

STRUCTURE OF SOCIAL ATTITUDES

H. J. EYSENCK

Institute of Psychiatry, University of London

Summary.—A quota sample of 1,442 subjects was administered a Wilson-Patterson type questionnaire of social attitudes containing 68 items. Correlations were calculated between items, and a factor analysis carried out. 13 meaningful primary factors were discovered, the correlations between which gave rise to 2 major higher-order factors. These were closely similar in content to the Radicalism and Toughmindedness factors previously isolated in research with more orthodox types of items.

There are many objects, ideologies, persons, groups and other entities toward which feelings of positive or negative valence may be formed. The social attitudes so generated are clearly not independent and the observed correlations between them constitute the raw material for an analysis of the structure of social attitudes. Eysenck (1954) has suggested that there are two major factors or dimensions in this field, radicalism-conservatism (R) and toughmindedness-tendermindedness (T). These factors emerged from research in which subjects were asked to fill in answers to detailed and explicit statements regarding some particular attitudes. Wilson (1973) has recently shown that similar factors emerge when subjects are simply offered single nouns toward which they can express agreement or disagreement; in this fashion, Wilson suggests that we can escape from semantic problems associated with the usual manner of framing questions. There is evidence to suggest that these factors are strongly determined by heredity and that they are related to personality variables (Eaves & Eysenck, 1974).

Others whose work has supported the two-factor hypothesis are Rokeach (1973) and Kerlinger (1970, 1972). All of these authors have used samples which were far from representative and the question arises whether similar factors could be found in a quota sample of the population. It also seemed of interest to discover to what extent primary or group factors could be discovered in such a sample. The study was carried out by a commercial polling agency (NOP); the sample was collected according to the rules of quota sampling and each respondent stated his or her name and address to make checking possible. The questionnaire used was introduced as part of a larger study concerned with permissiveness. The total number of subjects who filled in the questionnaire without omitting any item was 1,442; all were adult, with age and sex distribution closely resembling that of the whole population. Our analysis was carried out on this total sample, without breaking it up into sex or age groups. There were few refusals, and few subjects omitted responses (less than 5% in each case). The questionnaire used was an extended and adapted form of the Wilson-

Patterson one; it is given in Table 1. Instructions read out to respondents are also given.

The items were intercorrelated and factor analyzed, using principal components formulae and rotating factors with eigenvalues above unity by means of the Promax oblique factor rotation programme. Nineteen such factors were found, of which 13 were capable of interpretation. These factors, with high-loading items, are as follows. (1) *Permissiveness*: Striptease .83; Nudist camps .78; Hippies .51; Licensing Laws —.51; Wife-swapping .35. (2) *Morality*: Chastity .76; Inborn Conscience .60; Moral Training .51; Casual Living —.41. (3) *Toughmindedness*: Birching .68; Conscripton .66; Death Penalty .63; Military Drill .63; Strict Rules .37. (4) *Socialism*: Trade Unions .79; Socialism .63; Strikes .61; Inheritance Tax .40; Profit Sharing .39; Student Protest .30. (5) *Racism*: White Superiority .81; Apartheid .73; Mixed Marriage —.47; Coloured Immigration —.39. (6) *Religion*: Divine Law .73; Church Authority .69; Bible Truth .73; Sunday Observance .61; Self Denial .29. (7) *Sexual Liberation*: Legalised Abortion .75; Divorce .75; The Pill .57. These are the major primaries; in addition there were several with only two or at most three items identifying the factor. Such doublets are: (8) *Pacifism*: Disarmament .79; Pacifism .78. (9) *Patriotism*: Royalty .66; Patriotism .54. (10) *Welfare*: Council Housing .83; Welfare State .66. (11) *Taxation*: Surtax .67; Inheritance Tax .61. (12) *Law and Order*: Police .76; Law and Order .75. (13) *Sci-fi*: Supersonic Airliners .77; Astrology .61; Space Research .60. Purists will doubt the name given to this last factor, but the inclusion of astrology with the other scientific marvels of the age makes any other appellation doubtful.

These factors are, of course, correlated. Thus, permissiveness correlates —.28 with morality, —.39 with religion, and .27 with sexual liberation. Morality correlates .31 with patriotism, and .25 with law and order. Law and order correlates —.35 with pacifism, and pacifism —.27 with racism; it also correlates .30 with welfare. These are just some of the observed correlations, but they are sufficient to indicate the need for the extraction of higher-order factors. Two major factors emerged from the analysis, and Table 1 shows the loadings for the 68 items.

These two factors clearly resemble closely the Radicalism-conservatism and Toughmindedness-tendermindedness factors previously emerging from research into the structure of social attitudes. Radicalism is characterized by items such as evolution, strikes, the welfare state, mixed marriages, student protest, law reform, women's liberation, United Nations, nudist camps, pop music, modern art, immigration and the like, with the opposite pole being marked by white superiority, empire building, Sunday observance and birching. Tendermindedness is marked by items like moral training, liberals, inborn conscience, Bible truth, chastity, self-denial, etc., while its opposite pole has items like wife-swapping and casual living. The items in the quadrants, as before, clearly sug-

TABLE 1

Instructions: Here is a list of various topics. For each one, please indicate whether or not you agree with it by circling "Yes" or "No" as appropriate. If you are uncertain, please circle "?". It's just your first reaction I want; please do not spend too long on any one topic.

Item	R*	T	Item	R*	T
1. Death Penalty	.29	-.16	35. Empire Building	.31	-.08
2. Evolution Theory	-.42	-.03	36. Licensing Laws	.16	-.23
3. School Uniforms	.02	-.29	37. Space Research	-.47	.05
4. Striptease Shows	-.45	.15	38. Strikes	-.41	.11
5. Council Housing	-.13	-.06	39. Common Market	-.35	-.20
6. Sunday Observance	.28	-.31	40. Computer Music	-.28	.08
7. Hippies	-.49	.20	41. Chastity	-.04	-.45
8. Women's Lib	-.35	-.18	42. Royalty	.02	-.43
9. Student Protest	-.46	.08	43. Women Judges	-.26	-.28
10. Police	-.03	-.30	44. Capitalism	-.12	-.25
11. Surtax	-.35	-.19	45. Conventional Clothing	-.05	-.21
12. Wife-swapping	-.22	.40	46. Teenage Drivers	-.35	.06
13. Foreign Aid	-.32	-.14	47. Apartheid	.28	.15
14. Pop Music	-.35	.15	48. Nudist Camps	-.54	-.09
15. Welfare State	-.18	-.12	49. Church Authority	.15	-.31
16. Tradition	-.17	-.39	50. Inheritance Tax	-.19	-.05
17. Conscription	.18	-.25	51. Astrology	-.10	-.11
18. The Pill	-.50	-.00	52. Disarmament	-.18	.03
19. Patriotism	-.19	-.48	53. Censorship	.19	-.38
20. Modern Art	-.32	.07	54. Birching	.28	-.18
21. United Nations	-.36	-.37	55. Mixed Marriage	-.53	-.00
22. Self Denial	-.12	-.43	56. Strict Rules	.21	-.24
23. Working Mothers	-.21	-.05	57. Arab Politics	-.19	-.26
24. Military Drill	.08	-.32	58. Pacifism	-.23	-.06
25. Co-Education	-.37	-.13	59. Law and Order	-.04	-.30
26. Law Reform	-.33	-.14	60. Casual Living	-.17	.47
27. Divine Law	.08	-.39	61. Divorce	-.39	.04
28. Socialism	-.21	.05	62. Profit Sharing	-.21	-.11
29. White Superiority	.35	.13	63. Inborn Conscience	-.30	-.38
30. Cousin Marriage	-.24	.28	64. Coloured Immigration	-.34	.01
31. Moral Training	-.20	-.44	65. Bible Truth	.29	-.38
32. Suicide	-.26	.20	66. Trade Unions	-.24	-.05
33. Political Systems	-.33	-.32	67. Supersonic Airliners	-.26	-.00
34. Legalised Abortion	-.43	-.04	68. Liberals	-.28	-.34

*R, Radicalism-conservatism; T, Toughmindedness-tendermindedness.

gest religious beliefs (conservative tenderminded), fascist beliefs (conservative toughminded), communist beliefs (radical toughminded), and reformist conscience (radical tenderminded). There are a few items which do not fall into place (e.g., patriotism, police and military drill), but the majority do seem to mark the factors very much in the expected manner. The two factors are almost completely uncorrelated ($r = -.18$). We would conclude that, on the whole,

an examination of the structure of social attitudes on a quota sample of the population gives results very much in line with results obtained from many different samples in previous research, using different types of questionnaires.

REFERENCES

- EAVES, L. J., & EYSENCK, H. J. Genetics and the development of social attitudes. *Nature*, 1974, 1, 288-289.
- EYSENCK, H. J. *The psychology of politics*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1954.
- KERLINGER, F. N. A social attitude scale: evidence on reliability and validity. *Psychological Reports*, 1970, 26, 379-383.
- KERLINGER, F. N. The structure and content of social attitude referents: a preliminary study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 1972, 32, 613-630.
- ROKEACH, M. *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press, 1973.
- WILSON, G. *The psychology of conservatism*. London: Academic Press, 1973.

Accepted June 23, 1976.