



117  
648  
THS

ANOMIE AND AUTHORITARIANISM:  
A STUDY IN RELIABILITY

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.  
MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE  
Keith Gawain McKittrick  
1952



This is to certify that the  
thesis entitled  
"Anomie and Authoritarianism:  
A Study in Reliability"

presented by

Keith Gawain McKittrick

has been accepted towards fulfillment  
of the requirements for

M.A. degree in Psychology

Milton Rokeach

Major professor

Date May 26, 1952

2-228  
MAR 15 '79

ANOMIE AND AUTHORITARIANISM:  
A STUDY IN RELIABILITY

By  
KEITH GAWAIN MCKITRICK

A THESIS

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Michigan  
State College of Agriculture and Applied Science  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

1952



THESIS

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Grateful acknowledgment is made to Dr. Milton Rokeach for his inspiration and patient assistance throughout the course of this research.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgment	1
List of tables	111
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	6
III. HYPOTHESES AND METHODOLOGY	7
IV. PROCEDURE	13
V. PRESENTATION OF THE DATA	17
VI. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS	26
VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	30
Bibliography	32
Appendix	33



## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
I Comparison of Means and Percentages Between Sub-Samples AF and A-F-	16
II Percents of all "Agree" Responses to Both Forms of A and F Items	18
III Comparisons of Percents of "Agree" Responses to Both Forms of the A and F Items Between the Education Groups	19
IV Comparisons of Percents of "Agree" Responses to Both Forms of the A and F Items Between the Income Groups	20
V Comparison of Within-Sample Total "Agree" Responses on all Scales; Education and Income Groups	21
VI Correlations of each item with total score; All Scales	22

## ANOMIE AND AUTHORITARIANISM:

### A STUDY IN RELIABILITY

#### INTRODUCTION

The term "anomie" was first used in connection with social theory by the French sociologist Emile Durkheim in his book, De la division du travail social (3). Simpson, in his translation of this volume, has reinstated the old English word "anomy," obsolete since 1755 and first used in 1591. It was employed in the earlier period to mean "disregard of (divine) law," and later "lawlessness." Its derivation is from the Greek.

When Durkheim wrote about this concept, he had in mind primarily the disintegrated and demoralized state of a society in which there are no common values or morals that effectively govern the conduct of individuals. Others, according to their points of view have described this situation in different ways. Theologians would see a breakdown of faith in divine guidance; and political scientists would lay the blame on an ineffective governmental system. Thus the concept has definite collective connotations---those of an abnormal state of society. Merton (6), characterizes the instability of a society leading to anomie as "a symptom of dissociation between culturally prescribed aspirations and socially structured avenues for realizing these aspirations." He emphasizes the intense preoccupation with attainment of wealth to the disregard of legitimate

avenues for achieving this end. This would appear to be closely related to the "lawlessness" of which Simpson spoke.

Where psychology becomes concerned with the concept of anomie more directly is upon the latter's manifestation in the behavior of the individual. What are the symptoms of anomie? Durkheim spoke of the hopelessness brought on by the economic factors of the division of labor and of fluctuations in the business cycle. In Le Suicide he described the intolerable sense of futility culminating in "anomic suicide." DeGrazia, in his very readable book (2), combines a social-political orientation with a psychoanalytic description of anomie. In his protest against the harsh competitive nature of our society, he brings in pertinent material of Horney in which she speaks of the "unendurable emotional isolation stemming from the hostility of competitiveness." Jung is quoted with regard to the loss of meaning of life in general; the reader is referred to Fromm and Alexander where they speak of the "lack of purposefulness and the uncertainties of goals." DeGrazia aptly describes the "bewilderment and dulling anxiety" tormenting the jobhunter on the trek in search of a job which he knows is not there.

While similar syndromes have been noted regularly in clinical and social psychology, the first time that "anomie" had been put under systematic scrutiny and measurement was in 1951. At that time sociologist Leo Srole (8), attempted, by the use of attitude scales, to relate anomie to certain



socio-psychological variables, specifically prejudice and authoritarianism.

Before examining this latter study and its implications for the present research, this theoretical introduction will be rounded out with a brief account of the concept of authoritarianism and the scale which has been designed to measure it.

In their search for a coherent pattern of deep-lying personality trends entering the makeup of the potentially fascistic individual, Adorno et al. (1), documented results from their California Study which are considered classic in present-day social psychology. Among the findings that emerged from this research was the demonstration that an individual is likely to maintain a basic similarity of approach and outlook in a great many areas of life. A distinct personality syndrome was isolated which exemplified this generality of approach, and was described as the Authoritarian Personality. Persons of this type were characterized as rigid, conventional, power-oriented and punitive, with a repressive denial of weakness in themselves and a disdain of it in others. Their conceptions of sex roles and moral values are dichotomized, outgroups are stereotyped, and minority-group prejudice with self-righteousness is evident. It was found that harsh, exploitive parent-child relationships were closely associated with this prejudice in later life.

Earlier in the research, after selecting prejudiced in-

dividuals by means of attitude questionnaires, clinical interviews, and projective tests, the investigators became concerned with the idea of constructing a scale that would measure prejudice without appearing to have this aim and without mentioning specific minority groups. The second and more central purpose was that of constructing a scale which "might yield a valid estimate of antidemocratic tendencies at the personality level." After extensive revision and statistical refinement, a highly reliable scale was formed (split-half reliability averaged .90) which contained 34 items and was called the F (fascist) Scale.

Srole, in contrast to the California researchers, believed that the formations of patterns of prejudice could better be accounted for through the impact of socio-situational forces upon the individual resulting in a state of anomie. Here is seen a sharp divergence from the psychoanalytically oriented view which holds, rather, that the potential for prejudice lies deeply imbedded in the personality structure, conditioned by early family relationships.

Srole's first step in gathering support for his hypothesis was in the construction of a scale for measuring anomie.

This scale consisted of five items, each "on theoretical grounds" representing a component of this state of social dysfunction. Into a questionnaire form he included this anomie scale, a five-item prejudice inventory, and a five-item version of the California F Scale. Following the admin-

istration of this combined questionnaire to 401 bus riders in Springfield Massachusetts, some remarkable results were obtained.

By means of these short scales to measure each of the three variables involved, his findings apparently showed a closer relationship existing between anomie and prejudice than between authoritarianism and prejudice. While authoritarianism was still related to prejudice, it apparently was not independent of the sociological factors presumed to have been measured by the anomie scale. These relationships seemed to be in evidence most markedly within his low-education group.



## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The urgency of reaching a solution to the problem of reducing intergroup prejudice is clearly recognized. An adequate understanding of the problem of prejudice demands a sound theoretical representation in terms of the dynamics of its origin. The California finding with respect to the relationship between authoritarianism and prejudice is generally regarded as a significant theoretical contribution to this understanding. Divergent evidence such as the findings of Srole must, therefore, be examined critically in the interest of: (a) The exposition of faults in, and consequent revision of, the existing theory; or, (b) exposing faults in the methods of acquiring the divergent evidence.

## HYPOTHESES AND METHODOLOGY

Within the context of the above general problem, it is the purpose of this thesis to investigate the reliabilities of Srole's two measures, his five-item anomie (A) scale and the five-item authoritarianism (F) scale. In addition, two further measures of A and F will be examined with respect to their relative reliabilities. These two different scales, used for the purpose of this present study, will be described below.

Working in conjunction with Roberts (7), an experiment was designed in order to test the following general hypothesis regarding the high relationship found by Srole between anomie and prejudice in the low-education group:

The low-status respondents will tend to agree with the anomie statements (which are worded in such a manner that agreement indicates a state of anomie) in order to avoid the threat which might occur upon resistance or disagreement with the interviewer. In view of the relatively insecure position of these respondents, the interview situation may thereby generate a state of subordinate-conformity.

If such conformity were operative in Srole's sample, it can be seen what a gross distortion of results could accrue in the low-education group if their responses were influenced by this factor. It was necessary of course, to hypothesize

that a similar effect would occur with the F statements, which are also worded in such a manner that agreement in their case indicates authoritarianism.

Accordingly, alternate A and F scales were devised whereby each of the statements were reversed in meaning so that agreement with them would then logically reflect a lack of anomie or authoritarianism, respectively. (Agreement formerly assumed the presence of the attribute in question.) These were called the A- and F- scales. Thus if the statements were still responded to in the affirmative, it can be assumed that such "agrees" were given for the sake of acquiescence or conformity, and not in the interest of the actual ideational content of the items. This rationale must rest on the assumption that each of the changed statements carries a connotation which is exactly, or at least approximately, opposite from that of its original counterpart. The scales in each case would then be negatively equivalent. (A list of each item next to its changed version is found on Page 11.)

There are two aspects of this experiment which merit detailed consideration. One has to do with the validity of the two measures, and this forms the main subject of Roberts' (7) report. The second aspect, that of the reliability of these measures, is contained in this present thesis.

In an effort to determine the presence of conformity, and in turn the effect that it might have upon the reliabilities



of the scores obtained from the various scales, the following four hypotheses are offered, along with the means for testing each:

1. Conformity in the face-to-face interview situation will bias the responses toward excess agreement on both forms of the A and F scales, original and reversed. This will appear throughout the total sample, effecting a reduction in the reliabilities of all A and F scores.
  - (a) This rests upon the assumption of equivalent forms, (negative equivalence) and identity of sub-samples.
  - (b) The test: A determination will be made of the percents of the AF group responding to each A and F item with "agree." Also, the percents of the A-F- group responding to each A- and F- item with "agree" will be found. Excess agreement on both forms of each item will be noted.
2. Conformity will operate in the low-education groups to a greater extent than in the high-education groups.
  - (a) The test: Similar comparisons (as in Hypothesis 1) will be made between the AF and the A-F- low-education groups. Likewise, the conformity responses of the high-education groups will be noted. The relative degrees of conformity will then be compared.
3. Closely related to (2) above, an analysis of conformity responses of the low and high income groups should parallel closely that of the education groups.

(a) The same considerations as are listed in (2) with respect to methods will apply.

4. As a consequence of conformity-determined responses, the A and F scales are not internally consistent to a significant degree.

(a) Separate items will be correlated with total score.

Anomie items: Original (A), and reversed (A-).

1. A    There's little use writing to public officials,  
because often they aren't really interested in the  
problems of the average man.  
  
A-    Writing to public officials often does some good,  
because many public officials are really interested  
in the problems of the average man.
2. A    Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today  
and let tomorrow take care of itself.  
  
A-    It pays for a person to sacrifice today in order  
to provide for tomorrow.
3. A    In spite of what some people say, the lot of the  
average man is getting worse, not better.  
  
A-    In spite of what some people say, the lot of the  
average man is getting better, not worse.
4. A    These days a person doesn't really know whom he  
can count on.  
  
A-    In times of trouble, a person can usually find one  
or more people he can count on.
5. A    It's hardly fair to bring children into the world  
with the way things look for the future.  
  
A-    In spite of the way things look for the future,  
it's hardly fair to stop having children.

Authoritarianism items: Original (F), and reversed (F-).

1. F    There are two kinds of people in the world: the weak and the strong.  
  
F-    It is a mistake to think that there are two kinds of people in the world, the weak and the strong.
2. F    The most important thing to teach children is absolute obedience to their parents.  
  
F-    To teach children absolute obedience to their parents is not the most important thing.
3. F    Prison is too good for sex criminals; they should be publicly whipped or worse.  
  
F-    Although some people say that sex criminals should be publicly whipped or worse, it is better to treat them just like other criminals.
4. F    Any good leader should be strict with people under him in order to gain their respect.  
  
F-    Any good leader should be lenient with people under him in order to gain their respect.
5. F    No decent man can respect a woman who has had sex relations before marriage.  
  
F-    A man can respect a woman even though she has had sex relations before marriage.

## PROCEDURE

After constructing the alternate items, the four scales (A,A-,F,F-) were arranged in questionnaires as follows: In the first form which was called the AF Form, was included Srole's five-item A Scale, his five-item F scale, and one of the versions of the E Scale used in the California research. This latter was Form 45, employed to measure prejudice or ethnocentrism, hence the letter E. (1, p.128) The second form of the questionnaire contained the semantically reversed counterparts of the A and F items, plus the same E scale. This form was called the A-F- Form. (One of the complete questionnaire schedules is included in appendix A.) The rationale for inclusion of the prejudice scale is in line with the attempt to duplicate Srole's study with respect to the questioned interrelationships among the three variables of anomie, authoritarianism, and prejudice. This aspect is described in detail by Roberts, where his work is concerned directly with correlations among these three factors.

Each of the two forms of the 20-item questionnaire was orally administered to a portion of a stratified sample of 158 residents of Lansing, Michigan.

The stratification was accomplished by choosing approximately half of the respondents from modest-appearing dwellings; the other half was chosen from objectively more prosperous sections of the city. In this way a preponderance of high

and low-status individuals was sought for, rather than an approximation to the general population.

The interviewing was conducted on a door-to-door basis, and the residents were told in effect that an opinion survey was being performed by Michigan State College, of which the interviewer was a representative. It was stressed to each resident that his own opinions with respect to certain present-day social issues were considered important to the survey, but that strict anonymity would be preserved. Surprisingly few refusals occurred.

After initial rapport was established, the questioner and respondent seated themselves in the latter's living room where the interview was begun. The respondent's age, marital status, and years of schooling were obtained first. The statements of the questionnaire were then read aloud to him with three possibilities of response available, "agree," "disagree," and "can't decide." After this was completed, each individual was questioned with respect to his general outlook or mood of the day, thus, "Would you say that you are feeling better than usual today, worse than usual, or about the same as usual?" (It is possible that the pessimistic connotations of the anomie statements could be related to momentary mood.) Finally, each interviewee was asked to check the salary bracket located at the end of the schedule which represented his own income.

The sub-sample to which the AF forms were given totalled 86; the A-F- forms were administered to 72 persons. Between



the two latter groups, there were no significant differences in means, standard deviations, or percentages with regard to the following variables: income, education, age, sex, marital status, and score on the E Scale. These data are shown in Table I; they provide the basis for assuming homogeneity between the two sub-samples.



1

TABLE I  
COMPARISON OF MEANS AND PERCENTAGES  
BETWEEN SUB-SAMPLES AF AND A-F-

	AF	A-F-	t
	Mean		
Income	4900	4790	.25
Education	11.47	10.47 below	1.96
Age	44.45	42.15	1.00
Ethnocentrism	21.16	22.31	.43
Percent			
Sex	M 35% F 65%	M 44% F 56%	1.15
Marital Status	M 83%	M 90%	1.56

1

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

## PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

It will be recalled that an affirmative response to the original A item is assumed to denote the presence of anomie. Disagreement with the same statement in its reversed form should likewise imply the presence of anomie; the same assumptions hold for responses on the F and F- scales.

To repeat, if it can be shown that the makeup of the AF sample is homogeneous with that of the A-F- sample, and if the contents of the original and reversed items prove to be equivalent, ("agree" on AF = "disagree" on A-F-) is it not evidence for conformity if there occurs an excess of "agree" on both items?

In Table II, immediately following, percents of "agree" responses to each item are matched with those of "agree" on the same item which was altered so as to have the opposite meaning. The percentages were in each case derived from the appropriate sub-samples, AF, 85; A-F-, 71. (One subject was removed from each sample so as to effect a comparable distribution in terms of education.)

Any given p does not imply an exact q; (proportion of disagrees) "undecided" responses accounted for an additional percentage, the average of all of which was 7.45.

The tabular data relevant to the three additional hypotheses are found immediately following Table II.

TABLE II  
PERCENTS OF ALL "AGREE" RESPONSES  
TO BOTH FORMS OF A AND F ITEMS

Item No.	A	A-	F	F-
1.	32.1	88.6	79.8	37.1
2.	47.6	81.4	65.5	47.1
3.	27.4	72.9	44.0	57.1
4.	70.2**	97.1**	57.1**	61.4**
5.	15.5	78.6	41.7	65.5

\*\*Excess agreement, both forms of same item

TABLE III

COMPARISONS OF PERCENTS OF "AGREE" RESPONSES TO  
BOTH FORMS OF THE A AND F ITEMS BETWEEN  
THE EDUCATION GROUPS

Item No.	Low education		High education	
	A	A-	A	A-
1.	44.4	85.7	17.9	91.4
2.	55.5*	82.9*	38.5	80.0
3.	31.1	62.9	23.1	82.9
4.	75.5*	97.1*	64.1*	97.1*
5.	22.2	71.4	7.7	85.7

Item No.	Low education		High education	
	F	F-	F	F-
1.	84.4	40.0	74.4	34.3
2.	80.0	31.4	48.7	62.9
3.	53.3*	54.3*	33.3	60.0
4.	57.8*	68.6*	56.4*	54.3*
5.	46.7	68.6	35.9	62.9

\*Excess agreement, both forms of the same item

TABLE IV

COMPARISONS OF PERCENTS OF "AGREE" RESPONSES TO  
BOTH FORMS OF THE A AND F ITEMS BETWEEN  
THE INCOME GROUPS

Item No.	Low income		High income	
	A	A-	A	A-
1.	35.1	94.3	25.0	82.4
2.	56.8*	80.0*	37.5	85.3
3.	32.4	65.7	25.0	70.6
4.	75.7*	97.1*	57.5*	97.1*
5.	18.9	77.1	7.5	79.4

Item No.	Low income		High income	
	F	F-	F	F-
1.	86.5	42.9	72.5	35.3
2.	83.8	34.3	47.5	55.9
3.	51.4	45.7	40.0	67.6
4.	54.1*	71.4	55.0*	58.8*
5.	45.9	62.9	32.5	67.6

\*Excess agreement, both forms of the same item

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF WITHIN-SAMPLE TOTAL "AGREE" RESPONSES,  
ALL SCALES; EDUCATION AND INCOME GROUPS

FORM AF			
	Low education	High education	t
A scale	45.8%	30.3%	3.3
F scale	64.4	49.7	2.3
	Low income	High income	
A scale	43.8	30.5	2.7
F scale	64.3	49.5	2.9

FORM A-F-			
	Low education	High education	t
A- scale	80.0%	87.4%	not signif
F- scale	52.6	54.9	not signif
	Low income	High income	
A- scale	82.8	82.9	not signif
F- scale	51.4	57.1	not signif

Subgroup n's		
	AF	A-F-
Low education	45	35
High education	39	35
Low income	37	35
High income	40	34



TABLE VI  
CORRELATIONS OF EACH ITEM WITH TOTAL  
SCORE; ALL SCALES

Item No.	A scale Phi	F scale Phi
1.	.467	.356
2.	.709	.573
3.	.379	.657
4.	.468	.250
5.	.408	.500
N = 60; minimum significance level: .333		

Item No.	A- scale Phi	F- scale
1.	.185	.250
2.	.147	.102
3.	.102	.185
4.	.102	.102
5.	.218	.185
N = 50; minimum significance level: .364		

It can be seen from Table II that, with the exception of specific items No. 4 A,A-; 4 F,F-, there is no evidence of excess agreement on both forms of the anomie and authoritarianism items. It can be concluded then, that conformity has not been demonstrated throughout the total sample. (Hypothesis 1)

Hypothesis (2), that conformity would be more pronounced in the low-education groups, called for a delineation of these groups within each sub-sample. Low education was defined as eleventh grade schooling and below; the high-education group consisted of those who had completed high school or above. Table III shows that, as education is broken down thus, a greater suggestion of conformity appears in the data. There are now two items which show excess agreement on both forms in the low-education groups; compared to this, there is but one item showing this trend in the high groups.

A within-sample tabulation of total "agree" responses (Table V) shows significantly greater agreement per se in the low-education group as compared with the high group on both A and F scales. This is not found to be true in the A- and F- scales. Hypothesis (2) then, is not confirmed.

Hypothesis (3) deals with the same considerations with respect to income. With low income defined as below \$4000 per year, and high income as above this figure, the results are shown in Table IV.

Here, as with education, there are suggestions of greater

conformity in the low as compared with the high-income groups. However, this appears only on the A scales; the F results are merely similar to those of the overall sample.

According to Table V, there is again significantly greater within-sample agreement with the original A and F items in the low as compared with the high-income group. As with education, there was not found to be greater agreement in the case of the low-income group on the A-F- Form. Hypothesis (3) is thereby not substantiated.

Hypothesis (4), that the A scale and the F scale are not internally consistent to a significant degree, was tested by means of item-test correlation. The A- and F- scales were examined similarly.

As such instruments become shorter, each item makes an increasingly large contribution to the total score. With scales containing as few as five items, this variance becomes extremely great. Thus the total score for each individual in this case had to be re-computed for every item in terms of the remaining four. This was done in order that each one would be correlated with a score which is independent of the contribution made by that item. As is customary with this procedure, high and low criterion groups were established; in this case, groups had to be redefined for every item of the scales. The upper and lower 35 percent of scale scores made up these groups. Phi coefficients for each item of the A, F,

A-, and F- scales are shown in Table VI.

All items of Srole's A and F scales were found to be significantly correlated with the total score of the remaining four items, with the exception of F No.4. In contrast, all items of the A- and F- scales fell below the minimum significance level for N's of this size.

The data thus show all four hypotheses to be unsubstantiated.

## DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

Before integrating these data into the final picture, it will be recalled that the first three hypotheses had to do with the attempt to show that the influence of conformity may have played a role in determining Srole's results. As his questionnaires were orally-administered, in contrast to those of the California research where the respondent had no personal contact with the experimenter, a new interaction influence may have arisen.

First, the parallel operation of conformity throughout the total Lansing sample was attempted to be shown. Secondly, its primary locus was hypothesized to be found in the lower status groups' responses, those of the low-education and low-income groups. Such conformity, if operative, would in turn have a direct bearing upon the reliabilities of the anomie and authoritarianism scores. Hypothesis (4) made explicit this possibility by asserting that the A and F measures are not internally consistent to a significant degree.

Taking the data again step by step, Table II shows that in the case of the A Scale, (in conjunction with the A- Scale) there is only one item which shows evidence of excess agreement. Similarly, item No.4 in the F and F- scales gives the appearance of the conformity influence having been operative. But four out of five items in each scale are unaffected; thus the first hypothesis is not substantiated.

Within the status groups there are suggestions of greater conformity among the low-education and low-income groups as compared with the high groups. However, here again there is no reason to suspect a significant trend, especially in the light of the following: As will be recalled, the assumption upon which the rationale of reversing the statements rested, was that of negative equivalence to the originals<sup>1</sup>. The confirmation of this was contingent upon the correlations of the A- and F- scales with the E scale. If a negative correlation was found between A- and E, and between F- and E similar in magnitude to the positive correlations between A and E, F and E, this would be prima-facie evidence for the semantically opposite equivalence of the scales. Roberts (7), reports near-zero correlations between A- and E, and between F- and E.

Table V gives further evidence against an hypothesis of conformity. Here it is shown that the low-status groups agreed in significantly greater proportions with the statements of the original A and F scales than did the high-status groups within the AF sub-sample. These findings are in line with

---

<sup>1</sup>The question may be raised as to what methodological precautions were undertaken to assure that this requirement was met prior to experimentation. In reply, it must be recalled that the original items have been assumed to measure certain attitudes. If the statements are made the opposite in meaning, then it should follow logically that the attitudinal opposite should be forthcoming upon such reversal. Lacking, of course, is a prior empirical confirmation of oppositeness.

the theory of anomie (8, p.9) and with the data of Adorno et al., (1, p.267) and could hardly be said to reflect conformity. The same trend in reverse is shown with the A- and F- scales, though not to a significant degree.

Hypothesis (4) stated that, as a consequence of conformity-determined responses, the scores on the A Scale and the F Scale are not internally consistent to a significant degree. Significant Phi coefficients in nine of the ten items point clearly to the lack of support for this final hypothesis.

Inasmuch as these five-item A and F scales have attained such sizeable correlations with a prejudice (E) scale, (.55 and .64, respectively)<sup>1</sup> thus showing considerable validity, it would seem that they are relatively reliable enough for this purpose. Indeed, the potentialities of these measures for even greater correlation with prejudice might be realized upon further refinement, especially in the case of the F Scale where one item made but an insignificant contribution to total score.

As to the relative reliabilities of the A- and F- measures, Table VI shows that in every case the items making up each scale are correlated positively but insignificantly with total score. This fact, and in view of the slight (statistically not significant) reverse trend of agreement shown in

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Roberts (7)

Table V with both the A- and the F- scales, it is concluded that these measures may be reflecting a trend of opposite attitude, but to an unreliable extent. They must undergo further refinement as to content in order to function as valid complementary measures of anomie and authoritarianism.





## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A 20-item questionnaire including Leo Srole's five-item Anomie (A) Scale, his five-item version of the California F Scale, and a 10-item prejudice (E) scale was administered to 86 residents of Lansing, Michigan. A second form of this questionnaire with each of its A and F items reversed in meaning, was given to 72 additional residents. This item-alteration was done in an effort to test the hypothesis that Srole's finding of a high A-E relationship among low-status respondents was a function of interview-conformity rather than of the sociological factors thought to have been measured by his A Scale. This latter form of the scales was used in order to provide an assessment of conformity in the attempt to show that respondents might also agree with the opposite of the original statements.

The aims of the present thesis centered upon the effect that such conformity might have upon the reliabilities of Srole's A and F measures.

The data gave no indication that conformity had been in operation, either throughout the sample as a whole, or disproportionately within the low-status groups. The internal-consistency reliabilities of all but one item score of both the A and the F scales were beyond the significance level.

It was concluded, in the light of these results, that Srole's A and F measures were adequately reliable for the

purposes made of them.

In addition, upon the finding of insignificant internal-consistency correlations in the case of the experimental reversed scales, it was necessary to conclude that their use in the measurement of anomie and authoritarianism is not yet warranted at this stage.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## References

1. Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950.
2. DeGrazia, Sebastian, The Political Community: A Study of Anomie. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948
3. Durkheim, Emile, De la division du travail social. Translated by George Simpson. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1933.
4. Durkheim, Emile, Le Suicide. Translated by Spaulding and Simpson. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951.
5. Guilford, J.P., Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.
6. Merton, Robert K., Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe: the Free Press, 1949.
7. Roberts, Alan H., "Anomie and authoritarianism: A study in validity." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Michigan State College, 1952.
8. Srole, Leo, "Social dysfunction, personality and social distance attitudes." Paper read before the American Sociological Society, 1951 National Meeting, Chicago.

MICHIGAN  
STATE  
COLLEGE

## APPENDIX

.....  
Case No.

.....  
Date

(Form AF)

.....  
Block No.

LANSING OPINION SURVEY - (P)

DON'T ASK QUESTION ONE, BUT RECORD:

1. Is the respondent male or female?

Male \_\_\_\_\_

Female \_\_\_\_\_

## BEGIN HERE

INTERVIEWER: PUT YOUR NAME IN THE SPACE BELOW.

I am ..... from Michigan State College. We are making a survey of what the people of Lansing think and feel about a number of important social questions. We are not interested in names; there's nothing personal in this research. Your opinion is important for us to understand how people are thinking nowadays.

AFTER GETTING SETTLED FOR THE INTERVIEW, SAY:

We will try to cover many points of view with these questions. You may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others. Whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many other people feel the same way you do.

You remember that I said that we are not interested in your name, but for statistical purposes we'd like to have a little information about yourself. For example:

2. What is your date of birth? .....

3. What is your marital status? Married .....

Single .....

Other .....

Do you remember the name of the last school you went to?  
DO NOT RECORD ANSWER.

4. What was the last year you completed in school? CIRCLE ONE.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

5. What church were you brought up in? (IF "PROTESTANT", What denomination?)  
.....

I will read you each of the statements and you tell me whether you agree, disagree, or can't decide.

..... 6. There's little use writing to public officials because often they aren't

- ..... 7. There are two kinds of people in the world: the weak and the strong.
- ..... 8. Zootsuitsers prove that when people of their type have too much money and freedom, they just take advantage and cause trouble.
- ..... 9. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.
- .....10. Negroes have their rights, but it is best to keep them in their own districts and schools and to prevent too much contact with whites.
- .....11. The worst danger to real Americanism during the last 50 years has come from foreign ideas and agitators.
- .....12. The most important thing to teach children is absolute obedience to their parents.
- .....13. One trouble with Jewish businessmen is that they stick together and prevent other people from having a fair chance in competition.
- .....14. It would be a mistake ever to have Negroes for foremen and leaders over whites.
- .....15. In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better.
- .....16. Prison is too good for sex criminals. They should be publicly whipped or worse.
- .....17. Any good leader should be strict with people under him in order to gain their respect.
- .....18. I can hardly imagine myself marrying a Jew.
- .....19. If Negroes live poorly, it's mainly because they are naturally lazy, ignorant and without self control.
- .....20. These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on.
- .....21. No decent man can respect a woman who has had sex relations before marriage.
- .....22. There may be exceptions, but in general, Jews are pretty much alike.
- .....23. It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.
- .....24. The trouble with letting Jews into a nice neighborhood is that they gradually give it a typical Jewish atmosphere.
- .....25. Even though the United States is a member of the United Nations, the United States must be sure that she loses none of her independence and complete powers in matters that affect this country.
- .....26. Some days a person feels pretty good; other days he feels pretty bad about things in general. Would you say that you're feeling better than usual, the same as usual or worse than usual today?

Better.....

Same .....



## HAND RESPONDENT INCOME CARD.

27. Would you tell me which letter on this card best represents your yearly income?

- |                   |                    |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| A. Less than 1000 | G. 6000-6999       |
| B. 1000-1999      | H. 7000-7999       |
| C. 2000-2999      | I. 8000-8999       |
| D. 3000-3999      | J. 9000-9999       |
| E. 4000-4999      | K. 10,000 and over |
| F. 5000-5999      |                    |

DON'T ASK QUESTION 28, BUT RECORD:

28. Race?

White.....

Negro.....

Other.....



ROOM USE ONLY

Feb 27 '57

ROOM USE ONLY

May 17 '57

May 25 '54

May 6 '57

~~FEB 24 1961~~

~~APR 17 1961~~

~~DEC 11 1957~~

~~NOV 5 '57~~

~~MAY 23 '57~~







MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03145 5607