
RESEARCH REPORT

Authoritarianism, Religious Fundamentalism, Quest, and Prejudice

Bob Altemeyer

University of Manitoba

Bruce Hunsberger

Wilfrid Laurier University

Five studies of university students and their parents were carried out to investigate the relationships among right-wing authoritarianism, various indices of religious orientation, and prejudice. Measures of religious fundamentalism, and religious quest, developed for this research, proved to be psychometrically sound, and were good discriminators between prejudiced and unprejudiced persons, across a variety of different measures of prejudice and authoritarian aggression. Scores on both Religious Fundamentalism and Religious Quest scales also were correlated strongly with right-wing authoritarianism and the Christian Orthodoxy scale, although orthodoxy itself tended not to be correlated with prejudice. Apparently, religious fundamentalism and nonquesting are linked with authoritarianism and prejudice toward a wide variety of minority groups. Possible explanations for these relationships are discussed.

Are religious persons usually good persons? That surely depends on what one means by "religious" and "good." Two lines of evidence, both focusing on prejudice, seemingly lead to opposite answers. The first found that religious persons were more prejudiced than most. In fact, so many individual

Requests for reprints should be sent to Bruce Hunsberger, Department of Psychology, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3C5, Canada.

findings have confirmed a positive relationship between religion and prejudice that Wulff (1991) recently concluded:

Using a variety of measures of piety—religious affiliation, church attendance, doctrinal orthodoxy, rated importance of religion, and so on—researchers have consistently found positive correlations with ethnocentrism, authoritarianism, dogmatism, social distance, rigidity, intolerance of ambiguity, and specific forms of prejudice, especially against Jews and blacks. (pp. 219–220)

However, when religion is defined in specific ways, another line of evidence leads to the conclusion that more religious persons are less prejudiced. Such reports are also quite common, ranging from Allport and Ross's (1967) classic finding that persons with a strong intrinsic religious orientation tended to be relatively unprejudiced, and cross-cultural replications of this effect (e.g., Eisinga, Felling, & Peters, 1990; Ponton & Gorsuch, 1988), to reports that persons with a quest orientation to religion tend to be unprejudiced (Batson, Flink, Schoenrade, Fultz, & Pych, 1986; Batson, Schoenrade, & Pych, 1985; Batson & Ventis, 1982).

These confusing results appear to confirm Allport's (1954) conclusion that "The role of religion is paradoxical. It makes prejudice and it unmakes prejudice" (p. 444). But the reader probably knows the "contradiction" actually has resulted from more sophisticated understandings of what it means to be "religious," as we shall see later. This article hopes to advance us another square in that direction.

RIGHT-WING AUTHORITARIANISM AND RELIGIOSITY

Our quest began with the discovery (Altemeyer, 1981, 1988) that right-wing authoritarians tend to act religiously in many ways, and that such authoritarians also tend to do many deplorable things. Let us review the evidence for these two statements before asking the obvious question that follows.

Right-wing authoritarianism apparently can be defined usefully as the covariation of authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism (Altemeyer, 1981). This syndrome is measured by a Likert-type survey, inventively named the "RWA Scale" (Appendix A), which is presented to respondents as an opinion poll on a variety of social issues.

North American studies consistently have found that authoritarians tend to carry the teachings of their childhood religion into adulthood, and tend to go to church more often, pray, and read scripture more often than most others. They also report having experienced very little doubt about their religion throughout their lives. The correlations between these variables and RWA Scale scores have tended to land in the .40s and .50s and have been interpreted as examples of submission to the family and religious authorities of their lives (Altemeyer, 1988, chap. 6).

At the same time, certain types of religious training appear to promote right-wing authoritarianism in the individual. High RWAs report (at about the same level of correlation) that their religious training taught them to submit to authority more, led them to be more hostile toward "outsiders" and "sinners," and imposed stricter rules about "proper behavior," than do less authoritarian persons. Indeed, people raised in *no* religion are apt to be the least authoritarian respondents in a sample. So authoritarianism and certain types of religiosity appear to promote and sustain one another (Altemeyer, 1988).

As for our second proposition, concerning authoritarianism and deplorable behavior, persons who scored highly on the RWA Scale in North America tended to be quite accepting of unjust and illegal acts committed by government officials. For example, high RWAs (the upper quartile of the sample distribution) tended to support Richard Nixon to the very end of "Watergate," and beyond. In other studies, high RWAs were also amazingly susceptible to arguments that democracy gives people "too much freedom," and so were more likely to agree that the Bill of Rights ought to be repealed. Similarly, if you ask people whether they would be willing to help locate and arrest homosexuals, or Communists, or members of "religious cults," and then have them tortured and even executed, most subjects say "absolutely not." But high RWAs answer much more equivocally. These relationships, and those described later, also tended to roam in the .40s and .50s (Altemeyer, 1988).

Right-wing authoritarians tend to be highly punitive themselves. They believe in using "good old-fashioned physical punishment" in child rearing. If you ask them to recommend jail sentences for people convicted of a wide range of crimes, high RWAs tend to impose longer terms than others do. And in an experiment in which students had a chance (supposedly) to administer electric shocks to a peer trying to memorize some nonsense syllables, high RWAs administered significantly stronger shocks than did other "teachers" (Altemeyer, 1981).

Authoritarians are also relatively prejudiced. In South Africa, White high RWAs champion apartheid (Duckitt, 1990). Russian high RWAs are hostile toward the many ethnic groups in the former Soviet Union (and also oppose democratization; McFarland, 1990). In North America, research has shown that high RWAs dislike Blacks, Hispanics, homosexuals, feminists, aboriginals, East Indians, Japanese, Chinese, Pakistanis, Filipinos, Africans, Jews, *and* Arabs. One could say that right-wing authoritarians are equal-opportunity bigots, disliking all "different" people regardless of race, creed, or color. The other half of ethnocentrism, high regard for the "in-group," is also readily detectable among right-wing authoritarians. Their prejudices tend to run alongside a streak of White supremacy akin to the Nazis' Aryan Superman myth (Altemeyer, 1988).

Research also has shown that right-wing authoritarians tend to use a lot

of double standards in their thinking. They object much more to a leftist government abusing its power, than to a right-wing government doing the same thing. They would punish a gay who committed a crime significantly more than they would punish an antigay who did the same thing (Altemeyer, 1988). And in the United States, they think it much worse for the former Soviet Union to invade its neighbors than for America to do so. Russian high RWAs feel just the opposite (Altemeyer, 1990).

If you add in that authoritarians appear to have little self-understanding (e.g., they think of themselves as "rugged individualists," but are sometimes more likely to be swayed by normative pressure; Altemeyer, 1988), tend to be highly self-righteous (when experiments show they are just as likely to lie and cheat as others), and tend to be mean-spirited (Altemeyer, 1988), it does not add up to a pretty picture. But then again, right-wing authoritarians have marched some distance down the road to fascism, and Nazis are not very admirable.

RELIGIOSITY AND PREJUDICE

Hence, to the "obvious question." If authoritarian persons tend to be "religious," and if they also tend to be prejudiced, antidemocratic, mean-spirited, and so on, does it follow that religious persons are on the road to fascism?

Actually, it does not necessarily follow, logically, nor has this connection been consistently demonstrated empirically. For example, in a study of 533 University of Manitoba students tested in the fall of 1987 by Altemeyer, the RWA Scale correlated .48 with a measure of acceptance of Christian beliefs, the Christian Orthodoxy (CO) Scale (Fullerton & Hunsberger, 1982). It also correlated .41 with a measure of prejudice against most of the minorities mentioned a few paragraphs ago. But CO scores correlated precisely .00 with prejudice. The "Christian Orthodox authoritarians" did *not* tend to be the "prejudiced authoritarians." Why not?

There seems to be general agreement among "psychology of religion" experts that there are different ways of being religious, and only one of these will be tapped by a measure such as the CO Scale, which focuses on the content of the religious beliefs. Allport and Ross (1967) proposed a distinction between an intrinsic religious orientation (wherein religion serves as the master motive of one's life) and an extrinsic religious orientation (wherein religion serves as a means to other ends). They found that people with an intrinsic religious orientation were less prejudiced than those with an extrinsic orientation, who in turn were less prejudiced than those with an "indiscriminately proreligious" orientation. The finding that extrinsically religious people, who reportedly constitute the majority of churchgoers (Spilka, Hood, & Gorsuch, 1985) are relatively prejudiced, compared to intrinsically religious persons, has been replicated so often that Spilka et al.

were led to conclude that "the problem of religion and prejudice seems to be essentially solved" (p. 273). Possibly because this finding is so well accepted in the literature, there has been relatively little research on religion and prejudice since Gorsuch and Aleshire's (1974) review of the topic (Spilka et al., 1985).

However, Batson (e.g., Batson & Ventis, 1982) has proposed that a very different religious orientation, searching for answers to existential questions, which he calls "quest," actually is associated with greater tolerance and sensitivity to the needs of others. He also concluded that the negative relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and prejudice, reported by Allport and Ross (1967) among others, is actually an illusion generated by the inclination of intrinsic persons to *appear* to be more prosocial (Batson et al., 1985). Studies by Batson and his colleagues have added empirical support to these contentions (see, e.g., Batson et al., 1985, 1986; Batson & Ventis, 1982).

In the end, the conceptualization and operationalization of both Allport and Ross's (1967) intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations, and Batson's (Batson & Ventis, 1982) concept of quest have been the subject of much debate and criticism (e.g., Donahue, 1985; Gorsuch, 1984; Kirkpatrick & Hood, 1990; Wulff, 1991). Kirkpatrick and Hood (1990) even went so far as to suggest entirely abandoning the Intrinsic and Extrinsic scales because of the problems associated with them.

Recently, the concept of religious fundamentalism has shown some promise in explaining Allport's (1954) observation that religion seems to both make and unmake prejudice. McFarland (1989) found that his six-item measure of fundamentalism was positively correlated with self-report measures of discrimination toward Blacks, women, Communists, and homosexuals. He speculated, as Glock and Stark (1966) and others had earlier, that "fundamentalism cloaks a general closed-minded, ethnocentric mindset, which is shown here as a general tendency to discriminate" (p. 333). This is consistent with Kirkpatrick and Hunsberger's (1990) finding that McFarland's (1989) six-item measure of fundamentalism was a stronger predictor of discrimination than was the CO Scale.

Kirkpatrick, Hood, and Hartz (1991) drew a similar distinction between religious belief orthodoxy and fundamentalism. Based on Rokeach's (1960) theory of open and closed belief systems, Kirkpatrick et al. distinguished between the specific content of a Christian belief system (orthodoxy) and the structure of that belief system (fundamentalism). They suggested that fundamentalism refers to a centralized belief system, whose "meta-beliefs" may define the way in which orthodox beliefs are organized within that belief system.

It is possible that matters would be clear 25 years after Allport and Ross (1967) if constructs had been defined and measured with greater precision. The latter is particularly vexing. Both the Intrinsic and Extrinsic scales have

psychometric problems in addition to conceptual difficulties (Altemeyer, 1988; Hoge, 1972; Kirkpatrick & Hood, 1990). The original Quest Scale (Batson & Ventis, 1982) was only six items long, with all items worded in the pro-trait (questing) direction, making the test vulnerable to response sets.¹ McFarland (1989) added two con-trait (and two pro-trait) items in his revision of the Quest Scale, which still left the test seriously unbalanced. The six items on his Fundamentalism Scale are all worded in the fundamentalist direction.

FUNDAMENTALISM, AUTHORITARIANISM, AND PREJUDICE

As we considered our own and others' findings, we hypothesized that religious fundamentalism would be more highly connected with authoritarianism, and related behaviors such as prejudice, than either the Quest Scale or a measure of doctrinal beliefs such as the CO Scale. By "fundamentalism" we mean the belief that there is one set of religious teachings that clearly contains the fundamental, basic, intrinsic, essential, inerrant truth about humanity and deity; that this essential truth is fundamentally opposed by forces of evil which must be vigorously fought; that this truth must be followed today according to the fundamental, unchangeable practices of the past; and that those who believe and follow these fundamental teachings have a special relationship with the deity.

We would point out that this conceptualization differs from others that focus on specific *Christian* aspects of fundamentalism, such as the "born again" experience, the Bible, and the expected return of Jesus (e.g., Burton, Johnson, & Tamney, 1989; McFarland 1989; Tamney & Johnson, 1988; Wilcox, 1989). We were trying to paint on a larger canvas, capturing an attitude toward one's beliefs that might be found in many religions.

We invented a set of 28 opinion statements, half pro-trait, half con-trait, to measure our conceptualization, consciously trying to use wordings that would apply beyond Christianity. Nearly all of the 20 items that eventually made our Religious Fundamentalism (RF) Scale (Appendix B) were among these initial 28.

FALL 1990 STUDIES

The 28 items were administered to three samples in the autumn of 1990: 325 introductory psychology students at Wilfred Laurier University, 138 other

¹Response sets such as "yea-saying" will artificially inflate the correlations among items on a test and artificially inflate correlations between scores on an unbalanced scale with other unbalanced measures (Altemeyer, 1981; Hyman & Sheatsley, 1954).

students from the same source, and 235 parents of introductory psychology students at the University of Manitoba. Nearly all of these participants had been raised in Christian faiths. In each case we selected items for a 20-statement mock RF Scale according to item-whole correlations, with the restrictions that the resultant measure would be balanced against response sets, and not be overly repetitive. With only minor exceptions, the same items stood out in all three studies. Their mean interitem correlation varied from .41 to .48, with resulting Cronbach alphas of .93 to .95.

Correlations With Other Measures

All three studies collected responses to other measures as well, including the RWA Scale (whose average interitem correlations of .19 to .24 yielded alphas of .87 to .90). Authoritarianism-Fundamentalism scores correlated .66 to .75.

Christian orthodoxy, measured with the full 24-item CO Scale among the Manitoba parents and with an abbreviated six-item version (Hunsberger, 1989) among the student sample had interitem correlations of .61 to .67 and alphas varying from .90 to .98. In all three samples, these scores correlated significantly lower with the RWA Scale (.43 to .60) than the RF scores did. This confirmed our hunch that fundamentalism tapped the "religious aspect" of authoritarianism better than doctrinal beliefs per se did. (RF-CO correlations varied from .60 to .75)

All three studies also included McFarland's (1989) 10-item version of Batson's Quest Scale. Even with the "gluing effects" of response sets, it tended to suffer from weak interitem correlations (averaging .12 to .19) and hence low alphas (.56 to .70). These Quest scores correlated from -.26 to -.41 with Fundamentalism, -.27 to -.41 with RWA, and -.11 to -.16 with Christian Orthodoxy.

Finally, the second student study and the parent study also included a balanced 20-item Prejudice Scale very similar to that shown in Appendix C. Its mean interitem correlations varied from .27 to .31, with alphas from .88 to .90. As expected, these Prejudice scores correlated significantly (.40 and .56) with RWA, not at all (-.03 and .15) with CO, .08 and .25 with RF (a mixed message), and -.11 and -.23 with Quest. In all cases the lower correlation was obtained with the (smaller) student sample.

We were surprised that, despite its poor psychometric properties, the Quest Scale had correlated as well with Prejudice as the more reliable RF Scale. Perhaps it was quest, not fundamentalism, we should be pursuing after all. So we decided to continue McFarland's improvement of that scale.

JANUARY 1991 STUDENT STUDY

The immediate need was to develop enough "antiquiest" items to protect the measure from the heavy, destructive influence of accumulating response

sets. This was undertaken during a study of 238 University of Manitoba students being surveyed for other purposes. In the middle of their booklet, they responded to the 10 items from McFarland's scale and to the 12 new items (9 of them con-traits). This pool of 22 statements produced a balanced 12-item mock Quest Scale with intercorrelations averaging .19 (compared to .13 for just the original 10 items) and an alpha of, accordingly, .78 (vs. .58). This balanced scale (consisting of 4 "original" and 8 new statements) correlated an encouraging $-.66$ with RWA Scale scores, compared with $-.19$ for the unbalanced original 10 items.

FEBRUARY 1991 PARENT STUDY

Our search for the "good Christians" reached something of a conclusion (or at least a pause) with a study of Manitoba parents, which we describe in some detail.

Participants

Respondents were recruited through a procedure described in Altemeyer (1988, pp. 20-24). In brief, students in two introductory psychology classes were asked to address survey mailing envelopes to their parents, with the understanding that each completed survey would earn them 1% of their final grade in introductory psychology. Somehow this proposal to have their parents work for them appealed to 339 of the nearly 400 students present.

Altogether 617 booklets were sent out, with an explanatory letter (Altemeyer, 1981, p. 308) and an optical scan ("bubble") response sheet, of which 491 (80%) were completed. The 247 mothers and 244 fathers who answered the booklet ranged in age from 36 to 77 years (average age = 47.3 years). Their formal educations extended from a couple who had both gone to school for only 4 years to someone who did so for 26 years ($M = 13.2$ years). As such, this group was a little younger and a little more educated than samples of students' parents drawn in previous years, which has proved the trend over time. As usual, most of the parents answered every question they were asked.

Eighty-one of the respondents said they did not believe in any religion. About a third were Catholics ($n = 158$), and nearly all the rest were Protestants, of whom the United Church (a Canadian amalgamation of Congregationalists, Methodists, and Presbyterians) supplied the most (74). Six of the parents were Jews.

Parents of university students, of course, do not represent the population at large. They tend to be better educated and wealthier (before tuition payments, at least) and more urban than average, and probably less authoritar-

ian, prejudiced, and religious as well (Altemeyer, 1988). They are, however, a different and more weathered sample than the usual collection of 19-year-olds and, as we grow older, inherently more interesting.

Procedure

The survey booklet began with the RWA Scale shown in Appendix A, and the RF Scale produced in Appendix B. A revised pool of 24 Quest items followed, containing once again McFarland's (1989) 10-item version, the 8 new items from the January student study, and 6 new candidates (4 of them pro-quest). This pool of statements yielded the 16-item Revised Quest Scale shown in appendix D.

Respondents next encountered four measures used in previous studies of authoritarian aggression (Altemeyer, 1988, chap. 5):

1. A 12-item balanced Attitudes Toward Homosexuals scale (Appendix E), nearly identical to that used by Altemeyer (1988, p. 167). This measure assesses condemning, vindictive, and punitive sentiments toward gays. Probably its most chilling statement is "In many ways, the AIDS disease currently killing homosexuals is just what they deserve."

2. The 20-item Prejudice Scale shown in Appendix C.

3. A "Posse-Radicals" survey (Altemeyer, 1988, pp. 114-119). In brief, the participants were asked how they would react if the government someday outlawed "radical" and "extremist" political movements. Would they publicly endorse such a law, tell police about any radicals they knew, help hunt down and attack members of the outlawed organizations, and support torturing and executing them.

4. A "Trials" measure, in which the respondent "passes" sentence in three cases involving a dope pusher, a pornographer, and someone who spit on a provincial premier.

The booklet closed by asking the respondent's gender, age, educational attainment, home religion, present religion, and the frequency of (a) attending church, and (b) reading scripture outside of church.

Results

Table 1 presents the psychometric properties of the various scales used in this study. The means for the RWA, Prejudice, and Attitudes Toward Homosexuals measures are lower than previous results with parents, largely because new items on these tests are evoking gentler responses than the ones they replaced. Both of the new tests developed for this study, the RF Scale and the 16-item balanced Quest Scale, had good levels of interitem correla-

TABLE 1
Psychometric Properties of Scales: 1991 Parent Study

Scale	Psychometric Property				
	Number of Items	M	SD	Mean Intercorrelation	Cronbach's Alpha
RWA	30	156.4	37.4	.24	.91
RF	20	84.6	33.0	.37	.92
Quest (balanced)	16	79.6	22.0	.31	.88
Quest (unbalanced)	10	50.1	10.4	.15	.63
Prejudice	20	84.2	24.9	.28	.88
Attitudes Toward					
Homosexuals	12	56.3	20.2	.39	.89
Posse	6	20.5	11.2	.58	.89

Note. Quest (balanced) = 16-item Quest Scale (Appendix D). Quest (unbalanced) = McFarland's (1989) 10-item Quest Scale. Posse = Altemeyer's (1988) "Posse-Radicals" survey.

tion. The alpha reliabilities of the scales varied from .88 to .92, indicating our various instruments gave us a signal-to-noise ratio of about 9 to 1—which ought to help us see things clearly.

Table 2 presents the intercorrelations among the RWA and religion measures, as well as their relations with our various prejudice scales and the summed scores on the three Trials. The relations with level of education, and the values for the earlier 10-item Quest Scale (McFarland, 1989), also are included.

TABLE 2
Intercorrelations of RWA, RF, and Quest Scales, and Their Relationship to Prejudice Measures

Measure	Measure							
	RF	Quest (Balanced)	Quest (Unbalanced)	Prejudice	Attitudes Toward Homosexuals	Posse	Trials	Education
RWA	.68	-.67	-.41	.53	.64	.51	.33	-.28
RF		-.79	-.36	.30	.41	.34	.23	-.20
Quest (balanced)			.53	-.26	-.39	-.34	-.27	.25
Quest (unbalanced)				-.28	-.31	-.24	-.18	.19
Prejudice					.58	.44	.17	-.23
Attitudes Toward								
Homosexuals						.42	.23	-.21
Posse							.22	-.22
Trials								-.17

Note. All correlations are significant at the .01 level. Quest (balanced) = 16-item Quest Scale (Appendix D). Quest (unbalanced) = McFarland's (1989) 10-item Quest Scale. Posse = Altemeyer's (1988) "Posse-Radicals" survey. Trials = sum of three "sentences" passed by respondents; Education = self-reported level of education.

One can see immediately that Right-Wing Authoritarianism was substantially correlated with both of the religiosity measures, and with most of the prejudice measures (the exception being the Trials score). All of these correlations are highly significant, and (as in earlier studies) partialing out the effects of educational differences among the parents has little impact. (For example, taking the first figure in Table 2, the correlation between RWA and RF scores drops only from .68 to .66 when we control for their [weak] mutual relationships with education.)

Second, we see in Table 2 that the RF and Quest scales are highly (negatively) related measures. Moreover, they both correlate significantly with all of the authoritarian aggression measures, at a lower level naturally than the RWA Scale does, but equally so between them. Fundamentalists/"nonquesters" were more likely to be prejudiced, more likely to be hostile toward homosexuals, more likely to "join a posse" to hunt down radicals, and more likely to impose stiff sentences in the Trial cases presented. Again, education is too weakly correlated with these measures to be an important factor.

Finally, self-reports of attending church correlated .43 with Right-Wing Authoritarianism, .65 with Fundamentalism, and $-.56$ with Quest. Frequency of scripture readings outside church correlated lower, .28, .51, and $-.36$, respectively.

Item analyses. The rather solid associations among our scales were anchored in a thorough mesh of intercorrelation on the item level. Summed scores on the RWA Scale were significantly related (usually beyond the .001 level) with *each* of the 74 items comprising the other five tests used in this study. Summed scores on the RF Scale in turn were significantly correlated with all the items on the RWA Scale and to those on every other measure used, except for three Prejudice items (5, 9, and 20). Summed scores on the Quest Scale were significantly correlated with every item on the RWA and RF scales and with all the items on the measures of authoritarian aggression, except Items 5, 9, and 13 on the Prejudice Scale.

What does this show? For one thing, fundamentalists/nonquesters were not more authoritarian simply because of predictable differences on the conventionalism items of the RWA Scale. They were also more submissive and more aggressive. And they were not more aggressive against just a few groups, but against nearly all the minorities mentioned in the Prejudice Scale. And they were more willing than nonfundamentalists/questioners to support the arrest, torture, and execution of "radicals." And they not only wanted to isolate and restrict gays' opportunities in life, they also felt more that "the AIDS disease currently killing homosexuals is just what they deserve."

These item correlations were usually small (typically in the .20s and

.30s), as single-item correlations frequently are. But they were very widespread.

Factor analysis. A "classical factor analysis" (Harman, 1967) of these internally consistent scales produced just one dominant factor on which all the items have loadings of at least .40, or else the two well-correlated direction-of-wording factors often found on such tests (Altemeyer, 1981, chaps. 2 and 4). Furthermore, all of the 20 items on the RF Scale correlate better with the sum of the other 19 items on their test than they do with the sum of the 16 Quest items. Similarly, all but 2 of the Quest items (2 and 13) correlate better with the sum of the other 15 items on their test than they do with the RF lot. So, although these two scales are measuring highly related constructs, they are each consistently digging away more at their own particular aspect of religiosity than at the other.

Denominational differences. Table 3 breaks down the various measures according to the subjects' present religious affiliation. As has been found regularly before, persons with no affiliation, and Jews, scored lowest on the RWA Scale, whereas Mennonites and "Fundamentalists" (mainly Baptists, but also Jehovah's Witnesses, Salvation Army, Evangelical, and Pentecostal) scored highest. The same is true for RF Scale scores. And when it comes to questing, "no religions" and Jews scored highest, whereas Mennonites and Fundamentalists scored the lowest. The *F* and eta-square values at the bottom of Table 3 reveal that these religious orientations differed most sharply on the Fundamentalism Scale.

By way of contrast, none of the measures of authoritarian aggression differentiates among these religions nearly as well as it does among individuals. It is true, participants with no religion and Jews almost always scored lowest in prejudice, and so forth. Fundamentalists were the most hostile toward homosexuals and the most punitive in the Trials measure; and Mennonites were *relatively* prejudiced and hostile toward homosexuals. But Mennonites also scored quite low on the Posse measure, and, in general, sectarian differences in aggression scores are low and often nonsignificant. The average of scores obtained by members of the same denomination, of course, might be masking appreciable differences within that denomination (e.g., one kind of Mennonite vs. another).

Discussion

We began this article with the question, "Are religious persons usually good persons?" The answer in this study at least appears to be "no," if one means by "religious" a fundamentalist, nonquesting religious orientation, and by "good" the kind of nonprejudiced, compassionate, accepting attitudes espoused in the Gospels and other writings. But the answer is "yes" if

TABLE 3
Scale Scores by Present Religion

Present Religion ^a	Measure													
	RWA		RF		Quest (Balanced)		Prejudice		Attitudes Toward Homosexuals		Posse		Trials	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
None (N = 81)	127.5	37.9	54.2	21.1	100.7	15.1	76.8	28.1	49.1	20.8	16.2	10.2	28.0	15.9
Jewish (N = 6)	123.8	20.0	70.3	23.1	90.3	9.5	66.5	14.1	36.5	11.5	14.2	8.9	30.0	18.5
Catholic (N = 158)	163.2	31.9	92.1	25.6	71.0	19.2	87.4	23.6	57.6	19.0	23.3	12.0	35.4	17.8
Anglican (N = 29)	151.0	31.0	73.0	22.8	84.1	18.8	83.4	22.9	50.9	15.8	18.4	10.7	35.8	17.2
"Fundamentalist" (N = 20)	181.0	30.0	130.6	22.0	63.2	17.9	85.2	27.4	68.9	16.7	20.2	11.0	40.6	15.5
Lutheran (N = 23)	165.1	38.5	89.1	23.7	78.8	13.7	88.4	24.6	62.8	24.5	20.3	11.1	37.7	16.6
Mennonite (N = 36)	186.0	41.3	121.7	34.6	63.6	23.3	88.4	28.8	66.8	20.3	16.3	10.0	36.2	17.2
United Church (N = 74)	148.4	27.2	69.8	19.6	87.0	17.2	83.6	24.3	52.4	18.1	20.1	10.0	29.2	16.1
"Christian" (N = 34)	160.8	41.3	89.1	40.6	79.4	23.0	84.7	20.5	56.6	21.9	22.2	10.1	37.6	17.7
F	13.7		33.4		22.4		1.7		6.3		4.6		2.6	
p	<.001		<.001		<.001		<.10		<.001		<.001		<.01	
n ²	.21		.39		.30		.03		.11		.08		.05	

^aFigures based on the responses of 491 Manitoba parents from the February 1991 study; 18 parents were members of "other" faiths such as Greek Orthodox, Hinduism, Islam; 12 others did not answer the question.

one means by "religious" the nonfundamentalist, questing orientation found most often in persons belonging to no religion. Which irony gives one pause.

We should not overgeneralize the findings, on either the individual or group level. Many persons in our sample who scored high on the RF Scale and low on the Quest Scale showed nonprejudiced, accepting attitudes, whereas some nonfundamentalist questers were quite bigoted. These individuals were atypical in the overall scheme of things, "off-quadrant" cases, but they do exist.

As for groups, Table 3's scarcity of denominational differences in authoritarian aggression makes clear that these unfortunate attitudes are not found exclusively in "fundamentalist" religions. Rather, just as authoritarian "true believers" have been found consistently in all the religions tested (Altemeyer, 1981, p. 241, Note 21 on p. 325), there are fundamentalist, nonquesting, prejudiced Anglicans, Lutherans, Catholics, and so on, as well as Mennonites and Baptists.

What is the difference between being a "fundamentalist" and being a "nonquester?" *Conceptually*, very little. We would hardly expect that people who are sure God gave us a set of flawless religious teachings long ago also will believe that we should be searching far and wide for religious truth. *Empirically*, our two measures are highly and negatively correlated, as one would predict. In fact, not one of the 491 participants scored in the upper quartile of the RF Scale distribution and also in the upper quartile of the Quest Scale. Nor were there any low-lows.

So how do the tests differ? The Fundamentalism Scale deals with a wider range of religious topics than just the search for truth; that is probably why it correlates better with religious variables such as church attendance and denominational identity. It accordingly may be more useful in some kinds of studies, whereas the Quest Scale would be the choice in others.

It has been suggested in the past that questing, with its emphasis on religious doubt and identity, is appropriate only for college students and people still maturing in religious sentiment (Donahue, 1985; Wulff, 1991). This characterization is not supported here. Rather, the means of the responses to our Quest items (Appendix D) seem to challenge Allport's (1950) suggestion that doubt was simply a temporary phase as the individual moved toward true religious maturity (intrinsic faith). Large numbers of people apparently still are questing into their 40s and 50s. And of course, these tend to be the most tolerant, accepting, nonprejudiced participants—which Allport took as a sign of religious maturity.

Finally, the items on the RF and Quest scales fill in some more of the picture that previous research has sketched of how right-wing authoritarians view their religion and their God. Besides the certainty that their religion is "a complete, unfailing guide to happiness and salvation which must

be totally followed,"² authoritarians' religion also plays its role in their ethnocentrism, self-righteousness, and fear. "There are only two kinds of people in the world: the Righteous . . . and the rest." "To lead the best, most meaningful life, one must belong to the one, true religion." It is even more important "to believe in God and the right religion" than to be a good person. These "Good people" have "a special relationship with God" because they believe in him the most and do the best job following his laws. "God will punish most severely those who abandon his true religion" in this world filled with nonbelievers and Satanic temptation.

Connection to authoritarianism. These Fundamentalism beliefs easily could be linked (a) to the apparent psychological sources of authoritarian aggression—fear of a dangerous world and self-righteousness (Altemeyer, 1988, chap. 5) and (b) to the finding, now twice replicated, that authoritarians reduce guilt over their misdeeds almost completely through religion (Altemeyer, 1988, pp. 189–190)—which maintains the self-righteousness and thus recycles the aggression.

The Quest Scale adds closed-mindedness to the authoritarian's religiosity. Doubt itself is wrong; faith must conquer all. The problem of evil, and "clever arguments" against their beliefs, only make right-wing authoritarians "believe stronger than ever." Becoming too open-minded about religion easily can lead to "missing the truth." "We were *not* put on this earth to go searching for the truth, whatever it is, but instead to live our lives according to the revealed world of God." Those differing revelations in different religions were inherited by high RWAs from their parents almost as certainly as the color of their eyes.

It is easy to see why persons trained in such thinking would tend to accept, uncritically, the stereotypes about minorities that abound in our culture and would be relatively willing to do whatever the authorities said had to be done to such a minority.

And that is what these data seem to say.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. (1950). *The individual and his religion*. New York: Macmillan.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 432–443.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Altemeyer, B. (1990, July). *The mirror-image in U.S.–Soviet perceptions*. Paper presented at the 13th meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Washington, DC.

²Quotation marks delineate actual phrases from items in the RF and Quest scales.

- Batson, C. D., Flink, C. H., Schoenrade, P. A., Fultz, J., & Pych, V. (1986). Religious orientation and overt versus covert racial prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 175-181.
- Batson, C. D., Schoenrade, P. A., & Pych, V. (1985). Brotherly love or self-concern?: Behavioural consequences of religion. In L. B. Brown (Ed.), *Advances in the psychology of religion* (pp. 185-208). New York: Pergamon.
- Batson, C. D., & Ventis, W. L. (1982). *The religious experience: A social psychological perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Burton, R., Johnson, S., & Tamney, J. (1989). Education and fundamentalism. *Review of Religious Research*, 30, 344-359.
- Donahue, M. J. (1985). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: Review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 400-419.
- Duckitt, J. H. (1990). *A social psychological investigation of racial prejudice among White South Africans*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Eisinga, R., Felling, A., & Peters, J. (1990). Religious belief, church involvement, and ethnocentrism in The Netherlands. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 29, 54-75.
- Fullerton, J. T., & Hunsberger, B. (1982). A unidimensional measure of Christian orthodoxy. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 21, 317-326.
- Glock, C. Y., & Stark, R. (1966). *Christian beliefs and anti-Semitism*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Gorsuch, R. (1984). Measurement: The boon and bane of investigating religion. *American Psychologist*, 39, 228-236.
- Gorsuch, R., & Aleshire, D. (1974). Christian faith and ethnic prejudice: A review and interpretation of research. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 13, 281-307.
- Harman, H. H. (1967). *Modern factor analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hoge, D. R. (1972). A validated Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 11, 369-376.
- Hunsberger, B. E. (1989). A short version of the Christian Orthodoxy Scale. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 28, 360-365.
- Hyman, H. H., & Sheatsley, P. B. (1954). "The authoritarian personality": A methodological critique. In R. Christie & M. Jahoda (Eds.), *Studies in the scope and method of "the authoritarian personality"* (pp. 50-122). New York: Free Press.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Hood, R. W. (1990). Intrinsic-extrinsic religious orientation: The boon or bane of contemporary psychology of religion? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 29, 442-462.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A., Hood, R. W., & Hartz, G. (1991). Fundamentalist religion conceptualized in terms of Rokeach's theory of the open and closed mind: New perspectives on some old ideas. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 3, 157-179.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Hunsberger, B. E. (1990, November). *Fundamentalism, Christian Orthodoxy, and intrinsic religious orientation as predictors of discrimination/prejudice*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Virginia Beach, VA.
- McFarland, S. G. (1989). Religious orientations and the targets of discrimination. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 28, 324-336.
- McFarland, S. G. (1990, July). *Comparisons of authoritarianism in the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A.* Paper presented at the 13th meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Washington, DC.
- Ponton, M. O., & Gorsuch, R. L. (1988). Prejudice and religion revisited: A cross-cultural investigation with a Venezuelan sample. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 27, 260-271.
- Rokeach, M. (1960). *The open and closed mind*. New York: Basic.

- Spilka, B., Hood, R. W., & Gorsuch, R. L. (1985). *The psychology of religion: An empirical approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Tamney, J. B., & Johnson, S. D. (1988). Fundamentalism and self-actualization. *Review of Religious Research, 30*, 276-286.
- Wilcox, C. (1989). The fundamentalist voter: Politicized religious identity and political attitudes and behavior. *Review of Religious Research, 31*, 54-67.
- Wulff, D. (1991). *Psychology of religion: Classic and contemporary views*. New York: Wiley.

APPENDIX A:
"1990" RIGHT-WING AUTHORITARIANISM SCALE

-
1. Our country will be great if we honor the ways of our forefathers, do what the authorities tell us to do, and get rid of the "rotten apples" who are ruining everything. (4.39)
 2. It is wonderful that young people can protest anything they don't like, and act however they wish nowadays.^a (6.56)
 3. It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion, than to listen to the noisy rabble-rousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people's minds. (4.62)
 4. People should pay *less* attention to the Bible and the other old traditional forms of religious guidance, and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.^a (6.50)
 5. What our country *really* needs, instead of more "civil rights," is a good stiff dose of law and order. (5.48)
 6. Our country will be destroyed someday if we do not smash the perversions eating away at our moral fiber and traditional beliefs. (5.09)
 7. The sooner we get rid of the traditional family structure, where the father is the head of the family and the children are taught to obey authority automatically, the better. The old-fashioned way has a lot wrong with it.^a (6.82)
 8. There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual intercourse.^a (6.15)
 9. The facts on crime, sexual immorality, and the recent public disorders all show we have to crack down harder on deviant groups and troublemakers if we are going to save our moral standards and preserve law and order. (6.30)
 10. There is nothing immoral or sick in somebody's being a homosexual.^a (6.28)
 11. It is important to protect fully the rights of radicals and deviants.^a (6.00)
 12. Obedience is the most important virtue children should learn. (5.33)
 13. There is no "one right way" to live your life. Everybody has to create his *own* way.^a (3.72)
 14. Once our government leaders condemn the dangerous elements in our society, it will be the duty of every patriotic citizen to help stomp out the rot that is poisoning our country from within. (4.49)
 15. Government, judges and the police should never be allowed to censor books.^a (5.26)
 16. Some of the worst people in our country nowadays are those who do not respect our flag, our leaders, and the normal way things are supposed to be done. (5.12)
 17. In these troubled times laws have to be enforced without mercy, especially when dealing with the agitators and revolutionaries who are stirring things up. (4.58)
 18. Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.^a (4.35)
 19. Some young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they get older they ought to become more mature and forget such things. (5.57)
 20. There is nothing really wrong with a lot of the things some people call "sins."^a (5.11)
 21. Everyone should have his own life-style, religious beliefs, and sexual preferences, even if it makes him different from everyone else.^a (4.15)

Continued

APPENDIX A: (Continued)

-
22. The situation in our country is getting so serious, the strongest methods would be justified if they eliminated the troublemakers and got us back to our true path. (4.03)
 23. Authorities such as parents and our national leaders generally turn out to be right about things, and the radicals and protestors are almost always wrong. (4.43)
 24. A lot of our rules regarding modesty and sexual behavior are just customs which are not necessarily any better or holier than those which other people follow.^a (4.60)
 25. There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps.^a (4.87)
 26. The *real* keys to the "good life" are obedience, discipline, and sticking to the straight and narrow. (5.34)
 27. We should treat protestors and radicals with open arms and open minds, since new ideas are the lifeblood of progressive change.^a (5.39)
 28. What our country really needs is a strong, determined leader who will crush evil, and take us back to our truth path. (4.91)
 29. Students must be taught to challenge their parents' ways, confront the authorities, and criticize the traditions of our society.^a (7.00)
 30. One reason we have so many troublemakers in our society nowadays is that parents and other authorities have forgotten that good old-fashioned physical punishment is still one of the best ways to make people behave properly. (3.99)
-

Note. Item means from the February 1991 parent study are given in parentheses; the higher the number, the more authoritarian the response; "neutral" = 5.00.

^aCon-trait item, for which the - 4 to + 4 scoring key is reversed.

APPENDIX B:
RELIGIOUS FUNDAMENTALISM SCALE

1. God has given mankind a complete, unfailing guide to happiness and salvation, which must be totally followed. (5.44)
2. *All* of the religions in the world has flaws and wrong teachings.^a (4.52)
3. Of all the people on this earth, one group has a special relationship with God because it believes the most in his revealed truths and tries the hardest to follow his laws. (3.24)
4. The long-established traditions in religion show the best way to honour and serve God, and should never be compromised. (4.69)
5. Religion must admit all its past failings, and adapt to modern life if it is to benefit humanity.^a (4.36)
6. When you get right down to it, there are only two kinds of people in the world: the Righteous, who will be rewarded by God; and the rest, who will not. (3.62)
7. Different religions and philosophies have different versions of the truth, and may be equally right in their own way.^a (3.35)
8. The basic cause of evil in this world is Satan, who is still constantly and ferociously fighting against God. (5.24)
9. It is more important to be a good person than to believe in God and the right religion.^a (4.24)
10. No one religion is especially close to God, nor does God favor any particular group of believers.^a (3.32)
11. God will punish most severely those who abandon his true religion. (3.83)
12. No single book of religious writings contains all the important truths about life.^a (4.48)
13. It is silly to think people can be divided into "the Good" and "the Evil." Everyone does some good, and some bad things.^a (2.84)

Continued

APPENDIX B (*Continued*)

-
14. God's true followers must remember that he requires them to *constantly* fight Satan and Satan's allies on this earth. (5.48)
 15. Parents should encourage their children to study all religions without bias, then make up their own minds about what to believe.^a (4.31)
 16. There *is* a religion on this earth that teaches, without error, God's truth. (4.56)
 17. "Satan" is just the name people give to their own bad impulses. There really is *no such thing* as a diabolical "Prince of Darkness" who tempts us.^a (5.15)
 18. Whenever science and sacred scripture conflict, science must be wrong. (3.82)
 19. There is *no* body of teachings, or set of scriptures, which is completely without error.^a (4.19)
 20. To lead the best, most meaningful life, one must belong to the one, true religion. (3.95)
-

Note. Item means from the February 1991 parent study are given in parentheses; the higher the number, the more fundamentalist the response; "neutral" = 5.00.

^aCon-trait item, for which the -4 to +4 scoring key is reversed.

APPENDIX C:
"1990" MANITOBA PREJUDICE SCALE

1. There are entirely too many people from the wrong sorts of places being admitted into Canada now. (4.58)
2. In general, Indians have gotten *less* than they deserve from our social and anti-poverty programs.^a (5.41)
3. Canada should open its doors to more immigration from the West Indies.^a (5.90)
4. Certain races of people clearly do NOT have the natural intelligence and "get up and go" of the white race. (2.97)
5. The Vietnamese and other Asians who have recently moved to Canada have proven themselves to be industrious citizens, and many more should be invited in.^a (4.88)
6. It's good to live in a country where there are so many minority groups present, such as blacks, Asians, and aboriginals.^a (3.65)
7. Arabs are too emotional and hateful, and they don't fit in well in our country. (4.19)
8. As a group Indians and Metis are naturally lazy, promiscuous and irresponsible. (3.90)
9. Canada should open its doors to more immigration from Latin America.^a (5.21)
10. Black people as a rule are, by their nature, more violent than white people are. (2.71)
11. The people from India who have recently come to Canada have mainly brought disease, ignorance and crime with them. (2.96)
12. Jews can be trusted as much as everyone else.^a (2.85)
13. It is a waste of time to train certain races for good jobs; they simply don't have the drive and determination it takes to learn a complicated skill. (2.57)
14. The public needs to become aware of the many ways Blacks in Canada suffer prejudice.^a (3.86)
15. Every person we let into our country from overseas means either another Canadian won't be able to find a job, or another foreigner will go on welfare here. (4.15)
16. Canada has much to fear from the Japanese, who are as cruel as they are industrious. (2.93)
17. There is nothing wrong with intermarriage among the races.^a (3.82)
18. Indians should keep on protesting and demonstrating until they get just treatment in our country.^a (5.57)

Continued

APPENDIX C (Continued)

-
19. Many minorities are spoiled; if they really wanted to improve their lives, they would get jobs and get off welfare. (5.59)
 20. Canada should guarantee that French language rights exist all across the country.^a (6.51)
-

Note. Item means from the February 1991 parent study are given in parentheses; the higher the number, the more prejudiced the response; "neutral" = 5.00.

^aCon-trait item, for which the -4 to +4 scoring key is reversed.

APPENDIX D:
QUEST SCALE

1. It might be said that I value my religious doubts and uncertainties. (5.74)
 2. It is better for a person's religious beliefs to be firm and free of doubt.^a (4.52)
 3. You don't find the true religion by studying all the facts in the universe; you find it by praying to God for grace, humility and enlightenment.^a (4.42)
 4. Religious doubt allows us to learn. (6.31)
 5. When my religious beliefs are challenged by famine, disease, and other evils in the world, it only makes me believe in God's goodness more fervently than ever.^a (4.96)
 6. My religious beliefs may change in the future as I mature and learn. (4.67)
 7. Religion should just be an aspect of a more basic quest to discover the truth about everything, without prejudice and taking nothing on faith,. (4.62)
 8. My religious beliefs are far too important to me to be jeopardized by a lot of skepticism and critical examination.^a (4.87)
 9. The point of life is to search for the truth, with as open a mind as you can, NOT to memorize the "eternal truths" that have been handed down from generation to generation as matters of faith. (6.10)
 10. I am glad my religious beliefs are based upon faith; it would not mean as much to God, and to me, if these beliefs could be "scientifically proven" beyond a doubt.^a (4.31)
 11. We were NOT put on this earth to go "searching for the truth, whatever it is," but instead to live our lives according to the revealed word of God.^a (5.02)
 12. If an honest quest for the truth leads to the conclusion that there is *no* God, then that is what one must conclude. (3.99)
 13. The human mind is too limited to discover God and the Truth by itself; we simply have to accept the truths that have been revealed.^a (5.23)
 14. The real goal of religion ought to be to make us wonder, think, and search, NOT take the word of some earlier teachings. (5.38)
 15. When my religious beliefs are challenged by personal unhappiness, or by some clever argument, it just makes me believe stronger than ever.^a (4.60)
 16. My *goal* is to discover the truth, even if that means changing my religious beliefs. (4.85)
-

Note. Item means from the February 1991 parent study are given in parentheses; the higher the number, the more questing the response; "neutral" = 5.00.

^aCon-trait item, for which the -4 to +4 scoring key is reversed.

APPENDIX E:
ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMOSEXUALS SCALE

1. I won't associate with known homosexuals if I can help it. (5.15)
2. The sight of two men kissing does NOT particularly bother me.^a (7.10)

Continued

APPENDIX E (Continued)

-
3. If two homosexuals want to get married, the law should let them.^a (6.57)
 4. Homosexuals should be locked up to protect society. (2.81)
 5. Homosexuals should never be given positions of trust in caring for children. (5.01)
 6. I would join an organization even though I knew it had homosexuals in its membership.^a (4.42)
 7. In many ways, the AIDS disease currently killing homosexuals is just what they deserve. (3.40)
 8. Homosexuality is "an abomination in the sight of God." (5.24)
 9. Homosexuals have a perfect right to their lifestyle, if that's the way they want to live.^a (4.15)
 10. Homosexuals should be forced to take whatever treatments science can come up with to make them normal. (3.85)
 11. People should feel sympathetic and understanding of homosexuals, who are unfairly attacked in our society.^a (4.28)
 12. I wouldn't mind being seen smiling and chatting with a known homosexual.^a (4.28)
-

Note. Item means from the February 1991 parent study are given in parentheses; the higher the number, the more antihomosexual the response; "neutral" = 5.00.

^aCon-trait item, for which the -4 to +4 scoring key is reversed.

