

1969

## Philosophy of Human Nature as a Function of Political Preference, Political Involvement, and Age

Ralph L. Anderson  
*Central Washington University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Experimental Analysis of Behavior Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Anderson, Ralph L., "Philosophy of Human Nature as a Function of Political Preference, Political Involvement, and Age" (1969). *All Master's Theses*. 1186.  
<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/1186>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@cwu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@cwu.edu).

263

PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN NATURE AS A FUNCTION OF POLITICAL  
PREFERENCE, POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT, AND AGE

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Graduate Faculty  
Central Washington State College

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Science

---

by  
Ralph L. Anderson  
August, 1969

LD  
577.31

AS  
SPECIAL  
COLLECTION

174311

Library  
Central Washington  
State College  
Ellensburg, Washington

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

---

Donald R. Shupe, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

---

Max Zwanziger

---

Warren Street

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to express his appreciation to Dr. Donald Shupe for his advice and assistance, to Dr. Max Zwanziger and Dr. Warren Street for their advice in the writing of the thesis, and to Dr. Lawrence S. Wrightsman for the use of his PHN Scale.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. METHOD . . . . .	8
Sample . . . . .	8
Adult Involved . . . . .	8
Adult Uninvolved . . . . .	8
Student Involved . . . . .	9
Student Uninvolved . . . . .	9
Procedure . . . . .	9
III. RESULTS . . . . .	11
IV. DISCUSSION . . . . .	25
V. SUMMARY . . . . .	29
REFERENCES . . . . .	31
APPENDIX A. PHN Scale . . . . .	34
APPENDIX B. Letter of Introduction . . . . .	41
APPENDIX C. PHN Scores for All Subjects . . . . .	43

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Mean Scores for Each of the PHN Subscales by Main Effect . . . . .	12
2. Mean Age Per Group . . . . .	13
3. Analysis of Variance: Trustworthiness Subscale . . . . .	14
4. Means for Political Preference and Involvement Showing Interaction Effects for Trustworthiness . . . . .	15
5. Analysis of Variance: Altruism Subscale . . . . .	16
6. Means for Political Preference and Involvement Showing Interaction Effects for Altruism . . . . .	17
7. Analysis of Variance: Independence Subscale . . . . .	18
8. Analysis of Variance: Strength of Will Subscale . . . . .	19
9. Analysis of Variance: Complexity Subscale . . . . .	20
10. Analysis of Variance: Variability Subscale . . . . .	22
11. Analysis of Variance: Favorableness of Human Nature . . . . .	23
12. Analysis of Variance: Multiplexity of Human Nature . . . . .	24

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Following a speaking tour in Africa, Clinton Rossiter (1960), an American political scientist, reported that often "the first question from the floor was: 'Would you tell us, sir, what the difference is between a Republican and a Democrat [p. 107] ?'" This is an oft asked question even within our own country and one that reappears regardless of how many times it is supposedly answered. This question is the starting point for the present study.

The California F Scale (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950)--its high scores purportedly a measure of authoritarianism--has been a commonly used tool to investigate differences between political parties, or between supporters of men representing the two parties. In regard to a distribution of F scores for the supporters of different candidates, Milton (1952) found that supporters of MacArthur and Taft were significantly more often in the upper quartile while supporters of Eisenhower and Stevenson were significantly more often in the lower quartile. Stotsky and Lachman (1956) found higher F Scale scores among pro-Eisenhower students than among pro-Stevenson students. Wrightsman, Radloff, Horton and Mecherikoff (1961) obtained F Scale scores from supporters of



eight 1960 presidential candidates. They found supporters of "liberal" candidates had lower scores than supporters of "conservative" candidates. Leventhal, Jacobs, and Kudirka (1964) found that subjects with high scores on the F Scale preferred the Republican party and voted for Nixon in the 1960 presidential race, and subjects with low scores preferred the Democratic party and voted for Kennedy in 1960. Higgens (1965) found that those who preferred Goldwater over Johnson had higher F Scale scores than vice versa. Higgens and Kuhlman (1967) found that the supporters of the Republican Reagan had higher F Scale scores than the supporters of the Democrat Brown. All of these studies show that the supporters of the Republican or more conservative candidate obtain higher F Scale scores than the supporters of the Democratic or more liberal candidate.

Milton and Waite (1964) tested supporters of Wallace, Goldwater and Johnson with the Traditional Family Ideology Scale (TFI) (Levinson & Huffman, 1953), which is a modification of the California F Scale. They found that those subjects who preferred Wallace scored highest, those who preferred Goldwater next highest, and those who preferred Johnson scored lowest. These findings are consistent with those using the F Scale mentioned above.

Manheim (1959) found, in general, that men who had consistently voted Republican were more "active," as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, than did their Democratic counterparts. Also, as a total group the Republican men were more "active" than the

total group of Democratic men. The only difference found among women was that Democratic women with consistent voting records had higher scores on the "restraint" scale than did the Republican women with equally consistent voting records.

Rosenberg (1956) attempted to use an individual's attitudes toward other people as a point of differentiation between the two political parties. He gave three reasons why this approach should prove fruitful.

First, political ideologies often contain implicit assumptions about human nature. . . . Secondly, since a political system basically involves people in action, the individual's view of human nature is likely to be linked to his evaluation of how well the system actually works. . . . Thirdly, the individual's stand on certain specific political questions may be influenced by his assumptions about the nature of man [p. 690].

Using a scale he developed, Rosenberg found differences between subjects with "low faith in people" and subjects with "high faith in people" in their reaction to specific political questions. However, he did not find any differences between those with "high faith in people" and those with "low faith in people" along party lines.

Wrightsmen (1964a, 1964b) developed, and collected normative data for, a Philosophy of Human Nature Scale (PHN), which has the following six bipolar subscales:

- (1) Trustworthiness, or the extent to which people are seen as moral, honest, and reliable;
- (2) Altruism, or the extent of unselfishness, sincere sympathy, and concern for others present in people;
- (3) Independence, or the extent to which a person can maintain his convictions in the face of society's pressures toward conformity;
- (4) Strength of Will and Rationality, or the extent to which people understand the motives

behind their behavior and the extent to which they have control over their own outcomes; (5) The Complexity of Human Nature, a dimension which cuts across the above continua and deals with the extent to which people are complex and hard to understand or simple and easy to understand; and (6) the Variability in Human Nature, which also cuts across the first four dimensions and relates to the extent of individual differences in basic nature and the basic changeability in human nature [Wrightsman, 1964a, p. 744].

In addition, the four subscales measuring substantive dimensions (1-4) may be summed to give a general Favorableness of Human Nature score and the two subscales on Complexity and Variability (5 & 6) may be summed to give a score for the Multiplexity of Human Nature.

Using the PHN, Wrightsman (1965) found no significant differences between Goldwater and Johnson supporters. He did find that students who had no preference had higher complexity scores than did supporters of either candidate. Nottingham (1968), using the PHN, found no significant differences on any of the six subscale scores when comparing a group of liberal students with a group of conservative students.

One major problem with the above mentioned studies is that their subjects represent too broad a cut of the political spectrum. If there were differences between the two political parties, these studies might not have detected them because the samples were not restricted to actual party members. That is, to be considered a Republican a subject needed only support a Republican candidate. Generally, no distinction was made between different levels of political involvement. A

further limitation of the above studies, at least in those in which the sample was defined, is that all but one of them used students as subjects. It is difficult to generalize to the overall political atmosphere on the basis of student responses, especially with the recent emphasis on differences between the generations.

The present study will use the full PHN scale to assess differences in philosophy of human nature held by Republicans and Democrats (party preference), politically involved people and politically uninvolved people (involvement), and students and adults (age). It must be understood that the difference between the students and adults is not entirely one of age, but since this is perhaps the most salient difference, the factor is labelled "age" for brevity of reference.

The hypotheses were as follows:

1. Democrats will have higher scores than Republicans on the Trustworthiness subscale.
2. Democrats will have higher scores on the Altruism subscale than Republicans.
3. Republicans will have higher scores than Democrats on the Independence subscale.
4. Republicans will have higher scores than Democrats on the Strength of Will and Rationality subscale.
5. Democrats will have higher scores than Republicans on the Complexity subscale.

6. Democrats will have higher scores than Republicans on the Variability subscale.

7. Democrats will have higher scores on the Favorableness of Human Nature subscale than will Republicans.

8. Democrats will have higher scores on the Multiplexity of Human Nature subscale than will Republicans.

9. Students will have higher scores on the Favorableness of Human Nature subscale than will adults.

10. Adults will have higher scores on the Multiplexity of Human Nature subscale than will students.

11. Politically involved people will differ from politically uninvolved people on the Favorableness of Human Nature subscale.

12. Politically involved people will differ from the politically uninvolved people on the Multiplexity of Human Nature subscale.

Hypotheses one, two, three, four, and seven were suggested by Carlson (1966), who found that subjects with high faith in people were generally supportive of liberal ideals. Carlson also found that the conservative person felt that people's success was related to their own efforts. Also, in regard to hypotheses three and four, the Republican philosophy holds that the individual can better himself through hard work and will power.

Hypotheses five, six, and eight were suggested by Eysenck (1955) who found that preferences for simplicity go with conservative

persons. This idea is extended here somewhat beyond Eysenck's explicit statement, but it is still within the general context of his meaning.

Hypotheses nine and ten were hunches by the investigator. No relevant studies could be found to support or negate these hypotheses.

Finally, hypotheses eleven and twelve were suggested by Mannheim (1959) who found that the politically active people exhibited characteristics which differed from the general population, and Prewitt, Eulau, and Zisk (1967) who found that political awareness in youth sets one apart from one's peers with respect to personal contacts, images formed, and predispositions associated with the socialization process.

## CHAPTER II

### METHOD

#### Sample

To test the stated hypotheses, 120 people were selected and grouped as described below. Each subgroup had a total subject membership of eight males and seven females. Eight subgroups were required to test the combinations of the three conditions as outlined below. Each of the parties (Republican and Democrat) was represented by the four subgroups described below. These groups were selected randomly with the restriction that they be balanced in terms of sex.

#### Adult Involved

These Ss were selected from among members of the Republican and Democratic Central Committee and precinct committeemen and committeewomen of Kittitas County. The chairmen and vice-chairmen of both parties were excluded from the sample because the investigator worked with them in obtaining the sample, and knowledge of the intention of the study could have led to bias in taking the PHN Scale.

#### Adult Uninvolved

These Ss were selected from among those on file with the

Republican and Democratic parties as people who considered themselves party members. Only those people who have never held public or party office were considered eligible for this group.

### Student Involved

These Ss were selected from among the Young Republicans and Young Democrats on Central Washington State College campus. The chairmen of these organizations were not considered eligible for selection. The Young Democrats at the time of this study was a very small group. To supplement this group, the membership list of a Democratic organization, Students for McCarthy, was used in conjunction with the membership list of the Young Democrats.

### Student Uninvolved

These Ss were selected from the student directory of Central Washington State College with the stipulation that the S did not belong to the Young Republicans, the Young Democrats, or the Students for McCarthy group. Each S was asked to rate himself as a Republican or a Democrat and as very uninvolved, not very involved, somewhat involved, or very involved in the activities of his political party. (See Appendix A.) Only Ss who checked very uninvolved or not very involved were used.

### Procedure

Once the sample was drawn each S was contacted individually at the S's residence and asked to take the PHN scale (see Appendix A).



A letter of introduction signed by the chairman and vice-chairman of the appropriate party (see Appendix B) was used with the adult Ss to help in obtaining their cooperation. The scales were administered individually and independently scored by two people to insure accuracy. Any discrepancies were rescored by both judges until a consistent score was obtained.

## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS

Scales one through six of the PHN have a possible range from -42 to +42; the Favorableness of Human Nature scale has a range from -168 to +168, and the Multiplexity of Human Nature scale has a range from -84 to +84. A constant of 42, 168, or 84 was added to each S's score on the respective scales to simplify computation. (See Appendix C for raw data.) Table 1 shows the mean scores for each of the cells and for each of the eight subscales.

The scores for each of the eight scales were analyzed by means of a 2X2X2 factorial analysis of variance. Each analysis had the three main effects of party preference (Republican-Democrat), political involvement (involved-uninvolved) and age (adult-student). By choosing subjects from adult and student populations, differences in ages were obtained, as shown in Table 2.

Table 3 shows the source table for the analysis of variance for the Trustworthiness subscale. This analysis was used to test hypothesis one, that Democrats should be higher than Republicans. There were no differences in party preference or involvement. The only significant F values were for the main effect of age, the adults having the higher scores,

Table 1

Mean Scores for Each of the PHN Subscales by Main Effect

Subscales	Democrat				Republican			
	Uninvolved		Involved		Uninvolved		Involved	
	Student	Adult	Student	Adult	Student	Adult	Student	Adult
1. Trustworthiness	43.60	47.13	40.40	54.26	47.40	55.26	40.13	46.00
2. Altruism	31.20	45.13	37.26	45.93	41.53	52.06	35.53	40.86
3. Independence	38.00	45.40	31.87	39.86	39.40	47.13	32.87	42.73
4. Strength of Will	54.73	47.60	46.13	44.80	54.00	55.94	47.00	47.66
5. Complexity	47.40	48.26	58.60	50.66	53.13	45.86	52.93	51.53
6. Variability	50.41	54.93	55.53	55.73	54.00	51.73	57.46	52.86
7. Favorableness	167.46	185.20	155.66	184.00	182.33	211.06	154.86	177.80
8. Multiplexity	97.66	101.86	113.20	106.40	106.46	97.60	110.86	104.26

Table 2

Mean Age Per Group

	Democrat		Republican		Total
	Involved	Uninvolved	Involved	Uninvolved	
Adults	47.42 <sup>a</sup>	51.28 <sup>a</sup>	41.46 <sup>b</sup>	52.07 <sup>a</sup>	47.94 <sup>c</sup>
Students	21.60 <sup>b</sup>	21.20 <sup>b</sup>	21.06 <sup>b</sup>	21.26 <sup>b</sup>	21.28 <sup>d*</sup>

a N = 14

b N = 15

c N = 57

d N = 60

\* Adult age > student age,  $p < .001$

Mann-Whitney U,  $z = \text{approximately } 9.23$

Table 3

## Analysis of Variance: Trustworthiness Subscale

Source	df	MS	F
Democrat-Republican (A)	1	21.68	
Involved-Uninvolved (B)	1	297.68	2.02
Adult-Student (C)	1	1,817.41	12.30**
A X B	1	785.40	5.32*
A X C	1	25.20	
B X C	1	130.20	
A X B X C	1	285.22	1.93
Error	112	147.71	
Total	119		

\*  $p < .05$ \*\*  $p < .01$

and a significant interaction between party preference and involvement. Table 4 shows the means for political preference and involvement demonstrating the interaction. The uninvolved Republicans and involved Democrats obtained the higher scores.

Table 4

Means for Political Preference and Involvement Showing Interaction Effects for Trustworthiness

Involvement	Political Preference	
	Republican	Democrat
Involved	43.06	47.33
Uninvolved	51.23	45.36

Note--The means are based on an N of 30.

Table 5 shows the source table for the analysis of variance for the Altruism subscale. This analysis was used to test hypothesis two, that Democrats would consider people more altruistic than Republicans. There were no differences in party preference or involvement. Once more the only significant F values were for the main effect of age, the adults having the higher scores, and the interaction effect between political preference and involvement. Table 6 shows the means for political preference and involvement demonstrating the interaction. The uninvolved Republicans and involved Democrats again obtained the highest scores.

Table 5

## Analysis of Variance: Altruism Subscale

Source	df	MS	F
Democrat-Republican (A)	1	218.70	1.35
Involved-Uninvolved (B)	1	187.50	1.16
Adult-Student (C)	1	2,822.70	17.33**
A X B	1	1,116.30	6.85*
A X C	1	93.63	
B X C	1	218.70	1.35
A X B X C	1	.3	
Error	112	162.91	
Total	119		

\*  $p < .05$ \*\*  $p < .01$

Table 6

Means for Political Preference and Involvement Showing  
Interaction Effects for Altruism

Involvement	Political Preference	
	Republican	Democrat
Involved	38.19	41.59
Uninvolved	46.79	38.16

Note--The means are based on an N of 30.

Table 7 shows the source table for the analysis of variance for the Independence subscale. This analysis was used to test hypothesis three, that Republicans consider people more independent than Democrats. There was no significant difference in party preference. The only significant F values were for the main effect of involvement, the uninvolved scored higher than the involved, and the main effect of age, the adults scored higher than did the students.

Table 8, page 19, shows the source table for the analysis of variance for the Strength of Will subscale. This analysis was used to test hypothesis four, that Republicans would consider people possessing more strength of will than Democrats would. The only significant F value was for the main effect of involvement, the uninvolved scored higher than did the involved.

Table 9, page 20, shows the source table for the analysis of variance for the Complexity subscale. This analysis was used to test



Table 7

## Analysis of Variance: Independence Subscale

Source	df	MS	F
Democrat-Republican (A)	1	91.88	
Involved-Uninvolved (B)	1	957.68	7.04**
Adult-Student (C)	1	2.041.88	15.01**
A X B	1	1.00	
A X C	1	9.07	
B X C	1	14.00	
A X B X C	1	4.42	
Error	112	136.00	
Total	119		

\*  $p < .05$

\*\*  $p < .01$

Table 8

## Analysis of Variance: Strength of Will Subscale

Source	df	MS	F
Democrat-Republican (A)	1	240.83	1.52
Involved-Uninvolved (B)	1	1,333.33	8.46**
Adult-Student (C)	1	64.53	
A X B	1	28.04	
A X C	1	229.64	1.45
B X C	1	38.54	
A X B X C	1	93.62	
Error	112	157.45	
Total	119		

\*  $p < .05$

\*\*  $p < .01$

Table 9

## Analysis of Variance: Complexity Subscale

Source	df	MS	F
Democrat-Republican (A)	1	4.03	
Involved-Uninvolved (B)	1	681.63	5.19*
Adult-Student (C)	1	464.13	3.56
A X B	1	124.04	
A X C	1	4.80	
B X C	1	16.14	
A X B X C	1	403.33	
Error	112	130.25	
Total	119		

\*  $p < .05$ \*\*  $p < .01$

hypothesis five, that Democrats would consider people more complex than would Republicans. The only significant F value was for the main effect of involvement, the involved scored higher than did the uninvolved.

Table 10 shows the source table for the analysis of variance for the Variability subscale. This analysis was used to test hypothesis six, that Democrats would consider people more variable than would Republicans. There were no significant F values for this subscale.

Table 11, page 22, shows the source table for the analysis of variance for the Favorableness of Human Nature scale. This analysis was used to test hypotheses seven, that Democrats would consider people more favorably than Republicans; nine, that students would consider people more favorably than adults; and eleven, that there would be a difference between involved and uninvolved Ss. The only significant F values were for the main effect of involvement, the uninvolved scores were higher than the involved, and for the main effect of age, the adults scored higher than did the students.

Table 12, page 23, shows the source table for the analysis of variance for the Multiplexity of Human Nature scale. This analysis was used to test hypotheses eight, that Democrats would consider people more complex and variable than would Republicans; ten, that adults would consider people more complex and variable than would students; and twelve, that there would be a difference between involved and uninvolved Ss. The only significant F value was for the main effect of involvement, the involved scored higher than the uninvolved.

Table 10

## Analysis of Variance: Variability Subscale

Source	df	MS	F
Democrat-Republican (A)	1	.53	
Involved-Uninvolved (B)	1	108.03	1.84
Adult-Student (C)	1	8.53	
A X B	1	3.34	
A X C	1	252.31	2.23
B X C	1	83.34	
A X B X C	1	7.45	
Error	112	112.83	
Total	119		

\*  $p < .05$

\*\*  $p < .01$

Table 11

## Analysis of Variance: Favorableness of Human Nature

Source	df	MS	F
Democrat-Republican (A)	1	2,133.6	1.681
Involved-Uninvolved (B)	1	10,193.6	8.03**
Adult-Student (C)	1	17,909.6	14.11**
A X B	1	4,272.2	3.37
A X C	1	58.8	
B X C	1	43.2	
A X B X C	1	504.3	
Error	112	1,269.0	
Total	119		

\*  $p < .05$ \*\*  $p < .01$

Table 12

## Analysis of Variance: Multiplexity of Human Nature

Source	df	MS	F
Democrat-Republican (A)	1	0	
Involved-Uninvolved (B)	1	1,817.40	5.85*
Adult-Student (C)	1	612.00	1.97
A X B	1	151.89	
A X C	1	310.42	1.00
B X C	1	143.02	
A X B X C	1	329.56	1.06
Error	112	310.22	
Total	119		

\*  $p < .05$ \*\*  $p < .01$

## CHAPTER IV

### DISCUSSION

Of the original twelve hypotheses, the following two were supported by the data: 11. Politically involved people differ from the politically uninvolved people on the Favorableness of Human Nature scale; and 12. Politically involved people differ from the politically uninvolved people on the Multiplexity of Human Nature scale. Hypothesis nine was significant but in the opposite direction. There were no differences on any of the eight subscales between Democrats and Republicans. The only significant differences that approached consistency were between the involved and uninvolved Ss and between the adults and students.

The lack of differences between Democrats and Republicans on any of the eight subscales suggests the possibility that there are in fact few or no differences between the people who call themselves Democrats and the people who call themselves Republicans, at least as far as their opinions of other people are concerned. This result is in line with the findings of Wrightsman (1965) and Nottingham (1968) who, given their definition of what it means to be a Democrat or a Republican, found no differences between Democrats and Republicans using the PHN scale.



Rosenberg (1956) also found no differences between the faith in people of Democrats and Republicans, again given his definition of membership in these parties. There are two likely explanations for these findings. One, noted above, is that there is no difference between the members of the parties. The second possibility is that the PHN scale is not sensitive enough to detect existing differences. As noted earlier, the California F Scale does find consistent differences between the two parties. As far as this investigator can find, there have been no studies comparing the two scales, although there are areas of overlap between them. Why one should find differences and the other not remains unanswered at this point.

Out of the eight scales, five of them showed a significant difference between the politically involved Ss and the uninvolved Ss. Of those, two (Complexity and Multiplexity) showed higher scores for the involved and three (Independence, Strength of Will, and Favorableness) showed higher scores for the uninvolved. These differences are split along the two dimensions of the PHN scale, the general favorable opinion of other people and the belief in the complexity and variability of people. The involved Ss had higher scores on two of the three complexity scales. The uninvolved Ss had significantly higher scores on three of the five scales that measured a general favorable opinion of human nature. One can only speculate at this point on the meaning of these results. Perhaps people lost their favorable opinions of human nature but gain insight into the

complexity of people when they become involved in political parties.

One important factor resulting from the above findings is that the level of political involvement must be taken into consideration in future studies of this nature.

Four of the eight scales (Trustworthiness, Altruism, Independence, and Favorableness) showed a significant difference between adults and students with adults scoring higher in each case. These results suggest some comments on the current emphasis on the difference between generations. Perhaps the PHN scale is picking up the cynical views of students regarding the "over 30" age group. Or perhaps the students are relating their unhappiness over the state of affairs by saying "This must be caused by people reacting toward one another in this particular way." Perhaps these differences are a function of the Ss status as students or adults rather than the difference in age. Exactly what factors are operating here will have to await further study to be clarified. These results do clearly indicate, however, the need for caution in generalizing from students to the population at large.

The findings in this study have not settled any major problems. Perhaps in the true sense of psychological investigation, several new areas now need to be investigated, relating to the following questions:

(a) What is the relationship between authoritarianism, as measured by the California F Scale, and philosophy of human nature, as measured by the PHN Scale? (b) What is the relationship between political involvement

and one's opinion of human nature and human complexity? (c) Is there a change in one's view of other people corresponding to a change in political involvement? (d) Are the differences in views of human nature between students and adults due to differences in age or are there other factors operation? (e) If there are other factors operating, what are they?

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY

Many tools have been used by the social sciences to try to find differences between the Republicans and Democrats, among them the California F Scale, the Traditional Family Ideology Scale, and the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale. One problem with many of the studies that have been done is that their samples have been defined in terms of support for candidates from a party rather than membership in that party. Furthermore, little or no consideration was given to the level of involvement or the age of the subject.

The present study used the Philosophy of Human Nature (PHN) Scale and a 2X2X2 factorial design with party preference, level of political involvement, and age as the three main effects to test twelve specific hypotheses. One hundred twenty subjects were randomly selected from among the Democratic and Republican parties of Kittitas County and students from Central Washington State College, and the PHN Scale was administered to them.

The subjects' scores from each of eight subscales of the PHN (Trustworthiness, Altruism, Independence, Strength of Will and Rationality, Complexity, Variability, Favorableness of Human Nature, and Multiplexity

of Human Nature) were analyzed with a 2X2X2 factorial analysis of variance. No significant differences were found between Democrats and Republicans on any of the subscales. Five of the subscales showed significant differences between involved and uninvolved subjects, and four subscales yielded significant differences between adults and students. The results were discussed in relation to political involvement and age differences.

## REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. W. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Carlson, E. R. Concepts of man and attitudes on social issues. Paper presented at the Western Psychological Association convention, Long Beach, California, April, 1966.
- Eysenck, H. J. The psychology of politics. New York: Fredrick A. Prager, Inc., 1955.
- Higgins, J. Authoritarianism and candidate preference. Psychological Reports, 1965, 16, 603-604.
- Higgins, J., & Kuhlman, D. M. Authoritarianism and candidate preference: II. Psychological Reports, 1967, 20(2), 572.
- Leventhal, H., Jacobs, R. L., & Kudirka, N. Z. Authoritarianism, ideology, and political choice. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 69, 539-549.
- Manheim, H. L. Personality differences of members of two political parties. Journal of Social Psychology, 1959, 50, 261-268.
- Milton, D. Presidential choice and performance on a scale of authoritarianism. American Psychologist, 1952, 7, 597-598.
- Milton, O., and Waite, B. Presidential preference and traditional family values. American Psychologist, 1964, 19, 844-845.
- Nottingham, J. The relationship between philosophies of human nature and liberalism-conservatism. Unpublished paper, Peabody College, 1968.
- Prewitt, K., Eulau, H., & Zisk, B. Political socialization and political roles. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1967, 30(4), 569-582.
- Rosenberg, M. Misanthropy and political ideology. American Sociological Review, 1956, 21, 690-695.

- Rossiter, C. Parties and politics in America. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1960.
- Stotsky, B. A., & Lachman, S. J. Differences in political and social attitudes of pro-Eisenhower and pro-Stevenson students. Journal of Social Psychology, 1956, 44, 143-144.
- Wrightsman, L. S. Measurement of philosophies of human nature. Psychological Reports, 1964, 14, 743-751. (a)
- Wrightsman, L. S. Norms and standardization of the Philosophy of Human Nature scale. Unpublished paper, Peabody College, 1964. (b)
- Wrightsman, L. S. Attitudinal and personality correlates of presidential voting preferences. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association convention, Chicago, September, 1965.
- Wrightsman, L. S., Radloff, R. W., Horton, D. L., & Mecherikoff, M. Authoritarian attitudes and presidential voting preferences. Psychological Reports, 1961, 8, 43-46.



APPENDIX A

PHN SCALE

## PHN SCALE

The next section of this questionnaire is a series of attitude statements. Each represents a commonly held opinion and there are no right or wrong answers. You will probably disagree with some items and agree with others. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with matters of opinion.

Read each statement carefully. Then, in the separate answer sheet, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree by marking the appropriate space for each statement. The numbers and their meanings are indicated below:

If you agree strongly - mark +3

If you agree somewhat - mark +2

If you agree slightly - mark +1

If you disagree slightly - mark -1

If you disagree somewhat - mark -2

If you disagree strongly - mark -3

First impressions are usually best in such matters. Read each statement, decide if you agree or disagree and the strength of your opinion, and then mark the appropriate space on the answer sheet. Be sure to answer every statement.

If you find that the numbers to be used in answering do not adequately indicate your own opinion, use the one which is closest to the way you feel. Do not leave any questions blank.

Make no stray marks on the answer sheet.

Make your marks heavy and black.

## PHN SCALE

1. Great successes in life, like great artists and inventors, are usually motivated by forces they are unaware of.
2. Most students will tell the instructor when he has made a mistake in adding up their score, even if he had given them more points than they deserved.
3. Most people will change the opinion they express as a result of an onslaught of criticism, even though they really don't change the way they feel.
4. Most people try to apply the Golden Rule even in today's complex society.
5. A person's reaction to things differs from one situation to another.
6. I find that my first impression of a person is usually correct.
7. Our success in life is pretty much determined by forces outside our own control.
8. If you give the average person a job to do and leave him to do it, he will finish it successfully.
9. Nowadays many people won't make a move until they find out what other people think.
10. Most people do not hesitate to go out of their way to help someone in trouble.
11. Different people react to the same situation in different ways.
12. People can be described accurately by one term, such as "introverted," or "moral," or "sociable."
13. Attempts to understand ourselves are usually futile.
14. People usually tell the truth, even when they know they would be better off by lying.
15. The important thing in being successful nowadays is not how hard you work, but how well you fit in with the crowd.

16. Most people will act as "Good Samaritans" if given the opportunity.
17. Each person's personality is different from the personality of every other person.
18. It's not hard to understand what really is important to a person.
19. There's little one can do to alter his fate in life.
20. Most students do not cheat when taking an exam.
21. The typical student will cheat on a test when everybody else does, even though he has a set of ethical standards.
22. "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" is a motto most people follow.
23. People are quite different in their basic interests.
24. I think I get a good idea of a person's basic nature after a brief conversation with him.
25. Most people have little influence over the things that happen to them.
26. Most people are basically honest.
27. It's a rare person who will go against the crowd.
28. The typical person is sincerely concerned about the problems of others.
29. People are pretty different from one another in what "makes them tick."
30. If I could ask a person three questions about himself (and assuming he would answer them honestly), I would know a great deal about him.
31. Most people have an unrealistically favorable view of their own capabilities.
32. If you act in good faith with people, almost all of them will reciprocate with fairness towards you.
33. Most people have to rely on someone else to make their important decisions for them.

34. Most people with a fallout shelter would let their neighbors stay in it during a nuclear attack.
35. Often a person's basic personality is altered by such things as a religious conversation, psychotherapy, or a charm course.
36. When I meet a person, I look for one basic characteristic through which I try to understand him.
37. Most people vote for a political candidate on the basis of unimportant characteristics such as his appearance or name, rather than because of his stand on the issues.
38. Most people lead clean, decent lives.
39. The average person will rarely express his opinion in a group when he sees the others disagree with him.
40. Most people would stop and help a person whose car is disabled.
41. People are unpredictable in how they'll act from one situation to another.
42. Give me a few facts about a person and I'll have a good idea of whether I'll like him or not.
43. If a person tried hard enough, he will usually reach his goals in life.
44. People claim they have ethical standards regarding honesty and morality, but few people stick to them when the chips are down.
45. Most people have the courage of their convictions.
46. The average person is conceited.
47. People are pretty much alike in their basic interests.
48. I find that my first impressions of people are frequently wrong.
49. The average person has an accurate understanding of the reasons for his behavior.
50. If you want people to do a job right, you should explain things to them in great detail and supervise them closely.

51. Most people can make their own decisions, uninfluenced by public opinion.
52. It's only a rare person who would risk his own life and limb to help someone else.
53. People are basically similar in their personalities.
54. Some people are too complicated for me to figure out.
55. If people try hard enough, wars can be prevented in the future.
56. If most people could get into a movie without paying and be sure they were not seen, they would do it.
57. It is achievement, rather than popularity with others, that gets you ahead nowadays.
58. It's pathetic to see an unselfish person in today's world because so many people take advantage of him.
59. If you have a good idea about how several people will react to a certain situation, you can expect most people to react the same way.
60. I think you can never really understand the feelings of other people.
61. The average person is largely the master of his own fate.
62. Most people are not really honest for a desirable reason; they're afraid of getting caught.
63. The average person will stick to his opinion if he thinks he's right, even if others disagree.
64. People pretend to care more about one another than they really do.
65. Most people are consistent from situation to situation in the way they react to things.
66. You can't accurately describe a person in just a few words.
67. In a local or national election, most people select a candidate rationally and logically.
68. Most people would tell a lie if they could gain by it.

69. If a student does not believe in cheating, he will avoid it even if he sees many others doing it.
70. Most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people.
71. A child who is popular will be popular as an adult, too.
72. You can't classify everyone as good or bad.
73. Most persons have a lot of control over what happens to them in life.
74. Most people would cheat on their income tax if they had a **chance**.
75. The person with novel ideas is respected in our society.
76. Most people exaggerate their troubles in order to get sympathy.
77. If I can see how a person reacts to one situation, I have a good idea of how he will react to other situations.
78. People are too complex to ever be understood fully.
79. Most people have a good idea of what their strengths and weaknesses are.
80. Nowadays people commit a lot of crimes and sins that no one else ever hears about.
81. Most people will speak out for what they believe in.
82. People are usually out for their own good.
83. When you get right down to it, people are quite alike in their emotional makeup.
84. People are so complex, it is hard to know what "makes them tick."

APPENDIX B

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION



Fellow Republican (Democrat)

This letter is to introduce to you Ralph Anderson, a graduate student at Central Washington State College. He is doing some research for his Master's degree and would like to have your assistance. Would you please cooperate with him by taking a test that he has?

He has assured me that each person that takes this test will remain anonymous, as there is no place on the answer sheet for names. After you have taken the test, your answer sheet will be mixed up with the rest of the answer sheets.

If you are too busy at this time to cooperate with Ralph, would you please make arrangements to take the test at some other time? He will try to visit you when you are most free and would greatly appreciate your cooperation.

Because knowledge about the test before it is taken might influence how one might take the test, no questions about the test or the research can be answered at this time. If you would like to have the test and research explained after it is completed, ask Ralph to write to you afterward. Give him your name and address on a separate sheet of paper. He has said that he would be glad to explain the test and research to anyone interested.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Chairman, Kittitas County Republican  
(Democrat) Party

Vice-Chairman, Kittitas County  
Republican (Democrat) Party

APPENDIX C

PHN SCORES FOR ALL SUBJECTS

## APPENDIX C

## PHN SCORES FOR ALL SUBJECTS

<u>Republican</u>				<u>Democrat</u>			
<u>Uninvolved</u>		<u>Involved</u>		<u>Uninvolved</u>		<u>Involved</u>	
<u>Student</u>	<u>Adult</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Adult</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Adult</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Adult</u>

Trustworthiness Subscale

29	64	35	41	30	34	38	61
68	62	29	64	40	50	34	72
47	78	47	49	50	46	43	59
37	59	23	52	49	55	28	71
47	65	61	38	42	48	42	48
40	52	36	66	43	52	51	54
27	44	52	27	49	55	30	64
38	34	24	27	48	48	38	54
62	65	45	50	55	44	51	39
56	33	27	47	45	67	37	35
36	65	50	55	47	38	30	21
62	41	54	49	51	23	40	73
58	62	20	37	33	46	32	63
60	71	56	44	37	46	41	57
44	34	43	44	35	55	71	43

Altruism Subscale

21	57	21	43	27	38	10	48
63	47	23	57	35	48	43	55
49	64	37	48	24	46	54	62
30	52	24	39	30	57	24	32
44	71	55	28	34	66	8	70
28	31	46	43	33	56	54	54
42	55	47	23	29	53	24	53
31	36	25	43	22	31	20	48
30	71	29	32	33	42	19	17
59	32	26	37	29	46	29	41
33	57	42	33	28	29	71	36
61	45	46	49	33	43	51	57
51	39	25	54	38	41	36	33
45	63	46	39	25	46	52	47
36	61	41	45	48	35	64	36

<u>Republican</u>				<u>Democrat</u>			
<u>Uninvolved</u>		<u>Involved</u>		<u>Uninvolved</u>		<u>Involved</u>	
<u>Student</u>	<u>Adult</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Adult</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Adult</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Adult</u>

Independence Subscale

41	37	41	26	50	39	21	53
36	40	11	49	34	37	33	49
48	81	25	44	36	46	46	25
30	50	31	35	33	48	29	34
38	58	60	35	35	58	14	44
34	33	34	58	40	45	49	32
27	38	43	61	37	51	25	28
35	35	30	49	28	54	16	36
28	51	26	37	37	18	24	37
50	44	16	39	29	65	32	60
52	50	40	28	48	28	44	24
51	26	45	47	35	56	33	29
39	59	40	48	46	48	21	34
47	70	31	30	49	43	37	70
35	35	20	55	33	45	54	43

Strength of Will Subscale

42	53	47	54	52	37	36	49
36	49	41	61	51	32	41	49
57	78	45	39	60	43	50	35
45	57	36	66	51	47	57	41
42	69	60	25	62	60	58	50
52	55	42	65	53	51	51	39
67	45	56	48	43	62	36	27
47	57	37	41	49	56	17	46
57	70	61	51	60	26	43	55
57	48	44	50	57	70	55	68
60	32	60	52	54	28	37	47
65	38	55	40	62	64	45	40
71	52	54	56	54	31	44	33
47	74	28	35	66	50	59	62
65	62	39	32	47	57	63	31

<u>Republican</u>				<u>Democrat</u>			
<u>Uninvolved</u>		<u>Involved</u>		<u>Uninvolved</u>		<u>Involved</u>	
<u>Student</u>	<u>Adult</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Adult</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Adult</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Adult</u>

Complexity Subscale

34	61	58	59	42	56	38	46
80	43	31	36	58	42	48	24
45	49	44	66	46	40	84	68
39	50	50	56	41	37	59	57
49	45	44	49	59	47	56	42
79	44	62	40	56	33	56	50
60	53	28	42	41	76	36	42
37	60	48	40	39	35	76	50
59	37	66	55	34	62	61	45
54	45	72	62	57	61	69	58
50	40	50	62	60	51	58	63
50	47	63	50	53	48	58	64
39	35	67	49	50	48	50	48
58	31	49	52	38	47	64	60
64	48	62	55	37	36	66	43

Variability Subscale

69	71	47	61	44	54	27	49
65	36	47	65	48	50	54	49
58	56	49	58	58	56	71	54
62	44	70	61	41	45	64	66
40	66	53	54	62	50	78	62
60	45	64	59	42	58	56	46
63	46	69	49	44	71	53	64
49	63	59	37	49	62	56	50
31	31	53	56	47	75	46	48
48	61	63	48	53	69	72	54
55	31	70	58	57	46	31	48
37	59	61	49	62	49	53	66
59	46	63	52	49	58	61	59
45	59	52	51	49	44	72	56
69	62	42	35	51	37	39	65

<u>Republican</u>				<u>Democrat</u>			
<u>Uninvolved</u>		<u>Involved</u>		<u>Uninvolved</u>		<u>Involved</u>	
<u>Student</u>	<u>Adult</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Adult</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Adult</u>	<u>Student</u>	<u>Adult</u>

Favorableness Subscale

133	211	144	162	157	148	105	176
203	198	104	231	176	166	151	251
201	301	154	180	166	181	193	183
142	218	114	192	169	207	138	149
171	263	236	126	182	232	122	212
154	171	158	232	172	204	205	241
163	182	188	159	157	221	115	217
151	162	116	160	132	189	91	179
177	257	161	170	152	130	137	115
222	157	113	173	171	248	153	169
181	214	192	168	150	123	182	193
239	150	200	185	179	186	169	205
219	212	139	195	175	166	133	113
199	278	161	158	161	185	189	180
180	192	143	176	213	192	252	177

Multiplexity Subscale

103	132	105	120	86	110	65	95
145	79	85	101	106	72	102	73
103	105	93	124	104	96	155	122
101	94	114	117	82	82	123	123
89	111	103	101	121	97	134	104
120	89	126	99	96	91	98	96
142	99	97	91	85	147	89	106
86	123	107	77	88	97	132	100
90	68	119	111	81	137	107	93
112	106	135	110	110	135	141	112
105	71	120	120	117	97	89	111
87	106	124	99	115	97	111	130
98	81	130	101	99	106	111	107
103	90	101	103	87	91	136	116
113	110	104	90	88	73	105	108