

REGIONAL PATTERNS OF FUNDAMENTALISTIC  
ATTITUDE CONFIGURATIONS

*Gary M. Maranell*  
*University of Kansas*

The present study is an attempt to describe the attitude profile of the religious fundamentalist college student and to take cognizance of the regional variations in this profile. To accomplish this the research poses some explicit hypotheses regarding variables associated with fundamentalism. The investigation is thus concerned with the empirical examination of some general notions regarding the correlates of fundamentalism and regional variations in these correlations, and not with the "discovery" of any startling new correlates of religiosity.

The relationship between religious fundamentalism and the southern region of the United States has been a matter of conversation for some time. The historical affinity of the southerner for fundamentalistic religious belief is dramatized in his continuing hostility to secular trends. It is also present in the nature of the religious arguments against social change typically found in the area. The conservatism and hostility against such trends remain active to the present in the continuing rejection of the secularism of social science and other relevant scientific theory and endeavor, such as evolutionary theory.

Ford<sup>1</sup> has described the sectarian background of the protestantism of the Southern Appalachian region, and has further described rural-urban, educational, and socio-economic status differences within this region in regard to fundamentalistic religious beliefs. In spite of this type of interest the differential influence of fundamentalistic religious belief upon the child, college student, and adult in the various regions of the nation, including especially the south, has escaped extended investigation. Putney and Middleton<sup>2</sup> gathered data on religious ideologies from southern and northeastern state students but they did not concern themselves with regional variations. Salisbury<sup>3</sup> has investigated some aspects of religiosity and regional sub-culture and has compared and contrasted the orthodox-southern-protestant and orthodox-northern-protestant in many areas including the "centralness" of religious activities and indices of prejudice. He discovered among

other things a greater concern with religiosity in the south and that southern religious orthodoxy is associated with support for segregation.

Autobiographical evidence is also available regarding the position of religion, in this case fundamentalism, in the southerner's sub-culture. Lillian Smith,<sup>4</sup> for example, provides an interesting and enlightening account of a southerner's perspective of the interrelationship of some of the variables investigated in the present study, especially the variables of fundamentalism and prejudice.

The total impression gleaned from these and other sources, allows us to describe the southern sub-culture as a generally conservative-traditional attitude and belief system with religious fundamentalism as its core dimension. This belief system, it is felt, can best be described by attempting to contrast it with the more liberal-intellectual belief system of the non-fundamentalist. In view of this we can now turn our attention to the investigation of more explicit associations which, hopefully, will clarify some aspects of the southern fundamentalistic sub-culture and contrast it within the northern, in this case midwestern, sub-culture. The basic form of this research is the clustering of attitude and beliefs around fundamentalistic religious beliefs in the various regions. The basic concern is with the description of the sub-cultures and the difference in the attitudes which cluster around religious fundamentalism in the various regional sub-cultures.

#### *Hypotheses*

Hypothesis 1. *There are regional variations in the extent to which fundamentalistic attitudes are maintained.* Conservative religious tradition is generally conceived to be stronger in the southern states than elsewhere in the United States. Hypothesis one examines this conception. If the hypothesis is supported it would lead us to examine further the regional differences in the cluster of variables which are associated with fundamentalism. Where fundamentalism is found to be the most pervasive or where it is found to be an integral part of the sub-culture it should have a greater number of correlates since it should under these conditions be more tightly linked to the other attitudes and beliefs of the region. It is also possible that it would only be correlated to a different set of variables under these conditions than under differing conditions, but at any rate the variables associated with fundamentalism where it is normative would also be salient defining variables of the sub-culture of the region. This would lead us to the following hypotheses concerning the differential associations of fundamentalistic attitudes. Therefore the following hypotheses rest in part upon the previous hypothesis.

The following hypotheses can be clustered into three groups: (1) hypotheses regarding fundamentalism and the intellectual life, (2)

hypotheses regarding fundamentalism and aspects of bigotry, and (3) hypotheses regarding fundamentalism and "morals and morale." Each of these clusters contain three explicit hypotheses.

The following three hypotheses (2, 3, and 4) examine the relationship between fundamentalism and the intellectual life in each region. Hypothesis 2. *Fundamentalism is inversely related to academic attitudes.* This hypothesis examines the notion that conservative-traditional knowledge (fundamentalism) and intellectual inquiry (academic attitudes) are antithetical; that free inquiry is distrusted by tradition. This relationship should be highest in the areas or regions where fundamentalism is the most pervasive, or in the southern sample in this study. This hypothesis is a direct test of a Durkheimian assertion.<sup>5</sup> As Durkheim stated it, "men generally have the desire for self-instruction only in so far as they are freed from the yoke of tradition; for as long as the latter governs intelligence it is all-sufficient and jealous of any rival."<sup>6</sup>

Hypothesis 3. *Fundamentalism is inversely related to education.* This hypothesis examines the contention that education alters the conservative-traditional beliefs and attitudes and consequently that college freshmen will be less affected by intellectual attitudes and will thus still hold to their traditional beliefs. It is probable that the southern-traditional sub-culture if it is anti-academic, as is generally hypothesized above, could be minimally affected by education since the dominant traditional culture may insulate southern students against intellectual attacks upon these beliefs and even eliminate these attacks. In this case education would be inversely related to fundamentalism in the northern sample but not in the southern sample. This hypothesis is also a test of the previously stated assertion of Durkheim.

Hypothesis 4. *Fundamentalistic attitudes are altered to a greater extent by certain "relevant" majors — or "relevant" college majors are selectively avoided by fundamentalistic students.* This hypothesis is derived from the traditional-liberal culture distinction. Certain majors, such as the social sciences, demand intellectual inquiry into areas of traditional belief. This inquiry in turn demands some objectivity regarding tradition and this in turn tends to weaken the tradition. An equally possible basis for this hypothesis would be that disciplines which demand intellectual inquiry into traditional areas are selected mainly by individuals who have previously experienced some weakening of these traditions, in this case again fundamentalism.

The following three hypotheses (5, 6, and 7) concern the association between fundamentalism and aspects of bigotry. Hypothesis 5. *Fundamentalism is directly related to authoritarianism.* The source of this hypothesis is found in the nature of fundamentalism which involves the insistence that a particular source is life's complete authority. It also derives from the nature of authoritarianism which is the preference for

clear-cut authority structure in social life. This hypothesis also reflects the conservative-traditional nature of the fundamentalist. The authority is tradition expressed in this case in a particular source.

Hypothesis 6. *Fundamentalism is directly related to superstition.* This hypothesis proposes that fundamentalism and superstition are both non-intellectual traditional clusters of belief, and are closely related, perhaps finding origin in a common belief system.

Hypothesis 7. *Fundamentalism is directly related to prejudice.* This hypothesis is derived from G. Allport's contention that there are three intrinsic sources of bigotry in religion.<sup>7</sup> These are: (1) Revelation — or that revealed knowledge cannot be altered. According to Allport this had led to the position that "None may judge unless he have the judging word on his side" and since all sects claim the judging word the door is open to prejudice, for outsiders are judged promptly and unfavorably. (2) Election — or that one's own group is elected and that all others are not. (3) Theocracy — or that those in power are divinely ordained to enforce religious views.

The last three hypotheses concern the association between fundamentalism and "morals and morale." Hypothesis 8. *Fundamentalism is directly related to attitudes supporting the protestant ethic.* This hypothesis proposes that fundamentalists subscribe to the protestant ethic and therefore feel that success is the result of ethical behavior and "good works." This view is expected because of their emphasis upon religion and the high evaluation of success which they share with society in general.

Hypothesis 9. *Fundamentalism is inversely related to Machiavellian attitudes.* If, as the previous hypothesis suggests, fundamentalists subscribe to the protestant ethic and therefore feel that ethical hard work will lead to inevitable success, and if they share the general high societal evaluation of success — it would follow that they would be inclined to view their interpersonal relationships as highly ethical, or that their attitudes are non-Machiavellian.

Hypothesis 10. *Fundamentalism is directly related to personal optimism.* This hypothesis is derived from the previous hypothesis, for if the fundamentalist is a subscriber to the protestant ethic and desires success and is ethical in his interpersonal attitudes, he should expect eventual success. In view of this we would expect him to be personally optimistic. He is confident of his own eventual success although he may doubt that of others.

#### *Measurements and Methods*

An examination of these hypotheses demands the measurement of the attitude dimensions involved. The development of scales designed to measure religious attitudes has been a continuing enterprise of

Sociologists and Social Psychologists. They have included Likert, Guttman, and Thurstone scales and have measured such things as "attitudes toward the church,"<sup>8</sup> or "Orthodoxy,"<sup>9</sup> or simply "Religiousness".<sup>10</sup> In the present study each of the dimensions involved in the hypotheses was translated into a Likert scale. The scales were then subjected to item analysis in order to distill the final and most sensitive scale items.

The dimensions employed are: (1) Fundamentalism — these are religious attitudes and beliefs based upon a literal interpretation of the Bible. An example item is, "The Bible is completely and everlastingly true." (2) Academic attitudes — these are attitudes which can be characterized as conforming to scholarly endeavors, learning, academic freedom, and respect for academic life and academicians. An example item is, "College professors can have too much academic freedom." (Strongly disagree is the academic response.)<sup>11</sup> (3) Authoritarian attitudes — these are attitudes that relate to the unquestioning obedience to authority. The authoritarian is a person who believes in, advocates, practices, and enforces such obedience. This scale was derived from Adorno<sup>12</sup> with an emphasis upon clearer unidimensionality. (4) Superstitious attitudes — these are beliefs and attitudes that are inconsistent with the known laws of science or with what is generally considered as true and rational in the particular society. An example item is, "To be perfectly honest, I am bothered by a black cat crossing my path." (5) Prejudice — these attitudes involve negative prejudgment of minority groups. An example item is, "Negroes will always have lower morals than whites." (6) Attitudes conforming to the protestant ethic — these are attitudes which favor the religious and ethical basis for success. An example item is, "Success is the result of diligent hard work."<sup>13</sup> (7) Machiavellian attitudes — these are attitudes of a manipulative nature, which see individuals as objects to be maneuvered in interpersonal relations. An example item is, "The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear." (8) Optimism-pessimism — this is a scale derived from Goldman-Eisler<sup>14</sup> and it measures personal optimism and pessimism. An example item is, "In the end justice will prevail." All scales used five response categories ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Data was also gathered on (9) College major, (10) College class, (11) Region, and (12) Sex.

All of the continuous variables were collapsed into dichotomies. In each case these continuous variables were divided as close to the median of the distribution as possible. The cutting points selected in the total distribution were used in each partial or regional table.

The sample of 625 students examined in this study included students from four universities, two southern, one midwestern, and one best described as border. Students were grouped into regional samples on the basis of their home state. The total sample was made up of 289

southern students, 172 border students, and 164 midwestern students. The data was secured by means of questionnaires which were administered in Introductory Sociology classes in all four universities.

### *Findings*

#### *Hypothesis 1*

In regard to the first hypothesis it was discovered, as hypothesized, that fundamentalistic attitudes are more common in the southern student sample than in the border sample, which in turn has a greater proportion of students scoring high in fundamentalism than the midwestern sample. Table 1 provides the data bearing on this hypothesis. Thus we discover that religious fundamentalism is less pervasive in the midwestern and border samples than in the southern student sample.

#### *Hypothesis 2*

An examination of Table 2 reveals that fundamentalistic attitudes and academic attitudes are related in only the southern student sample and are inversely related as hypothesized. Therefore we find that anti-academic attitudes are clustered with or are related to fundamentalistic religious beliefs in only the southern sample. Hypothesis 2 is supported in only one of the regional samples.

#### *Hypothesis 3*

In regard to the third hypothesis we find that fundamentalism is inversely related to education, and, as expected, this clustering occurred in only the midwestern and border state student samples. An examination of the associations found in Table 3 suggests that southern education takes place within the fundamentalistic frame for education has no impact upon it. This is to be expected if fundamentalism is an integrated part of the region's sub-culture. In such a situation the conflicts and inconsistencies which might exist between tradition and scholarship are not pointed up or identified and perhaps are not even perceived. Education in the border and midwestern samples is significantly and inversely associated with fundamentalism. This suggests that university education in these regions has a greater "liberalizing" influence upon fundamentalistic belief or that the fundamentalism found in these regions is a less pervasive part of the sub-culture and is therefore less impervious to attack.

#### *Hypothesis 4*

This hypothesis, which is concerned with the relationship between fundamentalism and college major, is also supported. Table 4 which

bears upon this hypothesis summarizes the four analyses. In this case, where the variable of college major is not directional, an inverse or negative association describes the case in which social science majors are disproportionately low on fundamentalism or few of them score high on fundamentalism, and there are disproportionately more students with other majors in the high fundamentalism category than expected. When we control region we find that the relationship exists only in the southern sample where we previously found education generally unrelated to the variable of fundamentalism. The high Q and relatively small  $X^2$  found in the border sample is the result of a smaller N in this particular table. The smaller N is due to the fact that a great many border state students did not provide data on their college major. These differential associations reveal that in the south disciplines dealing with matters of tradition (social sciences) has fewer fundamentalistic students than disciplines like engineering and the natural sciences. A direct examination of tradition or the frontal assault upon it of the type usually found in social science courses is apparently needed in the south to liberalize the religious tradition, whereas education alone is generally sufficient in the midwestern sample.

#### *Hypothesis 5*

If we turn our attention now to the hypotheses dealing with the relationship between fundamentalism and bigotry we find in regard to hypothesis 5 that fundamentalism is directly related to authoritarianism as we expected. When region is controlled, however, we find that the relationship exists only in the southern and border state student samples and not in the midwestern sample. Table 5 presents this data.

#### *Hypothesis 6*

An examination of Table 6 reveals that fundamentalism and superstition are directly related, but that the significant relationships occur only within the southern and border state samples when region is controlled.

#### *Hypothesis 7*

Our examination of this hypothesis reveals, as hypothesized, that fundamentalism is directly related to prejudice. When we control region or home state the relationship is found to exist only among the southern students. Table 7 presents the findings relevant to this hypothesis. Thus we have found that fundamentalism is clustered with classical bigotry in only the southern university student sample.

#### *Hypothesis 8*

The last series of hypotheses to be examined are those dealing with the relationship between fundamentalism and "morals and morale." In

regard to hypothesis 8 we find that fundamentalism is associated with the tendency to ascribe to the protestant ethic, however we also find that this relationship occurs only in the southern and border state samples and not in the midwestern sample. Table 8 presents the findings relating to this hypothesis.

*Hypothesis 9*

This hypothesis is also supported for we find that fundamentalism is inversely associated with Machiavellian attitudes. This relationship is found to occur in only the southern state student sample. Table 9 presents these findings.

*Hypothesis 10*

Finally we find, as we hypothesized, that fundamentalists are personally optimistic. Table 10 presents the relevant findings.

In order to provide an overview and summary we will outline the profile of the fundamentalistic college student in the regions sampled. (1) Fundamentalistic students in the midwestern sample were not found to be greatly influenced by these particular attitudes, for very few variables included in this study were related to fundamentalism in this region. Perhaps this is the case because these attitudes are not supported by a conservative-traditional social structure focusing upon fundamentalism. It is also possible that religious fundamentalism is simply related to other and differing variables in the midwestern region. There is some evidence that the fundamentalistic tradition is weaker in the midwest for we find it is subject to modification through the process of general education. (2) In the south fundamentalism is consonant with the general conservative-traditional belief system of the area and these beliefs in this region have greater effects, at least in regard to the variables employed in this study. Fundamentalism in the southern region is significantly associated with prejudice, authoritarianism, superstition, the protestant ethic, which makes the fundamentalist interpersonally ethical and in turn optimistic. The social support of fundamentalism by tradition minimizes the liberalizing influence of general education and finds direct expression in anti-academic attitudes. Fundamentalistic tradition had been affected in this region where intellectual inquiry directly analyzes and assaults it as in such disciplines as the social sciences. (3) The border state fundamentalist falls between the preceding two. Tradition offers him some support, thus we find the hard-core correlates of fundamentalism in the region — authoritarianism, superstition, protestant ethic, and most appropriately we discover that general education is a sufficient liberalizer.

In conclusion we must point out that perhaps the most significant finding in this study is not the associations as such but the great

regional difference we observe with fundamentalism clearly fitting into a sub-cultural cluster of attitudes and beliefs in the southern student sample and just as clearly not belonging to a comparable sub-culture in the midwestern student sample.

**Table 1. Fundamentalism and Region**

Region	Fundamentalism		Total
	High	Low	
Midwestern . . . .	31%	69%	100% (164)
Border . . . . .	48%	52%	100% (172)
Southern . . . . .	53%	47%	100% (289)
Total . . . . .			625
$\chi^2 = 20.45$		$P < .01$	

**Table 2. Fundamentalism and Academic Attitudes**

TOTAL SAMPLE				MIDWESTERN SAMPLE			
Fundamentalism	Academic Attitudes			Fundamentalism	Academic Attitudes		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
High	46%	54%	100% (286)	High	53%	47%	100% (51)
Low	50%	50%	100% (339)	Low	49%	51%	100% (113)
Total			625	Total			164
$\chi^2=1.37$ $P>.05$ $Q=.09$				$\chi^2=.256$ $P>.05$ $Q=.09$			
BORDER SAMPLE				SOUTHERN SAMPLE			
Fundamentalism	Academic Attitudes			Fundamentalism	Academic Attitudes		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
High	48%	52%	100% (82)	High	42%	58%	100% (153)
Low	46%	54%	100% (90)	Low	54%	46%	100% (136)
Total			172	Total			289
$\chi^2=.069$ $P>.05$ $Q=.04$				$\chi^2=4.57$ $P<.05$ $Q=-.25$			

**Table 3. Fundamentalism and Education**

TOTAL SAMPLE				MIDWESTERN SAMPLE			
Education	Fundamentalism			Education	Fundamentalism		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
High	43%	57%	100% (480)	High	29%	71%	100% (143)
Low	57%	43%	100% (132)	Low	53%	47%	100% (17)
Total			612	Total			160
$\chi^2=8.054$ $P<.05$ $Q=-.27$				$\chi^2=4.17$ $P<.05$ $Q=-.47$			
BORDER SAMPLE				SOUTHERN SAMPLE			
Education	Fundamentalism			Education	Fundamentalism		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
High	35%	65%	100% (78)	High	53%	47%	100% (259)
Low	59%	41%	100% (90)	Low	52%	48%	100% (25)
Total			168	Total			284
$\chi^2=9.87$ $P<.01$ $Q=-.46$				$\chi^2=.015$ $P>.05$ $Q=.03$			

**Table 4. Fundamentalism and College Major**

TOTAL SAMPLE				MIDWESTERN SAMPLE			
College Major	Fundamentalism			College Major	Fundamentalism		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
Soc. Sc. etc.	29%	71%	100% (136)	Soc. Sc. etc.	27%	73%	100% (41)
Nat. Sc. etc.	49%	51%	100% (242)	Nat. Sc. etc.	35%	65%	100% (68)
Total			378	Total			109
$\chi^2=13.96$ $P<.01$ $Q=-.40$				$\chi^2=.844$ $P>.05$ $Q=-.196$			
BORDER SAMPLE				SOUTHERN SAMPLE			
College Major	Fundamentalism			College Major	Fundamentalism		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
Soc. Sc. etc.	27%	73%	100% (34)	Soc. Sc. etc.	33%	67%	100% (61)
Nat. Sc. etc.	47%	53%	100% (51)	Nat. Sc. etc.	58%	42%	100% (123)
Total			85	Total			184
$\chi^2=3.64$ $P>.05$ $Q=-.42$				$\chi^2=10.15$ $P<.01$ $Q=-.47$			

**Table 5. Fundamentalism and Authoritarianism**

TOTAL SAMPLE				MIDWESTERN SAMPLE			
Fundamentalism	Authoritarianism			Fundamentalism	Authoritarianism		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
High	62%	38%	100% (286)	High	45%	55%	100% (51)
Low	36%	64%	100% (339)	Low	38%	62%	100% (113)
Total			625	Total			164
$\chi^2=40.61$ $P<.01$ $Q=.48$				$\chi^2=.728$ $P>.05$ $Q=.14$			
BORDER SAMPLE				SOUTHERN SAMPLE			
Fundamentalism	Authoritarianism			Fundamentalism	Authoritarianism		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
High	72%	28%	100% (82)	High	61%	39%	100% (153)
Low	33%	67%	100% (90)	Low	36%	64%	100% (136)
Total			172	Total			289
$\chi^2=25.63$ $P<.01$ $Q=.67$				$\chi^2=18.59$ $P<.01$ $Q=.48$			

**Table 6. Fundamentalism and Superstition**

TOTAL SAMPLE				MIDWESTERN SAMPLE			
Fundamentalism	Superstition			Fundamentalism	Superstition		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
High .....	67%	33%	100% (286)	High .....	55%	45%	100% (51)
Low .....	35%	65%	100% (339)	Low .....	39%	61%	100% (113)
Total .....	625			Total .....	164		
$X^2=62.49$ $P<.01$ $Q=.58$				$X^2=3.64$ $P>.05$ $Q=.31$			
BORDER SAMPLE				SOUTHERN SAMPLE			
Fundamentalism	Superstition			Fundamentalism	Superstition		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
High .....	82%	18%	100% (82)	High .....	63%	37%	100% (153)
Low .....	39%	61%	100% (90)	Low .....	30%	70%	100% (136)
Total .....	172			Total .....	289		
$X^2=32.59$ $P<.01$ $Q=.75$				$X^2=30.49$ $P<.01$ $Q=.59$			

**Table 7. Fundamentalism and Prejudice**

TOTAL SAMPLE				MIDWESTERN SAMPLE			
Fundamentalism	Prejudice			Fundamentalism	Prejudice		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
High .....	53%	47%	100% (286)	High .....	37%	63%	100% (51)
Low .....	42%	58%	100% (339)	Low .....	40%	60%	100% (113)
Total .....	625			Total .....	164		
$X^2=7.55$ $P<.01$ $Q=.22$				$X^2=.097$ $P>.05$ $Q=-.05$			
BORDER SAMPLE				SOUTHERN SAMPLE			
Fundamentalism	Prejudice			Fundamentalism	Prejudice		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
High .....	39%	61%	100% (82)	High .....	67%	33%	100% (153)
Low .....	34%	66%	100% (90)	Low .....	50%	50%	100% (136)
Total .....	172			Total .....	289		
$X^2=.39$ $P>.05$ $Q=.06$				$X^2=8.26$ $P<.01$ $Q=.33$			

**Table 8. Fundamentalism and the Protestant Ethic**

TOTAL SAMPLE				MIDWESTERN SAMPLE			
Fundamentalism	Protestant Ethic			Fundamentalism	Protestant Ethic		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
High .....	64%	36%	100% (286)	High .....	59%	41%	100% (51)
Low .....	46%	54%	100% (339)	Low .....	44%	56%	100% (113)
Total .....	625			Total .....	164		
$X^2=19.39$ $P<.01$ $Q=.34$				$X^2=2.99$ $P>.05$ $Q=.29$			
BORDER SAMPLE				SOUTHERN SAMPLE			
Fundamentalism	Protestant Ethic			Fundamentalism	Protestant Ethic		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
High .....	71%	29%	100% (82)	High .....	61%	39%	100% (153)
Low .....	44%	66%	100% (90)	Low .....	48%	52%	100% (136)
Total .....	172			Total .....	289		
$X^2=12.10$ $P<.01$ $Q=.50$				$X^2=4.85$ $P<.05$ $Q=.26$			

**Table 9. Fundamentalism and Machiavellian Attitudes**

TOTAL SAMPLE				MIDWESTERN SAMPLE			
Fundamentalism	Machiav. Attitudes			Fundamentalism	Machiav. Attitudes		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
High .....	45%	55%	100% (286)	High .....	41%	59%	100% (51)
Low .....	53%	47%	100% (339)	Low .....	54%	46%	100% (113)
Total .....	625			Total .....	164		
$X^2=3.63$ $P>.05$ $Q=-.15$				$X^2=2.31$ $P>.05$ $Q=-.25$			
BORDER SAMPLE				SOUTHERN SAMPLE			
Fundamentalism	Machiav. Attitudes			Fundamentalism	Machiav. Attitudes		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
High .....	51%	49%	100% (82)	High .....	44%	56%	100% (153)
Low .....	47%	53%	100% (90)	Low .....	57%	43%	100% (136)
Total .....	172			Total .....	289		
$X^2=.35$ $P>.05$ $Q=.09$				$X^2=4.74$ $P<.05$ $Q=-.25$			

**Table 10. Fundamentalism and Personal Optimism**

TOTAL SAMPLE				MIDWESTERN SAMPLE			
Fundamentalism	Personal Optimism			Fundamentalism	Personal Optimism		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
High . . . . .	58%	42%	100% (286)	High . . . . .	78%	22%	100% (51)
Low . . . . .	47%	53%	100% (339)	Low . . . . .	58%	42%	100% (113)
Total . . . . .			625	Total . . . . .			164
X <sup>2</sup> =8.20 P<.01 Q=.23				X <sup>2</sup> =6.67 P<.01 Q=.46			
BORDER SAMPLE				SOUTHERN SAMPLE			
Fundamentalism	Personal Optimism			Fundamentalism	Personal Optimism		
	High	Low	Total		High	Low	Total
High . . . . .	50%	50%	100% (82)	High . . . . .	56%	44%	100% (153)
Low . . . . .	39%	61%	100% (90)	Low . . . . .	43%	57%	100% (136)
Total . . . . .			172	Total . . . . .			289
X <sup>2</sup> =2.15 P>.05 Q=.22				X <sup>2</sup> =4.76 P<.05 Q=.25			

**FOOTNOTES**

\*Financial support for this study was provided by the University of Arkansas Research Fund.

- 1 Thomas R. Ford, "Status, Residence, and Fundamentalist Religious Beliefs in the Southern Appalachians," *Social Forces*, 39 (October 1960) pp. 41-49.
- 2 Snell Putney and R. Middleton, "Dimensions and Correlates of Religious Ideologies," *Social Forces*, 39 (May 1961) pp. 285-290.
- 3 W. Seward Salisbury, "Religiosity, Regional Sub-Culture, and Social Behavior," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 2 (Fall 1962) pp. 94-113.
- 4 Lillian Smith, *Killers of the Dream* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1949).
- 5 E. Durkheim, *Suicide* (Glencoe: Free Press 1951) p. 162.

- 6 *Ibid.*
- 7 Gordon W. Allport, "Religion and Prejudice," *Personality and Social Encounter* (Boston: Beacon Press 1962) pp. 257-267.
- 8 L. L. Thurstone and E. J. Clave, *The Measurement of Attitude* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929).
- 9 Putney and Middleton, *op. cit.*
- 10 Rose K. Goldsen, et al. *What College Students Think* (Princeton: Van Nostrand 1960).
- 11 Since this is a totally new attitude scale the items are reproduced below:
  1. I'm not learning much of value in college.\*
  2. College costs more than it is really worth.\*
  3. The liberality of the college environment is a refreshing experience.
  4. College is only valuable for the information obtained.\*
  5. College professors should be accorded more prestige than they are.
  6. I think that professors should be allowed complete freedom in the classes.
  7. I find college professors impractical.\*
  8. I wish I didn't have to listen to the "radical ideas" that are forced upon me here at college.\*
  9. All I want from college is a degree.\*
  10. Academically I would like to be like many of my professors.
  11. College professors can have too much academic freedom.\*
  12. I don't approve of the "unconventional" ideas of some of my professors.\*

\* on these items "strongly disagree is the strongest academic response, on all the other items the strongest academic response is "strongly agree."
- 12 T. W. Adorno, et al. *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York: Harper 1950).
- 13 Since this is a totally new attitude scale the items are reproduced below:
  1. Conscientiousness is proof of a state of grace.\*
  2. Success is the result of diligent hard work.
  3. Unwillingness to work is an indication of sinful lack of grace.
  4. To wish to be poor or unsuccessful is the same as wishing to be unhealthy.
  5. The waste of time is the first and deadliest of faults.



6. Success and wealth are bad ethically only insofar as they are temptations to idleness.
  7. Time is money.
  8. He who will not work shall not eat.
  9. We are each assigned to a position and it is our duty to persevere in that position.
  10. Wealth and success do not exempt anyone from the command to labor.
  11. We must acquire all we can and save all we can.
  12. The acquisition of wealth is bad only when it is with the purpose of later living merrily and without care.
- \*on all of the items of this scale "strongly agree" is the strongest protestant ethic response.

- 14 Goldman-Eisler, "Breastfeeding and Character Formation," in C. Kluckhohn, et al. *Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture* (New York: Knopf 1953) pp. 146-184.

## THE IMPLICATIONS OF DURKHEIM'S PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

*Judith Willer*  
*University of Kansas*

*Durkheim and His Critics*

Reading Durkheim's critics leads one to conclude that either Durkheim was very confused or they are. Between them there is certainly no *conscience collective*. Some have claimed he was "conservative"<sup>1</sup> while others deny it;<sup>2</sup> his logic has been described as "fallacious"<sup>3</sup> and "incisive"<sup>4</sup>; he is a "moral philosopher"<sup>5</sup> to one critic and a "great empirical scientist"<sup>6</sup> according to another; his use of "*conscience collective*" is praised by one writer<sup>7</sup> and described as "deplorable"<sup>8</sup> by another; he has been characterized as "anti-individualistic"<sup>9</sup> by one critic while another has denied it.<sup>10</sup>

Perhaps the contradictory interpretations result from a real inconsistency in his work. Possibly he cannot be understood because his work is "out of line with twentieth-century thought."<sup>11</sup> Such explanations, however, are excessively superficial. What is the basis for the claim that Durkheim is inconsistent? It seems plausible that his thought is more complex than is typically realized by scholars searching it for simple logical continuities or discontinuities. Perhaps he merely appears inconsistent because he has been apprehended from diverse points of view or from a single point of view foreign to his own thought. Many of his critics have ignored the possibility that Durkheim's ideas were subject to development (as might surely be expected of any competent scholar) and that his writings could not thus be expected to agree on every point.

Moreover, Durkheim's ideas should not be loosely compared with "twentieth-century thought." Such a comparison both takes Durkheim out of his temporal context and implies that modern methods are necessarily "better". If Durkheim had a goal different from that of modern sociology his method could be expected to be different. *Different* scientific ideas and goals are not necessarily wrong ideas and goals — this assumption would lead to a science both static and