

## CHAPTER VI

# ETHNOCENTRISM IN RELATION TO SOME RELIGIOUS ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES

*R. Nevitt Sanford*

---

### A. INTRODUCTION

In approaching the topic of religion, the general question was similar to that raised in connection with politico-economic ideology: What trends in religious thought and practice can be distinguished and what, if any, is their significance for prejudice or its opposite? Categories for the analysis of religious thought were not, however, ready to hand. It seemed that a qualitative study of interview material had to precede any attempt to quantify trends in religious ideology. Such a study was made, and it is reported in Chapter XVIII,<sup>1</sup> but since the collection of interviews and of questionnaires proceeded simultaneously, it was not possible to make use of a completed qualitative analysis in preparing measuring instruments for use with groups of subjects. Only a few hypotheses, suggested during the early stages of the study, were represented in the content of the questionnaire. The present chapter is concerned solely with results obtained through the use of the questionnaire. These results were derived from data on the religious affiliations of the subjects and their parents as set forth on the first page of the questionnaire, from answers to an open-ended question about religion and the church which was used in a preliminary form of the questionnaire, and from responses to three scale items which belong in the general area of religion.

### B. RESULTS

#### 1. RELIGIOUS GROUP MEMBERSHIPS

a. ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF RELIGION. Data on religious affiliation were obtained by means of the question, "What is your religion?" which

<sup>1</sup> Interview material bearing on certain religious attitudes also appears in Chapters XI and XXI.

appeared on page one of the questionnaire in all four of its forms. In answering this question, subjects gave the name of some religious sect or wrote "none" or left the question blank. The answer "none" is taken as an indication that the subject rejects religion, while answering with the name of some religious group is taken as evidence that he somehow accepts religion. When the question is left blank, no inferences can be made. The data obtained by means of this question from the four forms of the questionnaire are summarized in Table 1(VI).

Attention may first be called to the fact that subjects who answer "none" (last column but one in Table 1(VI)) obtain an over-all mean A-S or E score, 2.71 (last row in Table 1(VI)), that is notably lower than the means for most of the religious groups.<sup>2</sup> The only exceptions appear in the case of the Unitarians, whose over-all mean is 1.99, and the Combined Minor Protestant Sects, whose over-all mean is 2.49. For all the other religious denominations the means are in the range 3.41 (Congregational) to 4.38 (Lutheran). These trends appear in the data for each form of the questionnaire as well as in the over-all totals. If all subjects who professed to some religious affiliation were placed in one group for statistical purposes, their mean score would be very much higher than that of those who claim no religious affiliation. There seems to be no doubt that subjects who reject organized religion are less prejudiced on the average than those who, in one way or another, accept it.

Subjects with religious affiliations are not, however, generally ethnocentric. Although the nonreligious subjects are clearly nonethnocentric on the average, the mean scores for the various religious denominations are, on the whole, very close to the neutral point.

The overwhelming majority of our subjects do profess to some religious affiliation. The nonreligious, nonethnocentric group is relatively small in number and, probably, not very important socially. The variability among the religious subjects seems to be almost as great as it is for our over-all sample. This means that among our religious subjects both extreme high and extreme low scorers are to be found. We must also take note of the fact that among the nonreligious subjects, high as well as low scorers appear. In this latter connection a possible sex difference is to be noted. Nonreligious women seem to obtain lower scores on the average than do nonreligious men. (Note, in the "none" column of Table 1(VI), the means for the groups of women and for the groups of men.) The nonreligious women almost always score definitely low while the nonreligious men are much more variable.

b. ETHNOCENTRISM IN DIFFERENT RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS. If we ask why some religious people score high and others low on ethnocentrism, we

<sup>2</sup> The estimation of the significance of differences between means in this chapter follows the same rule that was used in Chapter V. Cf. the footnote 12 to Chap. V. If the N's for the groups in question are as large as 50, then a difference of .6 is likely to be significant, at least at the 5 per cent level. Most of the differences discussed in this chapter are much larger than .6 and seem well above the minimum requirements of statistical significance.

TABLE I (VI)  
MEAN A-S OR E SCORES OF VARIOUS RELIGIOUS GROUPS

	I. Catholic		II. Protestant <sup>a</sup>		III. Combined Major Protestant Sects		Presby- terian		Methodist		Lutheran	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
<i>Groups taking Form 78:</i>												
Public Speaking Class Women	23	3.15	24	3.35	(80)	(3.52)	18	3.69	19	3.70	6	4.03
Public Speaking Class Men	9	3.66	14	3.73	(18)	(3.04)	5	2.98	4	2.60	1	3.70
Extension Class Women	8	4.38	13	3.99	(9)	(2.80)	2	1.80	1	2.50	0	--
Professional Women	10	2.44	17	2.64	(22)	(3.09)	1	5.10	1	4.80	0	--
Total: Form 78	50	3.29	68	3.37	(129)	(3.33)	26	3.46	25	3.52	7	3.99
<i>Groups taking Form 60:</i>												
Univ. of Oregon Student Women	3	3.36	4	1.85	(26)	(4.12)	8	3.63	4	4.08	1	5.25
Univ. of Oregon and Univ. of California Student Women	5	3.40	18	3.15	(20)	(3.60)	3	3.83	3	3.25	2	2.58
Univ. of Oregon and Univ. of California Student Men	4	3.98	13	3.15	(19)	(3.11)	2	3.92	3	2.86	2	4.50
Total: Form 60	12	3.58	35	3.05	(65)	(3.66)	13	3.72	10	3.47	5	3.88
<i>Groups taking Form 45:</i>												
Maritime School Men	25	4.36	77	4.59	(46)	(4.51)	3	5.23	12	4.65	9	4.42
Psychiatric Clinic Men	11	3.46	18	3.94	(6)	(4.32)	2	3.30	1	5.50	0	--
Psychiatric Clinic Women	18	4.55	15	4.58	(18)	(3.53)	5	3.58	6	2.90	3	3.80
San Quentin Men	24	4.67	38	4.49	(29)	(4.65)	4	4.35	7	4.83	4	4.98
Total: Form 45 <sup>c</sup>	54	4.24	110	4.48	(70)	(4.24)	10	4.02	19	4.14	12	4.27
<i>Groups taking Form 40:</i>												
Geo. Washington Univ. Women	16	4.51	15	3.99	(81)	(4.16)	15	4.53	12	4.52	4	4.15
Maritime School Men	35	5.15	59	5.24	(42)	(5.07)	7	4.09	9	5.07	4	5.80
Middle-Class Women	6	4.57	60	3.98	(61)	(3.59)	9	4.20	3	5.60	1	6.40
Middle-Class Men	3	6.20	29	4.28	(20)	(4.15)	3	4.00	5	4.48	1	5.00
Working-Class Men	14	4.67	16	3.75	(13)	(4.15)	0	--	5	4.12	5	4.20
Total: Form 40	74	4.92	179	4.42	(217)	(4.18)	34	4.31	34	4.69	15	4.81
Over-all total: four forms	190	4.21	392	4.13	(481)	(3.89)	83	3.92	88	4.10	39	4.38

<sup>a</sup>Protestant here refers to subjects who answered "Protestant" but did not give the name of any denomination.

<sup>b</sup>The following denominations of sects were combined: Bible, Brethren, Christian, Disciple, Evangelical, Humanist, Moral Rearmament, Natural Law, Nazarene, Quaker, Adventist, Unity, Universalist. The designations of these sects are those employed by the subjects in filling out their questionnaires. The division into major and minor Protestant sects does not conform in every particular with the actual membership figures for the whole United States; it was

naturally turn our attention first to the question of what role the particular religious denomination or sect has to play. Examination of Table I (VI) shows that there are no differences of any significance between Catholics and Protestants, and this regardless of whether we place in one category those subjects who answered "Protestant" or whether we combine the largest Protestant denominations. Among the Protestant denominations which have been classed as "major," only one group distinguishes itself: the Unitarians<sup>3</sup> have a lower mean score than any of the others. This seems to be in keeping with the generally liberal outlook of this group. The minor Protestant denominations taken together obtain a lower mean score than do any of the other religious groups save the Unitarians. Unfortunately, none of

<sup>3</sup> In terms of membership figures for the United States this body probably should not be classed as "major."

Congregational		Episcopal		Baptist		Christian Science		Mormon		Unitarian		IV. Combined Minor Protestant Sects <sup>b</sup>		V. None		VI. Blank	
N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
2	2.25	21	3.30	5	3.18	5	3.46	3	4.30	1	1.10	(0)	(--)	10	2.49	0	--
0	--	4	2.60	1	5.60	2	4.00	0	--	1	1.80	(3)	(2.27)	7	3.16	1	5.10
0	--	1	4.70	2	4.50	1	1.60	1	2.60	1	1.20	(0)	(--)	6	1.95	5	3.22
1	2.90	11	3.46	3	1.87	0	--	1	2.70	4	2.18	(0)	(--)	9	1.28	2	1.95
3	2.47	37	3.31	11	3.28	8	3.36	5	3.64	7	1.83	(3)	(2.27)	32	2.19	8	3.14
0	--	8	3.90	2	5.42	2	5.13	1	4.17	0	--	(0)	(--)	3	1.17	1	1.67
1	1.75	7	4.05	1	3.25	3	4.11	0	--	0	--	(0)	(--)	5	2.30	0	--
1	2.08	2	2.71	3	2.97	2	4.00	4	2.31	0	--	(0)	(--)	10	2.27	1	1.58
2	1.92	17	3.82	6	3.83	7	4.37	5	2.68	0	--	(0)	(--)	18	2.09	2	1.63
0	--	4	3.83	10	4.62	4	4.13	4	4.50	0	--	(0)	(--)	23	3.65	5	2.62
0	--	0	--	1	5.70	1	4.50	1	3.60	0	--	(2)	(1.50)	8	3.38	3	3.67
1	3.00	2	3.60	1	6.60	0	--	0	--	0	--	(0)	(--)	15	1.91	2	3.45
0	--	4	5.00	2	5.90	5	4.02	3	3.90	0	--	(0)	(--)	12	4.22	5	5.82
1	3.00	6	3.75	12	4.88	5	4.20	5	4.32	0	--	(2)	(1.50)	46	3.04	10	3.10
3	3.67	30	4.00	10	4.24	4	4.40	1	4.60	2	1.10	(4)	(2.85)	10	2.94	2	2.40
1	1.40	4	6.50	7	5.45	6	4.80	4	5.30	0	--	(0)	(--)	18	4.76	3	4.53
8	4.48	17	2.58	4	5.70	5	3.96	1	6.20	13	2.25	(2)	(2.60)	14	1.37	4	3.50
1	2.40	5	2.92	1	6.60	1	6.60	2	5.90	1	1.60	(0)	(--)	14	2.49	1	1.20
0	--	1	4.60	1	4.20	1	3.60	0	--	0	--	(1)	(3.40)	11	2.24	3	4.00
13	3.89	57	3.67	23	4.99	17	4.49	8	5.52	16	2.06	(7)	(2.86)	67	2.89	13	3.51
19	3.41	117	3.58	111	3.94	37	4.18	23	4.23	23	1.99	(23)	(2.49)	163	2.71	33	3.18

influenced somewhat by the representation of these sects within our over-all sample.

<sup>b</sup>The San Quentin Group was not included in obtaining any of the over-all values: their means were so much higher than those of any other group, for reasons which seemed to have little to do with religion (see Chapter XXI), that the inclusion of this large group would throw the general picture out of focus.

these minor groups was represented by enough subjects to warrant separate statistical treatment, and we have undoubtedly combined groups which have little in common. There is, however, 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*, and that this is something which works against ethnocentrism. An interesting project would be to obtain representative samples of these groups and to study the specific contents of their beliefs in relation to patterns of response on the present scales.

c. CHURCH ATTENDANCE. Another type of difference among people with religious affiliations, a difference that might be significant for prejudice, is in the matter of frequency of church attendance. It might be supposed that those who attend regularly participate more fully in those aspects of formalized religion which seem to favor ethnocentrism, and hence will obtain higher A-S or E scores than those who attend less frequently. The data

TABLE 2 (VI)  
 MEAN A-S OR E SCORES FOR GROUPS SHOWING VARIOUS FREQUENCIES OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE

	1. Regular		2. Often		3. Seldom		Combined			Blank		Over-all			
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	1, 2, 3		N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	S. D.
							N	Mean							
<i>Groups taking Form 78:</i>															
Public Speaking Class Women	45	3.09	39	3.71	47	3.28	131	3.34	6	3.20	3	4.70	140	3.32	1.43
Public Speaking Class Men	11	3.43	10	3.28	23	3.55	44	3.45	7	2.87	1	1.90	52	3.34	1.48
Extension Psychology Class Women	6	4.47	7	3.09	24	3.21	37	3.39	4	3.70	1	2.50	42	3.40	1.36
Professional Women	14	2.70	11	3.04	24	2.76	49	2.81	13	1.76	1	1.70	63	2.57	1.37
Totals:	76	3.20	67	3.47	118	3.21	281	3.27	30	2.37	6	3.37	297	3.18	1.46
<i>Groups taking Form 60:</i>															
Univ. of Oregon Student Women	11	3.36	11	3.59	25	3.39	47	3.45	0	--	0	--	47	3.43	1.38
Univ. of Oregon and Univ. of California Student Women	17	3.39	10	3.59	24	3.87	51	3.18	3	4.42	0	--	54	3.25	1.29
Univ. of Oregon and Univ. of California Student Men	15	2.99	14	3.30	20	2.97	49	3.07	8	2.19	0	--	37	2.95	1.26
Totals:	43	3.24	35	3.47	69	3.09	147	3.23	11	2.80	0	--	158	3.20	1.32
<i>Groups taking Form 45:</i>															
Maritime School Men	14	4.74	29	4.36	100	4.46	143	4.46	32	3.82	3	4.77	178	4.36	1.60
Psychiatric Clinic Men	7	2.60	9	3.89	22	4.24	38	3.86	10	2.98	2	3.50	50	3.67	1.59
Psychiatric Clinic Women	12	4.35	13	3.65	29	4.20	54	4.10	16	2.28	1	1.30	71	3.65	1.60
Totals:	33	4.15	51	4.09	151	4.38	235	4.28	58	3.25	6	3.77	299	4.07	1.63
<i>Groups taking Form 40:</i>															
Geo. Washington Univ. Women	47	4.34	42	4.43	36	3.44	125	4.11	5	2.32	2	4.20	132	4.04	1.58
Maritime School Men	17	4.67	45	5.42	82	5.09	144	5.14	16	4.66	4	4.40	164	5.08	1.76
Middle-Class Women	35	4.14	38	3.61	57	3.92	130	3.89	17	1.56	7	4.06	154	3.64	1.96
Middle-Class Men	9	3.56	12	5.37	27	4.26	48	4.40	19	2.60	2	3.90	69	3.88	2.08
Working-Class Men	8	4.50	13	4.72	27	3.72	48	4.14	9	2.40	2	3.60	59	3.83	1.72
Totals:	116	4.27	150	4.62	229	4.28	495	4.38	66	2.78	17	4.08	578	4.19	1.90
Over-all Totals:	268	3.79	303	4.14	567	3.94	1138	3.96	165	2.87	29	3.87	1332	3.82	--

obtained by means of the question, "How often do you attend services?" which appeared in all forms of the questionnaire are given in Table 2(VI). Our supposition with respect to those who attend regularly is not borne out. The mean score for subjects in this category is not significantly different from the means of those who attend often or of those who attend seldom. If, however, we combine these three categories, "regularly," "often," "seldom," and compare the mean score of subjects in this broader category with that of subjects who say they never attend, then it appears that the latter score very notably lower. Once again, it appears that those who reject religion have less ethnocentrism than those who seem to accept it. What it is among the latter that makes for high or for low scores has still to be discovered.

d. RELIGIOUS AFFILIATIONS OF PARENTS. It may be inquired whether religious subjects do not differ, in a way that is significant for prejudice, with respect to the manner in which religious pressures have been applied and the manner in which they have been accepted. It has been pointed out earlier that a group membership which the subject chooses for himself may have a different significance than a group membership which he has by virtue of having grown up within it. It may be suggested also that the homogeneity of the religious pattern to which the subject was subjected during his formative years and the consistency with which religious pressures have been applied have a bearing upon prejudice. Some light may be shed upon these matters by examining the data obtained by asking the subjects to state on their questionnaires what was or is the religion of their father and of their mother. This made it possible to consider various relations between father's religion and that of the mother as possible correlates of ethnocentrism score.

The results of this proceeding are shown in Table 3(VI). Here it is worth noting that, with each form of the questionnaire, A-S or E score is slightly higher on the average in those subjects whose father and mother had the same religion than in those whose parents had different religions.<sup>4</sup> The difference which appears in the over-all totals probably approaches statistical significance. In groups taking Forms 78 and 60 the mean score is slightly lower for subjects neither of whose parents was religious than for subjects in either of the first two categories; in the case of the three groups taking Forms 40 and 45 whose responses were analyzed, the number of subjects in the category "neither religious" is so small as to be negligible. These results suggest that ethnocentrism may be higher in subjects whose parents presented

<sup>4</sup> Calculations of this relationship were performed on only one group taking Form 45 and two groups taking Form 40. The relationships with which we were concerned had appeared so consistently in all groups examined up to the time Form 60 was revised, that it seemed we might economize merely by sampling the remaining groups. This, as it turned out, was not very fortunate, in as much as some of the relationships found with Forms 78 and 60 are not confirmed in the groups selected for analysis from among those taking Forms 40 and 45.

TABLE 3 (VI)

## MEAN A-S OR E SCORES FOR GROUPS SHOWING VARIOUS RELATIONS BETWEEN FATHER'S RELIGION AND MOTHER'S RELIGION

	Relation Between Father's and Mother's Religion														
	Same Religion		Different Religion		M Religious F Not		F Religious M Not		Neither Religious		Blank		Over-all		
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	S. D.
<i>Groups taking Form 78:</i>															
Public Speaking Class Women	75	3.42	38	3.53	14	2.89	2	1.40	5	2.66	6	3.00	140	3.32	1.43
Public Speaking Class Men	36	3.40	7	3.19	5	3.66	0	--	2	1.20	2	4.30	52	3.34	1.48
Extension Psychology Class Women	25	3.43	10	3.20	2	4.55	0	--	2	2.80	3	3.47	42	3.40	1.36
Professional Women	35	2.73	15	2.37	9	2.37	0	--	2	1.05	2	3.75	63	2.57	1.37
Totals:	171	3.28	70	3.20	30	2.97	2	1.40	11	2.13	13	3.42	297	3.18	1.46
<i>Groups taking Form 60:</i>															
Univ. of Oregon Student Women	22	3.47	9	3.69	8	3.72	2	2.00	2	3.54	4	2.71	47	3.43	1.38
Univ. of Oregon and Univ. of California Student Women	37	3.54	7	2.66	3	3.47	1	3.00	2	2.88	4	1.71	54	3.25	1.29
Univ. of Oregon and Univ. of California Student Men	41	3.17	6	2.94	5	2.10	0	--	2	2.21	3	1.78	57	2.95	1.26
Totals:	100	3.38	22	3.16	16	3.17	3	2.33	6	2.88	11	2.09	158	3.20	1.32
<i>Groups taking Form 45:</i>															
Maritime School Men	120	4.36	30	4.24	9	4.94	0	--	1	4.60	18	4.21	178	4.36	1.60
<i>Groups taking Form 40:</i>															
Geo. Washington Univ. Women	78	4.29	45	3.84	3	2.67	0	--	1	3.40	5	2.96	132	4.04	1.58
Maritime School Men	115	5.20	19	4.80	12	4.47	0	--	2	5.20	16	4.99	164	5.08	1.76
Totals:	193	4.83	64	4.12	15	4.11	0	--	3	4.60	21	4.51	296	4.61	--
Over-all Totals:	584	4.03	186	3.68	70	3.51	5	1.96	21	2.81	63	3.78	929	3.87	--

a united religious front than in subjects in whose case the religious influence from the parents was inconsistent, partial, or nonexistent. It may be that in the ethnocentric subjects whose mother and father were both religious, we are dealing with submission to ingroup authority and that the effects are the more pronounced the more consistent that authority has been.

But regardless of what might have been the relation between the father's religion and that of the mother, the subject may or may not have accepted the religious pressures of his family. Going on the assumption that in America religion is most largely a "maternal" matter, we have brought together in Table 4(VI) the mean A-S or E scores of groups showing various relations between the subject's religion and the mother's religion. Here it appears that, in general, subjects professing the same religion as the mother have a higher score on A-S or E than do subjects professing a religion different from that of the mother. Where the mother is religious but the subject not, or the subject is religious while the mother is not, the prejudice score is still lower and as we should expect, the lowest means appear when neither the subject nor the mother is religious. Concerning these results as a whole, one might say that whereas religious affiliation goes with higher scores on the scales, this is less likely to be the case if the religion is "one's own," that is to say, if it has been accepted independently of or in revolt against the main carrier of religious influence in the family. Where this has been the case, the chances are that the religion has been fairly well internalized. More than this, we have reason to believe that submission to and dependence upon parental authority is an important determinant of ethnocentrism; subjects, particularly women, who profess a religion that is different from that of the mother have probably been able to free themselves from these attitudes and hence, to a considerable degree, from prejudice.

The results just presented are much more pronounced in women than in men. The explanation here might be that for men the mother is not usually a center of conflict with respect to authority and that men who side with the mother in the matter of religion may gain thereby something of that Christian humanism which works against prejudice.

These results on family relationships in relation to religion and ethnocentrism suggest that in order to understand why some religious people are prejudiced and others are not, it is necessary to explore the deeper psychological aspects of the problem rather than limit ourselves to gross sociological factors.

## 2. "IMPORTANCE" OF RELIGION AND THE CHURCH

One approach to the psychological aspects of religion was to ask subjects directly, "How important in your opinion are religion and the Church?" This question appeared on the questionnaire form used just prior to Form 78. Answers were obtained from 123 women students in an Introductory Psy-



TABLE 4 (VI)  
 MEAN A-S OR E SCORES FOR GROUPS SHOWING VARIOUS RELATIONS BETWEEN SUBJECT'S RELIGION AND MOTHER'S RELIGION

	Relation Between Subject's and Mother's Religion																	
	Same		Different		M Religious S Not		M Not Religious		Neither Religious		Blank		Over-all					
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	S.D.			
<i>Groups taking Form 78:</i>																		
Public Speaking Class Women	82	3.50	41	3.32	9	2.47	6	2.23	0	--	2	3.45	140	3.32	1.43			
Public Speaking Class Men	38	3.37	5	3.48	7	3.71	1	1.20	1	1.20	0	--	52	3.34	1.48			
Extension Psychology Class Women	19	3.90	10	3.23	10	2.62	1	4.00	1	1.60	1	4.70	42	3.40	1.36			
Professional Women	31	2.74	21	2.95	9	1.48	0	--	2	1.05	0	--	63	2.57	1.37			
Totals:	170	3.37	77	3.22	35	2.51	8	2.33	4	1.23	3	3.87	297	3.18	1.46			
<i>Groups taking Form 60:</i>																		
Univ. of Oregon Student Women	21	4.22	16	3.00	1	1.17	4	2.85	2	1.17	3	3.33	47	3.43	1.38			
Univ. of Oregon and Univ. of California Student Women	28	3.45	18	3.18	4	2.29	2	3.21	1	2.33	1	2.50	54	3.25	1.29			
Univ. of Oregon and Univ. of California Student Men	25	3.15	22	3.11	5	1.60	1	1.67	1	2.75	3	2.78	57	2.95	1.26			
Totals:	74	3.57	56	3.10	10	1.83	7	2.79	4	1.85	7	2.98	158	3.19	1.32			
<i>Groups taking Form 45:</i>																		
Maritime School Men	129	4.56	16	4.13	22	3.61	0	--	1	4.50	10	3.72	178	4.36	1.60			
Psychiatric Clinic Men	24	4.16	14	2.94	6	3.17	0	--	0	--	6	3.88	50	3.67	1.59			
Psychiatric Clinic Women	40	4.25	11	3.75	9	2.22	0	--	4	1.18	7	3.30	71	3.65	1.60			
Totals:	193	4.44	41	3.62	37	3.20	0	--	5	1.84	23	3.64	299	4.07	1.63			
<i>Groups taking Form 40:</i>																		
Geo. Washington Univ. Women	85	4.27	33	3.88	8	3.08	0	--	1	3.40	5	2.92	132	4.04	1.58			
Maritime School Men	128	5.10	15	5.43	12	4.33	0	--	2	5.20	7	5.17	164	5.08	1.76			
Middle-Class Women	84	4.22	47	3.38	10	1.22	1	1.40	1	1.20	11	2.95	154	3.64	1.96			
Middle-Class Men	40	4.49	13	3.75	13	2.60	0	--	1	1.00	2	2.70	69	3.89	2.08			
Working-Class Men	33	4.16	7	3.83	11	2.62	5	5.00	1	1.00	2	3.40	59	3.83	1.72			
Totals:	370	4.56	115	3.86	54	2.80	6	4.40	6	2.83	27	3.53	578	4.19	1.90			
Over-all Totals:	807	4.19	289	3.51	136	2.76	21	3.07	19	2.03	60	3.53	1332	3.82	--			

chology Class at the University of California.<sup>5</sup> The responses of the subjects were categorized according to the following scheme:

1. Generally and without qualification against both religion and the Church.
2. "Not important," with no qualifications given.
3. Agnostic; emphasis on values, ethics, way of living fostered by religion and the Church.
4. Emphasis on religion as a source of inner strength and satisfaction.
5. Acceptance of religion but rejection of the Church; emphasis on such concepts as faith and God.
6. "Mildly important," with no qualifications given.
7. Religion and the Church both important; acceptance of prayer, church attendance, religious rituals.

Mean A-S score for subjects giving each of these categories of response was calculated. Means for categories 6 and 7 were relatively high, means for all the other categories relatively low. These results were not, however, satis-

TABLE 5 (VI)

MEAN A-S SCORES OF GROUPS GIVING DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF  
RESPONSE TO THE QUESTION: "HOW IMPORTANT ARE RELIGION  
AND THE CHURCH?"

<u>Categories of Response</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean A-S Score</u>	<u>S. D.</u>
"High" categories 6 and 7 combined	65	180.7	54.5
"Low" categories 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 combined	58	115.4	41.8

factory from a statistical point of view, mainly because several of the categories were represented by very few subjects. It seemed justifiable to combine categories 6 and 7, on the basis that both described a favorable attitude toward religion and the church while making no distinction between the two; similarly, all the remaining categories could be combined on the basis that they represented something other than uncritical acceptance of formalized religion. The means for these two higher-order categories appear in Table 5(VI). Subjects who believe that religion and the church are both important have a mean A-S score of 180.7, and the other subjects, those who are against religion and the church generally, those who accept religion but not the church, and those who emphasize the personal, ethical, and rational aspects of religion, have a mean of 115.4. The difference between these two means is 65.3 and the C. R. is 7.3.

<sup>5</sup> The over-all data for this group were presented in Chapter III.

These data may be taken to mean that for subjects high on A-S, religion is important primarily as a matter of convention. Subjects who are low on A-S may either be against religion or have a religion that is relatively personal and internalized. The fact of acceptance or rejection of religion is not as important as the *way* in which it is accepted or rejected.

### 3. SCALE ITEMS

Three items pertaining to religious ideology were included in the scale which attempted to measure potentially fascistic trends in the personality. This scale will be described in the next chapter but it seems appropriate to consider here those items which touch upon the topic of religion. The first item was the following: "The modern church with its many rules and hypocrisies, does not appeal to the deeply religious person; it appeals mainly to the childish, the insecure, and the uncritical." The hypothesis here was that disagreement with the item would indicate uncritical acceptance of the church and, hence, ethnocentrism, and that agreement with the item would indicate either an antireligious attitude or a genuinely religious but more intellectual point of view from which the church might be criticized—something which we should expect to go with low scores on the scales for measuring prejudice. The results were disappointing. The mean score on the item for the 295 subjects taking Form 78 of the questionnaire was 4.67 and the  $D. P_{AS}$  was  $-1.18$ . It appeared in retrospect that the statement was too complex and awkward, and hence, frequently misunderstood. More than this, the high mean score indicates that relatively few people were ready to criticize the church in this way; this, of course, would lower the chances of the item's being discriminating. Needless to say, the item was not retained in the questionnaire after its first trial.

Another item in the scale was the following: "Every person should have a deep faith in some supernatural force higher than himself to which he gives total allegiance and whose decisions he does not question." The hypothesis was that agreement with this statement, which expresses very firm belief in the supernatural and an attitude of submission toward it, would be associated with prejudice. The mean score for the 295 subjects taking Form 78 was 3.97 and the  $D. P_{AS}$ , 1.26. When the item, slightly revised, was used in Form 60 of the questionnaire ( $N = 226$ ) the mean score was 3.60 and the  $D. P_{E}$ , 1.38. These  $D. P.$ 's are large enough to indicate that the relation of this item to ethnocentrism approaches statistical significance. The item was significantly correlated with the remainder of the scale in which it appeared, and this total scale was highly correlated with ethnocentrism.

The third item was as follows: "Sciences like chemistry, physics, and medicine have carried man very far but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind." It was considered that subjects in agreeing with this item conceived of a mysterious spiritual

realm of things with respect to which investigation was taboo and toward which their attitude was one of reverence. This outlook was expected to correlate with ethnocentrism. The mean in the case of Form 78 was 4.35 and the D. P.<sub>AS</sub>, .97. In the case of Form 60, where the item appeared in a slightly revised version, the mean was 4.98 and the D. P.<sub>E</sub>, 1.32. Here, once again, is evidence of a relationship between a particular religious idea and ethnocentrism. This item, like the "supernatural force" item discussed above, was significantly correlated with the remainder of the scale for measuring implicit antidemocratic trends and it was employed throughout the course of the study.

These results suggest that had it been possible to express a variety of religious beliefs, ideas, and sentiments in the form of scale items, more impressive quantitative results bearing on the relations of religious ideology to ethnocentrism would have been obtained. This is a matter which might well be the topic of future research.

### C. DISCUSSION

Belonging to or identifying oneself with a religious body in America today certainly does not mean that one thereby takes over the traditional Christian values of tolerance, brotherhood, and equality. On the contrary, it appears that these values are more firmly held by people who do not affiliate with any religious group. It may be that religious affiliation or church attendance is of little importance one way or the other in determining social attitudes, that the great majority of middle-class Americans identify themselves with some religious denomination as a matter of course, without thinking much about it. This would be in keeping with the facts that the mean scores and the variability for the large religious denominations are very similar to those found in our sample as a whole. It may be argued, however, that this conventional approach to religion expresses enough identification with the *status quo*, submission to external authority, and readiness to emphasize moralistically the differences between those who "belong" and those who do not, to differentiate, in terms of E score, members of the large denominations from the nonreligious and from the members of those minor groups which actually stand for trends of an opposite character. At the same time, members of the major denominations seem to differ widely among themselves with respect to trends of this kind, and where there are signs that the acceptance of religion has been determined primarily by conventional or external considerations, E score tends to go up. Thus it is that agreement between the parents in the matter of religious affiliation, a circumstance that might lessen the chances of an awakening on the part of the subject to the issues involved, and sameness of the subject's religion and that of the mother, something that might be indicative of submissiveness toward au-

thority, tend to be associated with ethnocentrism. But among the members of the major denominations there are many subjects whose religion would appear to be "genuine," in the sense that it was arrived at more or less independently of external pressure and takes the form of internalized values. These subjects, it seems, tend to score low, often very low, on ethnocentrism. Subjects with this same outlook probably predominate in the low-scoring Protestant denominations and often, no doubt, they profess to no religious affiliation at all.

It seems that we can approach an understanding of the relations between religion and ethnocentrism by paying attention to what the acceptance or the rejection of religion means to the individual. When the problem is approached from this point of view the psychological factors which appear as most important are much the same as those which came to the fore in the preceding chapters: conformity, conventionalism, authoritarian submission, determination by external pressures, thinking in ingroup-outgroup terms, and the like vs. nonconformity, independence, internalization of values, and so forth. The fragmentary data on religious ideology afforded by the scale items lend themselves to the same mode of interpretation. An attitude of complete submissiveness toward "supernatural forces" and a readiness to accept the essential incomprehensibility of "many important things" strongly suggest the persistence in the individual of infantile attitudes toward the parents, that is to say, of authoritarian submission in a very pure form. Psychological variables of the kind discussed here are investigated directly in the next chapter.

#### D. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Subjects who profess to some religious affiliation express more prejudice than those who do not; but mean A-S or E scores for all the large denominations are close to the theoretical neutral point. The vast majority of our subjects do identify themselves with some religious group, and the variability with respect to ethnocentrism among these subjects is almost as great as it is in our sample as a whole. The factor of religious denomination does not prove to be very significant. Among the largest denominations no differences of any significance appear; but Unitarians, who seem to be distinguished by their liberalism, and a group of minor Protestant groups, in the case of which there might be some spirit of nonconformity or some lack of identification with the *status quo*, score lower than the others. Frequency of church attendance is also not particularly revealing; however, the finding that those who never attend obtain lower E scores than those who do attend is added evidence that people who reject organized religion are less prejudiced than those who accept it.

When the religious affiliation of the subject is considered in relation to that

of his parents, it appears that ethnocentrism tends to be more pronounced in subjects whose parents presented a unified religious front than in cases where the religious influence from the parents was inconsistent, partial, or nonexistent. Furthermore, there is an indication that agreement between the subject and his or her mother in the matter of religion tends to be associated with ethnocentrism, disagreement with its opposite. These results suggest that acceptance of religion mainly as an expression of submission to a clear pattern of parental authority is a condition favorable to ethnocentrism.

A quantitative approach to religious ideology was made by including in one form of the questionnaire an open-ended question concerning the importance, in the subject's mind, of religion and the church. When a categorization of the answers to this question was made and mean A-S scores calculated, it turned out that the subjects who considered both religion and the church important were very considerably more anti-Semitic than were subjects who considered neither important or emphasized the ethical aspects of religion or differentiated between the church and "real" religion and, while rejecting the former, stressed the more personal and the more rational aspects of the latter.

Two scale-items pertaining to religious ideology appeared to be slightly correlated with prejudice. The more agreement with statements to the effect that people should have "complete faith in some supernatural force" and that "there are some things that can never be understood by the human mind," the higher did the A-S score tend to be.

In general, it appeared that gross, objective factors—denomination and frequency of church attendance—were less significant for prejudice than were certain psychological trends reflected in the way the subject accepted or rejected religion and in the content of his religious ideology. These trends—conventionalism, authoritarian submission, and so forth—were generally the same as those which came to the fore in preceding chapters, and we turn now to our attempt to investigate them directly.