

**ASSESSING DEFERENCE TO AUTHORITY
IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES**

ROBIN COLLINS, AUGUST 2003

[THIS IS A SHORTENED VERSION OF THE ORIGINAL PAPER.]

Executive Summary:

There are many myths we have about other nations, and there are many myths we prefer to retain about our own. One popular story is that Canadians are polite folks and as a result interaction with others is revealed in a national tendency to be deferent to authority. The corollary is that Americans as a group are neither of these things -- neither polite nor deferent. Deference is perhaps more important than politeness, if political researchers are correct in arguing (as many have) that our relationship with authority underpins the strength of our democracy. So we should look closely at national predispositions if they are true.

This research paper begins with the assumption that the story is wrong, and Canadians are *not* more deferent to authority than Americans. It employs a series of statistical procedures to explore the influence of power-embedded social relationships and demographics (gender, social class, age, region) and institutions (religion, political orientation, education), in responding to a single critical question¹, and in order to establish whether Americans are more deferential overall. They are.

The study also appears to reveal a sobering, perhaps disturbing, truth about the nature of the U.S. education (or indoctrination) system at the secondary level and earlier. Canadian deference to authority declines quickly and confidently as the level of education rises (as would be expected), but Americans do not show the same willingness of their northern neighbours to "do the right thing" when the chips are down. These are serious matters when a superpower comes knocking and makes demands upon its citizens.

¹The question is: "In general, would you say that people should obey the law without exception, or are there exceptional occasions on which people should follow their consciences even if it means breaking the law?"

Introduction:

This paper began as a comparative exploration of attitudes towards free speech in the United States and Canada. In the data collection process, while comparing perceptions about the limits of law, there emerged a different line of inquiry. One ISSP 1996 survey² question assessed whether respondents would obey laws in all circumstances or follow their consciences in exceptional circumstances and thereby be willing to violate the law. This question appeared to distinguish those who might show deference to authority (or to the law) from those who might be willing to be guided by another (personal) moral authority where the two conflicted.

It seems self-evident to many of us (in Canada at least) that a large majority should follow their consciences even if they have to challenge legal authority to do so, but the survey results reveal a different than expected truth, particularly when comparing Canadians to Americans.

Deference (or obedience) to authority is the tendency to respect and follow orders or the guidance of institutions or other individuals, but even when contrary to one's own advice. That type of discipline, notes Michael Adams in his recently published book, Fire and Ice, "registers a willingness to obey the customs and demands of institutions and ideologies" (Adams:22).

In the 1960s, Stanley Milgram performed a series of now famous experiments, testing the tendency of individuals to obey authority, even with full knowledge that human suffering would be the result. He found that a majority of people "obeyed the orders of the experimenter to the end, proceeding to punish the victim until they reached the most potent shock available on the generator. After the 450-volt shock was administered three times, the experimenter called a halt to the session."³ (Milgram, 1969:33) Milgram's experimental results suggested that obedience to authority is possibly a widely-held human attribute, although not a universal one.

The role of deference and obedience in historical and contemporary examples of genocide and gross human rights abuse has been the subject of much literature and debate. Glover (page 332-3) points out that while there is a "widespread human willingness to obey even terrible orders", as history records, it doesn't happen all the time. Glover underlines that

² The International Social Survey Program dataset for 1996:Role of Government

³ In the experiment, participants only thought they were administering a shock.

Milgram's experiments also showed that "where there is less pressure to conform, people may be more willing to disobey".

In this mixture of social norms and individual human compliance, it may be difficult to extract where deference begins and authority ends, or where societal norms interlace with personal morality. Regardless of the cause and direction of the phenomenon, differences in levels of deference or obedience in different countries and over time are of great political interest when we examine the democratic deficit and assess the potential for social change within populations.

This paper considers that deference and obedience to authority are *prevalent within, and therefore also consequences of, a wide range of social constructs and relationships* -- including those expressed through gender (male dominance over females), social class (lower classes deferent to upper classes), region (periphery deferent to the urban center), and in education (less educated deferent to highly educated).

Some have tried to elaborate on the significant impact deference to authority has had on the practice and realization of democracy. Notes Nevitte (36), Eckstein's studies in the 1960s and early 1990s held that "norms about authority -- particularly the structure, shape, and congruence of authority patterns -- are fundamental to understanding the dynamics of democracy." Nevitte refers to the healthy "growing disaffection with traditional hierarchical organizations" signifying a "general shift from elite-directed to elite-directing behaviours", which was observed by Ronald Inglehart (Nevitte: 37).

Our assumptions about a working democracy rest in part upon the breadth of publicly expressed opinion that is "formed through open and interactive processes or rational deliberation" (in Moon, 18). That being the case, availability of opinion must primarily be placed beside the willingness of people to act on personal priorities and moral assumptions -- themselves formed within that discourse. Green points out that for many moral philosophers, "no credible justification for authority will validate the wide sweep of law's claims. Even in a reasonably just state, law's authority is not always justified." Indeed, deference to authority in its extreme formulation, is considered an act of submission, an individual's humiliation, and perhaps denial of one's self value. In the United States, remnants of deference characteristics may have deep historical roots. Wyatt-Brown, for example, validates the assessment of an early

scholar of slavery, Stanley Elkins, who stated (controversially at the time) that deference by slaves to their masters “was a social reality, not a myth.”⁴

According to Ronald Inglehart, “during the past forty years, a massive decline in trust in government has taken place among the U.S. public”. This change is part of a broader decline in deference to authority throughout the industrial world. Authorities hold weakened influence and people are “increasingly critical of hierarchical authority”, “increasingly resistant to authoritarian government, more interested in political life, and more apt to play an active role in politics.” It is useful to compare Inglehart’s conclusions about the American public in particular, with those of others.

When comparing deference to authority in Canada and the United States, several writers note new and significant trends within the two countries. Michael Adams (president of the research and polling group, Environics), reports in Fire and Ice that “deference to authority at the top of the Canadian map is not as pronounced as it is at the top of the American map (which in itself should raise a few eyebrows, given the two countries’ respective histories and supposed characters)”. Adams’ “map” refers to a representation of social values in which the “top” represents “authority”, and the “bottom” represents “individuality”. His multi-year survey findings show that among traditional groups (particularly elders and pre-baby boomers), the tendency towards deference, and acceptance of traditional gender roles, religiosity, and orderliness are greater among Americans than Canadians. He writes that “we find trends that indicate confidence in and deference to large institutions, and belief in the significance of traditional markers of status and identity..[and] also a certain fearfulness of change.” (Adams:129-130)

Adams also sees autonomy as a harbinger of democratic expression, a view consistent with Moon’s, which is that autonomy is the “capacity to think, judge, and give direction to one’s life and the ability to participate in collective governance” (Moon:21). Legitimate authority, for some, is authority that people accept, in the absence of a “resort to power or influence” (Gower:170). Karla Gower argues persuasively that the more people “are seen as part of society and the more the state is trusted, the greater the restriction on expression for the

⁴ Elkins was criticized for suggesting that slaves were passive in the face of humiliation and oppression. Wyatt-Brown clarifies that Elkins “did not, however, attribute this unflattering portrait to innate racial factors, but to the nature of American masterhood.” Elkins had noted that “slaveholders ruled unchecked and unconcerned” and “slaves acted the role of powerlessness and servility as the best means of survival.”

protection of public safety and welfare.” (222) She found that in the latter part of the twentieth century “political thought took a conservative shift” in the United States. “Some intellectuals argued that [American] morals and values had to be reconnected to politics for social unity” (211), whereas in Canada, the shift exemplified in the Charter of Rights and Freedom (based on the U.S. model, in Gower’s view) was towards rights-based liberalism. In other words, a fundamental change in orientation has taken place in both countries.

Adams' research found that in 1983, 75% of Canadians showed a measurable deference to authority. But by 1996, 44% of Canadians had moved “out” of deference and into the “most autonomous zone in our mapspace”.⁵ While the most recent surveys suggest a movement after 1996 towards more traditional values in Canada, they do not indicate motion towards “a focus on the traditional institutions of family, religion and community”. In other words, the recent trend-setters are more traditional and less outspoken, but not necessarily more deferent to authority.

Adams suggests that the evidence over three timeframes (1992, 1996, 2000) shows significant movement of many social values towards different poles by Americans and Canadians, such that the two "national identities" appear to be becoming more different. He notes that “for every step Canadian youth may seem to be taking in the direction of American youth, American youth take several more, traveling farther and faster along the path to nihilism and anomie.” (Adams:138)

Adams’ primary message is that different founding values, historical experience and political institutions have more impact than globalization on current values systems. His research shows how deference to society is in evidence among the expected groupings (the Deep South in the USA as compared to New England, older over younger citizens, females as compared to males. He finds that the trends are impacted by the extent of religious observance, and by income and education levels, for example).

Neil Nevitte has suggested that Canadian value changes over recent decades stem from a declining birth rate and growing immigration – the combined result of which has been a dramatic change in the “traditional” origin of immigrants (Nevitte:17). Whether or not one

⁵ However, Adams notes that “postmodern tribes” more recently (after 1996) were not becoming leaders, but rather were showing signs of resistance to social change -- a reversal that was both “surprising, and even a little alarming”. Young people who “are supposed to lead us forward toward more progressive, postmodern values, were abandoning the process...in favour of more traditional (some might even say retrograde) territory that our society had already trodden generations ago.”

considers new immigrants to be more or less conservative than previous waves, there has still been a dramatic reduction in levels of confidence citizens show towards government institutions (in the timeframe studied by Nevitte, 1981-1990) (Nevitte: 56). Confidence-in-government levels in the United States show an even more dramatic decline (49.6% to 31.8% in the USA, compared with 36.9% and 29.4% in Canada over the same period). Nevitte's study (which pre-dates that of Adams by several years) finds that Americans and Canadians were remarkably similar in the 1990 World Values Survey, when rated for the importance given to traditional values (in family, work, leisure time, politics). The distinction was in their attitudes towards the importance of religion (Canada 30%, USA 54%). Aside from the Irish (48%), no other country among the twelve industrialized countries surveyed, considered religion as “very important”, according to the 1990 survey.

Relevant to the current project, Nevitte's study also found evidence that countered the standard mythology that Canadians are “more respectful of authority” than are Americans (Bell and Lipset in Nevitte:33). Quite the opposite appeared to be true. Signs of a dropping deference to authority were in evidence in Europe (in ten out of twelve countries), as well as in Canada and the United States in the 1981-1990 period. *But the drop has been more pronounced in Canada, compared to the U.S.* The 11% drop in Canada is profound, notes Nevitte, because “a single decade is a relatively short time frame for changes as basic as orientations towards authority to take place.

Nevitte found that age, level of education (and inclination to move from a materialist to post-materialist national perspective) were good barometers of orientation with respect to authority: As age increases, education level decreases; as outlook towards materialism increases, deference to authority also increases (pages 40-41). In every case, however, *the rate of decrease was noticeably more gradual in the United States, as compared to Canada and Europe*. Nevitte therefore rejects Lipset's claim that Canadians are “more deferential than their American counterparts”.

Nevitte also found that “non-confidence in government institutions and protest behaviour” are good indicators of orientation away from political authority (102-103)⁶. He

⁶ Worth some attention is an analysis of what is occurring in a society where confidence-in-government declines at a significant rate, and at a rate greater than any evident decline in deference to authority.

suggests that among the factors causing the drift may be the “emergence of new left libertarian beliefs” that embrace increased levels of participatory democracy.

Methodology:

This paper compares orientations towards authority within Canada and the United States and assesses whether some of the observations by Nevitte, Adams and others are consistent with what can be extracted from the 1996 survey data in the ISSP⁷ Role of Government dataset. If appropriate dataset variables can be found that reflect national tendencies towards or away from deference and obedience to authority, then aspects of Canadian and American deference can be compared. Some conclusions can be drawn about whether widely-held stereotypes (mythologies) are borne out by the data, and what implications for democracy manifest levels of deference might have.

As *deference* is believed to be an attitude or ideology rather than an easily-monitored event, it is a complex undertaking to extract deference attributes from variables within the available dataset. There is no specific question that asks if respondents are "deferent" or not, and to do so would solicit predictable, if unreliable, responses! Nonetheless, one question (variable V4) comes close to fitting the bill.

There were four hypotheses being tested for this quantitative data research effort:

The primary (main) hypothesis is that responses to a specific question⁸ that approximates deference attitude in the ISSP dataset for Canada and the United States show a clear distinction between the two countries. (The exact phrasing of the question was: "*In general, would you say that people should obey the law without exception, or are there exceptional occasions on which people should follow their consciences even if it means breaking the law?*")

If assumptions are true, Canadian responses will reveal a lowered level of deference overall than will American responses. To test that hypothesis, a model was constructed using a recoded version of variable V4 in the 1996 ISSP dataset ("obey laws without exception") as the dependent variable (DV).

There were three other hypotheses to be tested: H₂ postulates that as education level increases, deference decreases. H₃ postulates that as social class level rises, deference

⁷ "The International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) is a continuing annual programme of cross-national collaboration on surveys covering topics important for social science research. Since 1983 it brings together pre-existing social science projects and co-ordinates research goals, thereby adding a cross-national, cross-cultural perspective to the individual national studies." See: http://www.gesis.org/en/data_service/issp/

⁸ Responses were categorized as 1. Obey the law without exception 2. Follow conscience on occasions 3. Can't choose, don't know 4. NA, refused.

decreases. H₃ also proposes that deference will be evident in a series of other “power-embedded” social constructs, such as sex (gender), religious associations, region and residence (urban or rural).

H₄ postulates that support for law enforcement spending is not strongly related to deference (in other words, this would be evidence that lowered deference to authority is not strongly correlated with a critique of the legitimacy of law and policing).

Possible weaknesses of the research model:

A lingering concern is over how key wording in the survey question (*"obeying the law without exceptions"*) might be interpreted by respondents. Did it represent a test of respondents' *respect for law* or as a test of their *willingness to stand for personal principles*? It was important to discern also whether what is being observed is actually deference to *authority* in the analysis model and not *obedience to law in the sense of opposing the flouting of the law*. Limitations of the dataset and research methodology were such that other questions could not be devised to test assumptions about what respondents were thinking when they chose "obey the law" over "follow one's conscience". Our assumption -- an important one -- is that quite aside from those respondents who might regularly challenge the law for political reasons, others who chose to select "conscience over law" probably knew what they were agreeing to, even if those who chose "obey the law without exceptions" did not share the same assumptions.

Nonetheless, the wording of the check-off boxes was not as precise as the preamble to question V4 in the questionnaire. The preamble refers unambiguously to *"exceptional occasions"* when people will follow their consciences and break the law. But the key options presented by the checkboxes⁹ below the preamble are: 1. *Obey the law without exception*; and 2. *Follow conscience on occasions*. If "occasionally" following one's conscience is perceived as a flippant disregard for law or a preference for law-breaking, this might have had a greater impact on deeply suspicious -- and conservative -- populations, whether or not they perceived themselves as deferential.

⁹ The surveys were administered to respondents who completed them on their own and then dropped them off. According to the ISSP description for Canada: "Self-completion with drop-off and collection"; and for the USA: "Self-administered supplement completed after the main GSS questionnaire".

Another possibility is that the “law” is interpreted by some as a reference to a higher moral law (religious law) -- as distinct from secular law. Those countries classified as religious states or states traditionally with a high level of influence by the church in secular matters, are expected to show a much greater tendency towards "obedience to law" over "following one's conscience" (see table 2). Without further research, it is difficult to discern whether religious societies or societies with significant influence by the church on the state, are simply more conservative (and thus more deferent to authority) or that they perceive "law" as religious law. That is a study worth some attention, but its impact either way is not believed to invalidate the tentative findings of this research project.

A further concern with the research model is that because several of the independent variables under consideration are expected to express similar societal power relationships, they are likely to be correlated with one another. What is being pursued in this project is the deference *within* the independent variables, but what is being measured is likely the expression of a broader range of subjective components within each variable. Controls will be used to try to separate the correlation from the causation, but the effort may not be entirely satisfactory.

Throughout the research project, the assumption made is that an appropriate confidence level for analysis is the standard used for many social science data analysis studies: a measure of .05 is sufficient to reject the null hypothesis.

The main research hypothesis, (H_1), is relatively easy to accept or reject. However, greater confidence in H_1 will be achieved if H_2 , H_3 and H_4 are also accepted.

Important note: All of the empirical data and most of the analytical discussion of it [univariate, bivariate crosstabs, correlations, multivariate crosstabs, linear regression] have been removed from this compressed version of the research paper. If they are of interest to you, please contact the author.

Conclusions:

The strongest case in support of the primary research hypothesis (H_1) may simply be its face validity. The survey question (the original V4) seems to capture the concept of deference well and the 1996 ISSP data point to a distribution that has been described and confirmed by other recent and credible studies (particularly those authored by Nevitte and Adams).¹⁰

The vast majority in both countries support same or additional funding for law enforcement. A minority in both countries supports reduced spending on law enforcement although a greater number do in Canada (12.4%) than in the USA, (7%). In any case, those numbers are certainly not sufficient to explain the overall 17.6% difference in support for conscience over law (Canada, compared to the USA.)¹¹

We can conclude, then, that in the main, the primary hypothesis is strongly supported by the evidence, which is that Americans as a group show more deference to authority than do Canadians. The data in Table 1, below, have been selected to emphasize the spread of responses based on age, education level and country in response to the dependent variable. The table indicates that higher education level has a more dramatic effect on American than Canadian positions towards “following conscience over law on exceptional occasions”. In Canada and the United States, the lag between the sexes (while not as prominent as the lag between levels of schooling) is a nonetheless relatively prominent (and likely persistent) factor.

Canadians convincingly appear more willing to go the route of their consciences and that inclination is more similar to a subset of Europeans and others that have strong secular societies with progressive democratic institutions (see table 2, below.) Americans as a group are less willing to obey conscience over law (by a ratio of 57.3% to 42.7%, as compared to Canadians 74.9% to 25.1%), although it should be emphasized that a majority of both Canadians and Americans as national groups still trust their personal judgements even in violation of the law. To be fair to the Americans, it should be noted that overall, the average of

¹⁰ Two secondary hypotheses (H_2 and H_3), while not strong (nor are some aspects statistically valid) still do point to some of the expectations assumed by H_1 . Regression analysis supports the hypothesis that there is a positive influence, particularly by *certain* levels of education on respondents' selection of "conscience" over "obeying laws without exception". Both the Canadian and American regression models are significant, although the models proposed explain about 18.6% of the variation in the recoded dummy variable "follow conscience", for Canada, and about 15.5% for the USA. Of the variables selected for regression, only three were significant for Canada while eleven were significant for the USA model. This sharp distinction also suggests that the research model may have been on the right track.

¹¹ Therefore there is also support for H_4 .

those countries surveyed revealed 59% choosing “obey law”, as compared to 41% choosing “follow conscience -- averages that are much more similar to American than Canadian ratios.¹²

Particularly striking is the consistent level of change (about 30% or more in the United States, half or less than in Canada) representing the impact of university education completion on deference attitudes. There is a mechanism at play here that seems to reveal a sobering truth about the nature of the US education system. (The data also show a smoother rising line in Canada indicating that generally speaking the more education one completes in Canada early on, the more self-confident in the face of authority one is likely to be.) University graduates in the United States do catch up. They eventually reach and slightly exceed Canadian numbers for abiding by conscience even in violation of law.

Canadians appear to be learning to think for themselves in a step-by-step fashion as they progress through their schooling. One message we can draw from this analysis is that education attainment (handled right) may play the most important role in determining deference levels within communities. In 1996, of those Canadians in the 25 to 64 age group, 31% had attained a post-secondary level education other than university, and 17% had attained a university level education (a total of 48%). In the USA 8% had attained post secondary schooling other than university level and 26% have attained a university level “college” education (for a total of 34%).¹³ Access to higher education for American working class and middle class citizens may be critical, and needs to be improved if Canadian levels of *deference avoidance* are to be attained (and presuming this is desirable).

In a recent review of the American country band, the Dixie Chicks, Larry Pynn asks, “Who would have thought that country music -- the most inoffensive jingoistic of American musical genres -- would have provided such a frighteningly sharp delineation of just how different Canadians are from our American neighbours. Canadians consider criticizing and challenging their political leaders as a basic democratic right, extending even to times of war, when so much more is at stake.” Criticism of the Dixie Chicks¹⁴ for having spoken out against

¹² Only respondents in France showed a higher percentage choosing “follow conscience” than did Canadian respondents.

¹³ The source of statistics on U.S. and Canadian higher education attainment levels is: <http://www11.sdc.gc.ca/en/cs/sp/arb/publications/research/2002-000014/2002-000014.pdf> There is some reference to the distinction between “attainment” and completion. 1999 comparison data is also available.

¹⁴ Shortly after this paper was written, Michael Adams coincidentally also referred to the Dixie Chicks phenomenon when he wrote in the *Globe and Mail*: “The U.S. Supreme Court may be forcing George Bush to cede a little territory in the bedrooms of his nation. But given the high and rising levels of deference to patriarchal and religious authority in the United States, Mr. Bush's fatherly “my house, my rules” statement will undoubtedly serve to retard any official moves to sanction same-sex unions in the United States. In the meantime, gay and politically progressive Americans will slink back to their rooms like defeated teenagers,

the war in Iraq brought them an “avalanche of criticism”, writes Pynn. Even when rocker Bruce Springsteen stepped in, he felt obliged to appeal to more mythology to get the Chicks off the hook: Their banishment from pop radio, said Springsteen, was “un-American”. His defence of outspokenness required an appeal to *patriotism* -- itself a deferential construct.

to crank up the Dixie Chicks and await the next election. And Canadians -- Catholic and otherwise -- will keep going their own way.”

Table 1: Percentage of Population Following Conscience Over Law on Exceptional Occasions

Canada	High School	University	% Change
Age 31-40	75.4	92.7	+17.3
Age 61-over	70.7	74.2	+3.5
Male	77.1	87.8	+10.7
Female	68	80.4	+12.4
 USA	 High School	 University	 % Change
Age 31-40	55	86.2	+31.2
Age 61-over	48	92.3	+35.3
Male	61.2	90.4	+29.2
Female	46.4	77.8	+31.4

Table 2: All Countries (V3) Choices: Recoded V4 (RV4)

V3 Country		* RV4 recoded v4 Crosstabulation		
% within V3 Country		RV4 recoded v4		
		1 obey laws without exception	2 follow conscience	Total
V3 Country	1 Australia	32.4%	67.6%	100.0 %
	2 West germany	27.4%	72.6%	100.0 %
	3 East Germany	29.1%	70.9%	100.0 %
	4 Great Britain	38.5%	61.5%	100.0 %
	6 United States	42.7%	57.3%	100.0 %
	8 Hungary	50.0%	50.0%	100.0 %
	9 Italy	35.1%	64.9%	100.0 %
	10 Ireland	39.8%	60.2%	100.0 %
	12 Norway	31.9%	68.1%	100.0 %
	13 Sweden	33.2%	66.8%	100.0 %
	14 Czech Republic	49.0%	51.0%	100.0 %
	15 Slovenia	41.3%	58.7%	100.0 %
	16 Poland	63.5%	36.5%	100.0 %
	17 Bulgaria	60.3%	39.7%	100.0 %
	18 Russia	39.3%	60.7%	100.0 %
	19 New Zealand	33.2%	66.8%	100.0 %
	20 Canada	25.1%	74.9%	100.0 %
	21 Philippines	52.2%	47.8%	100.0 %
	22 Israel Jews	69.6%	30.4%	100.0 %
	23 Israel's Arabs	48.4%	51.6%	100.0 %
	24 Japan	32.8%	67.2%	100.0 %
	25 Spain	64.2%	35.8%	100.0 %
	26 Latvia	41.3%	58.7%	100.0 %
	27 France	15.2%	84.8%	100.0 %
	28 Cyprus	36.1%	63.9%	100.0 %
Total		41.0%	59.0%	100.0 %

Table 3: Regression Analysis, Canada

Dummy variables (listed in left column) are significant where “Sig.” is less than .05; largest values for “t” (whether + or -) indicate which variables account most for variation in the dependent variable “follow conscience”. In this table, therefore, only DFEMALE, RECODV27 and RECV13 are significant.

		Coefficients ^a				
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.604	.662		.912	.363
	DINCPRI dummy incomplete primary	-.273	.226	-.084	-1.209	.228
	DPRIMARY dummy primary complete	-.008	.111	-.005	-.075	.940
	DINCSec dummy incomplete secondary	-.107	.087	-.081	-1.234	.218
	DINCTERT dummy incomplete post-secondary	-.016	.071	-.017	-.220	.826
	DUNIVERS dummy university complete	.036	.088	.029	.404	.686
	DLOWER dummy lower class	-.035	.266	-.008	-.132	.895
	DWORKING dummy working class	-.181	.100	-.108	-1.809	.071
	DUPPER dummy upper class	.318	.262	.069	1.212	.226
	RV220 recoded church attendance	.008	.043	.011	.189	.851
	DRC dummy roman catholic	.364	.501	.400	.726	.468
	DBAPT dummy baptist	.328	.535	.101	.612	.541
	DOTHPROT dummy other protestant	.331	.525	.142	.630	.529
	DOTHCHRI dummy other christian	.356	.508	.327	.702	.483
	DOTHER dummy other non christian	.327	.511	.254	.641	.522
	DFEMALE dummy female	-.103	.052	-.114	-1.987	.048
	RECV201 Recode age	-.028	.019	-.090	-1.478	.140
	DLEFTIES dummy leftwingers	.076	.069	.071	1.105	.270
	DRIGHTY dummy rightwingers	-.119	.116	-.061	-1.032	.303
	RECV12 Recoded revolutionaries freedom to meet	-.046	.035	-.111	-1.271	.205
	RECV13 Recoded revolutionaries right to publish book	.099	.038	.229	2.604	.010
	RECODV27 Recoded spending on law enforcement	-.093	.043	-.131	-2.177	.030
	RECODV35 Recoded power of government	.025	.043	.034	.586	.558
	RECV55 Recoded satisfaction how democracy works	-.023	.047	-.031	-.500	.618
	DEAST dummy eastern canada	-.132	.078	-.122	-1.687	.093
	DQUEBEC dummy quebec	-.034	.080	-.035	-.429	.669
	DWEST dummy western canada	.083	.076	.082	1.086	.279
	DURBAN dummy urban	-.013	.181	-.004	-.072	.943

a. Dependent Variable: DV4CON dummy follow conscience

Table 4: Regression Analysis, USA

Dummy variables (listed in left column) are significant where “Sig.” is less than .05; largest values for “t”, whether + or -, indicate which variables account most for variation in the dependent variable “follow conscience”. In this table, therefore, there are eleven significant variables, with DUNIVERS -- completion of university -- showing the greatest influence.

		Coefficients ^a				
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.556	.163		3.413	.001
	DINCPRI dummy incomplete primary	-.082	.273	-.009	-.302	.763
	DPRIMARY dummy primary complete	-.204	.091	-.071	-2.231	.026
	DINCSEC dummy incomplete secondary	-.118	.053	-.072	-2.255	.024
	DINCTERT dummy incomplete post-secondary	.120	.038	.106	3.145	.002
	DUNIVERS dummy university complete	.245	.064	.127	3.845	.000
	DLOWER dummy lower class	-.078	.071	-.036	-1.104	.270
	DWORKING dummy working class	.011	.033	.011	.319	.750
	DUPPER dummy upper class	-.036	.077	-.015	-.467	.641
	RV220 recoded church attendance	-.018	.027	-.023	-.664	.507
	DRC dummy roman catholic	-.164	.056	-.142	-2.942	.003
	DBAPT dummy baptist	-.120	.059	-.101	-2.032	.042
	DOTHPROT dummy other protestant	-.092	.064	-.066	-1.442	.150
	DOTHCHRI dummy other christian	-.175	.056	-.152	-3.144	.002
	DOTHER dummy other non christian	-.069	.108	-.022	-.638	.523
	DFEMALE dummy female	-.092	.031	-.093	-2.938	.003
	RECV201 Recode age	-.006	.012	-.017	-.507	.612
	DLEFTIES dummy leftwingers	-.047	.037	-.045	-1.289	.198
	DRIGHTY dummy rightwingers	-.088	.038	-.082	-2.321	.021
	RECV12 Recoded revolutionaries freedom to meet	.043	.022	.101	1.994	.046
	RECV13 Recoded revolutionaries right to publish book	.033	.024	.071	1.378	.169
	RECO DV27 Recoded spending on law enforcement	-.031	.025	-.039	-1.266	.206
	RECO DV35 Recoded power of government	.014	.029	.016	.495	.621
	RECV55 Recoded satisfaction how democracy works	.059	.025	.076	2.383	.017
	DNCENTRA dummy northcentral usa	-.075	.061	-.040	-1.232	.218
	DSOUTH dummy southern usa	-.069	.037	-.067	-1.857	.064
	DWESTUSA dummy western usa	.048	.042	.041	1.156	.248
	DURBAN dummy urban	-.043	.040	-.034	-1.079	.281

a. Dependent Variable: DVACON dummy follow conscience

Bibliography:

- Michael Adams, Fire and Ice, The United States, Canada and the Myth of Converging Values, (Penguin: Toronto 2003)
- Michael Adams, "The Word, Unheeded" in Globe and Mail, page A26, August 15, 2003.
- Thomas Blass, ed., Obedience to Authority, Current Perspectives on the Milgram Paradigm, (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: London 2000)
- Jeffrey W. Bowlby, "Post-Secondary Education Attainment in Canada and the United States in the 1990s", Applied Research Branch, Strategic Policy, Human Resources Development Canada, 2002, internet resource published at:
<http://www11.sdc.gc.ca/en/cs/sp/arb/publications/research/2002-000014/2002-000014.pdf>
- Robin Collins, "Coercion and Obedience in Political Repression", internet resource published at
http://www3.sympatico.ca/lothcol/collins/coercion_and_obedience.htm
- Jonathan Glover, Humanity, A Moral History of the Twentieth Century, (Pimlico: London 2001)
- Karla K. Gower, Liberty and Authority in Free Expression Law, the United States and Canada, (LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC: New York 2002)
- Leslie Green, review of "The Ethics of Deference: Learning from Law's Morals", internet resource published at <http://ndpr.icaap.org/content/archives/2003/4/green-soper.html>
- Andrew Hacker, Two Nations, Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal, (Scribner: New York 2003)
- Ronald Inglehart, "Postmodernization Brings Declining Respect For Authority But Rising Support For Democracy" (1999), Internet resource published at <http://wvs.isr.umich.edu/papers/postmod.shtml>
- Stanley Milgram, Obedience to Authority, An Experimental View, (Harper-Perennial: New York 1975)
- Richard Moon, The Constitutional Protection of Freedom of Expression, University of Toronto Press, Toronto 2000.
- Neil Nevitte, The Decline of Deference: Canadian Value Change in Cross-national Perspective, (Broadview Press: Toronto 1996)
- Michael Ornstein and Michael Stevenson, Politics and Ideology in Canada, Elite and Public Opinion in the Transformation of a Welfare Society, (McGill-Queen's University Press: Montreal and Kingston 1999)
- Larry Pynn, "The Vocal Dixie Chicks", Ottawa Citizen page C1, August 4, 2003
- Noah Richler, "Taking Measure of Our Country", National Post page B1, July 3, 2003
- Bertram Wyatt-Brown, "The Mask Of Obedience: Slave Psychology In The Old South", Internet resource published at <http://www.clas.ufl.edu/users/bwyattb/sambo2.htm>