservative, scored higher on anxiety than did the normative population.

The various studies comparing religious liberals and conservatives on anxiety and emotional disturbance have reported inconsistent findings. This may be due to a consistent failure to actually measure religious beliefs instead of assuming that a particular group is conservative or liberal.

Summary

The study of religious beliefs in relation to certain personality factors has received attention from a large number of writers (2, 3, 19, 25, 50). However, most of the studies have been neither empirical nor experimental in nature (33). Of all the tests reviewed in the Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook (9), only five are listed under a religious heading. None of these are judged to be valid for studying the actual religious beliefs of adults (14).

Most of the studies have concentrated on contrasting religious conservatives and liberals on selected personality variables. Religious beliefs have been studied probably more often in relation to dogmatism than any other single variable (36). Adorno (2) and Rokeach (48, 50) are probably best known for research in this area. Adorno (2) compared college students on the basis of denominational membership, assuming some groups to be conservative and others to be liberal. The findings failed to show any significant difference between Roman Catholics and major Protestant groups.

Roman Catholics were found to be more dogmatic than a group identified as "none," which was composed of students who rejected all religion.

Rokeach (50) studied dogmatism as found among college students using a midwestern and eastern sample. In the midwestern sample the Roman Catholic group was found to be more dogmatic than a Protestant and a "none" group. The Protestant group was not significantly different from the "none" group. Students in the eastern sample were also grouped according to their denominational membership. In this study no significant differences were found between Roman Catholics, Protestants, Jews, or the "none" group. The only difference which approached significance (.10 level) was that between the Roman Catholics and the Jews, with the Roman Catholics being more dogmatic. Other studies have reported similar findings (3, 4, 5, 15, 60). The majority of studies have found dogmatism to be more often related to conservative than to liberal religious beliefs.

Religious beliefs have often been studied in relation to intellectual interests, attitudes, and abilities (4, 15, 24). Several studies have pointed to a basic conflict between conservative religious beliefs and a high level of interest in intellectual affairs and confidence in the validity and use of the scientific method (5, 13, 18, 30). Religious liberals have been found to be significantly more characterized by a preference for reflective thought and

academic activities than have conservatives. Conservatives have been found to be more dominated by immediate conditions and tended to dislike dealing with complex ideas or abstractions (24). Clark (13) studied 3,000 well-educated persons, nearly half of whom were listed in Who's Who. The great majority of the group indicated that they had only slight interest in or commitment to conservative religion.

According to a study by Knapp and Goodrich (30), very few successful scientists have come from Roman Catholic universities, where conservative beliefs are upheld. This study indicates that a high percentage of successful scientists were graduated from secular American colleges where liberal religious beliefs were held by the faculty.

Roe (42) reports findings based on intensive interviews with sixty-four outstanding scientists. All of them indicated that they were unable to accept traditional conservative beliefs and showed little interest or concern about religious matters.

It seems that virtually all the studies comparing religious beliefs with intellectual interests and attitudes have arrived at similar findings. There appears to be a natural incongruence between conservative religious beliefs and a progressive attitude toward intellectual pursuits and the advancement of science. Years ago, Dewey (15) discussed this conflict and concluded that the scientific method is naturally adverse to a fixed dogma.

Some writers have centered their attention on the study of religious beliefs in relation to level of anxiety and emotional disturbance. Research in this area has reported inconsistent findings. Some researchers have found religious conservatives to be less emotionally disturbed with less anxiety, while others have reported conservatives to have more anxiety and emotional disturbance. Allport (4) concludes that, in order for religious beliefs to have an emotionally stabilizing effect, they must be internalized into the real self. At least one study has shown that individuals who have clearer, more differentiated beliefs have less emotional disturbance and anxiety. These individuals were described as having more ego strength and less need for engaging in ego-defense mechanisms (14).

The inconsistent findings concerning anxiety and emotional disturbance seem in part due to a failure of the researchers, generally, to study individuals who have well-differentiated beliefs in comparison with those who may only superficially adhere to religious dogma. Most studies have also failed to actually measure religious beliefs, but have compared groups on the basis of denominational membership assumed to be either conservative or liberal.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adler, Alfred, Religion and Individual Psychology, Vienna, Rolf Paeser, 1933.
2. Adorno, T. W. and others, The Authoritarian Personality, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1950.
3. Allport, Gordon W., The Individual and His Religion, New York, The MacMillan Company, 1950.
4. _____ and B. M. Kramer, "Some Roots of Prejudice," Journal of Psychology, XXII (July-October, 1946), 9-39.
5. Argyle, Michael, Religious Behavior, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1958.
6. Armstrong, R. C. and others, "Religious Attitudes and Emotional Adjustment," Journal of Psychological Studies, XIII (March, 1962), 35-47.
7. Barker, Edwin N., "Authoritarianism of the Political Right, Center, and Left," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, New York, 1958.
8. Bello, Francis, "The Young Scientist," Fortune, XLIX (June, 1954), 142-148.
9. Buros, O. K., The Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook, Highland Park, New Jersey, Gryphon Press, 1959.
10. Burt, H. E. and D. R. Falkenberg, "The Influence of Majority and Expert Opinions on Religious Attitudes," Journal of Social Psychology, XIV (November, 1941), 269-278.
11. Chein, L. V., "Personality Traits and Interests of Theological Students," Religious Education, XLVII (January, 1952), 28-32.
12. Clark, W. H., The Psychology of Religion, New York, The MacMillan Company, 1958.

13. Clark, W. H., "A Study of Some of the Factors Leading to Achievement and Creativity with Special Reference to Religious Skepticism and Belief," Journal of Social Psychology, XLI (February, 1955), 57-59.
14. Cline, Victor B. and James M. Richards, "A Factor-Analytic Study of Religious Beliefs and Behavior," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, I (June, 1965), 569-578.
15. Dewey, John, A Common Faith, New Haven, Connecticut, Yale University Press, 1934.
16. DiRenzo, Gordon J., "Dogmatism and Orientation Toward Liturgical Change," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, VI (February, 1967), 278.
17. Dreger, R. M., "Some Personality Correlates of Religious Attitudes as Determined by Projective Techniques," Psychological Monographs, LXVI (1952), Whole No. 3.
18. Ellis, John Tracy, "The American Catholic and the Intellectual Life," Thought, XXX (Autumn, 1955), 351-388.
19. Freud, Sigmund, The Future of an Illusion, Garden City, New Jersey, Doubleday, 1957.
20. Fromm, Eric, Psychoanalysis and Religion, New Haven, Connecticut, University Press, 1950.
21. Funk, R. A., "A Survey of Religious Beliefs and Manifest Anxiety in a College Population," Dissertation Abstracts, XV (1965), 2569.
22. Guilford, J. P., Personality, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.
23. Hadley, Betty J., "Autocratic Versus Democratic Beliefs of Graduate Students in Nursing," Nursing Research, XVII (January, 1968), 19-26.
24. Heist, Paul and others, Omnibus Personality Inventory Manual, New York, The Psychological Corporation, 1958.
25. James, William, The Varieties of Religious Experience, New York, Random House, 1902.
26. Johnson, P. E., "Religious Psychology and Health," Mental Hygiene, XXXI (October, 1947), 556-566.

27. Jung, Carl G., Modern Man in Search of a Soul, New York, Harcourt, Brace and World Company, 1933.
28. Kane, John J., Catholic-Protestant Conflicts in America, Chicago, Regnery Press, 1955.
29. Knapp, R. H. and H. B. Goodrich, "The Origins of American Scientists," Science, CXVI (July, 1952), 543-545.
30. _____ and Joseph J. Greenbaum, The Younger American Scholar: His Collegiate Origins, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1953.
31. Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Wagner Thielens, The Academic Mind, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1958.
32. Leuba, James H., The Belief in God and Immortality, Boston, Sherman French and Company, 1916.
33. McDowell, M. M., Techniques Used in Attitudinal Measurement in Religion, Salt Lake City, Utah, Westminster College, 1963.
34. McGrath, J. R., "Religious Group Differences in Value Orientations, Interpersonal Relations, and Personal Adjustment," unpublished paper read at the meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Cambridge, Massachusetts, October, 1966.
35. Meissner, W. W., Annotated Bibliography in Religion and Psychology, New York, Academy of Religion and Mental Health, 1961.
36. Michaels, J. A., A Survey of the Empirical Study of Religion of the Past Twenty-Five Years, Los Angeles, University of California, 1956.
37. Oates, W. E., Religious Factors in Mental Illness, New York, Association Press, 1955.
38. O'Dea, Thomas F., American Catholic Dilemma, New York, Sheed and Ward, Inc., 1958.
39. Page, F. H., "The Psychology of Religion After Fifty Years," Canadian Journal of Psychology, V (June, 1951), 60-67.
40. Ranck, J. O., "Some Personality Correlates of Religious Attitudes and Beliefs," Dissertation Abstracts, XV (1955), 878-879.

41. Rank, Otto, Psychology and the Soul, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1950.
42. Roe, Anna, The Making of a Scientist, New York, Dodd and Mead, 1952.
43. Rokeach, Milton, "Change Within Value Systems," Journal of Social Issues, XXIV (January, 1968), 13-33.
44. _____, "Dogmatism and Opinionation on the Left and Right," American Psychologist, VII (May, 1952), 310.
45. _____, "A Method for Studying Individual Differences in 'Narrow-Mindedness,'" Journal of Personality, XX (September, 1951), 219-233.
46. _____, "The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism," Psychological Review, XLI (May, 1954), 194-204.
47. _____, "The Nature of Attitudes," International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, New York, MacMillan, 1968.
48. _____, The Open and Closed Mind, New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1960.
49. _____, The Paradox of Religious Beliefs, Proceedings of the Christian Association for Psychological Studies, April, 1968, pp. 51-58.
50. _____, "Political and Religious Dogmatism: An Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality," Psychological Monographs, LXX (1956), Whole No. 425.
51. _____ and B. Fruchter, "A Factorial Study of Dogmatism and Related Concepts," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIII (November, 1956), 356-360.
52. _____ and C. Hanley, "Eysenck's Tendermindedness Dimension: A Critique," Psychological Bulletin, LIII (May, 1956), 169-176.
53. _____ and others, "A Distinction Between Dogmatic and Rigid Thinking," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIII (July, 1956), 87-93.
54. Sanua, Victor D., "Religion, Mental Health and Personality: A Review of Empirical Studies," American Journal of Psychiatry, CXXV (March, 1969), 1203-1213.

55. Schneiders, Alexander, A Personality Dynamics and Mental Health, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.
56. Scott, E. M., "Presumed Correlation Between Religion and Mental Health," Guild of Catholic Psychiatrists Bulletin, VIII (January, 1961), 113-121.
57. Stark, Rodney, "On the Incompatibility of Religion and Science," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, III (Fall, 1963), 3-20.
58. Stern, K., "Religion and Psychiatry," Commonweal, XLIX (October, 1948), 30-33.
59. Strunk, Orio, Religion: A Psychological Interpretation, New York, Abingdon Press, 1962.
60. Symington, T. A., Religious Liberals and Conservatives, Contributions to Education, No. 640, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935.
61. Thouless, R. H., "Scientific Method in the Scientific Study of Religion," Character and Personality, VII (September, 1938), 103-108.
62. Van Buskirk, J. D., Religion and Mental Health, New York, MacMillan, 1952.
63. Vanderneldt, J. H., "Religion and Mental Health," Mental Hygiene, XXXV (April, 1951), 177-189.
64. Vaughan, R. P., Mental Illness and the Religious Life, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1962.
65. Webster, Alan Charles, "Patterns and Relations of Dogmatism, Mental Health and Psychological Health in Selected Religious Groups," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII (1967), 4142A.
66. Wilson, Warner and Howard L. Miller, "Fear, Anxiety, and Religiousness," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, V (Fall, 1965), 34-40.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Subjects

The subjects included in this study were all enrolled as regular, full-time students in three Protestant seminaries located within the Dallas-Fort Worth, Texas area. The seminaries were Dallas Theological Seminary, Perkins School of Theology, and Southwestern Baptist Seminary. The Dallas Theological Seminary is an independent, non-denominational seminary; Perkins School of Theology is affiliated with the Southern Methodist Church; and Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary is affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention. The original sample included 203, with 71 from Dallas Theological Seminary, 68 from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, and 64 from Perkins School of Theology. A total of 153 students were included in the final sample, with Groups C, M, and L having 51 in each. All the subjects were male, Caucasian, college graduates expecting to enter the ministry upon graduation from seminary.

Procedures for Collecting the Data

Permission to collect the data at each seminary was received initially from the administrator supervising professors of theology. In each instance the administrator

contacted one or more professors of theology, asking for their cooperation and properly identifying the author of this dissertation as the one who would collect the data. Appointments were made with each instructor to discuss further the nature of the study and to establish approximate dates for collecting the data. These dates were finalized at a later time. The three instruments to be used were shown to each instructor and the approximate total time necessary for administering them was suggested. It was determined that the instruments would be administered during regular class hours and that two separate periods would be required in order for the subjects to complete their responses to the instruments. It was suggested to the instructors that the students not be told the nature of the measurements being taken nor the purpose of the study. The instruments were administered during regular class periods with identical instructions being read to each group. All data were collected during the 1969 fall semester within a period of three weeks.

Treatment of the Data

The original sample included a total of 203 subjects. In order to test the hypotheses as stated in Chapter I, three groups were selected from the original sample. The three groups totaled 153 subjects, with 51 being placed in each group. Scores made on the "Inventory of Theological Beliefs" were used as a basis for identifying those individuals who

were finally included in each group. All of the scores of the sample were placed in rank order. Those individuals scoring at or above the 75th percentile were placed together and identified as Group C (conservative). Subjects constituting the middle 25 per cent of the sample were placed together and identified as Group M (moderate), and those individuals scoring at or below the 25th percentile were identified as Group L (liberal). This arrangement corresponded to the meaning of the scores, since higher scores were assumed to represent more conservative religious beliefs, while lower scores were assumed to represent liberal beliefs.

Each of the eleven hypotheses was tested for significant differences. The statistical technique used for determining significance was the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test (10). The data were processed by the North Texas State University Computer Center. The print-out provided by the Computer Center stated values for determining significance at the .05 and .01 level of confidence. Significance was indicated by differences between means which reached or exceeded the values given for each variable.

Description of the Instruments

The three instruments used in this study were the "Rokeach Dogmatism Scale," the Omnibus Personality Inventory, and the "Inventory of Theological Beliefs." The "Rokeach Dogmatism Scale" was first developed by Milton E. Rokeach in

the year, 1948. The scale was developed out of an investigation into the possible relationship between rigidity concerning ethnocentrism and anti-democratic attitudes. In his original study, Rokeach defined rigidity as the inability to change one's mental set when the objective, external conditions demanded it, or the inability to restructure a field in which there are alternative solutions to a problem in order to solve the problem more efficiently (13).

In later research, Rokeach (14, 17) enlarged his theoretical position in order to explain the relationship between cognitive organization and social attitudes such as ethnocentrism and authoritarianism. This later research was primarily concerned with narrow-mindedness, reification, and concreteness of thinking. Rokeach had his subjects attempt to define ten concepts which were arranged in four categories: abstract, reified, concrete, and miscellaneous. Through this procedure he found that in the concrete definition the concept defined in terms of a person or group holding a belief and that this type of definition appeared significantly more frequently among ethnocentric persons. In following this up, he had his subjects write paragraphs and interrelate the same ten concepts. In turn, he then grouped these by content and analysis into three groups: comprehensive or integrated; isolated, in which concepts were integrated but broken into two or more sub-groups; and narrow cognitive organization. When these were correlated with

ethnocentrism scores, it was determined that narrow organization increases directly with increases in ethnocentrism (17). It was on this basis that Rokeach was able to develop a more comprehensive theory of dogmatism.

Through his research concerning authoritarianism, Rokeach attempted to organize authoritarianism along a belief-disbelief dimension. In this, Rokeach conceived of three layers of belief-disbelief. The central peripheral region represented the person's "primitive" beliefs which are the beliefs a person has acquired about the nature of "self." The second or intermediate region represented the beliefs a person has in and about the nature of authority and the people who line up with authority on whom he depends to help him form a picture of the world he lives in. The third region was a peripheral one which represented the beliefs derived from figures of authority (1, 4, 15).

The dogmatism scale developed by Rokeach was basically designed to measure individual differences along a continuum of openness versus closedness of belief systems. Rokeach has demonstrated this scale is valid in its claim to measure open and closed systems of belief-disbelief and is in fact a measure of general authoritarianism (12, 15, 16, 18). The scale has gone through five revisions and editions. The final, or latest, is Form E, which was used in this study. The Form E of the "Rokeach Dogmatism Scale" contains forty items having a correlated reliability of .91 (16). This

reliability data were gathered in three areas of social climate: midwestern United States, eastern United States, and England. The midwestern group was composed of college students at Michigan State University enrolled in beginning psychology courses during the years, 1952, 1953, 1955, and 1956. The eastern group was composed of college students enrolled at New York University and Brooklyn College, taking beginning courses in psychology during the year 1952. Reliabilities were also obtained from Ohio State University in 1955 and Purdue University in 1956. The English group was composed of students attending University College in London and students enrolled in Birkbeck College and a worker sample from an automobile factory in London in 1954 (15).

A combination of three methods was used to establish the validity of the "Rokeach Dogmatism Scale." The first was validation against other standardized scales claiming to measure the same or similar hypothetical constructs. The second was a theoretical validation approach accomplished by testing hypotheses emerging from a set of theoretical considerations. The third was through comparison of known groups, which showed a significant difference between high and low dogmatism at the .01 level (15).

The Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI) was developed at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley and grew out of a need for a special instrument to accommodate research objectivities at

Berkeley. The original OPI scales were the work of John Darley and T. R. McConnell and were derived from a supposedly representative and special compilation of what were judged to be relevant scales from several sources. Most of the scales in the current form (Form F) of the inventory have been developed during a revision process which took more than seven years (6).

The OPI was constructed to measure selected attitudes, values, and interests, mainly pertaining to the two areas, normal ego-functioning and intellectual activity. Under the area of ego-functioning, scales have been included which measure social concern, social-emotional maturity, success in social relations, and masculinity-femininity. Included under intellectual activity are scales which propose to measure interest in working with ideas and abstractions, esthetic interests, and theoretical orientation. In order to supplement the variables in these two areas, measurement of flexibility, impulsivity, emotional disturbance, and anxiety were included (6).

A brief description of the ten scales selected for use in this study is as follows:

Thinking Introversion (TI)--liking for reflective thought, ideas and abstractions, and academic activities (6, p. 4).

Theoretical Orientation (TO)--preference for dealing with theoretical matters and problems and for using scientific methods (6, p. 4).

Estheticism (Es)--interest in, and sensitivity of response to, painting, sculpture, music, literature and drama (6, p. 4).

Complexity (Co)--tolerance or liking for flexibility in viewing and organizing phenomena with emphasis on the novel and experimental, as contrasted with a rigid or simplistic view (6, p. 4).

Autonomy (Au)--drive for personal independence, intellectual and political liberalism, and tolerance; freedom from judgmental or authoritarian thinking (6, p. 4).

Religious Orientation (RO)--extent of involvement, commitment and belief in conventional religious doctrines and practices (6, p. 4).

Impulse Expression (IE)--readiness to express impulses (including feelings of sensuality, rebellion, and aggression), and to seek gratification either in thought or in overt action (6, p. 4).

Personal Integration (PI)--attitudes and behaviors that characterize the socially adjusted or integrated persons as contrasted with the socially alienated or disturbed person (6, p. 5).

Anxiety Level (AL)--freedom from symptoms of anxiety related to social maladjustment and poor self-concept (6, p. 5).

Practical Outlook (PO)--interest in the practical and utilitarian applications of ideas and things: tendency to set a high value upon material possessions and concrete accomplishments (6, p. 5).

In the OPI Manual a section is devoted to "suggested uses of the OPI" for research purposes. The authors conclude that

From the standpoint of selection of or differentiation among students, individual scales and clusters of scales have been and can be used to serve the following purposes: (1) to assess degrees or levels of intellectual disposition

and the particular emphasis in such a disposition, (2) to assess differences in major orientations of students, e.g., degrees of authoritarianism, religious commitment, or altruism, (3) to measure variations in impulsivity and flexibility, (4) to provide cues for type and intensity of emotional disturbance, and (5) to identify persons who exhibit major correlates of creativity (6, p. 26).

The published norms for the OPI are based on a large sample of entering students at diverse institutions of higher education. In all, thirty-seven institutions were included in the norms established. These were selected in such a way as to achieve some appropriate representation in the various categories of higher education. "Included in these samples were institutions representing various categories such as public and private colleges (men's, women's, and co-educational) as well as institutions with graduate schools" (6, p. 10). Also included were junior colleges, institutes of art and institutes of technology. From the standpoint of academic excellence, the authors concluded that only a few of the institutions among the thirty-seven could be described as poor or inferior (6). In personal correspondence addressed to the author of this dissertation and dated June 27, 1969, the senior editor of the OPI discusses the use of these norms for other entering students at institutions of higher learning. He indicates that in studies known to him the OPI has been used to study both undergraduate and graduate students, as well as faculty members of certain institutions. He suggests that the published norms pose no real problem when used with all these groups (see Appendix A).

The validity of the OPI is supported by research from many sources. Correlation with other measures comprises most of the data concerning validation, with validity coefficients reported for each of the individual scales of the OPI (6). The TI scale (Thinking Introversion) showed correlations of $-.63$ and $.47$ with the "Economic" and "Aesthetic" scales, respectively, of the Allport-Vernon-Lindsey Study of Values, $.68$ with the "Thoughtfulness" measure of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, and $-.50$ with the "Business Interest" scale of the Opinion, Attitude, and Interest Survey (OAIS). The TO scale (Theoretical Orientation) showed significant correlations of $.35$ with faculty ratings for "self reliance and originality," $.33$ with "overall effectiveness" as a graduate student, $.62$ with the "Theoretical" scale of the Study of Values, and $.53$ and $.46$ with problem-solving ability and the mathematical test, respectively, on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (6, pp. 28-29).

The Au scale (Autonomy) was found to correlate with the "Economic," "Aesthetic," and "Religious" measures ($-.29$, $.44$, and $-.23$, respectively) of the Study of Values. It also correlated with the California Personality Inventory measures of "Capacity for Status" ($.38$), "Social Presence" ($.35$), "Socialization" ($-.30$), "Achievement via Independence" ($.46$), and "Flexibility" ($.45$) (6, pp. 29-30).

The only correlational statistics reported for the RO scale (Religious Orientation) were $-.66$ with the "Religious"

scale and .32 with the "Theoretical and Aesthetic" scale of the Study of Values. The IE scale (Impulse Expression) correlated significantly with "Hypomania" (.65), "Schizophrenia" (.60), "Psychopathic Deviate" (.48), and "Psychos-thenia" (.47) measures on the Minnesota Multiphasic Per-sonality Inventory. In correlating the PI scale (Personal Integration) with measures on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, coefficients of .40 with "Sociability," .77 with "Emotional Stability," .67 with "Objectivity," and .43 with "Personal Relations" were found. The PO scale (Practical Outlook) was found to have correlations of .62 and -.42 with the "Economic" and "Aesthetic" scales of the Study of Values (6, pp. 28-32).

The Co scale (Complexity) has its highest correlations with the measures of "Creative Personality" (.58) and "Intellectual Quality" (.52) on the OAIS. With measures of "Need for Change" and "Order" on the Activities Index, it correlates .46 and -.49, respectively. The Es scale (Estheticism) had correlations of .36 with the "Creative Personality" scale and .47 with the "Humanities Interest" scale of the OAIS. The correlations between the AL (Anxiety Level) and PI (Personal Integration) scales are high (.69 and .65 for men and women respectively). Correlations of the AL scale with other variables parallel those obtained with the PI scale (6, pp. 28-31).

The manual reported three separate estimates of the reliability of the OPI: the Kuder-Richardson Formula 21, the corrected split-half method, and the test-retest method. The Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 and the corrected split-half method are given as estimates of the internal consistency, which show values ranging from .67 to .69. The test-retest values reflect the tendency of individuals to retain their relative positions when tested a second time and range from .79 to .94. These reliability estimates must be viewed as extremely stable (6).

The "Inventory of Theological Beliefs" was designed and constructed by the author of this dissertation. Its purpose is to determine a person's score position along a conservative-liberal continuum in regard to theological beliefs. This instrument was constructed for use in such a study as this, since no other instrument available seemed appropriate. Cline and Richards (3) point out that in the Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook only five tests are listed under a religious heading. Four of these are knowledge tests published by specific denominational groups for use in parochial school systems for the purpose of testing awareness of specific Biblical facts and events. The fifth is called a general test of Biblical information and is given a particularly critical review.

The "Inventory of Theological Beliefs" contains sixty items and covers the six major divisions of systematic

theology. After a careful and thorough review of several standard reference books in the field, ten key issues from each of these six divisions were identified and two statements for each were developed by the author of this dissertation. One statement was constructed in such a way as to reflect what was judged to be a typical conservative point of view on that particular issue, while the second statement was constructed in such a way as to reflect a typical liberal point of view. The liberal and conservative statements were randomly arranged throughout the instrument in an effort to overcome the possibility of response set. Final wording was determined after several revisions, following consultation meetings with faculty members in two of the seminaries included in the study. The faculty members participated in the construction of the wording of each item in order to make them more appropriate (11).

Two methods of estimating the validity of the "Inventory of Theological Beliefs" were used. These were validation against known groups and examination for construct validity. In an effort to estimate the construct validity the instrument was submitted to a panel of twelve professors, all of whom hold earned doctorates in theology. Each was asked to indicate his agreement or disagreement with each of the sixty items as to whether or not they were typical and appropriate as conservative or liberal statements. Of the twelve participating, four were from the faculty of Dallas

Theological Seminary, four were from Southwestern Theological Seminary, two were from Perkins School of Theology, and two were from Dallas Baptist College. Perfect agreement is indicated by a score of sixty. The Dallas Theological Seminary professors all scored sixty. One of the four was president of the seminary. The two professors from Perkins School of Theology together had an average score of fifty-five. Both groups from Southwestern and Dallas Baptist College had an average score of fifty-nine. The combined average for all professors was 97 per cent agreement.

Concerning the estimation of validity against known groups, the following information is offered. Dallas Theological Seminary is a seminary which publicly describes its official theological statement of beliefs as being fundamentalist. This term is widely recognized in theological circles as describing a most conservative belief system. Perkins School of Theology is publicly known as being relatively liberal in its theological belief system.

In an earlier study, the "Inventory of Theological Beliefs" was administered to a group of forty-seven students enrolled at Dallas Theological Seminary and to a group of seventy-five students enrolled at Perkins School of Theology. The mean score for the Dallas group was 58.85 and for the Perkins group, 18.11. This difference was found to be significant beyond the .01 level of confidence (11).

Reliability information for the "Inventory of Theological Beliefs" is based on two separate groups, using the test-retest method. The first group was all theological students attending Dallas Theological Seminary and Perkins School of Theology. A total of 122 individuals were included in this study and the time period between the first and second administration was approximately six weeks. A coefficient of stability of .94 was obtained (11). The second group included all undergraduate college students enrolled in five educational psychology classes at Southeastern Louisiana University. A total of 187 individuals were included in this study with a period of approximately ten weeks separating the two administrations. A coefficient of stability of .89 was obtained.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bostrom, Robert M., "Dogmatism, Rigidity, and Rating Behavior," Speech Teacher, XXXI (November, 1964), 32-37.
2. Buros, O. K., The Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook, Highland Park, New Jersey, Gryphon Press, 1959.
3. Cline, Victor B. and James M. Richards, "A Factor-Analytic Study of Religious Beliefs and Behavior," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, I (June, 1965), 569-576.
4. Haiman, Franklyn S., "A Revised Scale for the Measurement of Open-Mindedness," Speech Monographs, XXXI (June, 1964), 97-102.
5. Heist, Paul, personal correspondence, June 27, 1969.
6. _____ and others, Omnibus Personality Inventory Manual, New York, The Psychological Corporation, 1958.
7. Johnson, Bruce Robert, "An Investigation of the Cognitive and Defensive Aspects of Dogmatism," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVI (1965), 6838.
8. Kemp, C. Gratton, "Improvement of Critical Thinking in Relation to Open-Closed Belief Systems," Journal of Experimental Education, XXXI (March, 1963), 321-323.
9. _____, "Perception of Authority in Relation to Open and Closed Belief Systems," Science Education, XLVII (December, 1963), 482-484.
10. McGuigan, F. J., Experimental Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1968.
11. Oswald, Robert M., "A Comparison of Two Theological Student Groups in Relation to Theological Views, Rigidity, Authoritarianism, and Political-Economic Conservatism," unpublished master's thesis, School of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1963.

12. Rokeach, Milton, "Dogmatism and Opinionation on the Left and Right," American Psychologist, VII (May, 1952), 310-311.
13. _____, "Generalized Mental Rigidity as a Factor in Ethnocentrism," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLIII (January, 1948), 259-278.
14. _____, "The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism," Psychological Review, LXI (May, 1954), 194-204.
15. _____, The Open and Closed Mind, New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1960.
16. _____, "Political and Religious Dogmatism: An Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality," Psychological Monographs, LXX (1956), Whole No. 425.
17. _____, "Prejudice, Concreteness of Thinking and Reification of Thinking," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LI (January, 1951), 83-91.
18. _____, "Religious and Political Commitment in Relation to Dogmatism and the Authoritarian Personality," American Psychologist, X (August, 1955), 340-341.
19. Thomas, Charles L., "The Relationship of Competence of Industrial Arts Student Teachers to Dogmatism as Revealed by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale," Dissertation Abstracts, XXV (1964), 5145.
20. Voth, John Abram, "Dogmatism and Test Performance Relationships of Doctoral Graduates in Education," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVI (1965), 3153.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present and describe the statistical results obtained from this study. Data analyzed were mean scores of three groups of seminary students on the twelve variables measured in this study. The statistical technique used to test for significance was Duncan's New Multiple Range Test. A significance level of .05 was required for acceptance of the hypotheses for all computations (1).

In order to test for significance when using the Duncan's New Multiple Range Test, the difference between means of any two groups, called the mean difference, must reach or exceed the range product in order to be significant (2, p. 286).

No hypothesis was made concerning scores made on the "Inventory of Theological Beliefs." These values were merely used as a basis for forming the three groups which were to be compared on the remaining variables. As a matter of information, however, the data from the "Inventory of Theological Beliefs" is presented in Table I.

All mean differences exceed the range product values required for significance at the .01 level. Therefore, these

TABLE I

MEANS, MEAN DIFFERENCES, AND RANGE PRODUCTS FOR THE VARIABLE THEOLOGICAL BELIEFS FOR GROUPS C, M, AND L

Groups	Means	Mean Differences	Range Products	
			.05	.01
C-L	60.00-10.00	50.00*	1.99	2.61
C-M	60.00-44.60	15.39*	1.89	2.50
M-L	44.60-10.00	34.60*	1.89	2.50

*Significant at the .01 level.

groups were significantly different, beyond the .01 level, on the variable of theological beliefs.

Hypothesis I stated that "a significant difference in dogmatism will be found between the means of Groups C, M, and L, with Group C scoring highest and Group L scoring lowest." Results of testing this hypothesis are given in Table II.

A comparison of the mean differences with the appropriate range product values indicates that Groups C and L and Groups M and L were significantly different, beyond the .01 level. Groups C and M were significantly different at the .05 level. All groups were significantly different on the variable of "dogmatism," with Group C scoring highest and Group L scoring lowest. Therefore, Hypothesis I was supported in every instance.

Hypothesis II stated that "significant differences in 'thinking introversion' will be found between the means of

TABLE II

MEANS, MEAN DIFFERENCES, AND RANGE PRODUCTS FOR THE VARIABLE OF DOGMATISM FOR GROUPS C, M, AND L

Groups	Means	Mean Differences	Range Products	
			.05	.01
C-L	175.78-140.11	35.66**	8.38	10.97
C-M	175.78-165.90	9.88*	7.96	10.52
M-L	165.90-140.11	25.78**	7.96	10.52

*Significant at the .05 level.

**Significant at the .01 level.

Groups C, M, and L, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest." The data relating to testing this hypothesis are shown in Table III.

TABLE III

MEANS, MEAN DIFFERENCES, AND RANGE PRODUCTS FOR THE VARIABLE OF THINKING INTROVERSION FOR GROUPS C, M, AND L

Groups	Means	Mean Differences	Range Products	
			.05	.01
C-L	27.17-30.70	3.52*	2.13	2.79
C-M	27.17-27.33	.15	2.02	2.67
M-L	27.33-30.70	3.37*	2.02	2.67

*Significant at the .01 level.

The data reveal that Groups C and L and Groups M and L were significantly different, beyond the .01 level, on the variable of "thinking introversion." No significant

difference was found between Groups C and M. Group L scored highest, but it cannot be concluded that Group C scored lowest, since there was no significant difference between Groups C and M. Therefore, Hypothesis II was supported in that Groups C and L and Groups M and L were significantly different, with Group L scoring highest. It was rejected in that there was no significant difference between Groups C and M.

Hypothesis III stated that "significant differences in 'theoretical orientation' will be found between the means of Groups C, M, and L, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest." A comparison of the group means for this hypothesis is shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV

MEANS, MEAN DIFFERENCES, AND RANGE PRODUCTS FOR THE VARIABLE OF THEORETICAL ORIENTATION FOR GROUPS C, M, AND L

Groups	Means	Mean Differences	Range Products	
			.05	.01
C-L	20.86-33.66	12.803*	2.22	2.90
C-M	20.86-21.07	.215	2.11	2.78
M-L	21.07-33.66	12.588*	2.11	2.78

*Significant at the .01 level.

The data relating to Hypothesis III indicate that Groups C and L and Groups M and L were significantly different, beyond the .01 level, on the variable of "theoretical

orientation." No significant difference was found between Groups M and C. Therefore, Hypothesis III was supported in that Groups C and L and M and L were significantly different, with Group L scoring highest. It is rejected in that there was no significant difference between Groups C and M.

Hypothesis IV stated that "significant differences in 'aestheticism' will be found between the means of Groups C, M, and L, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest." The data relating to this hypothesis are presented in Table V.

TABLE V
MEANS, MEAN DIFFERENCES, AND RANGE PRODUCTS FOR THE VARIABLE
OF AESTHETICISM FOR GROUPS C, M, AND L

Groups	Means	Mean Differences	Range Products	
			.05	.01
C-L	17.21-20.96	3.74**	1.87	2.46
C-M	17.21-19.73	2.15*	1.78	2.36
M-L	19.37-20.96	1.58	1.78	2.36

*Significant at the .05 level.

**Significant at the .01 level.

The data indicate that Group C and L were significantly different, beyond the .01 level, on the variable of "aestheticism," with Group C scoring lowest. The mean difference between Groups C and M reached the .05 level of significance. No significant difference was found between Groups M and L.

Hypothesis IV was supported in that Groups C and L and Groups C and M were significantly different, with Group C scoring lowest. It was rejected in that there was no significant difference between Groups M and L.

Hypothesis V stated that "a significant difference in 'complexity' will be found between the means of Groups C, M, and L, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest." The data relating to this hypothesis are presented in Table VI.

TABLE VI

MEANS, MEAN DIFFERENCES, AND RANGE PRODUCTS FOR THE VARIABLE OF COMPLEXITY FOR GROUPS C, M, AND L

Groups	Means	Mean Differences	Range Products	
			.05	.01
C-L	11.94-18.96	7.01 *	1.81	2.37
C-M	11.94-14.72	2.78 *	1.72	2.27
M-L	14.72-18.96	4.235*	1.72	2.27

*Significant at the .01 level.

The data reveal that mean differences for all groups exceeded the range product values necessary for significance at the .01 level, with Group L scoring highest and Group C scoring lowest on the variable of "complexity." Hypothesis V was therefore supported in all instances.

Hypothesis VI stated that "significant differences in 'autonomy' will be found between the means of Groups C, M,

and L, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest." Results of testing this hypothesis are found in Table VII.

TABLE VII
MEANS, MEAN DIFFERENCES, AND RANGE PRODUCTS FOR THE VARIABLE
OF AUTONOMY FOR GROUPS C, M, AND L

Groups	Means	Mean Differences	Range Products	
			.05	.01
C-L	10.27-13.43	3.15*	1.96	2.57
C-M	10.27-12.88	2.60*	1.86	2.47
M-L	12.88-13.43	.54	1.86	2.57

*Significant at the .01 level.

A comparison of mean differences with the appropriate range product values indicates that Groups C and L and Groups C and M were significantly different, beyond the .01 level, on the variable of "autonomy," with Group C scoring lowest. No significant difference was found between Groups M and L. Hypothesis VI was supported in that Groups C and L and C and M were significantly different, and Group C scored lowest. It is rejected in that there was no significant difference between Groups M and L.

Hypothesis VII stated that "significant differences in 'religious orientation' will be found between the means of Groups C, M, and L, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest." A comparison of the group means relating to this hypothesis is shown in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

MEANS, MEAN DIFFERENCES, AND RANGE PRODUCTS FOR THE VARIABLE OF RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION FOR GROUPS C, M, AND L

Groups	Means	Mean Differences	Range Products	
			.05	.01
C-L	3.33-13.03	9.70*	1.24	1.63
C-M	3.33- 5.00	1.66*	1.18	1.56
M-L	5.00-13.03	8.03*	1.18	1.56

*Significant at the .01 level.

The data relating to Hypothesis VII indicate that there were significant differences between all groups, beyond the .01 level, on the variable of "religious orientation." Group C scored lowest, and Group L scored highest. Therefore, Hypothesis VII was supported in all instances.

Hypothesis VIII stated that "significant differences in 'impulse expression' will be found between the means of Groups C, M, and L, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest." The data obtained on this variable are presented in Table IX.

The data indicate that Groups C and L and Groups M and L were significantly different at the .01 level on the variable of "impulse expression." No significant difference was found between Groups C and M. Hypothesis VIII was supported in that Groups C and L and Groups M and L were significantly different, with Group L scoring highest. It was rejected in

TABLE IX

MEANS, MEAN DIFFERENCES AND RANGE PRODUCTS FOR THE VARIABLE OF IMPULSE EXPRESSION FOR GROUPS C, M, AND L

Groups	Means	Mean Differences	Range Products	
			.05	.01
C-L	17.90-26.35	8.45*	3.00	3.92
C-M	17.90-20.70	2.80	2.85	3.77
M-L	20.70-26.35	5.64*	2.85	3.77

*Significant at the .01 level.

that there was no significant difference between Groups C and M.

Hypothesis IX stated that "significant differences in 'anxiety level' will be found between the means of Groups C, M, and L, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest." The results of testing this hypothesis are reported in Table X.

TABLE X

MEANS, MEAN DIFFERENCES, AND RANGE PRODUCTS FOR THE VARIABLE OF ANXIETY LEVEL FOR GROUPS C, M, AND L

Groups	Means	Mean Differences	Range Products	
			.05	.01
C-L	15.11- 8.64	6.47*	2.08	2.73
C-M	15.11-14.17	.94	1.98	2.62
M-L	14.17- 8.64	5.52*	1.98	2.62

*Significant at the .01 level.

A comparison of mean differences with the required range product values indicates that Groups C and L and Groups M and L were significantly different, beyond the .01 level, on the variable of "anxiety level." No significant difference was found between Groups C and M. Therefore, Hypothesis IX was rejected in that Group C scored highest and Group L scored lowest. It was also rejected in that there was no significant difference between Groups C and M.

Hypothesis X stated that "significant differences in 'practical outlook' will be found between the means of Groups C, M, and L, with Group C scoring highest and Group L scoring lowest." Table XI contains the data relating to this hypothesis.

TABLE XI

MEANS, MEAN DIFFERENCES, AND RANGE PRODUCTS FOR THE VARIABLE OF PRACTICAL OUTLOOK FOR GROUPS C, M, AND L

Groups	Means	Mean Differences	Range Products	
			.05	.01
C-L	15.43-13.98	1.45	1.60	2.10
C-M	15.43-14.11	1.31	1.52	2.02
M-L	14.11-13.98	.13	1.52	2.02

The data indicate that there was no significant difference between any of the group means on the variable of "practical outlook," although the means were in the direction

that was hypothesized. Hypothesis X was rejected in all instances.

Hypothesis XI stated that "significant differences in 'personal integration' will be found between the means of Groups C, M, and L, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest." The data pertaining to this hypothesis are shown in Table XII.

TABLE XII

MEANS, MEAN DIFFERENCES, AND RANGE PRODUCTS FOR THE VARIABLE OF PERSONAL INTEGRATION FOR GROUPS C, M, AND L

Groups	Means	Mean Differences	Range Products	
			.05	.01
C-L	44.74-38.80	5.94*	3.26	4.28
C-M	44.74-37.92	6.82*	3.10	4.10
M-L	37.92-38.80	.88	3.10	4.10

*Significant at the .01 level.

A comparison of the mean differences with the required range product values indicates that Groups C and L and Groups C and M were significantly different beyond the .01 level. No significant difference was found between Groups M and L. Hypothesis XI was rejected in that Group C scored highest and Group L scored lowest. It was rejected in that there was no significant difference between Groups M and L.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. McGuigan, F. J., Experimental Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
2. McNemar, Quinn, Psychological Statistics, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was conducted in order to determine if seminary students, identified as conservative, moderate, or liberal in theological beliefs, were significantly different on the following variables: dogmatism, thinking introversion, theoretical orientation, aestheticism, complexity, autonomy, religious orientation, impulse expression, anxiety level, practical outlook, and personal integration. The following hypotheses were tested:

I. Significant differences in "dogmatism," as measured by the "Rokeach Dogmatism Scale," will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring highest and Group L scoring lowest.

II. Significant differences in "thinking introversion," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

III. Significant differences in "theoretical orientation," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

IV. Significant differences in "aestheticism," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

V. Significant differences in "complexity," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

VI. Significant differences in "autonomy," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

VII. Significant differences in "religious orientation," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

VIII. Significant differences in "impulse expression," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

IX. Significant differences in "anxiety level," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

X. Significant differences in "practical outlook," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found

between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring highest and Group L scoring lowest.

XI. Significant differences in "personal integration," as measured by the Omnibus Personality Inventory, will be found between the means of Groups L, M, and C, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

The subjects included in this study were 153 full-time seminary students. All were male seniors attending one of three Protestant seminaries in the Dallas-Fort Worth area and planning to enter the ministry upon graduation. The "Inventory of Theological Beliefs," "Rokeach Dogmatism Scale," and Omnibus Personality Inventory were administered to all subjects. In order to test the hypotheses of this study, three groups were selected from the original sample of 203. Each of the selected groups included 51 students.

Scores made on the "Inventory of Theological Beliefs" were arranged in rank order of sequence. Those individuals scoring at or above the 75th percentile were identified as Group C (conservative), those constituting the middle 25 per cent were identified as Group M (moderate), and those scoring at or below the 25th percentile were identified as Group L (liberal). All instruments were administered at regular class hours within a period of three weeks during the 1969 fall semester. All tests were given in the same order and with identical instructions to each class. All hypotheses were tested for significance using the Duncan's

New Multiple Range Test. A significance level of .05 was required for acceptance of the hypotheses for all computations.

Findings

1. Hypothesis I was supported in each instance. All groups were found to be significantly different on the variable of dogmatism and scored in the directions predicted. Group C was most dogmatic and Group L was least dogmatic.

2. Hypothesis II was supported in that Groups C and L and Groups M and L were significantly different, with Group L scoring highest. It was rejected in that there was no significant difference between Groups C and M.

3. Hypothesis III was supported in that Groups C and L and M and L were significantly different, with Group L scoring highest. It was rejected in that there was no significant difference between Groups C and M.

4. Hypothesis IV was supported in that Groups C and L and Groups C and M were significantly different, with Group C scoring lowest. It was rejected in that there was no significant difference between Groups M and L.

5. Hypothesis V was supported in all instances. Significant differences were found between all groups, with Group L scoring highest and Group C scoring lowest.

6. Hypothesis VI was supported in that Groups C and L and Groups C and M were significantly different, with Group

C scoring lowest. It was rejected in that there was no significant difference between Groups M and L.

7. Hypothesis VII was supported in all instances. Significant differences were found between all groups, with Group C scoring lowest and Group L scoring highest.

8. Hypothesis VIII was supported in that Groups C and L and Groups M and L were significantly different, with Group L scoring highest. It was rejected in that there was no significant difference between Groups C and M.

9. Hypothesis IX was rejected in that Group C scored highest and Group L scored lowest. It was also rejected in that there was no significant difference between Groups C and M.

10. Hypothesis X was rejected in all instances. Mean scores did occur in the direction predicted, but no significant difference was found between any two groups.

11. Hypothesis XI was rejected in that Group C scored highest and Group L scored lowest. It was rejected in that there was no significant difference between Groups M and L.

Conclusions

The hypotheses of this dissertation made no predictions as to whether mean scores of Groups C, M, and L would be above or below the normative means reported in the OPI Manual (1). Some comparisons of the OPI norms with the group means

will be made, however, when such comparisons seem to add to the conclusions. No normative means are available for the "Rokeach Dogmatism Scale."

1. Groups C, M, and L were all lower than the normative mean of 24.0 on the variable of autonomy as reported in the OPI Manual (1, p. 50). These groups were below average in the need for independence from authority as traditionally imposed through social institutions. They should be expected to show little opposition in situations where the rights of others are being infringed upon. They are inclined to be more intellectually and politically conservative than the average, are judgmental and tend to be intolerant of the religious beliefs of others. The data indicate that these conclusions are descriptive of all three groups, but more so for Group C than for Groups L and M.

2. Groups C and M scored lower than the normative mean of 12.6 on the variable of religious orientation as reported in the OPI Manual (1, p. 50). Group L scored about average on this variable. Groups C and M are very conservative and traditional in their religious beliefs and practices. They prefer being around people who are religious and are likely to reject the viewpoints of others. The above conclusions are more descriptive of Group C than of Group M. Group L is inclined to show more moderation in these areas.

3. It was concluded that the variable of practical outlook is not highly useful in identifying differences

between Groups C, M, and L. All groups were found to be average on this variable as compared with the normative mean of 15.1 reported in the OPI Manual (1, p. 50).

4. Group L scored well above the normative mean of 21.1 on the variable of theoretical orientation as reported in the OPI Manual (1, p. 50). Groups C and M scored at the mean. Group L shows a greater preference for using the scientific method in their thinking and exhibit a strong interest in science and scientific activities. They are generally more critical, analytical, and logical in their approach to problems. Groups C and M are more apt to prefer having a theory explained to them, as opposed to trying to understand it on their own. They, as compared with Group L, are less inclined to enjoy reading scientific articles. Group L places a high level of confidence in the ability of science to help solve mankind's problems. In contrast, Groups C and M believe that theology will always prove more valuable in this respect.

5. On the variable of thinking introversion, Groups C, M, and L all scored above the normative mean of 24.5 as reported in the OPI Manual (1, p. 50). These data indicate that all groups, more so than the average, like reflective thinking and show interest in a wide range of ideas. They enjoy thought-provoking speeches and like to ponder over ideas presented in class. Strong interest is shown in learning about the history of human thought and original ideas.

Since Groups C and M scored only slightly above the mean, these conclusions are less valid concerning them than concerning Group L, which scored well above the norm.

6. Groups C, M, and L showed greater differences on the variable of complexity than any other variable except religious orientation. Group C scored well below the normative mean of 15.6 as reported in the OPI Manual (1, p. 50). Group M scored only slightly below, but was nevertheless significantly different from Group C. Group L scored well above the mean. Group C dislikes situations that tend to be uncertain and unpredictable. As compared with Group L, they have less difficulty in accepting traditional regulations. They are less inclined to use analogies and metaphors in their thinking and find straightforward reasoning more to their liking. In contrast, Group L is willing to try something even though there is no assurance it is going to work. They are more apt to deal with new ideas even though it is known they may turn out to be a waste of time. Group L is more likely to believe that there is more than one right answer for most problems. Conclusions concerning Groups C and L are only moderately true about members of Group M.

7. Groups C, M, and L all scored above the normative mean of 10.6 as reported in the OPI Manual on the variable of aestheticism (1, p. 50). This is to be expected for students deeply interested in religious matters. All groups,

more so than the average, enjoy listening to poetry, looking at paintings, or other artistic experiences. They show a high level of sensitivity and respond well to aesthetic stimulation. These conclusions are more descriptive of Groups L and M than of Group C.

8. Groups C, M, and L all scored below the normative mean of 30.7 as reported in the OPI Manual on the variable of impulse expression (1, p. 50). All groups show a lower than average tendency to freely express their natural impulses or to seek gratification in overt actions or in conscious thought. All groups deny having frequent feelings of rebellion or aggression and do not highly value sensual reactions and feelings. It may be concluded that this reveals a degree of inhibition which might naturally be expected from students learning to play the social role typically ascribed to ministers. These conclusions are significantly more true about C and M than about Group L. This difference is to be expected, since those preparing to be ministers of conservative churches are likely to be required to adhere to a more restricted and inhibited social role.

9. On the variable of personal integration all groups were found to be above the normative mean of 30.3 as reported in the OPI Manual (1, p. 50). According to the OPI Manual, this scale measures an aspect of personal adjustment. These groups admit to few feelings of rebellion and aggression.

They have few attitudes and behaviors that characterize socially alienated or emotionally disturbed persons. It is interesting to note that these descriptions are more true about members of Group C than Groups M or L. Individuals with conservative religious beliefs have often been assumed to have poorer personal adjustment. In terms of degrees, the above descriptions are more true about Group M than Group L.

10. On the variable of anxiety level Groups C and M scored above the normative mean of 12.5 as reported in the OPI Manual, while Group L scored below the mean (1, p. 50). This finding indicates that Groups C and M have little personal anxiety and manifest few symptoms usually associated with anxiety. They do not see themselves as often being worried or nervous. Neither do they describe themselves as being tense or high-strung. On the other hand, members of Group L tend to have a poor opinion of themselves and have some difficulty in adjusting to their social environment. Anxiety level is, therefore, concluded to be lower for those holding to conservative or moderate religious beliefs than for those having liberal religious beliefs.

11. Level of dogmatism is certainly related to whether a group's religious beliefs are conservative, moderate, or liberal. The significant differences between Groups C, M, and L indicate that high level of dogmatism is more related

to conservative religious beliefs. Members of Group M were less dogmatic than Group C, but more dogmatic than Group L.

Implications

1. Members of Group C should be associated with those educational institutions that emphasize high respect for traditional authority and who reward students for conformity to highly orthodox religious views. Seminaries that expect and encourage their students to be open to liberal, unorthodox questioning of conservative theology should select students such as those in Group L. Students in Group C should not be expected to fit well into seminaries where there is a strong emphasis on the application of the scientific method to historical problems concerning original Biblical manuscripts, their authenticity and authorship. On the other hand, students in Group L would have difficulty submitting to answers to critical problems based merely on traditional beliefs. Members in Group M are intellectually and theologically more flexible than those in Group C, and if necessary, could adjust more easily as a student enrolled in a seminary reflecting religious views more liberal than their own.

2. Seminaries concerned with determining the extent of the need for counseling services should expect students such as those in Group L to admit personal problems more freely. They would be more likely to respond to opportunities for counseling and behavioral modification.

3. Students such as those in Group C would not, as ministers, fit well into those churches whose members expect strong leadership towards social change and defending the civil rights of minority groups in society. They would be less inclined to work well in those churches where the right of youth to question authority and to actually participate in leadership is accepted. Just the opposite is implied for students such as those in Group L.

4. The mean of Group M was not always significantly different from the means of Groups C or L. It was, however, always a value falling between the means obtained for Groups C and L. This implies the ability of the "Inventory of Theological Beliefs," not only to identify a group which is moderate in theological beliefs, but also to have correlational value in predicting a group's performance on other variables such as those measured in this study.

5. Data obtained in this study imply a fallacy in the theory proposed by Rokeach that dogmatism is not primarily related to conservative religious beliefs. It should be noted that in the Rokeach study, religious beliefs were not actually measured, but were merely assumed on the basis of denominational membership. In this study religious beliefs were measured and those identified as conservative were found to be more dogmatic while liberals were found to be least dogmatic.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. In order to determine whether the findings of this study are regional in character, replications of this study in other geographical areas should be conducted.

2. In order to determine whether the findings of this study are peculiar to only Protestant seminary students, replications of this study should be made which include Jewish and Roman Catholic seminary students.

3. In order to determine whether the findings in this study are peculiar to seminary students only, replications of this study should be made including non-seminary students.

4. In order to determine whether the findings in this study are possibly due in part to the seminary experience, replications of this study should be made including only entering seminary freshmen.

5. In order to determine how post-seminary experience may alter the responses obtained in this study, a follow-up study should be made of the same students after a specified time spent in the ministry.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Heist, Paul and others, Omnibus Personality Inventory Manual, New York, The Psychological Corporation, 1958.

APPENDIX A

June 27, 1969

Dear Mr. Oswald:

In reference to your recent request about the suitability of the published norms for the OPI, you addressed yourself to a serious question but not one that posses [sic] an impossibility in interpreting the present norm of the period. Any set of norms can be used or seen as reference points for the interpretation of any future data on this same instrument. Obviously, such a brief statement begs a question about the precise or clinical interpretation in giving meaning to specific scores. Ideally, one would have limited data to provide a basis of comparison for any types of groups of persons to whom such inventory of this is administered. As I mentioned to you, we are presently collecting a large sample of data on graduate students, which we will use for establishing further reference plans for graduate students at several age levels.

In completing the standardization process for the formate version of the OPI, we made a number of exploratory attempts to check out the efficacy or the validity of using this single set of norms for various age levels. With exception of one or two scales, we have found that older students and older persons, including those who have not completed their high school or college degree, tend to obtain scores which pose no real problem in interpreting them to the standpoint of these existing norms. Quite a variety of studies on students and graduate students have been conducted in the last 5 to 7 years. In other studies the OPI has been used to study both undergraduate and graduate students. To the best of our knowledge and the users of this inventory, these particular norms pose no real problem and fairly adequate interpretation for persons who scored different points on the scales or representing several different age levels. Many authorities have concurred with us that until good or better norms are published for persons falling in older age groups, this present set of norms on a rather diverse sampling of schools should serve rather well for those pursuing a variety of course majors.

The OPI has also been used in recent years to study samples of faculty in certain institutions. The inventory has also been employed to study graduate students and a variety of majors and at various age levels. To date, to the best of my knowledge, no researcher has been greater disturbed by the necessity of using only the existing freshman norms. The inventory has also been employed to study a variety of adult examples, among which were a rather large sample of women artists and in the second case an even more extensive or more expanded sample of well known educational researchers across the nation. Among studies being conducted here in the last decade, Mr. Richard Gray has an interesting project under way with one of the nearby seminaries. I know that he would be very much interested in looking at your data when you make it available to the public.

We would be very happy to have you share the results of any studies that you'll be conducting with the use of this inventory. Best wishes to you for an interesting and challenging experience.

Sincerely,

Paul A. Heist
Research Psychologist and
Professor of Higher Education

APPENDIX B

INVENTORY OF THEOLOGICAL BELIEFS

This inventory of beliefs consists of sixty different response opportunities which cover a wide range of religious concepts. As you read each item, you are asked to quickly indicate your response. Do not choose the response marked "reject" unless you feel that you strongly disagree with and cannot accept either of the other two statements. You should be able to finish the inventory in thirty minutes or less.

1. What do you believe about the inspiration of the Bible?
 - a. The original writings were without error, each word being divinely inspired by the Holy Spirit.
 - b. The Bible is not the Word of God directly, but is a record and a witness to the revelation of God, and no claim of infallibility should be made for it.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
2. What do you believe Christ taught and believed about the inspiration of the Old Testament?
 - a. Christ used the O.T. as a means of teaching because it offered accommodation, but he was actually teaching much higher truth.
 - b. He believed that it was divinely inspired, authoritative and without error.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
3. What do you believe the writers of the New Testament believed about the inspiration of the Old Testament?
 - a. They held to it as being divinely inspired, authoritative and without error.
 - b. They regarded the Old Testament as reflecting the ancient primitive concept of God which was not equal with their present, higher concept of God. It was not regarded as being infallible.

- c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
4. What do you believe the writers of the New Testament believed as to the inspiration of their own writings?
- a. They believed they were equal with the Old Testament, being divinely inspired, authoritative and without error.
 - b. They never really claimed divine inspiration or inerrancy for their writings.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
5. Which one of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. The spiritual content of the Bible can only be understood by a "born again" Christian through the ministry of the indwelling Holy Spirit.
 - b. Any person can understand the Bible if he is sincere and persistent in his study.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
6. Granting that a personal God does exist, you believe:
- a. God is all-knowing, all-powerful, perfect in love, perfect in holiness and without beginning or end, being altogether just and righteous.
 - b. The above attributes are correctly stated, but the attribute of love far outweighs the others. The attribute of love takes complete precedence over the others.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
7. Which one of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. God has not decreed or purposed even the broad outline of human history as such, but this depends solely upon the behavior of man himself.
 - b. God has decreed or purposed the ultimate course of human history.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.

8. Which one of the following do you believe to be true?
 - a. All who have been or ever will be saved were elected to salvation by God before the world began.
 - b. Any salvation enjoyed by man depends upon the efforts and achievements of man and not upon election of God.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
9. As concerning God being a trinity you believe:
 - a. There is one supernatural being, manifest in three persons, being God the Father, God the Son (who is Jesus Christ), and God the Holy Spirit.
 - b. In trinitarianism, but that the Holy Spirit represents the influence of God in the world for good and should not necessarily be recognized as a person.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
10. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
 - a. Angels are actual personalities created by God for the purpose of worshipping God and serving the heirs of salvation.
 - b. The concept of angels arose in ancient mythology and was carried over into scripture to demonstrate spiritual truth.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
11. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
 - a. Satan as a personality is unreal, but as a Biblical myth, is useful in characterizing opposition to God.
 - b. Satan as a personality does exist, being an evil fallen angel.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
12. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
 - a. This present world system is basically evil and is under the control of the "god of this world" who is Satan.

- b. A loving God would not allow any such evil personality such as "Satan" to control this world.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
13. Which one of the following is true concerning demons?
- a. Demons as such are unreal, originating in mythology and tradition.
 - b. Demons operate actively in this world being under the control of Satan.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
14. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. The theory of evolution gives the best explanation for the existence of man.
 - b. Man was created by an act of God without evolution.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
15. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. The Genesis account of the fall of man actually happened as recorded and is a historical fact.
 - b. The Genesis account of the fall of man should be taken as a religious myth, and not necessarily a historical fact.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
16. Which one of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. Man in his natural state is separated by sin from God and is spiritually dead.
 - b. No man is spiritually "dead," as such, but simply needs to recognize his sonship and seek fellowship with God.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
17. Which one of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. Man in his natural state is depraved in every area of his being and sins by nature.

- b. Man is basically good and is not affected directly by the sin of Adam.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
18. Which one of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. Sin is simply the greed and selfishness of a spiritually maladjusted person.
 - b. Sin is "lawlessness," originating with Satan's rebellion in heaven, but entering the human race through Adam's disobedience.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
19. Which one of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. Salvation is a process of growing into full fellowship with God by following the example and teachings of Jesus.
 - b. Man is saved from the guilt of sin by grace alone through personal faith in the shed blood of Jesus Christ.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
20. Which one of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. There is a place for the everlasting punishment of sin for those who die in unbelief.
 - b. A loving God could never send anyone to a place of everlasting punishment.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
21. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. Christ died as a substitutionary atonement for the sins of mankind.
 - b. Christ's death primarily was an example rather than a substitution.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.

22. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- Man is born in the image of God, but may become a sinner as a result of his own actions.
 - All individuals are born into the human race "dead" in sin.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
23. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- Hell is a literal place of eternal punishment for those who die rejecting Christ.
 - Hell is not a literal place but is symbolical of God's displeasure with man's disobedience.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
24. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- Justification is by personal faith in Christ alone.
 - Justification is by personal faith in Christ plus good works.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
25. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- Redemption describes the religious process of change from an ignoble life to one of meaningfulness and self-fulfillment.
 - Redemption is the concept that sinful man is redeemed by the blood of Christ from the penalty of sin.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
26. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- Christ is the fulfillment of the sacrificial lamb of the Old Testament.
 - Christ was not the fulfillment of the sacrificial lamb of the Old Testament.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.

27. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- Man's destiny is determined by his own behavior apart from any sovereign act of God.
 - God has chosen the elect to salvation from before the foundation of the world.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
28. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- Regeneration takes place instantaneously when one receives Christ as Saviour.
 - Regeneration is a process involving man's lifelong quest for God.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
29. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- Christ's death propitiated the wrath of a holy God.
 - God is a God of love and needs no propitiation and desires none.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
30. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- Even though a Christian may sin he does not lose his salvation.
 - A Christian may fall from grace through disobedience or faithlessness.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
31. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- The primary mission of the church is to work for the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth through social, economic and cultural betterment as contained in the teachings of Christ.
 - The mission of the church primarily is to bring mankind to salvation through Christ.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.

32. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- The church, as the body of Christ, is composed only of regenerate persons.
 - The church consists of a group of people working in a cooperative effort to know and serve God.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
33. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- There is no distinction between the local church and the body of Christ.
 - It is possible for unregenerate persons to be members of a local church without being members of the body of Christ.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
34. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- The Holy Spirit indwells each member of the body of Christ.
 - All men are indwelt by the Holy Spirit in the sense that they possess a spark of the divine nature.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
35. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- It would be desirable if all churches could be united into one great world church.
 - Such a world church would undoubtedly be apostate and undesirable from a Biblical standpoint.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
36. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- We should not expect a literal, bodily return of Christ to the earth.
 - The scriptures teach that the second coming of Jesus Christ will be a literal, bodily return and will terminate the present age.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.

37. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- The Bible teaches a general pattern of things to come in the latter days.
 - The message of the Bible pertains to contemporary living and should not be taken as predicting future events.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
38. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- The Bible teaches that there will be a short period of great tribulation just preceding the return of Christ to the earth.
 - Tribulation is spoken of in the Bible only as the normal experience of Christians in every age.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
39. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- The Bible does not teach that Christ will reign a thousand years upon earth in a literal, bodily sense.
 - The Bible teaches that Christ will reign a thousand years upon the earth in a literal, bodily sense.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
40. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- The Bible teaches that the present earth will be destroyed by fire under the judgment of God.
 - First century Jewish apocalyptic ideas are not to be taken literally in the context of contemporary interpretation.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
41. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- Jesus Christ was born of a human virgin mother but had no human father.
 - Since only two New Testament writers mention a virgin birth, one's belief in it should not be taken as a test of orthodoxy.

- c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
42. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. Jesus Christ was simply the most God-like man who ever lived.
 - b. Jesus Christ is the second person of the Trinity, having existed from all eternity past, being co-equal with the Father and the Holy Spirit.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
43. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. Jesus Christ came into the world primarily as a teacher and example for men.
 - b. Jesus Christ came into the world primarily to die for the sins of men.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
44. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. In respect to his nature and his total human experience, Jesus Christ was absolutely without sin.
 - b. It is not necessary nor should we claim sinlessness for Christ in respect to his human nature and human experience.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
45. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. The miracles performed by Christ during His earthly ministry were supernatural in character.
 - b. Most of Christ's miracles can be explained by means of natural phenomena.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
46. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. Christ authenticated the inspiration of the Old Testament scriptures.
 - b. Christ considered some of the Old Testament scriptures to be less than inspired.

- c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
47. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- The promise of Christ to return refers to either the coming of the Holy Spirit or the reception accorded a Christian at death.
 - Christ taught his disciples that he would return to the earth bodily at the end of the age.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
48. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- Christ clearly taught that He was co-equal with God the Father.
 - Jesus Christ made no personal claim to deity.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
49. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- Christ is right now seated at the right hand of the Father in heaven interceding for Christians.
 - We have no definite knowledge of any present ministry of Christ.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
50. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- Christ recognized and allowed for those sincere individuals who differed in their approach unto God.
 - Christ taught that no man could have access to God except through him (Christ) personally.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
51. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- The Holy Spirit is portrayed in scriptures as the third person of the Trinity.
 - The Bible does not clearly ascribe the attributes of personality to the Holy Spirit.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.

52. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- The Holy Spirit is presently engaged in a ministry of restraining, in part, the wickedness of this world.
 - No such work as described immediately above is ascribed in scripture to the Holy Spirit.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
53. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- A person can experience salvation apart from any personal experience of conviction by the Holy Spirit.
 - The convicting work of the Holy Spirit is an absolute necessity in the salvation of an individual.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
54. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- Regeneration is a distinct work of the Holy Spirit in imparting a new nature when a person believes in Christ.
 - Regeneration continues throughout a person's life and cannot be described as being an instantaneous event.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
55. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- The baptism of the Holy Spirit is the placing of believers into the body of Christ.
 - The baptism of the Holy Spirit is simply a means of expressing the influence of God in a person's life.
 - Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
56. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- The Holy Spirit inspired the writers of the Bible in such a way that their original writings were inerrant.

- b. To say that the scriptures are inspired by the Holy Spirit is not necessarily to claim the infallibility of every word of the original writings.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
57. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. God uses the natural talents of any man who wants to serve him.
 - b. Spiritual gifts are sovereignly bestowed uniquely upon each believer in Christ.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
58. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. God simply expects a man to make the maximum use of his inherent natural abilities.
 - b. God expects the Christian to live above his own natural tendencies through the power of the indwelling Holy Spirit.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
59. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. The unique indwelling ministry of the Holy Spirit began on the day of Pentecost.
 - b. The Holy Spirit has carried on substantially the same ministry to all men of all ages.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.
60. Which of the following do you believe to be true?
- a. Jesus Christ was conceived of the Holy Spirit in the womb of the Virgin Mary.
 - b. The above may be true, but there is a distinct possibility that Christ may have had a human father.
 - c. Reject--I do not accept either of the above.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Adler, Alfred, Religion and Individual Psychology, Vienna, Rolf Paeser, 1933.
- Adorno, T. W. and others, The Authoritarian Personality, Vienna, Rolf Paeser, 1933.
- Allport, Gordon W., The Individual and His Religion, New York, The MacMillan Company, 1950.
- Argyle, Michael, Religious Behavior, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1958.
- Asch, S. E., Social Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952.
- Buros, O. K., The Fifth Mental Measurement Yearbook, Highland Park, New Jersey, Gryphon Press, 1959.
- Clark, W. H., The Psychology of Religion, New York, The MacMillan Company, 1958.
- Dewey, John, A Common Faith, New Haven, Connecticut, Yale University Press, 1934.
- Frankl, Victor, The Doctor and the Soul, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.
- Freud, Sigmund, The Future of an Illusion, Garden City, New Jersey, Doubleday, 1957.
- Fromm, Eric, Psychoanalysis and Religion, New Haven, Connecticut, University Press, 1950.
- Guilford, J. P., Personality, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.
- Hall, Calvin S. and Gardner Lindzey, Theories of Personality, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1957.
- Heist, Paul and others, Omnibus Personality Inventory Manual, New York, The Psychological Corporation, 1950.
- James, William, The Varieties of Religious Experience, New York, Random House, 1902.

- Jung, Carl G., Modern Man in Search of a Soul, New York, Harcourt, Brace and World Company, 1933.
- Kane, John J., Catholic-Protestant Conflicts in America, Chicago, Regnery Press, 1955.
- Knapp, Robert H. and Joseph J. Greenbaum, The Younger American Scholar: His Collegiate Origins, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Lazarsfield, Paul F. and Wagner Thielens, The Academic Mind, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1958.
- Leuba, James H., The Belief in God and Immortality, Boston, Sherman French and Company, 1916.
- McDowell, M. M., Techniques Used in Attitudinal Measurement in Religion, Salt Lake City, Utah, Westminster College, 1963.
- McGuigan, F. J., Experimental Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
- McNemar, Quinn, Psychological Statistics, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.
- May, Rollo, Existence: A New Dimension in Psychiatry and Psychology, New York, Basic Books, 1958.
- Meissner, W. W., Annotated Bibliography in Religion and Psychology, New York, Academy of Religion and Mental Health, 1961.
- Michaels, J. A., A Survey of the Empirical Study of Religion of the Past Twenty-Five Years, Los Angeles, University of California, 1956.
- Oates, W. E., Religious Factors in Mental Illness, New York, Association Press, 1955.
- O'Dea, Thomas F., American Catholic Dilemma, New York, Sheed and Ward, Inc., 1958.
- Rank, Otto, Psychology and the Soul, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1950.
- Roe, Anna, The Making of a Scientist, New York, Dodd and Mead, 1952.
- Rokeach, Milton, The Open and Closed Mind, New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1960.

- Schneiders, Alexander, A Personality Dynamics and Mental Health, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.
- Strunk, Orio, Religion: A Psychological Interpretation, New York, Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Symington, T. A., Religious Liberals and Conservatives, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935.
- Van Buskirk, J. D., Religion and Mental Health, New York, MacMillan, 1952.
- Vaughan, R. P., Mental Illness and the Religious Life, Milwaukee, Bruce, 1962.

Articles

- Allen, Donald and Harjit Sandhu, "A Comparative Study of Delinquents and Non-Delinquents: Family Affect, Religion and Personal Income," Social Forces, XLVI (February, 1967), 263-269.
- Allport, G. W. and B. M. Kramer, "Some Roots of Prejudice," Journal of Psychology, XXII (July-October, 1946), 9-39.
- Armstrong, R. C. and others, "Religious Attitudes and Emotional Adjustment," Journal of Psychological Studies, XIII (March, 1962), 35-47.
- Bello, Francis, "The Young Scientist," Fortune, XLIX (June, 1954), 142-148.
- Bostrom, Robert M., "Dogmatism, Rigidity, and Rating Behavior," Speech Teacher, XXXI (November, 1964), 32-37.
- Burt, H. E. and D. R. Falkenberg, "The Influence of Majority and Expert Opinions on Religious Attitudes," Journal of Social Psychology, XIV (November, 1941), 269-278.
- Chein, L. V., "Personality Traits and Interests of Theological Students," Religious Education, XLVII (January, 1952), 28-32.
- Clark, W. H., "A Study of Some of the Factors Leading to Achievement and Creativity with Special Reference to Religious Skepticism and Belief," Journal of Social Psychology, XLI (February, 1955), 57-59.

- Cline, Victor B. and James M. Richards, "A Factor-Analytic Study of Religious Beliefs and Behavior," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, I (June, 1965), 569-578.
- Crutchfield, Richard S., "Assessment of Persons Through a Quasi Group-Interaction Technique," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLVI (October, 1951), 577-588.
- DiRenzo, Gordon J., "Dogmatism and Orientation Toward Liturgical Change," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, VI (February, 1967), 278.
- Dreger, R. M., "Some Personality Correlates of Religious Attitudes as Determined by Projective Techniques," Psychological Monographs, LXVI (1952), Whole No. 3.
- Ellis, John Tracy, "The American Catholic and the Intellectual Life," Thought, XXX (Autumn, 1955), 351-388.
- Funk, R. A., "A Survey of Religious Beliefs and Manifest Anxiety in a College Population," Dissertation Abstracts, XV (1955), 2569.
- Hadley, Betty J., "Autocratic Versus Democratic Beliefs of Graduate Students in Nursing," Nursing Research, XVII (January, 1968), 19-26.
- Haiman, Franklyn S., "A Revised Scale for the Measurement of Open-Mindedness," Speech Monographs, XXXI (June, 1964), 97-102.
- Johnson, Bruce Robert, "An Investigation of the Cognitive and Defensive Aspects of Dogmatism," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVI (1965), 6838.
- Johnson, P. E., "Religious Psychology and Health," Mental Hygiene, XXVI (October, 1947), 556-566.
- Kemp, C. Gratton, "Improvement of Critical Thinking in Relation to Open-Closed Belief Systems," Journal of Experimental Education, XXXI (March, 1963), 321-323.
- _____, "Perception of Authority in Relation to Open and Closed Belief Systems," Science Education, XLVII (December, 1963), 482-484.
- Knapp, R. H. and H. B. Goodrich, "The Origins of American Scientists," Science, CXVI (July, 1952), 543-545.

- Page, F. H., "The Psychology of Religion After Fifty Years," Canadian Journal of Psychology, V (June, 1951), 60-67.
- Ranck, J. G., "Some Personality Correlates of Religious Attitudes and Beliefs," Dissertation Abstracts, XV (1955), 878-879.
- Rokeach, Milton, "Change within Value Systems," Journal of Social Issues, XXIV (January, 1968), 13-33.
- _____, "Dogmatism and Opinionation on the Left and Right," American Psychologist, VII (May, 1952), 310.
- _____, "Generalized Mental Rigidity as a Factor in Ethnocentrism," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, XLIII (January, 1948), 259-278.
- _____, "A Method for Studying Individual Differences in 'Narrow-Mindedness'," Journal of Personality, XX (September, 1951), 219-233.
- _____, "The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism," Psychological Review, LXI (May, 1954), 194-204.
- _____, "Political and Religious Dogmatism: An Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality," Psychological Monographs, LXX (1956), Whole No. 425.
- _____, "Prejudice, Concreteness of Thinking and Reification of Thinking," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LI (January, 1951), 83-91.
- _____, "Religious and Political Commitment in Relation to Dogmatism and the Authoritarian Personality," American Psychologist, X (August, 1955), 340-341.
- _____ and B. Fruchter, "A Factorial Study of Dogmatism and Related Concepts," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIII (November, 1953), 356-360.
- _____ and C. Hanley, "Eysenck's Tender-Mindedness Dimension: A Critique," Psychological Bulletin, LIII (May, 1956), 169-176.
- _____, W. C. McGovney, and M. R. Denny, "A Distinction Between Dogmatic and Rigid Thinking," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LI (July, 1955), 87-93.
- Sanua, Victor D., "Religion, Mental Health and Personality: A Review of Empirical Studies," American Journal of Psychiatry, CXXV (March, 1969), 1203-1213.

- Scott, E. M., "Presumed Correlation Between Religion and Mental Health," Guild of Catholic Psychiatrists Bulletin, VIII (January, 1961), 113-121.
- Spradlin, Bonnie Ann, "Authoritarianism in a Population of Ministers," Dissertation Abstracts, XXX (1969), 2226B.
- Stark, Rodney, "On the Incompatibility of Religion and Science," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, III (Fall, 1963), 3-20.
- Stern, K., "Religion and Psychiatry," Commonweal, XLIX (October, 1948), 30-33.
- Thomas, Charles L., "The Relationship of Competence of Industrial Arts Student Teachers to Dogmatism as Revealed by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale," Dissertation Abstracts, XXV (1964), 5145.
- Thouless, R. H., "Scientific Method in the Scientific Study of Religion," Character and Personality, VII (September, 1938), 103-108.
- Vanderneldt, J. H., "Religion and Mental Health," Mental Hygiene, XXXV (April, 1951), 177-189.
- Voth, John Abram, "Dogmatism and Test Performance Relationships of Doctoral Graduates in Education," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVI (1965), 3153.
- Webster, Alan Charles, "Patterns and Relations of Dogmatism, Mental Health and Psychological Health in Selected Religious Groups," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII (1967), 4142A.
- Wilson, Warner and Howard L. Miller, "Fear, Anxiety, and Religiousness," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, V (Fall, 1965), 34-40.

Publication of Learned Organization

- Rokeach, Milton, The Paradox of Religious Beliefs, Proceedings of the Christian Association for Psychological Studies, Chicago, Illinois, April, 1968, pp. 51-58.

Encyclopedia

Rokeach, Milton, "The Nature of Attitudes," International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, New York, MacMillan, 1968.

Unpublished Material

Barker, Edwin N., "Authoritarianism of the Political Right, Center, and Left," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, New York, 1958.

DeWit, Fred, "The Measurement of Values by Means of Analysis of Judgments," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, 1955.

Heist, Paul, personal correspondence, June 27, 1969.

McGrath, J. E., "Religious Group Differences in Value Orientations, Interpersonal Relations, and Personal Adjustment," paper read at the meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Cambridge, Massachusetts, October, 1966.

Oswald, Robert M., "A Comparison of Two Theological Student Groups in Relation to Theological Views, Rigidity, Authoritarianism, and Political-Economic Conservatism," unpublished master's thesis, School of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1963.