

Appendix C: Cultural Revolution Experiment 1995

Endogenous Variables

Authoritarianism: My measure of authoritarian ‘predisposition’ (distinguished in my conception from ‘authoritarian attitudes’), constructed from subjects’ choices upon being presented with a series of paired words, and being instructed: “For each of the following pairs of words, please indicate which one appeals to you more. Even if both words seem appealing or neither is very appealing, just pick the one that sounds better to you”. A simple scale was formed by summing the number of authoritarian choices made across the three pairs that seemed most reflective of the concept in question, among the entire series, specifically: “obey or question”, “rules or progress”, “obedience or curiosity” (authoritarian choice here presented first). The scale was rescored to be of one-unit range, and then centered on a mean of ‘0’.

Political Conservatism: Subjects’ self-placement on a standard liberal-conservative measure in response to: “Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as: very liberal, liberal, somewhat liberal, moderate, somewhat conservative, conservative, very conservative?”, with “don’t know” responses assigned to “moderate”. Scale rescored to one-unit range, and centered on mean ‘0’.

Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA): An overall measure of ‘authoritarian attitudes’ (as distinct from ‘authoritarian predisposition’) formed by averaging the extent of subjects’ agreement/disagreement (indicated on five-point Likert scales ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’) with 20 statements drawn directly from Altemeyer’s RWA scale. Missing values on the individual items were imputed using exogenous variables. The items were reversed as appropriate, then averaged, and the final scale was rescored to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’. The statements presented to subjects (and in this order) were as follows:

- (i) The way things are going in this country, it’s going to take a lot of “strong medicine” to straighten out the troublemakers, criminals, and perverts.
- (ii) It is wonderful that young people today have greater freedom to protest against things they don’t like and to “do their own thing”.
- (iii) 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 doubts in people’s minds.
- (iv) 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.
- (v) It may be considered old-fashioned by some, but having a decent, respectable appearance is still the mark of a gentleman and, especially, a lady.
- (vi) 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.
- (vii) There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual intercourse.
- (viii) Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.

Appendix C: Cultural Revolution Experiment 1995

- (ix) Rules about being “well -mannered” and respectable are chains from the past which we should question very thoroughly before accepting.
- (x) 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.
- (xi) Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
- (xii) The self-righteous “forces of law and order” threaten freedom in our country a lot more than most of the groups they claim are “radical” and “godless”.
- (xiii) If a child starts becoming unconventional and disrespectful of authority, it is his parents’ duty to get him back to the normal way.
- (xiv) In the final analysis the established authorities, like parents and our national leaders, generally turn out to be right about things, and all the protesters don’t know what they’re talking about.
- (xv) 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.
- (xvi) There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps.
- (xvii) The real keys to the “good life” are obedience, discipline, and sticking to the straight and narrow.
- (xviii) It is best to treat dissenters with leniency and an open mind, since new ideas are the lifeblood of progressive change.
- (xix) Students in high school and university must be encouraged to challenge their parents’ ways, confront established authorities, and in general criticize the customs and traditions of our society.
- (xx) 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.

Perception of a ‘Dangerous World’: Overall measure of the tendency to perceive a dangerous world, constructed by averaging the extent of agreement/disagreement (indicated on five-point Likert scales) with the following seven items (reversed as appropriate) all drawn from Altemeyer’s original scale. Missing values on individual items were imputed from exogenous variables. Final measure rescored to be of one unit range.

- (i) It seems that every year there are fewer and fewer truly respectable people, and more and more persons who threaten everyone else.
- (ii) Although every era has its problems, a person’ s chances of living a safe, untroubled life are better today than ever before.
- (iii) With everything in such a state of disorder, it’ s hard for people to know where they stand from one day to the next.
- (iv) Our society is not full of devious and untrustworthy people who prey on decent people. News reports of such cases are grossly exaggerated and misleading.
- (v) People who think that earthquakes, wars, and famines mean the end of the world is coming soon are being foolish.
- (vi) If our society keeps degenerating the way it has been lately, it’ s likely to collapse like a rotten log and everything will be chaos.
- (vii) Any day now, chaos and anarchy could erupt around us. All the signs are pointing to it.

Appendix C: Cultural Revolution Experiment 1995

Racial Intolerance: A scale indicating overall racial intolerance, formed by summing the following three equally-weighted components and then re-scoring the result to range from '0' to '1', with intolerant responses scoring high.

(i) Negativity of feelings about African-Americans, as gauged by response to the following 'feeling thermometer' instructions:

'Now we would like to get your feelings about various people and groups of people. For each person or group please give your evaluation on a scale of 0 to 10. A score of 0 would indicate that you feel very negatively about the group or person, while a score of 10 would indicate that you feel very positively. Of course, you can use any number in between. If you don't have any real feelings or are neutral toward a person or group you would give them a 5'.

Subjects were then presented with scales for rating a list of 12 'targets', in this order: Bill Clinton, Jesse Jackson, Bob Dole, Conservatives, Atheists, people on welfare, the Ku Klux Klan, Feminists, African-Americans, Liberals, homosexuals, and Black activists. The affect here expressed for African-Americans was re-scored to range from '0' to '1', and reversed such that negative evaluations scored high.

(ii) How much more positively subjects feel about the Ku Klux Klan than they do about (a baseline composite of) political groups and actors on average (all gauged by the just described 'feeling thermometer' device), subtracting their average feeling thermometer score for Clinton, Dole, Conservatives and Liberals from their rating of the Ku Klux Klan. Final result re-scored to range from '0' to '1'.

(iii) The extent to which a subject judges that "members of the American Nazi Party, who believe that blacks and jews are genetically inferior" are less "violent", "dishonest", "threatening", "untrustworthy", "dangerous", "unpredictable" and "extremist" than "people who advocate overthrowing the capitalist system in this country". Note that these seven judgments did not explicitly compare Nazis and Communists. Rather, they were rendered separately for each group (on five-point scales ranging, for example, from "violent" to "non-violent"), immediately following consideration of the political intolerance scenarios (see below) for that group. The overall measure then subtracted the summed ratings for the Communists from the summed ratings for the Nazis (with positive assessments scoring high), such that the final score indicates simply how much more positively the subject evaluates Nazis than Communists. Scale re-scored to range from '0' to '1'.

Political Intolerance: A scale indicating overall political intolerance, formed by summing the following three equally-weighted components and then re-scoring the result to range from '0' to '1', with intolerant responses scoring high.

(i) A count of the number of times (across five hypothetical scenarios) subjects failed to give the tolerant response, in considering whether a person "who belongs to an organization that is dedicated to overthrowing the capitalist system in this country" should be allowed "to make a speech in this area advocating" those ideas, and "to teach in public schools", whether they would "favor removing" from the public library "a book this person wrote about" those ideas, whether the government should "be allowed to wiretap the phone of such a person", and whether people

Appendix C: Cultural Revolution Experiment 1995

who advocate those ideas should ‘be banned from being President of the U.S.’. Re-scored to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’.

(ii) As above, but this time considering each scenario in regard to ‘a person—like a member of the American Nazi Party—who believes that blacks and jews are genetically inferior’.

(iii) A scale indicating general opposition to political freedom, formed by summing six (equally-weighted) five-point Likert items gauging subjects’ agreement/disagreement that ‘radical and extremist political groups should be allowed to speak their views in public even if there is a threat of disruption or disorder’; ‘free speech should not be guaranteed to radical groups who threaten to disrupt order in our society’; ‘any political group should be allowed to say what they want even if some of the things they say are highly threatening to some parts of society’; ‘society shouldn’t have to put up with groups whose political ideas are offensive to the majority’; ‘it is important to allow a person to stand up for an unpopular political view, even if most people find the view highly offensive’; and ‘it is better to live in an orderly society than to allow people so much freedom that they can become disruptive’. Re-scored to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’.

Moral Intolerance: A scale indicating overall moral intolerance, formed by summing the following four equally-weighted components and then re-scoring the result to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’, with intolerant responses scoring high.

(i) Dummy variable indicating that the subject responded with anything other than ‘same as any other film’ to the question: ‘How do you feel about movies that use foul language or show nudity and sexual acts on the screen? Do you think they have just as much right to be shown as any other films, that they should be shown but with location and minimum age set by the government, or should they be banned?’.

(ii) Dummy variable indicating that the subject responded with anything other than ‘not regulated at all’ to the question: ‘Do you think pornography should be prohibited by law, regulated by law but not prohibited, or not regulated at all?’.

(iii) Dummy variable indicating that the subject responded ‘totally forbidden’ to the question: ‘How should we deal with prostitution? Should it not be the government’s business, should it be allowed but regulated by law, or should it be totally forbidden by law?’.

(iv) Negativity of feelings about homosexuals, as gauged by the previously described ‘feeling thermometer’ device, re-scored to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’, and reversed such that negative evaluations score high.

Punitiveness: A scale indicating overall punitiveness, formed by summing the following two equally-weighted components and then re-scoring the result to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’, with punitive responses scoring high.

(i) Dummy variable indicating that the subject responded with approval to the question: ‘Do you approve or disapprove of the death penalty for people convicted of murder?’.

(ii) Dummy variable indicating that the subject responded ‘punish’ to the question: ‘Should the major purpose of prison be to rehabilitate those convicted of crimes, or to punish them for their crimes?’.

General Intolerance: A scale indicating general intolerance, formed by averaging the 12 (equally weighted) components described above, and then re-scoring the result to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’, with intolerant responses scoring high.

Appendix C: Cultural Revolution Experiment 1995

Explanatory Variables

Openness to Experience: A composite measure that borrows four suitable items from a series actually intended by convention to measure “intolerance of ambiguity”, to reflect the personality dimension ‘Openness to Experience’. Overall measure formed by summing four (equally-weighted) five-point Likert items gauging subjects’ agreement/disagreement that “a problem has little attraction for me if I don’t think it has a solution” (disagree); “I often find that vague and impressionistic pictures really appeal to me” (agree); “I don’t like to work on a problem unless there is a possibility of coming out with a clear-cut and unambiguous answer” (disagree); and “I like to fool around with new ideas, even if they turn out later to be a total waste of time” (agree). Final result re-scored to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’.

Suspicion: Dummy variable scored ‘1’ if subjects indicated any suspicion regarding the experiment (e.g. enquiring as to its purposes, asking how the data would be used) or any discomfort about taking part (e.g. needing to be assured that the responses would be kept confidential), although not at a level or of a nature sufficient to justify excluding their responses altogether (e.g. doubting the legitimacy of the stimulus materials).

Male: Dummy variable scored ‘1’ if male, otherwise ‘0’.

Errors per word in commentary: A count of the number of spelling and serious grammatical errors per word of commentary, in subjects’ written responses to the reassuring and threatening stimulus articles they read. These errors were counted by a coder specifically trained for this particular task, blind to my objectives and hypotheses, and ignorant of the stimuli in each case. By my instruction, ‘errors’ would include misspellings, serious grammatical errors, and also obviously wrong word choices (e.g. writing about ‘corrosion’ when context made apparent he/she really meant ‘corruption’).

Political knowledge: Combines two equally-weighted components—leader knowledge and party knowledge—to form an overall measure indicating general political knowledge, re-scored to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’. The ‘leader knowledge’ component was a count of the number of correct (open-ended) responses provided to the query “What job or political office does he now hold?” regarding eight national and international public figures, specifically: Al Gore, William Rehnquist, Boris Yeltsin, Tom Foley, Warren Christopher, Ted Turner, Fidel Castro, and Daniel Patrick Moynihan. In the ‘party knowledge’ component, subjects score points for being able to correctly place (directly after placing themselves) the Republican and Democratic parties on the standard seven-point ideology scale described above for ‘political conservatism’, in response to the query: “Using the same categories of very liberal to very conservative, where would you place the (Republican/Democratic) party?”. By my designation, any “conservative” placement or “moderate” is considered correct for the Republicans, and any “liberal” placement or “moderate” is considered correct for the Democrats.

No punishment; expression of disappointment; loss of privileges; scolding; spanking: These five interval measures, all of the same set, were formed from responses to the instruction “Please indicate how your mother or father would most typically have punished you for each of the

Appendix C: Cultural Revolution Experiment 1995

following”, followed by: ‘Disobeying them in a matter like coming straight home from school, or cleaning up your room before going out to play’; ‘Lying about something like whether you’d brushed your teeth or fed a pet’; ‘Using ‘dirty’ or sexual language’; ‘Talking back to another adult or showing disrespect toward another adult in some similar way’; ‘Getting the house dirty by tracking in mud, getting dirt on the furniture, etc.’; ‘Starting a fight in school’; ‘Stealing a dollar from a purse, a sugar bowl, etc.’; and ‘Deliberately disobeying them in front of other children in order to show off’. Each of the five measures is then a simple count of the number of times the subject responded (across the eight hypothetical scenarios) that *that* (e.g. spanking) was how they would most typically have been punished for the said ‘offence’. Each measure was rescored to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’, with ‘1’ thus indicating that they would have been punished in that manner (e.g. spanked) for every one of the eight offences, and ‘0’ that they never would have been punished in that manner for any of the offences.

Childhood read ‘fiction: anything and everything’; ‘fiction: love and friendship’; ‘fiction: classics/human struggle’; ‘non-fiction: history and society’: These four dummy variables, all of the same set, were formed from subjects’ responses to the question: ‘What sort of books did you read—just for pleasure--when you were growing up?’. A series of dummy variables was formed to categorize the types of books that subjects nominated in these open-ended responses, which included (in addition to those already noted above) ‘fiction: crime/military/espionage’; ‘fiction: horror/thriller’; ‘science fiction’; and ‘non-fiction: biography/true stories/sports/nature/science’.

Parents divorced in childhood: Dummy variable indicating that the parents were divorced before the subject graduated from high school.

Moved around in childhood: Crude ordinal variable arranging along three points responses to the question: ‘When you were growing up, did you mostly live in one place, did your family move around a bit, or did your family move around a lot?’. Rescored to range from ‘0’ to ‘1’.

Mom and Dad had equal say; Mom had the say; Dad had the say: A series of three dummy variables categorizing responses to the question: ‘When family decisions were made did your father have the most say, did your mother have the most say, or did they have about an equal amount of influence on the decision?’.

Have traveled overseas: Dummy variable indicating whether the subject has ‘ever traveled outside of the U.S.’.

Appendix C: Cultural Revolution Experiment 1995

Table C.1: Univariate Statistics

Endogenous Variables		
<i>Scale Variables</i>	<i>mean(sd)</i>	<i>range</i>
Authoritarianism ('authoritarian predisposition') (<i>direct measure</i>)	.00(.29)	-.21 -- .79
Political Conservatism (<i>direct measure</i>)	.00(.25)	-.51 -- .49
Right-Wing Authoritarianism ('expressed attitudes')	.55(.18)	0 – 1
*Perception of a 'Dangerous World'	.48(.21)	0 -- 1
Racial intolerance	.37(.19)	0 – 1
Political intolerance	.47(.23)	0 – 1
Moral intolerance	.59(.28)	0 – 1
Punitiveness	.67(.38)	0 – 1
General intolerance of difference	.56(.20)	0 – 1
Explanatory Variables		
<i>Scale Variables</i>	<i>mean(sd)</i>	<i>range</i>
Authoritarianism (<i>instrument</i>)	.00(.14)	-.32 -- .68
Political conservatism (<i>instrument</i>)	.00(.15)	-.37 -- .63
Openness to experience	.53(.24)	0 – 1
Errors per word in commentary	.03(.04)	0 – .375
Political knowledge	.70(.25)	0 – 1
No punishment	.08(.12)	0 -- .50
Expression of disappointment	.28(.24)	0 – 1
Loss of Privileges	.21(.21)	0 - .875
Scolding	.36(.23)	0 – 1
Spanking	.07(.13)	0 -- .625
*Moved around in childhood	.17(.31)	0 – 1
<i>Categorical Variables</i>	<i>% in category</i>	
Suspicion	4.85%	
Male	60.19%	
Read 'fiction: anything and everything'	12.62%	
Read 'fiction: love and friendship'	18.45%	
Read 'fiction: classics / human struggle'	10.68%	
Read 'non-fiction: history & society'	11.65%	
Parents divorced in childhood	25.24%	
Mom and Dad had equal say/Mom had the say/Dad had the say	54.37% / 21.36% / 24.27%	
*Have traveled overseas	66.02%	

Source: CRE95, Whites only; N=103.

Appendix C: Cultural Revolution Experiment 1995

Table C.2: Determinants of Authoritarianism

<i>Explanatory Variables</i>	1 st stage estimates	2 nd stage, basic model	2 nd stage, threats added
Political Conservatism (instrument) _a		.01(.23)	-.30(.35)
<i>Exogenous Variables</i>			
Openness to Experience	-.26(.12)**	-.25(.12)**	-.25(.13)**
Suspicion	-.07(.10)	--	--
Male	.12(.06)**	.11(.06)**	.10(.06)*
Errors per word in commentary	1.72(.36)**	1.54(.53)**	1.98(.65)**
Political knowledge	.00(.10)	--	--
No punishment v. spanking	-.49(.31)*	-.49(.32)*	-.47(.32)*
Expression of disappointment v. spanking	-.39(.22)**	-.43(.23)**	-.39(.25)*
Loss of privileges v. spanking	-.32(.29)	-.34(.30)	-.32(.31)
Scolding v. spanking	-.21(.24)	-.22(.24)	-.20(.25)
Read 'fiction: anything and everything'	-.11(.09)*	-.12(.08)*	-.12(.09)*
Read 'fiction: love and friendship'	-.13(.07)**	-.13(.07)**	-.12(.08)*
Read 'fiction: classics/human struggle'	-.08(.08)	-.09(.08)	-.09(.08)
Read 'non-fiction: history and society'	.02(.10)	--	--
Parents divorced in childhood	-.20(.06)**	-.16(.05)**	-.16(.06)**
Moved around in childhood	-.09(.07)	-.10(.07)*	-.13(.08)*
Mom and Dad had equal say v. Dad had the say	-.01(.07)	--	--
Mom had the say v. Dad had the say	.08(.08)	--	--
Have traveled overseas	.05(.05)	<i>excl.</i>	<i>excl.</i>
<i>Experimental Threat Conditions</i>			
Belief diversity			-.01(.08)
Bad leadership			.03(.09)
Unjust world			.02(.06)
No afterlife			--
<i>Political Conservatism_a*Threat</i>			
Conservatism*belief diversity			.60(.51)
Conservatism*bad leadership			.39(.58)
Conservatism*unjust world			.53(.36)*
Conservatism*no afterlife			--
Constant	.38(.25)	.44(.24)*	.41(.26)
R ²	.34	.32	.34

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized 2SLS regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses). ** p < .05. * p < .10 (one-tailed tests applied as appropriate). *excl.* indicates variable excluded for identification; -- indicates variable dropped for lack of effect. See Table C.1 for univariate statistics.

_a See Table C.3, '1st stage estimates', for the variables and estimates used to construct the instrument for political conservatism.

Source: CRE95, Whites only, N=103.

Appendix C: Cultural Revolution Experiment 1995

Table C.3: Determinants of Political Conservatism

<i>Explanatory Variables</i>	1 st stage estimates	2 nd stage, basic model	2 nd stage, threats added
Authoritarianism (instrument) ^a		.51(14)**	.14(.27)
<i>Exogenous Variables</i>			
Openness to Experience	-.11(.10)	--	--
Suspicion	.08(.11)	.14(.09)*	.14(.10)*
Male	.02(.06)	--	--
Errors per word in commentary	1.11(.36)**	--	--
Political knowledge	.17(.09)*	.19(.09)**	.22(.09)**
No punishment v. spanking	-.33(.22)*	--	--
Expression of disappointment v. spanking	-.18(.12)*	--	--
Loss of privileges v. spanking	-.18(.18)	--	--
Scolding v. spanking	-.04(.14)	--	--
Read 'fiction: anything and everything'	-.06(.07)	--	--
Read 'fiction: love and friendship'	-.09(.07)*	--	--
Read 'fiction: classics/human struggle'	.07(.09)	--	--
Read 'non-fiction: history and society'	-.14(.08)**	-.14(.07)**	-.17(.07)**
Parents divorced in childhood	-.08(.06)	<i>excl.</i>	<i>excl.</i>
Moved around in childhood	.03(.09)	--	--
Mom and Dad had equal say v. Dad had the say	.14(.06)**	.14(.06)**	.16(.06)**
Mom had the say v. Dad had the say	.11(.07)	.10(.07)	.12(.07)
Have traveled overseas	.10(.05)**	.08(.05)**	.07(.05)*
<i>Experimental Threat Conditions</i>			
Belief diversity			.05(.05)
Bad leadership			-.01(.06)
Unjust world			-.01(.06)
No afterlife			--
<i>Authoritarianism_a*Threat Conditions</i>			
Authoritarianism*belief diversity			.83(.60)*
Authoritarianism*bad leadership			.79(.47)**
Authoritarianism*unjust world			.64(.39)**
Authoritarianism*no afterlife			--
Constant	-.09(.15)	-.27(.08)**	-.30(.08)**
R ²	.29	.25	.30

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized 2SLS regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses). ** p < .05. * p < .10 (one-tailed tests applied as appropriate). *excl.* indicates variable excluded for identification; -- indicates variable dropped for lack of effect. See Table C.1 for univariate statistics.

^a See Table C.2, '1st stage estimates', for the variables and estimates used to construct the instrument for authoritarianism.

Source: CRE95, Whites only, N=103.

Appendix C: Cultural Revolution Experiment 1995

**Table C.4: Influence of Authoritarian Predisposition on Related Predispositions
Given Experimental Manipulation of Threat**

<i>Endogenous Variables</i> → ↓ <i>Explanatory Variables</i>	Authoritarian Attitudes (RWA Scale)	Perception of a 'Dangerous World'
Authoritarian predisposition (<i>instrument</i>) _a	.02(.20)	.02(.22)
<i>Exogenous Variables</i>		
Openness to Experience	-.17(.08)**	--
Suspicion	--	--
Male	--	-.12(.05)**
Errors per word in commentary	--	--
Political knowledge	--	--
No punishment v. spanking	-.17(.14)*	--
Expression of disappointment v. spanking	--	--
Loss of privileges v. spanking	--	--
Scolding v. spanking	--	--
Read 'fiction: anything and everything'	--	--
Read 'fiction: love and friendship'	--	--
Read 'fiction: classics/human struggle'	--	--
Read 'non-fiction: history and society'	-.08(.05)*	-.17(.05)**
Parents divorced in childhood	--	.12(.05)**
Moved around in childhood	<i>excl.</i>	<i>excl.</i>
Mom and Dad had equal say v. Dad had the say	--	--
Mom had the say v. Dad had the say	--	--
Have traveled overseas	--	--
<i>Experimental Threat Conditions</i>		
Belief diversity	.00(.05)	.05(.06)
Bad leadership	-.01(.05)	.06(.07)
Unjust world	-.02(.05)	.00(.06)
No afterlife	.00(.05)	-.04(.07)
<i>Authoritarianism_a*Threat Conditions</i>		
Authoritarianism*belief diversity	.90(.48)**	1.50(.50)**
Authoritarianism*bad leadership	.83(.32)**	1.07(.36)**
Authoritarianism*unjust world	.43(.30)*	.76(.34)**
Authoritarianism*no afterlife	.31(.42)	.41(.58)
Constant	.68(.06)**	.53(.04)**
<i>R</i> ²	.29	.24

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized 2SLS regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses).
** p < .05, * p < .10 (one-tailed tests applied as appropriate). *excl.* indicates variable excluded for identification; -- indicates variable dropped for lack of effect. See Table C.1 for univariate statistics.

_a See Table C.2, '1st stage estimates', for the variables and estimates used to construct the instrument for authoritarianism (authoritarian predisposition).

Source: CRE95, Whites only, N=103.

Appendix C: Cultural Revolution Experiment 1995

Table C.5: Differing Reactions of Authoritarians and Conservatives to the Existence/Absence of Alien Life-Forms

	Racial Intolerance	Punitiveness
Authoritarianism	-.47(.14)**	-.06(.20)
Political Conservatism	.21(.18)	.38(.31)
no aliens (<i>v. aliens</i>)	-.04(.05)	-.21(.11)**
Authoritarianism*no aliens	.76(.19)**	.74(.31)**
Political Conservatism*no aliens	-.26(.23)	-.18(.42)
Constant	.39(.04)**	.76(.07)**
R^2	.33	.32

Note: Cell entries are unstandardized OLS multiple regression coefficients (standard errors in parentheses). ** $p < .05$, * $p < .10$ (one-tailed tests applied as appropriate). See Table C.1 for univariate statistics.

Source: *CRE95*, Whites only; N=42 (subjects in the 'aliens' and 'no aliens' conditions only).