

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

2006

Predictors of the importance of freedom of speech

Daniel Michael Downs

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Downs, Daniel Michael, "Predictors of the importance of freedom of speech" (2006). *Theses Digitization Project*. 3484.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/3484>

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

PREDICTORS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF
FREEDOM OF SPEECH

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
Psychology:
General-Experimental

by
Daniel Michael Downs
September 2006


PREDICTORS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF
FREEDOM OF SPEECH

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino


by
Daniel Michael Downs


September 2006

Approved by:


Dr. Gloria Cowan, Chair, Psychology

7/28/06
Date


Dr. Yuchin Chien


Dr. Geraldine Stahly

ABSTRACT

Freedom of speech refers to the liberty of expression and diversity in the free exchange of ideas. The purpose of this study was to examine factors (including intellect, individualism, authoritarianism, liberalism, separate knowing, and gender) that may influence an individual's judgment of the importance of freedom of speech. This study also contrasted the patterns of the association of these personality factors and social attitudes with the importance of freedom of speech and with the association of the perceived harm of hate speech and these personality factors and social attitudes. Ninety-nine female and 56 male college students participated in the study. The current study hypothesized that an individual's perceived importance of freedom of speech would be positively correlated with intellect, individualism, liberalism, separate knowing, and the value ranking (i.e., those who rank freedom as more important than equality will be more likely to perceive the importance of freedom of speech than those who rank equality more important than freedom) and that the perceived importance of freedom of speech would be

negatively correlated with authoritarianism.

Additionally, the study hypothesized a gender difference in perceived importance of freedom of speech, with male participants indicating a higher level of perceived importance of freedom of speech than female participants. A correlational-regressional approach was used to test the hypotheses in regards to the interrelationships among perceived importance of freedom of speech and gender, intellect, authoritarianism, individualism, liberalism, the value ranking and separate knowing. The related data analyses included calculating and testing the significance of pearson product-moment correlation coefficients and point biserial correlation coefficients, as well as conducting a simultaneous multiple regression analysis. In general, there were significant associations of freedom of speech with individualism, authoritarianism, gender and the value ranking. Moreover, the results indicated gender differences in the perceived importance of freedom of speech and the harm of hate speech. For men, freedom of speech was associated with liberalism, intellect, and authoritarianism and hate speech was associated only with political orientation.

For women, freedom of speech was associated with individualism and the value ranking, and hate speech was associated with individualism, intellect and political orientation. These findings indicate that personality and social variables do predict the importance of freedom of speech, which is an important step in increasing our understanding of free speech. However, more research needs to be conducted with gender as a moderator.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank the many people who made this thesis possible.

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Gloria Cowan without whom this thesis would not exist. It is difficult to overstate my gratitude to you. You have provided endless support, motivation, enthusiasm and encouragement. Also, thank you for guiding me through the writing of this thesis and for all the corrections and revisions. I could not have imagined having a better supervisor and mentor.

My appreciation goes to my other committee members as well, which without the many insightful contributions this thesis would not have been possible. Thank you Dr. Yuchin Chien for the appropriate methodological approaches for my thesis and the clarity with which you delivered them. I would also like to thank you for your support and encouragement during my time in the graduate program. To Dr. Geraldine Stahly for your helpful comments and insight during this thesis. Thanks to all of you not just for being on my committee but for all of your guidance and assistance.

I am forever indebted to my family and friends for their understanding, endless patience and encouragement when it was most required. Finally, this thesis is dedicated to my parents, without whom none of this would have even been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS vi

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 1

 Purpose of the Project 10

 Hypotheses 12

CHAPTER TWO: METHOD

 Design 15

 Participants 16

 Measures 17

 Procedure 25

 Analyses 26

CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS 28

CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION

 General Hypotheses 33

 Findings on Correlates of Freedom of Speech . . . 34

 Freedom of Speech and Hate Speech 40

 Gender Differences 41

 Regression Analyses 44

 Relationship Between Predictors and Criteria
 for Men and Women Separately 45

 Conclusions and Future Directions 49

APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT 51

| | |
|--|----|
| APPENDIX B: DEMOGRPAHIC SHEET | 53 |
| APPENDIX C: THE ATTITUDES TOWARD THINKING AND LEARNING SURVEY | 55 |
| APPENDIX D: THE INDIVIDUALISM-COLLECTIVISM SCALE | 58 |
| APPENDIX E: THE CONSERVATISM-LIBERALISM SCALE | 60 |
| APPENDIX F: THE MINI-MARKERS: A BRIEF VERSION OF GOLDBERG'S UNIPOLAR BIG-FIVE | 63 |
| APPENDIX G: THE RIGHT WING AUTHORITY ANISM SCALE | 66 |
| APPENDIX H: THE ROKEACH'S ORIGINAL VALUE SURVEY | 69 |
| APPENDIX I: THE HARM OF HATE SPEECH SCALE | 71 |
| APPENDIX J: THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH SCALE | 74 |
| APPENDIX K: DEBRIEFING SHEET | 77 |
| APPENDIX L: MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND POSSIBLE RANGES | 79 |
| APPENDIX M: INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE VARIABLES. | 81 |
| APPENDIX N: INTERCORRELATIONS FOR MALES | 83 |
| APPENDIX O: INTERCORRELATIONS FOR FEMALES | 85 |
| APPENDIX P: REGRESSION ANALYSES | 87 |
| REFERENCES | 89 |

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

The First Amendment was ratified on December 15, 1791 and has generally been held as the foundation of modern democracy, which involves the protection and conservation of differences (Delgado, 1994). These freedoms granted in the First Amendment have been discussed, debated, and fought over throughout American history. The founding fathers believed in the power of ideas and debate, not censorship. Furthermore, the premise behind Freedom of Speech and the First Amendment is to protect the ability of the people, as a collective, to decide their own fate and permit true self-determination (Raikka, 2003). Free speech may permit individuals to realize themselves as part of the whole and, ultimately, through debate, achieve a common good.

Individuals known as "legal realists," are fighting to extend the limits of free speech. Those who oppose absolutist freedom of speech claim that it subordinates and harms members of oppressed groups (e.g., for women through pornography and for ethnic minorities through hateful speech) (Cowan, Resendez, Marshall, & Quist, 2002; Newman, 2002). The claim is that there is an existing imbalance of power and that freedom of speech reinforces inequality with oppressive speech. One may counter argue with the notion that there is no challenge in defending something you agree with. The difficulty would be standing up for your opponent, so that everyone's rights are preserved, such as is done by the American Civil Liberties Union. It is important to note, however, that speech has been used as a powerful weapon in the past to inflict harm by degrading, terrorizing, wounding, and humiliating individuals (McKinnon, 1993).

Although a doctrine has evolved which protects free speech, government may regulate speech if there is an immediate threat of violence flowing from the message. The doctrine is found in Justice Holmes's opinion in *Schenck v. United States* (1919) (Raikka, 2003). Holmes wrote, "The question in any case is whether the words are used in such circumstances and are of such nature as to create a clear

and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent" (pp. 28). Individuals may use speech to disregard others, but those who conceptually value freedom of speech believe that ultimately unrestricted speech, regardless of the content of such speech, will benefit society greatly as a whole. For example, freedom of speech has been an essential tool in the advancement of minority groups (Cole, 1996; Kelley, 1996). Historical movements that are the result of the free expression of ideas include the civil rights movement, the gay liberation movement, and the women's movement (Cowan et al., 2002). If speech is restricted it silences those who may benefit largely from its expression. Furthermore, to understand the true concept of freedom of speech, one must be able to distinguish between the costs of speech in the immediate state and the broader implications of freedom of speech.

An individual who thinks intellectually may take a stronger stance on freedom of speech and view it as beneficial to society as a whole, despite its immediate harm. Moreover, someone who thinks intellectually may believe it is the future of the society and all its citizens, not the present society, which will benefit from free expression. An individual who possesses intellect may

be defined as being insightful, introspective, imaginative, and having wide interests (McCrae & John, 1989). In addition, intellectual individuals have an expressed desire to engage in and understand the world, as well as a preference for a complete understanding of a complex problem (McCrae & John, 1989). Therefore, an individual who possesses intellect may be open to ideas and see the larger implications of freedom of speech. For example, one who thinks intellectually may not support a Ku Klux Klan march, but might believe that the restriction of even racist speech may be harmful long-term to a democratic society. That is, intellectual individuals may be able to see beyond the immediate costs of freedom of speech and take a more systemic perspective. In a study examining the perceived causes of rape, Cowan and Quinton (1999) found a significant relationship between intellect and support for systemic causes of rape (i.e., society causes rape). Therefore, one might consider that individuals who possess higher intellect may be more likely to view free speech in a systemic way (i.e., relating to or affecting society as a whole).

Liberalism may also be related to the perceived importance of freedom of speech. The meaning of "liberal" is rooted in the terms intellectually independent and

broad-minded (Ferguson, 1999). The word "liberal" is derived from Latin meaning free and also pertains to qualities of intellect and character. The word liberalism may also refer to a political system or a tendency of opposition to authority (Ferguson, 1999). Liberals often hold the ideals of favoring proposals for reform, new ideas for progress, and are tolerant of the ideas and behavior of others.

Also, liberals have the proclivity to be tolerant of change (i.e., not bound by authoritarianism, orthodoxy, or tradition). Therefore, liberals should find that freedom of speech is necessary to advance progress and human welfare. In contrast, conservatives view censorship as essential in protecting the government against subversives and keeping a morally refined society (Post, 1988). In terms of pornography, the free speech advocates argue that although hateful, even pornography should not be censored.

In addition to liberalism, one who values individualism may perceive the importance and value of freedom of speech since individualism refers to the opposition of external control. Additionally, individualism is the tendency to magnify individual liberty, as against external authority (Donisthorpe, 1889). Also, individualism can be defined as a "social

pattern that consists of loosely linked individuals that view themselves as independent of collectives" (Triandis, 1995). In contrast, Triandis (1995) defined collectivism as "a social pattern consisting of closely linked individuals who sees themselves as parts of one or more collectives." In addition, collectivism is defined as socializing members to view themselves as members of the larger social group and to place the group's concerns before their own (Johnson, Harkness, Mohler, Van de Vijver, & Ozcan, 2000). Through all forms of individualism it is stated that the importance of self is in opposition to restraint (i.e. assistance from without). Schimmack, Oishi and Diener (2005) conceptualized individualistic cultures as stressing the rights of individuals and de-emphasizing subordination and obligation to groups. Katz and Haas (1988) conducted a study on racial ambivalence and value conflict and contrasted the two core values of individualism and communalism, which parallel that of freedom and equality. Katz and Haas (1988) described individualism as self-reliance, personal freedom, and achievement. Furthermore, Katz and Haas claimed that the focus of individualism embodies the Protestant ethic (i.e. emphasizing devotion to work and individual achievement). Therefore, one who values individualism may be able to

understand the importance of freedom of speech along with the implications of the First Amendment framed in our constitution.

An additional factor is the concept of separate knowing. Separate knowing can be defined as abstract analysis, objective observation, and the comprehension of great ideas (Galotti, Clinchy, Ainsworth, Lavin, & Mansfield, 1999). Galotti et al. (1999) identified separate knowing as a form of procedural knowledge (i.e. formal reasoning ability). Separate thinkers distance themselves from the content they study (i.e., impersonal analysis) (Galotti et al., 1999). Consequently, separate thinkers may be able to perceive the long-term benefits from freedom of speech and separate themselves from an emotional approach that emphasizes harm to an individual. Separate knowing can be considered an analytical tool that allows an individual to objectively perceive free speech as benefiting society in the future, rather than viewing free speech as potentially victimizing members of minority groups in the present. Freedom of speech within itself is an abstract concept (Cowan & Khatchadourian, 2003). Therefore, one who is capable of and values separate thinking may be more likely to perceive the importance of freedom of speech. Cowan and Khatchadourian (2003) found a

positive correlation between separate thinking and the importance of freedom of speech. In addition, Cowan et al.'s (2002) study found that men rated the importance of freedom of speech significantly higher than women. In Cowan and Khatchadourian (2003) study, women scored higher than men in the perceived harm of hate speech. Moreover, separate knowing was found to be a partial mediator of gender differences in freedom of speech (i.e., when separate knowing was controlled for, the relationship between gender and freedom of speech was reduced significantly, but not completely).

In addition to identifying relevant predictor variables for attitudes about favoring freedom of speech, this study also examined those who would limit free expression. Traditionally, conservatives wish to censor free speech (Lambe, 2004). Crowson, Thoma, and Hestevold (2005) found that those who are high on right wing authoritarianism (RWA) are likely to favor the maintenance of norms and to be cognitively rigid. Additionally, Crowson et al. (2005) found a positive correlation between conservatism and authoritarianism. The term authoritarian is used to describe an organization or a state which enforces strong and sometimes oppressive measures against those in its sphere of influence,

generally without attempts at gaining their consent and often not allowing feedback on its policies (Butler, 2000). Additionally, authoritarianism can be described as using censorship as a tool to limit free expression (Lambe, 2004). One who holds authoritarian beliefs may not support freedom of speech, particularly those whose views are different. In an open society access to information is pivotal and with pro-censorship attitudes it may be a long and difficult road to knowledge. In this study, we sought to examine right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), which consists of three sets of attitudes. The RWA encompasses: authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression and conventionalism (Altemeyer, 1981). High RWA scorers tend to support authority figures, such as the government, and support taking action to censor certain social groups (i.e., often those who are viewed as physically or morally threatening) (Cohrs, Moschner, Maes, & Kielmann, 2005).

Both freedom of speech and the protection from the harm of hate speech are two core values that have the proclivity to be in opposition due to conflicting social goals. This creates an interesting challenge in that one may see the benefits of freedom of speech while necessitating protection from the harm of hate speech. Hate speech is a controversial term for speech intended to

degrade, or incite prejudicial action against someone based on one's race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or disability (Butler, 1997). Moreover, hate speech has been used as a weapon to perpetuate the ongoing oppression of minority groups (Cowan et al., 2002). Some argue that hate speech must be regulated to protect members of these groups (Butler, 1997).

On the other hand, others argue that disallowing hate speech directly interferes with the right of free speech and the free discussion of opinions, which is a right in modern democracies (Butler, 1997). Furthermore, attitudes about hate speech and censorship have been examined across a diverse range of constructs, including empathy, gender differences, ways of knowing, and value saliency (Cowan, et al., 2002; Cowan & Khatchadourian, 2003). This study set out to contrast social attitudes that may be related to freedom of speech (i.e., liberalism, separate knowing, individualism, authoritarianism, and intellect) with those related to the harm of hate speech.

Purpose of the Project

This study was conducted to examine the influences on the perceived importance of freedom of speech, since only limited psychological research has been conducted to

examine freedom of speech in the past. In summary, this study explores the aspects of personality factors and social attitudes that might explain variations in the perceived importance of freedom of speech. The predictors include intellect, authoritarianism, and separate knowing as personality factors. Intellect and separate knowing may allow an individual to comprehend the long-term benefits of free speech. In addition, those individuals who possess social attitudes, such as individualism and liberalism may recognize that government restriction on free speech could be more detrimental to society as a whole in the future. This study may help to increase the understanding of what accounts for the variance in the perception of freedom of speech. Although it is likely that most Americans value freedom of speech, variations in its prioritization may exist, with those most strongly committed to freedom of speech without any speech restrictions called "First Amendment Absolutists" (Canavan, 1999). Furthermore, it is important to understand what influences this central value. Among the major concepts in this study, prior research has only examined the relationship between separate knowing and the perceived importance of freedom of speech (Cowan et al., 1999). Therefore, it is important to determine what other psychological factors may

influence an individual's perception on the importance of Freedom of Speech. In addition, this study contrasted the patterns of these social attitudes and personality factors with the harm of hate speech. However, no specific hypotheses are offered in regards to the harm of hate speech.

Hypotheses

The current study hypothesized that an individual's perceived importance of freedom of speech would be positively correlated with each of the predictor variables (excluding authoritarianism). In other words, the higher the levels of intellect, individualism, liberalism, and separate knowing; the higher the levels of the perceived importance of freedom of speech, and the lower the levels of intellect, individualism, liberalism, and separate knowing; the lower the levels of the perceived importance of freedom of speech. Also, another hypothesis was that perceived importance of freedom of speech would be positively correlated with the value ranking of freedom and equality (i.e., those who ranked freedom as more important than equality (value 1) would be more likely to perceive the importance of freedom of speech than those who ranked equality more important than freedom (value

2)). The current study also hypothesized that an individual's perceived importance of freedom of speech would be negatively correlated with authoritarianism.

Another goal of the current study was to examine potential group differences in perceived importance of freedom of speech. Men tend to be more abstract thinkers than are women (Gilligan, 1982), a concept which has been shown to be associated with better critical thinking and objective analytical abilities (Galotti et al., 1999). Freedom of speech has been purported to require one to utilize these reasoning abilities in order to fully understand the importance of free speech (Cowan & Khatchadourian, 2003). Additionally, it was found that men rated the importance of freedom of speech significantly higher than women (Cowan et al., 2002). Thus, the study hypothesized that gender would be associated with the perceived importance of freedom of speech. Specifically, male participants would indicate a higher level of perceived importance of freedom of speech than female participants.

It was also hypothesized that an individual's viewpoint about the relative importance of "freedom" and "equality" would significantly associate his or her perceived importance of freedom of speech (with those who

view freedom as being more important than equality demonstrating a greater level of perceived importance of freedom of speech than those who view equality as being more important than freedom).

In addition to testing the above-mentioned hypotheses, another objective of the current study was to establish an equation that can most accurately predict level of perceived importance of freedom of speech from level of intellect, level of individualism, level of liberalism, level of separate knowing, right wing authoritarianism, and gender.

CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Design

A correlational-regression approach was used to test the hypotheses regarding the interrelationships between the criterion variable (level of perceived importance of freedom of speech) and each of the following six predictor variables: level of intellect, level of individualism, level of liberalism, level of right wing authoritarianism, level of separate knowing, the value ranking, and gender. This study also contrasted the patterns of the association of these personality factors and social attitudes and the importance of freedom of speech with the association between these personality factors and social attitudes and the perceived harm of hate speech.

The Mini-markers (Saucier, 1994) (a brief version of Goldberg's Unipolar Big-Five markers of personality) was used to measure intellect, The Individualism-Collectivism Survey (Triandis, 1995) was used to measure individualism, Revised NEO Personality Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992) was used to measure liberalism, The Attitudes Toward Thinking and Learning Survey (Galotti et al., 1999) was

used to measure separate knowing, The Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale (Altemeyer, 1996) was used to measure authoritarianism, values from Rokeach's Original Value Survey (Rokeach, 1968) was used to measure the value ranking of freedom and equality and the Freedom of Speech Scale and The Harm of Hate Speech Scales (Cowan, Resendez, Marshall & Quist, 2002) were used to measure the importance of freedom of speech and the perceived harm of hate speech.

Participants

This study was conducted using 155 students who were recruited from undergraduate psychology courses at California State University, San Bernardino. This study consisted of 99 female and 56 male participants. The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 58 with a mean of 25 (SD = 7.84). The racial composition of the participants is as follows: 62 (40%) Hispanic, 52 (33.5%) Caucasian, 9 (5.8%) African American, 9 (5.8%) Asian, 4 (2.6%) American Indian, and 19 (12.3%) other. Participation was voluntary; extra credit was given to all participants as an incentive to participate.

Measures

In this study the following materials were used: an informed consent form (see Appendix A), a demographic sheet (see Appendix B), the Attitudes Toward Thinking and Learning Survey (ATTLS, see Appendix C), the Individualism-Collectivism Scale (ICS, see Appendix D) the Revised Version of the NEO Personality Inventory (NEO, see Appendix E), the Mini-Markers: A Brief Version of Goldberg's Unipolar Big-Five (MM, see Appendix F), the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale (RWA, see Appendix G), the Rokeach's Original Value Survey (ROVS, see Appendix H), The Harm of Hate Speech Scale (HSS, see Appendix I) The Freedom of Speech Scale (FSS, see Appendix J), and a debriefing statement (see Appendix K).

Informed Consent Form. The informed consent form was used to identify the researcher, explain the nature and purpose of the study, and the research method. Additionally, it included the expected duration of research participation, description of how confidentiality was maintained, mention of participant right's to withdraw their participation and their data from the study at any time without penalty, information about the foreseeable risks and benefits, the voluntary nature of their

participation, and whom to contact regarding questions about participants' rights or injuries.

Demographic Information. The demographic sheet was used to assess the participant's background information. The demographic sheet included the participant's gender, age, ethnicity, average annual income, political orientation and level of educational attainment.

The Attitudes Toward Thinking and Learning Survey (ATTLS: Galotti et al., 1999). This scale was developed to assess separate knowing (objective analysis) and connected knowing. This scale, an instrument with demonstrated reliability and validity, consists of 20 items total—10 items for separate knowing and 10 items for connected knowing. A 7-point Likert scale was utilized, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). For this study, only the separate knowing items were used. An example of an item for separate knowing is, "It's important for me to remain as objective as possible when I analyze something." Individual's responses to the 10 items were summed together and the means were calculated yielding a mean score that could range from 1 (low separate knowing) to 7 (high separate knowing). Cronbach's

alpha for separate knowing was .87 (Galotti et al., 1999) and was .82 in the present study.

Individualism-Collectivism Scale (ICS: Triandis, 1995). Sixteen of these items were used to assess participant's individualistic social orientation and 16 items were used as indicators for collectivism. For this study, only the eight items measuring horizontal individualism (independence) were utilized. The individualism subscale consists of eight items and a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree). An example of an individualism item includes: "One should live one's life independently of others." Individual's responses to the eight items were summed together and the means were calculated yielding a mean score that could range from 1 (low individualism) to 7 (high individualism). Cronbach's alpha for responses to the ICS is .84 (Johnson et al., 2000). One item (i.e., One should live one's life independently of others) was excluded to improve reliability. The resulting Cronbach's alpha for the current study was .78 with seven items. The results regarding this item were excluded from the analyses.

Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R: Costa & McCrae, 1992). This scale was adopted to examine individual's political viewpoints. This scale consists of 10 items that assess an individual's liberal political views. A 5-point Likert scale was used, ranging from 1 (*very inaccurate*) to 5 (*very accurate*). An example of a statement is, "I believe in one true religion." Individual's responses to the 10 items were summed together and the means were calculated yielding a mean score that could range from 1 (low liberalism) to 5 (high liberalism). Two items (i.e., I believe too much tax money goes to support artists and I believe that criminals should receive help rather than punishment) were excluded to improve reliability. The resulting Cronbach's alpha for the current study was .60 with 8 items. Additionally, a political orientation was presented on a 7-point scale ranging from very conservative (1) to very liberal (7).

Mini-markers: A Brief Version of Goldberg's Unipolar Big-Five, (MM: Saucier, 1994). This scale consists of 20 items and was designed to assess intellectual matters. A 5-point Likert scale was used, ranging from 1 (*very inaccurate*) to 5 (*very accurate*). Individual's responses to the 20 items were summed together and the means were

calculated yielding a mean score that could range from 1 (low intellect) to 5 (high intellect). Cronbach's alpha for this measurement was .87 (Saucier, 1994) and was .82 in the present study.

Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale (RWA: Altemeyer, 1996). This scale measures authoritarianism as shown by three attitudinal clusters: authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism. This scale consists of 30 items. In this study, a 20-item version was used, and consistent with Altemeyer's (1996) findings, responses were scored on 9-point Likert scale ranging from -4 (*very strongly disagree*) to +4 (*very strongly agree*) with 0 representing neutral. A sample item is as follows: "What our country really needs is a strong, determined leader who will crush evil, and take us back to our true path." Individual's responses to the 20 items were summed together and the means were calculated yielding a mean score that could range from -4 (low Authoritarianism) to +4 (high Authoritarianism). Higher means reflect greater levels of RWA. Cronbach's alpha for responses to the RWA was .89 (Altemeyer, 1996) and was .86 in the present study.

Rokeach's Original Value Survey (ROVS: Rokeach, 1968). A modified version of this instrument was used to examine the relative importance of freedom and equality and would be considered dichotomous (i.e., freedom > equality vs. equality > freedom). The primary interest was in the ranking of the freedom value relative to the equality value. Eight of Rokeach's 18 terminal values were used in this study and are listed in alphabetical order with brief definitions. The eight values are as follows: 1) A Comfortable Life 2) A Sense of Accomplishment 3) A World at Peace 4) Equality 5) Family Security 6) Freedom 7) Inner Harmony and 8) Wisdom. Six of the eight, with the exception of freedom and equality were provided as context (i.e., filler items) for the rankings of the two key values in this study: freedom and equality. The value scale was scored dichotomously; i.e., with freedom more important than equality or equality more important than freedom. Participants were asked to rank the eight values and according to the ranking participants were classified into either the (equality > freedom) group or the (freedom > equality) group.

The Harm of Hate Speech Scale (HSS: Cowan, Resendez, Marshall & Quist, 2002). This instrument was used to

assess participant's perceived harm of hate speech. It consists of 16 items and a 5-point Likert scale was used, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). An example of an item is, "Hate speech encourages discrimination against minority groups." The 16 items for harm of hate speech were summed together and the means were calculated yielding a mean score that could range from 1 (low level of perceived harm of hate speech) to 5 (high level of perceived harm of hate speech). Higher means indicate a higher level of perceived harm of hate speech. The alpha coefficient for this scale was .88 (Cowan, Resendez, Marshall & Quist, 2002) and was .89 in the present study.

The Freedom of Speech Scale (FSS: Cowan, Resendez, Marshall & Quist, 2002). This instrument was used to assess attitudes toward freedom of expression and anticensorship attitudes. It consists of 16 items and a 5-point Likert scale was used, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). An example of an item is, "Free expression offers hope for changing intolerant attitudes." The 16 items for freedom of speech were summed together and the means were calculated yielding a mean score that could range from 1 (non supportive of freedom

of speech) to 5 (supportive of freedom of speech). The alpha coefficient for the Freedom of Speech scale was .85 (Cowan, Resendez, Marshall & Quist, 2002) and was .81 in the present study. Items for both Freedom of Speech and the Harm of Hate Speech scales were intermixed and combined into one scale.

The Debriefing Statement. In the debriefing statement, participants were informed of the major research questions addressed in the study, whom they can contact if they experience distress due to the study and/or if they want to discuss or obtain the results of the study. Moreover, to ensure the validity of the study, the participants were requested not to discuss the details of the study with potential participants.

The scales were presented to participants in four counterbalanced orders to control for potential sequencing or carry over effects. However, Rokeach's Original Value Survey, the freedom of speech scale and the harm of hate speech scale always appeared first, so as not to be influenced by responses to the predictor scales before the outcome scales.

Procedure

The questionnaires were administered to students in undergraduate psychology classes. The participants were informed about the general nature of the study, that their participation was completely anonymous, and that extra credit was available as incentive for participating. The participants were asked to complete a pencil-and-paper survey including an informed consent form, a demographic sheet, the Attitudes Toward Thinking and Learning Survey (ATTLS), the Revised Version of the NEO Personality Inventory (NEO), the Individualism-Collectivism Scale (ICS) the Mini-Markers: A Brief Version of Goldberg's Unipolar Big-Five (MM), the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale (RWA), the Rokeach's Original Value Survey (ROVS), the Freedom of Speech Scale (FSS), The Harm of Hate Speech Scale (HSS) and a debriefing statement. In this study, an additional scale (Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MC-C)) was also included, however, the results regarding this scale were not reported in the study. Items for the separate knowing scale (ATTLS) were combined with the individualism scale (ICS), items for the liberalism scale (NEO) were combined with the intellect scale (MM) and items for the freedom of speech scale (FSS) were combined with the hate speech scale (HSS) for administration. The

nine scales (ATTLS & ICS, NEO & MM, FSS & HSS, RWA, MC-C, and ROVS) were arranged and presented to the participants in four counterbalanced orders beginning with the demographic sheet followed by the MC-C then the FSS and HSS, which were always presented first. The ATTLS & ICS (1), NEO & MM (2), RWA (3), and ROVS (4) were presented in the following 8 counterbalanced orders: MC-C, FSS and HSS [(1) ATTLS & ICS → NEO & MM → ROVS → RWA, (2) NEO & MM → RWA → ATTLS & ICS → ROVS, (3) RWA → ROVS → NEO & MM → ATTLS & ICS, (4) ROVS → ATTLS & ICS → RWA → NEO & MM]. Participants were asked to return the questionnaires either to the researcher or to the peer-advising center. At the end of the study, participants were debriefed to the real nature of the study.

Analyses

To analyze data related to the interrelationship between the criterion variable (perceived importance of freedom of speech) and each of the following predictor variables (gender, intellect, individualism, authoritarianism, liberalism, value ranking, and separate knowing), Pearson-product moment correlation coefficients and point biserial correlation coefficients were calculated and their significance was tested. This study

also contrasted the patterns of the association between these personality factors and social attitudes and the importance of freedom of speech with the association between these personality factors and social attitudes and the perceived harm of hate speech. A simultaneous multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict the criterion variable using the above-mentioned predictor variables. A significance level of $p < .05$ was adopted to conclude statistical significance for the results.

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Appendix L presents means, standard deviations and possible ranges for all variables. The obtained means for the scales are within one scale point of the means of the response options of the scales except intellect and individualism. The harm of hate speech scale was negatively skewed (-3.96), and is platykurtic (3.39) meaning that there is a higher frequency of values near the mean.

Appendix M presents intercorrelations between the variables. The perceived importance of freedom of speech was positively associated with individualism and negatively associated with authoritarianism. That is, the higher one scored on the individualism scale the more one perceived the importance of freedom of speech and the less authoritarian an individual the more one perceived the importance of freedom of speech. As predicted, those who ranked freedom as more important than equality were more likely to perceive the importance of freedom of speech than those who ranked equality more important than freedom. Additionally, the perceived importance of freedom of speech was negatively associated with gender. For the

data, male participants were entered as a one and female participants were entered as a two, therefore the gender effect means that men were more likely to perceive the importance of freedom of speech compared to women. The perceived harm of hate speech was positively associated with gender and political orientation. The gender effect indicates that females were more likely to perceive the harm of hate speech compared to males. Those who identified as being more liberal were more likely to perceive the harm of hate speech, but liberalism was not related to perceived importance of freedom of speech.

Because gender differences were found for the harm of hate speech and perceived importance of freedom of speech, further analyses were conducted to examine intercorrelations between the variables for males and females separately. Appendix N presents the intercorrelations between the variables for males. In contrast to the overall sample and the female sample, the perceived importance of freedom of speech was positively associated with liberalism and intellect in the male sample. The more intellectual and liberal males identified themselves as, the more they perceived the importance of freedom of speech. The perceived importance of freedom of speech was negatively associated with authoritarianism,

which is consistent with the overall sample, but not in the female sample. That is, the lower males scored on the authoritarianism scale the more they perceived the importance of freedom of speech. The perceived harm of hate speech was positively associated with political orientation, which is consistent with the overall sample and the female sample. That is, the more liberal males identified themselves as, the more they perceived the harm of hate speech.

Appendix O presents the intercorrelations between the variables for females. For females, the perceived importance of freedom of speech was positively associated with individualism and negatively associated with the value ranking of freedom vs. equality, which is consistent with the overall sample. In contrast to the male sample, women who ranked freedom as being more important than equality were more likely to perceive the importance of freedom of speech. In addition, the higher females scored on the individualism scale, the more they perceived the importance of freedom of speech. The perceived harm of hate speech was positively associated with intellect and individualism in the female group. In contrast to males and the overall sample, the higher female participants scored on the intellect scale the more likely they

perceived the harm of hate speech. Also, consistent with the overall sample, women who scored higher on the individualism scale were more likely to perceive the harm of hate speech. The perceived harm of hate speech was positively associated with political orientation (the single item that was used to measure liberalism), which is consistent with the overall sample and the male sample. The higher levels of liberalism were associated with higher levels of the perceived harm of hate speech for women.

Simultaneous regression analyses were performed to examine to what extent the variability in the criterion variable (freedom of speech) and (the harm of hate speech) can be accounted for by the predictor variables (i.e., liberalism, authoritarianism, separate knowing, political orientation, and intellect), as well as gender and the value ranking of freedom vs. equality (see Appendix P). For the freedom of speech scale, the equation was significant, $F(7, 121) = 3.77, p = .001$, and an R^2 of .18. The significant individual predictors were individualism, authoritarianism and gender. It is also important to note that the value ranking of freedom vs. equality approached significance ($p = .055$). For the harm

of hate speech scale, the equation was significant, $F(7, 121) = 5.43, p < .001$, and an R^2 of .24. Gender and liberalism were significant individual predictors.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

The goal of the present study was to increase understanding of what may account for individual differences in the importance of freedom of speech. Freedom of speech is a major social issue; therefore, it is important to identify psychological factors that may influence an individual's perception of its importance. For most social issues, freedom of speech and the harm of hate speech are juxtaposed. Free speech is not independent of context, i.e., it can take place in the context of hate speech. A conflict may exist about protecting speech and the harm that speech does. Thus, the additional goal of this study was to contrast the patterns of the association of the importance of freedom of speech with the association of the perceived harm of hate speech with other variables. However, no specific hypotheses were offered in regards to the harm of hate speech.

General Hypotheses

The hypotheses of the current study were that an individual's perceived importance of freedom of speech would be predicted by social and personality variables

(separate knowing, individualism, intellect, value ranking, liberalism, and authoritarianism). Another hypothesis was that male participants would indicate a higher level of perceived importance of freedom of speech than female participants. In addition to testing the above-mentioned hypotheses, another objective of the current study was to establish an equation that could best predict level of perceived importance of freedom of speech from the predictor variables.

Findings on Correlates of Freedom of Speech

The results indicated that the significant individual predictors of the perceived importance of freedom of speech were individualism, authoritarianism and gender. Also, those who prioritize freedom as being more important than equality were more likely to value freedom of speech. Regarding gender, males, compared to females, were more likely to perceive the importance of freedom of speech. Contrary to the predictions, separate knowing, intellect and liberalism were unrelated to the perceived importance of freedom of speech in the sample as a whole.

Regarding freedom of speech and individualism, individualism was positively correlated with the perceived importance of freedom of speech. It appears clear why one

who values individualism (i.e., the ability to do whatever one pleases with very few restrictions) would value the importance of freedom of speech. In contrast to individualism, in a collectivist society, members are part of the larger social group and place the group's concerns before their own, which may emphasize subordination of individuals or minority groups. In addition, collectivists, in contrast to individualists, tend to support homogeneity of the collective. On the other hand, democracy as well as the First Amendment involves and endorses individuality and individualism. Furthermore, those who value individualism may utilize freedom of speech as an expression of the notion that difference is not synonymous with inequality.

Not surprisingly, authoritarianism was found to be negatively associated with the perceived importance of freedom of speech. Past research has shown that right wing authoritarianism (RWA) is associated with punitiveness, military intervention and political intolerance (Cohrs et al., 2005). Also, RWA has accounted for 50% of the variance in generalized prejudice (Altemeyer, 1998). An authoritarian may not perceive the importance of freedom of speech because speech can be used to promote equality and to criticize the government. As mentioned, RWA is

characterized as blind submission to authority (Altemeyer, 1981). In addition, RWA can be described as obedience to leadership and allegiance to government. Crowson et al. (2005) found that RWA was positively associated with closed-mindedness and preference for order. Also, individuals who grow up with authoritarian beliefs have the propensity to gravitate toward traditional values and hold a right-wing ideology (Butler, 2000). An authoritarian may be cognitively rigid and not support post conventional reasoning. Therefore, an authoritarian is unlikely to support freedom of speech to promote change and equality. Lastly, an authoritarian may view free speech as a threat because it could be used as a means to criticize leadership.

As predicted, those who ranked freedom as more important than equality were more likely to perceive the importance of freedom of speech than those who ranked equality more important than freedom. Elizur (1984) defined values as referring to the importance of outcomes. Theoretically, individuals experience the cognitively driven comparisons of values over a lifetime rather than assessing the importance of each value separately. Conceptually, freedom and equality are central to individuals in the West, and free speech is an important

value in an open and self-governing society. It is not surprising that in terms of value priorities, one who values freedom over equality is more likely to value the importance of freedom of speech, even when the harm of hate speech is equated with absence of equality.

These findings are consistent with past research. Cowan et al. (2002) found that priming for equal protection directed attitudes and values toward the harm of hate speech, whereas participants' attitudes and values towards advocating freedom of speech was a result of the priming of freedom of speech. Rokeach (1968) postulated that values (e.g., freedom and equality) guide our attitudes and perceptions of events. Therefore, one's attitude should be consistent with their prioritization of values. In an evaluation of the prioritization of values in the United States between 1968 and 1981, Rokeach and Ball-Rokeach (1989) found that freedom was consistently prioritized as more important than equality. Rokeach (1973) also noted that the ranking of equality has dramatically decreased over the past four decades, which is a predictor of liberal and antiracist attitudes.

Surprisingly, separate knowing was not related to the perceived importance of freedom of speech. In view of the complexity and abstractness of freedom of speech (i.e.,

perceiving the long-term benefit to groups not the individual), one could anticipate that the importance of freedom of speech would be associated with separate knowing. Separate knowing is defined as abstract thinking, analytical analysis, and the ability to distance oneself from the content of study. Therefore, it could be reasoned that a separate knower would perceive the importance of freedom of speech. A person with a separate knowing learning style may be able to separate an issue considered from oneself (e.g., victims of hate speech), from personal reference, and discern it as if it exists for its own sake. These findings on separate knowing are inconsistent with previous research, which found that separate knowing was a predictor of the perceived importance of freedom of speech (Cowan & Khatchadourian, 2003). However, a possible limitation to this study was the presentation of the items. In this study, only separate knowing was tested whereas in past research separate knowing items were embedded with connected knowing items (Cowan & Khatchadourian, 2003; Galotti, 1999). If the items from both scales were presented together, it may have increased the saliency of the separate knowing items.

In this study, liberalism was not associated with freedom of speech, which appears counterintuitive. Broadly

speaking, liberals seek a society characterized by freedom of thought for individuals and limitations on power, especially of government. However, progressive critics of free speech or leftists argue for more governmental control, particularly to make sure that under-represented voices are heard. However, it should be noted that the internal consistency of the liberalism scale used in this study was low; therefore, only a one-item liberalism question was used to measure political viewpoints. Also, it can be argued that liberalism no longer stands unequivocally for freedom of speech. It is important to note that liberalism is a complex combination of attitudes and values, which could be why a strong association was not found with freedom of speech. In general, the findings show that future research should consider a more differentiated view of political liberalism. When studying these relationships between freedom of speech and liberalism, researchers should consider incorporating multiple measures of political liberalism or partialing out components of liberalism that are theoretically irrelevant to freedom of speech.

In contrast to the prediction, intellect was not related to the perceived importance of freedom of speech. In theory, freedom of speech is an abstract concept. To

comprehend the notion that it has been utilized in the advancement of minority groups, one may need to harbor the ability to think at a higher, more intellectual level as well as in the long-term. Intellectuals may not be disengaged from the victims of hate speech but they may realize that censoring speech would be detrimental to groups in the future. Although intellect was not associated with the importance of freedom of speech in the sample as a whole, gender differences in correlations of freedom of speech and the harm of hate speech with intellect were found (see below).

Freedom of Speech and Hate Speech

As one would expect, results indicated that the perceived importance of freedom of speech was negatively associated with the harm of hate speech. The liberty of one's free speech and self-expression can result in the harm and oppression of another. Hate speech trades on prejudice, and it intimidates and stigmatizes its targets. As a society, when hate speech is prevalent, we are subjected to issues of concern about limitations and consequences of freedom of speech. One may exemplify this collision between freedom of speech and the harm of hate speech with the Danish cartoonist who exercised his right

to freedom of speech through depicting Mohammed as a terrorist by publishing a picture of a bomb in Mohammed's head dress. As a result, some perceived the cartoon as a message of hatred and personally abusive. But hate speech as speech, at least in the United States, still falls under the protection of the First Amendment.

Gender Differences

This study found support for gender differences in the perceived importance of freedom of speech and the perceived harm of hate speech. In Cowan and Khatchadourian's (2003) study, separate learning partially explained gender differences. However, nothing was measured in the study that contributed to the understanding of the gender differences. So, why would men be more likely to rate the importance of freedom of speech higher than women? Tracing the trajectory of the First Amendment to its origin, one could concede that its purpose is empowerment. One could argue that a possible explanation for the gender difference in the perceived importance of freedom of speech may be due to men and women's differential access to power. Haines and Kray (2005) found that men, compared to woman, held stronger implicit and explicit associations between self and power.

Additionally, they found that women who were assigned to a high power role have stronger implicit self-masculine associations than do women assigned to a low power role. Throughout history, men (i.e., the entitled gender) have had both access to speech and more power to be heard. Therefore, not having speech may be a greater concern for men compared women. Whereas, only in recent times have women fully utilized free speech.

Historically, power has been defined and analyzed in reference to men and the positions they hold in society (Powers & Reiser, 2005). Schwartzman (2002) has postulated that the speech of women is less effective than the speech of men. Evidence indicates that men generally possess higher levels of expert and legitimate power than women do and that women possess higher levels of referent power than men do (Carli, 1999). These differences are reflected, to some extent, in the influence strategies used by men and women and, more clearly, in gender differences in social influence. Women generally have greater difficulty exerting influence than men do, particularly when they use influence that conveys competence and authority and when they are attempting to influence men. These findings indicate that gender differences in influence are mediated by gender

differences in power (Carli, 1999). Through history, men may have more power to make their speech heard, understood, and accepted, which may explain why the males in this study were more likely to favor free speech compared to women. However, the women's movement has brought about broad societal change in regards to power and may ultimately balance the gender difference in the importance of freedom of speech.

The results here show women were more likely to perceive the harm of hate speech compared to their male counterparts. Freedom of expression is valuable because it allows one to express oneself freely, which requires self-policing. However, some people are using this opportunity to express their viewpoints to endorse hatred for certain groups of people. The existing literature is consistent regarding gender differences in terms of attitudes about hate speech. Women have a greater sensitivity to the harm of hate speech and are more likely to censor hate speech compared to men (Cowan & hodge, 1996; Lambe, 2004; Cowan & Mettrick, 2002; Cowan et al., 2002). Also, prior research suggests women will be more likely to censor pornography compared to men (Cowan, 1992; Lambe, 2004). Hate speech, compared to freedom of speech, is different because it clearly trades on prejudice and primarily appeals to

emotions. The results that women are more likely to perceive the harm of hate speech could be due to their ability to empathize with the victims of hate speech. In Cowan and Khatchadourian's (2003) study, empathic concern was positively correlated with the harm of hate speech, and empathy mediated the relationship between gender and the harm of hate speech. That is, differences in empathy explained gender differences in beliefs about the harm of hate speech. In addition to being more empathic than men, empathic women have been raised to be nurturing, caring, passive and polite, whereas men have been socialized to be assertive, emotionally strong and protective. Furthermore, women may perceive the harm of hate speech for the reason that it creates inequality and oppresses minority groups, and women as a minority are often the targets of hate speech.

Regression Analyses

Regarding the combination of predictors, individualism, authoritarianism, and gender were significant independent predictors of the perceived importance of freedom of speech. Gender and political orientation (i.e., liberal attitudes) were significant predictors of the perceived harm of hate speech. It should

be noted that the predictors were selected to predict freedom of speech, not the harm of hate speech. However, the variance accounted for was actually larger for the harm of hate speech than for freedom of speech, despite there being fewer variables predicting it. Future research should use larger samples of males and females separately because the patterns of correlations were different for men and women in the sample.

Relationships Between Predictors and Criteria for Men and Women Separately

Since gender differences were found, further analyses were conducted to examine intercorrelations between the variables for men and women separately. For the male sample, intellect was positively correlated with perceived importance of freedom of speech, and for the female sample, intellect was positively correlated with the harm of hate speech. It is unclear why intellect would predict freedom of speech for men and not for women and why it would predict the harm of hate speech for women and not for men. Intellect may predict the more salient concern for each gender. Males who think intellectually may have the ability to reason about abstract concepts, e.g., the importance of freedom of speech. Also, men who think

intellectually may perceive the importance of freedom of speech because it can be used as a social tool to influence masses. Furthermore, they may be less immersed in what concerns an individual or group of individuals and may have a tendency to express themselves freely about abstract and impersonal topics. It should be noted that in this study intellect was highly positively correlated with separate knowing (i.e., analytical analysis), which may help buttress this view.

For the women, intellect was positively correlated with the harm of hate speech. Again, this pattern of differences between the genders is unclear. However, females, compared to males, in this study were more concerned with the harm of hate speech and a possible explanation may be that intellect is predicting the more consequential concern for each gender. It is important to note that there were more variables predicting the harm of hate speech for the female sample than for the male sample. Although hate speech is less abstract than freedom of speech, females who think intellectually may be more likely to decipher what is being communicated in hate speech and identify with the victims.

In addition to intellect, in the male sample, liberalism was positively associated with the perceived

importance of freedom of speech. Liberalism was not a significant predictor in the female sample. Liberalism tends to envelop free speech. Males who identify as being liberal may be more concerned with free speech because they can see it as a catalyst for the progression of new ideas and change. And men, compared to women, may be more likely to use free speech to express their support of proposals for reform.

In this study, authoritarianism was negatively associated with the perceived importance of freedom of speech for men, but not for women. It is unclear why this holds true for men, but not for women. Men may be more likely to favor the maintenance of norms and be cognitively rigid compared to women. Research has shown that authoritarianism is a positive predictor of willingness to censor expression (Lambe, 2004), which may help explain why men in this study who scored higher on RWA rated the importance of freedom of speech lower than men who were lower on RWA.

Although for the women, individualism was a significant predictor of the perceived importance of freedom of speech and was not for men, the correlation for the female sample was so similar to that of the male sample that sample size most likely contributed to the

difference in significance. It was found that individualism was also positively associated with the harm of hate speech for the women, but not the men. Throughout American history, there has been an asymmetry between genders. That is, at the beginning of the twentieth century, women were outsiders to the formal structures of political life and were subject to wide-ranging discrimination. Women, being deeply divided by race, class, religion, and ethnicity, may not have always identified with one another. Therefore, their identity (i.e., their sense of solidarity) has waxed and waned. Interestingly, individualism was a significant predictor of both freedom of speech and the harm of hate speech for female participants. Hate speech is a major concern for women, however those women who score high on individualism (i.e., the belief in the primary importance of the individual and in the virtues of self-reliance) may perceive the importance of freedom of speech as a means to be heard. Additionally, it is interesting to note that individualism was strongly associated with intellect in the women, but not the men, which may suggest that women can hold subjective based attitudes (harm of hate speech) and objective types of attitudes (freedom of speech). It is possible that women are better critical thinkers than

men in the areas of conflicts of attitudes and values. However, it may be possible that women are more conflicted about freedom of speech and the harm of hate speech than men.

In this study, women compared to men, ranked the value of freedom being more important than equality. Women may better understand the juxtapositioning of these important values. As mentioned earlier, women who value freedom over equality may perceive the importance of freedom of speech as a catalyst to fight for women's rights. It may be apparent that if one group is censored because some find it offensive, then all groups will be censored, including women. Therefore, the protection of the First Amendment is necessary to protect women's opinions to be voiced.

Conclusions and Future Directions

The reliance on a college student sample limits the generalizability of the results. Further testing should be conducted with a random sample more representative of the population to improve confidence in generalizability. Also, a national sample may be able to provide knowledge of other independent variables that may be related to attitudes about freedom of speech and the harm of hate

speech, such as geographic or regional differences. Additionally, it is important to note that the results yield correlational data; therefore, one should not make claims about the causal relationships of any of the independent variables. However, indicating that relationships do exist is an important step in increasing our understanding of free speech, since it is a relatively neglected area of psychological research. Future research should continue to develop a more thorough understanding of the contours of public attitudes about the importance of freedom of speech and the harm of hate speech. It may then be possible to design effective educational strategies for strengthening our collective commitment to freedom of speech and to lessen the expression of hateful speech.

APPENDIX A
INFORMED CONSENT

Freedom of Speech

Informed Consent

You are invited to participate in our study regarding freedom of speech in society and individual characteristics. This study is being conducted by Daniel Downs under the supervision of Dr. Gloria Cowan from the Psychology Department of California State University, San Bernardino. There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study and participation is completely voluntary. Your responses will be anonymous. Participants are free to withdraw at any time during the study. An estimated 45 minutes of your time will be needed for completion of this questionnaire, which is worth 2 extra credit units for psychology students.

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Department of Psychology Institutional Review Board Sub-Committee of the California State University, San Bernardino, and this consent form should bear the official Psychology IRB stamp of approval.

If you have any questions or concerns about the study, Dr. Cowan may be reached at (909) 537-5575 or by email at gcowan@csusb.edu.

Please review the following indicating your willingness to participate:

1. The above study has been explained to me and I understand what my participation involves.
2. I understand that I am free to withdraw from this study at any time, without penalty and free to decline any questions that make me feel uncomfortable.
3. I understand all my responses will remain anonymous and that group results can be made upon my request at the end of March 2006.
4. I understand that after participation, I can receive further information about this study at my request.

DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Place a check or 'x' in the space below acknowledging you are at least 18 years of age, have read and understood the statement above. By marking the space, you are also giving voluntary consent to participate in this study.

Please check here: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX B
DEMOGRAPHIC SHEET

Demographic Information

This survey will be kept confidential. The Following information is essential for analyzing final results.

Age _____

College major or field of study _____

Gender: Male ___ Female ___ Other (please specify) ___

Ethnic identity: (please check one)

American Indian ___ American-Asian/Asian ___ Black/African-American ___

Mexican-American/Latin/Hispanic ___ White/Caucasian/Euro-American ___ Other ___

Annual Income: (please check one)

Under \$15,000 ___ \$15,001-\$25,000 ___ \$25,001-\$30,000 ___

\$30,000-\$40,000 ___ \$40,001-\$50,000 ___ Above \$50,001 ___

APPENDIX C
THE ATTITUDES TOWARD THINKING AND LEARNING SURVEY

Listed below are a number of statements concerning values. While considering society as a whole, please indicate by circling whether you agree, disagree, or if you neither agree or nor disagree:

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Strongly Disagree | | | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | | | Strongly Agree |

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I like playing devil’s advocate-arguing the opposite of what someone is saying. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. It’s important for me to remain as objective as possible when I analyze something. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. I try to listen to other people’s positions with a critical eye. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. I find that I can strengthen my position through arguing with someone who disagrees with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. One could call my way of analyzing things “putting them on trial”, because of how careful I am to consider all of the evidence. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. I often find myself arguing with the authors of books I read, trying to logically figure out why they’re wrong. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. I have certain criteria I use in evaluating arguments. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

8. I try to point out weaknesses in other people's thinking to help them clarify their arguments. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. I value the use of logic and reason over the incorporation of my own concerns when solving problems. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. I spend time figuring out what's "wrong" with things; for example, I'll look for something in a literary interpretation that isn't argued well enough. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

APPENDIX D
THE INDIVIDUALISM-COLLECTIVISM SCALE

Listed below are a number of statements concerning values. While considering society as a whole, please indicate by circling whether you agree, disagree, or if you neither agree or nor disagree:

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---|---|-------------------|---|---|----------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Strongly | | | Neither Agree Nor | | | Strongly |
| Disagre | | | Disagree | | | Agree |

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Winning is everything. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. It is important to me that I do my job better than others can do it. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. Competition is the law of nature. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. I often do "my own thing." | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. I'd rather depend on myself than others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. I rely on myself most of the time; I rarely rely on others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. My personal identity dependent from others is very important to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

APPENDIX E
THE CONSERVATISM-LIBERALISM SCALE

For the following items, please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your own age. Please read each statement carefully, and then circle the number that best corresponds to how each statement describes you.

Response Options

- 1: Very Inaccurate
- 2: Moderately Inaccurate
- 3: Neither Inaccurate nor Accurate
- 4: Moderately Accurate
- 5: Very accurate

| | Very Inaccurate | | | | Very Accurate |
|---|--------------------|---|---|---|------------------|
| 1. I believe in one true religion. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I tend to vote for conservative political candidates. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I tend to vote for liberal political candidates. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I believe that too much tax money goes to support artists. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I believe that laws should be strictly enforced. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I believe that there is not absolute right or wrong. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. I believe that we coddle criminals too much. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. I believe that we should be tough on crime. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. I believe that criminals should receive help rather than punishment. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. I like to stand during the national anthem. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Political Orientation (please circle one):

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Very
Conservative

Conservative

Slightly
Conservative

Neutral

Slightly
Liberal

Liberal

Very
Liberal

APPENDIX F

THE MINI-MARKERS: A BRIEF VERSION OF GOLDBERG'S UNIPOLAR
BIG-FIVE

For the following items, please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your own age. Please read each statement carefully, and then circle the number that best corresponds to how each statement describes you.

Response Options

1: Very Inaccurate 3: Neither Inaccurate nor Accurate 5: Very accurate
 2: Moderately Inaccurate 4: Moderately Accurate

Very
Inaccurate

Very
Accurate

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I have a rich vocabulary. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. I have a vivid imagination. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. I am not interested in abstract ideas. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. I have excellent ideas. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. I am quick to understand things. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. I do not have a good imagination. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. I try to avoid complex people. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. I use difficult words. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. I spend time reflecting on things. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. I have difficulty imagining things. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. I avoid difficult reading material. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. I am full of ideas. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. I carry the conversation to a higher level. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. I will not probe deeply into a subject. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. I catch on to things quickly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17. I can handle a lot of information. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. I love to think up new ways of doing things. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. I love to read challenging material. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. I am good at many things. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

APPENDIX G

THE RIGHT WING AUTHORITARIANISM SCALE

While considering society as a whole, please indicate by placing the number that best describes your opinions next to each statement.

-4 -3 -2 -1 0 1 2 3 4
Very Strongly Neither Agree Very Strongly
Disagree Nor Disagree Agree

1. ___ Our country desperately needs a mighty leader who will do what has to be done to destroy the radical new ways and sinfulness that are ruining us.
2. ___ Gays and lesbians are just as healthy and moral as anybody else.
3. ___ It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rabble-rousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people's minds.
4. ___ Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.
5. ___ The only way our country can get through the crisis ahead is to get back to our traditional values, put some tough leaders in power, and silence the troublemakers spreading bad ideas.
6. ___ There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps.
7. ___ Our country needs free thinkers who will have the courage to defy traditional ways, even if this upsets many people.
8. ___ Our country will be destroyed someday if we do not smash the perversions eating away at our moral fiber and traditional beliefs.
9. ___ Everyone should have their own life-style, religious beliefs, and sexual preferences, even if it makes them different from everyone else.
10. ___ The "old-fashioned ways" and "old-fashioned values" still show the best way to life
11. ___ You have to admire those who challenged the law and the majority's view by protesting for abortion rights, for animal rights, or to abolish school prayer.
12. ___ What our country really needs is a strong, determined leader who will crush evil, and take us back to our true path.

13. ___ Some of the best people in our country are those who are challenging our government, criticizing religion, and ignoring the "normal way things are supposed to be done.
14. ___ God's laws about abortion, pornography, and marriage must be strictly followed before it is too late, and those who break them must be strongly punished.
15. ___ There are many radical, immoral people in our country today, who are trying to ruin it for their own godless purposes, whom the authorities should put out of action.
16. ___ A "woman's place" should be wherever she wants to be. The days when women are submissive to their husbands and social conventions belong strictly in the past.
17. ___ Our country will be great if we honor the ways of our forefathers, do what the authorities tell us to do, and get rid of the "rotten apples" who are ruining everything.
18. ___ There is no "ONE right way" to live life; everybody has to create their own way.
19. ___ Homosexuals and feminists should be praised for being brave enough to defy "traditional family values.
20. ___ This country would work a lot better if certain groups of troublemakers would just shut up and accept their group's traditional place in society.

APPENDIX H
THE ROKEACH'S ORIGINAL VALUE SURVEY

Please rank the following list of values in terms of how **IMPORTANT** each is personally from that which is the **MOST** important (rank=1) to **LEAST** important (rank=8).

For example: If Wisdom is the most important value for you then rank it #1.

_____ A Comfortable Life

_____ A Sense of Accomplishment

_____ A World at Peace

_____ Equality

_____ Family Security

_____ Freedom

_____ Inner Harmony

_____ Wisdom

APPENDIX I
THE HARM OF HATE SPEECH SCALE

The following statements pertain to hate speech and freedom of speech. After reading each statement carefully, rate your responses by placing the number that best describes your opinions next to each statement.

Rate each item:

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| <u>Strongly Disagree</u> | <u>Disagree</u> | <u>Undecided</u> | <u>Agree</u> | <u>Strongly Agree</u> |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

1. ___ Hate speech violates the civil rights of minority group members
2. ___ Hate speech silences minority group members and therefore inhibits self expression by those targeted by it.
3. ___ Hate speech encourages discrimination against minority groups.
4. ___ Hate speech causes long-term emotional and psychological harm to its targets.
5. ___ Hate speech devalues minority groups members by implying they are inferior and by failing to treat them as individuals.
6. ___ Hate speech intimidates and casts fear in the hearts of victims.
7. ___ Hate speech indirectly harms minority group members (e.g. creates a negative social climate).
8. ___ Hate speech causes immediate emotional distress to its targets.
9. ___ Toleration of hate speech leads to violent acts.
10. ___ Hate groups, through their speech, entice some individuals to commit crimes of violence.
11. ___ Protection of hate speech tells the public that protecting hate speech is more important than protecting the people threatened by it.
12. ___ There is a pressing need to curb the language and actions that may lead to hate crimes.
13. ___ The dehumanization that occurs with hate speech is too harmful to tolerate.
14. ___ Suppression of racist speech is justified because such expression undermines racial equality.

15. ___ Hate speech frequently silences its victims, who, more often than not, are those who are already heard from least.

16. ___ Verbal assaults are acts of discrimination.

APPENDIX J
THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH SCALE

The following statements pertain to hate speech and freedom of speech. After reading each statement carefully, rate your responses by placing the number that best describes your opinions next to each statement.

Rate each item:

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| <u>Strongly Disagree</u> | <u>Disagree</u> | <u>Undecided</u> | <u>Agree</u> | <u>Strongly Agree</u> |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

1. ___ Hate groups, such as the Aryan Brotherhood, should have the same rights under the Constitution to express their opinions and beliefs as other groups.
2. ___ Laws against hate speech give those with power the right to impose on others their views of what is politically or morally correct.
3. ___ Prohibiting hate speech is a violation of the First Amendment's guarantee of free speech.
4. ___ Censorship of speech leaves little room for debate or diverse points of view.
5. ___ The government acts unconstitutionally when it suppresses speech on the basis of subject matter or viewpoint expressed.
6. ___ Laws that restrict hate speech would unfairly affect people's freedom to engage in the "marketplace of ideas."
7. ___ Free expression offers hope for changing intolerant attitudes.
8. ___ A free exchange of ideas, even if hateful, is necessary in a free society.
9. ___ Laws against hate speech will not protect or benefit minority group members that have traditionally suffered from discrimination.
10. ___ "Sticks and stones may break your bones, but words will never hurt you".
11. ___ Hate speech codes lead us down the slippery slope toward uniformity of thought.
12. ___ Speech alone is harmless compared to action.
13. ___ Free expression tends to encourage personal empowerment, an important weapon in the fight against bias.
14. ___ The best solution for hate speech is not to punish speech, but to produce more speech.

15. ___ Laws against hate speech would make people afraid to say anything about anyone, and in the end, would stop all free speech.

16. ___ Censorship of hate speech could lead to setbacks in minority groups' progress towards equality.

APPENDIX K
DEBRIEFING SHEET

Debriefing Statement

This study is interested in discovering characteristics that might predict the degree to which a person supports freedom of speech. There is little previous research in this area and we hope to open new doors as well as facilitate further research. We truly appreciate your help with this study and if there are any further questions and/or concerns, please feel free to contact Dr. Gloria Cowan with the Department of Psychology at California State University, San Bernardino, (909) 537-5570.

If participation in this survey has resulted in any psychological discomfort please contact the CSUSB Counseling Center at (909) 537-5040 for an appointment.

All data collected will remain anonymous, confidential, and will in no way be linked to you. If you are interested in the results of this study please contact Dr. Cowan at the end of March 2006.

You may remove and keep this page.
We greatly appreciate your participation in this study.

APPENDIX L
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND POSSIBLE RANGES

Table 1

Scale Means, Standard Deviations and Possible Ranges

| Scales Range | N | Mean | SD | Possible |
|-----------------------|-----|------|------|----------|
| Freedom of Speech | 153 | 3.06 | .55 | 1 - 5 |
| Harm of Hate Speech | 152 | 3.62 | .63 | 1 - 5 |
| Liberalism | 155 | 2.60 | .64 | 1 - 5 |
| Political Orientation | 151 | 4.15 | 1.39 | 1 - 7 |
| Intellect | 154 | 3.78 | .52 | 1 - 5 |
| Individualism | 155 | 5.53 | .81 | 1 - 7 |
| Separate Knowing | 155 | 4.29 | .92 | 1 - 7 |
| Social Desirability | 155 | 1.47 | .23 | 1 - 2 |
| Authoritarianism | 154 | -.83 | 1.37 | -4 - 4 |

Note. Higher scores reflect greater levels for each scale.

APPENDIX M
INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE VARIABLES

Table 2

Scale Intercorrelations

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---------|--------|---------|--------|--------|---------|------|---------|-----|-----|
| 1. Freedom of Speech | — | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Harm of Hate Speech | -.41*** | — | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Liberalism | .13 | .15 | — | | | | | | | |
| 4. Intellect | .16 | .03 | -.11 | — | | | | | | |
| 5. Individualism | .26** | .06 | .11 | .43*** | — | | | | | |
| 6. Separate Knowing | .12 | .14 | .03 | .33*** | .32*** | — | | | | |
| 7. Social Desirability | -.08 | .05 | -.03 | .04 | .03 | -.08 | — | | | |
| 8. Authoritarianism | -.24** | -.00 | -.65*** | -.22** | -.25** | -.07 | .02 | — | | |
| 9. Gender | -.24** | .35*** | .07 | -.12 | -.15 | -.43*** | .09 | .01 | — | |
| 10. Freedom v. Equality | -.19* | .13 | .12 | .04 | -.05 | -.03 | .02 | .02 | .04 | — |
| 11. Political Orient (Liberalism item) | .03 | .26** | .66*** | .05 | .27** | .03 | -.01 | -.50*** | .06 | .05 |

Note. When freedom v. equality was entered 1=ranked freedom first and 2=ranked equality first.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

APPENDIX N
INTERCORRELATIONS FOR MALES

Table 3

Scale Intercorrelations for the Males

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|--|--------|------|---------|-------|--------|------|-----|------|---------|
| 1.Freedom of Speech | — | | | | | | | | |
| 2.Harm of Hate Speech | -.33* | — | | | | | | | |
| 3.Liberalism | .32* | .18 | — | | | | | | |
| 4.Intellect | .28* | -.17 | .04 | — | | | | | |
| 5.Individualism | .24 | -.11 | .17 | .24 | — | | | | |
| 6.Separate Knowing | .17 | -.25 | .14 | .28* | .49*** | — | | | |
| 7.Social Desirability | -.18 | .07 | -.17 | .09 | .11 | -.13 | — | | |
| 8.Authoritarianism | -.30** | .04 | -.66*** | -.27* | -.25 | -.22 | .13 | — | |
| 9.FreedomvEquality | -.12 | .05 | -.13 | .07 | -.17 | .02 | .11 | .31* | — |
| 10.Political Orient (Liberalism item) | .12 | .30* | .71*** | -.04 | .27* | .03 | .10 | .19 | -.48*** |

Note. When gender was entered 1=Male and 2=Female. When freedom v. equality was entered 1=ranked freedom first and 2=ranked equality first.

APPENDIX O
INTERCORRELATIONS FOR FEMALES

Table 4

Scale Intercorrelations for the Females

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---|--------|-------|---------|--------|-------|------|------|--------|-----|
| 1. Freedom of Speech | — | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Harm of Hate Speech | -.37** | — | | | | | | | |
| 3. Liberalism | .01 | .09 | — | | | | | | |
| 4. Intellect | .03 | .27* | -.17 | — | | | | | |
| 5. Individualism | .24* | .27** | .10 | .50*** | — | | | | |
| 6. Separate Knowing | -.07 | .16 | .04 | .33** | .22** | — | | | |
| 7. Social Desirability | .01 | .09 | .03 | .04 | .02 | -.01 | — | | |
| 8. Authoritarianism | -.20 | .04 | -.64*** | -.19 | -.25* | -.01 | -.04 | — | |
| 9. Freedom v. Equality | -.24* | .18 | .29** | .03 | .01 | -.03 | -.03 | -.17 | — |
| 10. Political Orient (Liberalism item) | -.02 | .23* | .62*** | .10 | .28** | .05 | -.09 | -.52** | .11 |

Note. When gender was entered 1=Male and 2=Female. When freedom v. equality was entered 1=ranked freedom first and 2=ranked equality first.

APPENDIX P
REGRESSION ANALYSES

Table 5

*Regression Analyses Summary for Relational Variables
Predicting Importance of Freedom of Speech and the Harm
of Hate Speech*

| <i>Predictor Variables</i> | β | <i>t</i> | P |
|----------------------------|---------|----------|------|
| <i>Freedom of Speech</i> | | | |
| Intellect | .06 | .59 | .56 |
| Individualism | .21 | 2.20 | .03 |
| Separate Knowing | -.08 | -.82 | .41 |
| Freedom v. Equality | -.16 | -1.93 | .06 |
| Authoritarianism | -.22 | -2.22 | .03 |
| Political Orientation | -.12 | -1.19 | .24 |
| Gender | -.20 | 2.20 | .03 |
| <i>Harm of Hate Speech</i> | | | |
| Intellect | .02 | .17 | .86 |
| Individualism | .00 | .01 | 1.00 |
| Separate Knowing | -.03 | -.29 | .77 |
| Freedom v. Equality | .10 | 1.30 | .20 |
| Authoritarianism | .09 | .94 | .35 |
| Political Orientation | .30 | 3.12 | .00 |
| Gender | .36 | 4.08 | .00 |

Note. Beta coefficients computed with all variables in the equation.

Freedom of Speech, $F(7, 121) = 3.77, p = .001, R^2 = .179$

Harm of Hate Speech, $F(7, 121) = 5.43, p < .001, R^2 = .239$

REFERENCES

- Altemeyer, B. (1981). Right-wing authoritarianism. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian specter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other "authoritarian personality." *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 30, 47-92.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. C. (2000). Personality and emotional correlates of right-wing authoritarianism. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 28(1), 1-14.
- Canavan, F. (1999). Speech that matters. *Society*, 36, 11-15.
- Carli, L. L. (1999). Gender, interpersonal power, and social influence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(1), 81.
- Cohrs, C. J., Moschner, B., Maes, J., and Kielmann, S. (2005). The motivational bases of Right-Wing Authoritarianism and social dominance orientation: Relations to values and attitudes in the aftermath of September 11, 2001. *Society for Personality and Social Psychology*, 31(10), 1425-1434.

- Cole, D. (1996) Racist speech should be protected by the constitution. In P.A. Winters (Ed.), *Hate Crimes* (pp. 89-96). San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Cowan, G., & Hodge, C. (1996). Judgments of hate speech: The effects of target group, publicness, and behavioral responses of the target. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*, 355-374.
- Cowan, G., & Khatchadourian, D. (2003). Empathy, ways of knowing, and interdependence as mediators of gender differences in attitudes toward hate speech and freedom speech. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 27*, 300-308.
- Cowan, G., & Mettrick, J. (2002). The effects of target variables and setting on the perception of hate speech. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*, 277-299.
- Cowan, G., & Quinton, W.J. (1997). Cognitive style and attitudinal correlates of the perceived causes of

- rape scale. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 227-245.
- Cowan, G., Resendez, M., Marshall, E., & Quist, R. (2002). Hate speech and constitutional protection: Priming values of equality and freedom. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58, 247-263.
- Crowson, H. M., Thoma, S. J., & Hestevold, N. (2005). Is political conservatism synonymous with authoritarianism? *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 145(5), 571-592.
- Delgado, R. (1994). First amendment formalism is giving way to first amendment legal realism. In L.J. Lederer & R. Delgado (Eds.), *The price we pay*. New York: Hill & Wang.
- Donisthorpe, W. (1889). *Individualism: A system of politics*. London: MacMillan Co.
- Elizur, D. (1984). Facets of work values: A structural analysis of work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 379-389.
- Ferguson, E. (1999). A facet and factor analysis of typical intellectual engagement (tie): Associations with locus of control and the five factor model of

- personality. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 27, 545-562.
- Galotti, K.M., Clinchy, B.M., Ainsworth, K.H., Lavin, B., & Mansfield, A.F. (1999). A new way of assessing ways of knowing: The attitudes toward thinking and learning survey (ATTLS). *Sex Roles*, 40, 745-766.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Haines, E.L., & Kray, L.J. (2005). Self-power associations: The possession of power impacts women's self-concepts. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 643-662.
- Johnson, T.P., Harkness, J., Mohler, P., Van de Vijver, F., & Ozcan, Y. Z. (2000). Respondent cultural orientation and survey participation: The effects of individualism and collectivism. Alexandria, VA: American Statistical Association.
- Katz, I., & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and American value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55, 893-903.

- Kelley, J. (1996). Restricting speech does not fight racism on campuses. In P.A. Winters (Ed.), *Hate Crimes* (pp.97-99). San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press.
- Lambe, J. L. (2004). Who wants to censor pornography and hate speech? *Mass Communication & Society* 7, (3), 279-299.
- McCrae, R.R., & John, O.P. (1987). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 175-207.
- Post, R.C. (1988). Cultural heterogeneity and law: Pornography, blasphemy, and the first amendment. *California Law Review*, 76, 297-307.
- Powers, R.S., & Reiser, C. (2005). Gender and self-perceptions of social power. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 33, 553-568.
- Raikka, J. (2003). The argument from truth as a basis for legislation concerning freedom of speech. *Trames*, 7, 249-256.
- Reynolds, W.M. (1982) Development of reliable and valid short form of Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 47, 396-399.

- Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Rokeach, M., & Ball-Rokeach, S.J. (1989). Stability and change in American value priorities. *American Psychologist*, 44, 775-784.
- Saucier, G., & Goldberg, L. R. (1998). What is beyond the Big Five? *Journal of Personality*, 66, 495-524.
- Schimmack, U., Oishi, S. & Diener, E. (2005). Individualism: A valid and important dimension of cultural differences between nations. *Personality and Social Psychology*, 9, 17-31.
- Schwartzman, L.H. (2002). Hate speech, illocution, and social context: A critique of Judith Butler. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 33, 421-441.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. San Francisco, CA: Westview Press.