2. Empirical test on ethics (E-T-E).

By Kurt – W. Laufs, ©

E-T-E (STE; DET-rev.) follows deduction psychologically empirical science, and after A. Schweitzer's cultural ethics, and Th. W. Adorno's authoritarianism F-conception, with 8 theoretical Factors on ethics and it's psychological interpretation, objectively, reliably, and contents validly as paper-and pen-procedure with seven points ranking scale.

High selectivities at inter-correlations results approximate normal-distribution.

Immanuel Kant's problem of *transcendence, and empirical ethics,* formerly discussed by the author, here, as „Ende der Transzendenz" (Laufs, K. – W., 1995; look also for WEB-site „Zwischen Individuum und Masse, I", between individual and mass, vol. I).

Research on values and attitudes had shown after observations of human behaviour and actions attitudes in psychological fields, in Germany. Firstly, for this test here, had been found hypothetical dimensions after *naught hypothesis, H0: there were no ethics, it rather were nonsense, (naught times hypothesis maketh zero).*

Alternative hypothesis, HA, said: according to philosophically consistent Schweitzer and Adorno dimensions as "Lebens-Auffassung" (life-view, LV), „Welt-Anschauung" (global world view, WV), and „Prinzipien-Treue" (truth to principles, purposes, maximes, PT), empirical ethics really exist.

Table 1: eight three-configuration patterns, (hypothetical factors)

.	LV	PT	WV	
1.	+	+	+	
2.	+	+	-	
3.	+	-	+	
4.	+	-	-	
5.	-	+	+	.
6.	-	+	-	
7.	-	-	+	
8.	-	-	-	

With 18 E-T-E questions, (2 x 3 x 3), there had been processed dichotomically binarised items for 8 hypothetical factors of empirical ethics, ranking scaled sensu classical psychological testing theory, and information-theoretically, and binarily.

To a sample of N = 20 psychologically mostly sane probandi, (male and female), statististic reliability shows after Cronbach α ~ .999, after high item -selectivities.

Factor analysis approves with 99% of explanation vof variance with 2 main components one general factor F I of „allgemein empirische Ethik" (general empirical ethics) ~ (74%), and a component F II of faschistoidy (authoritarianism) ~ (25%) after varimax rotation (Nie, N.H. et al., 1975, SPSS, loc. Cit.).

Objectively to mark testing-items at LV (+/-), PT (+/-), WV (+/-), dichotomously, also could serve to actional field research in attitudes, on prejudices and stereotypes, and also for self-(auto-) and others- (Hetero-) to estimate (ratings), as well as paper-pencil-test.

Table 2 shows the *E-T-E list of items* (also for testing shield).

Table 2: E-T-E - item-analysis (0 put 0,1)

	(N)	rotated components	
Factors:		F 1	F 2
Directions of answer:		yes	no
LV + (affirmation of life, not neurotic, etc.):			
01. I enjoy life.	(20)	.924	-.380
02. I love to enjoy.	(19)	.922	-.385
03. I love mankind.	(20)	.917	-.395
LV - (denial of life, rejection of pleasure/consumtion, character-neurotics, etc., psycho-pathology, religious cults, depression, compulsion, obsession, etc.):			
04. I understand life as full of trouble and pain.	(1)	-.927	.372
05. I loathe to enjoy.	(1)	-.922	.386
06. I find human lifes to be worthless.	(0)	-.914	.403

PT + (truth to principles and legal attitudes, ethical, self-determined values, etc.)

		N	F1	F2
07. I take my own decisions.		(19)	.931	-.360
08. I agree to laws, which I find correctly.		(19)	.931	-.360
09. My principles (maximes) turn me on.		(20)	.942	-.331

PT - (loss of principlest, authoritarianism, F-syndrome, schizoide, weak ego, compulsion obsession, paranoia, etc.):

10. I hardly can take my own decisions.		(1)	-.925	.378
11. I fundamentally reject laws.		(1)	-.927	.373
12. I have no principles at all.		(1)	-.925	.378

WV + (democratic attitudes, democratic behaviour, social intelligence, etc.):

13. I find, democratic opposition of importance.		(20)	.940	-.335
14. Democraty to be stronger, if strong entitled.		(19)	.937	-.343
15. I find, democratic control of importance.		(19)	.939	-.343

Zu WV - (dictatorial, extremist, totalitarian, F-syndrom, compulsion, obsession, ego-weakness, paranoia etc.):

16. I find dictatorship to be best for most people.		(0)	-.361	.930
17. I find liberty to be weakness.		(1)	-.417	.908
18. I find esoterical keeping secret of importance for a new global order.		(1)	-.324	.946
		N	F1	F2

For each of dimensions LV (+/-), PT (+/-), WV (+/-), binarily after numerical addions there can result following numerical *testing values, ranks: 6 > 4 > 2 > 0 > -2 > -4 > -6.*

Standard - error ~ + 2 > - 2 ~ /4/ to single testing values for E-T-E - dimensions LV, PT, WV. *Testing value sums < +2 appear critical.*

Testing results by E-T-E are not to over interprete, also considering the small sample here, of N = 20.

Here follow further tables and factor analysis for E-T-E, (D-E-T rev.).

Table 3: E-T-E item-inter-correlations: communality: ~ 1,000

Item Nr.	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09
01	--	.999	.999	-.997	-.998	-.997	.996	.996	.996
02	.999	--	.999	-.998	-.998	-.998	.996	.996	.996
03	.999	.999	--	-.998	-.998	-.997	.996	.996	.994
04	-.997	-.998	-.998	---	.999	.999	-.996	-.996	-.995
05	-.998	-.998	-.998	.999	---	.999	-.997	-.997	-.996
06	-.997	-.998	-.997	.999	.999	---	-.994	-.994	-.993
07	.996	.996	.996	-.996	-.997	-.994	---	.999	.999
08	.996	.996	.996	-.996	-.997	-.994	.999	---	.999
09	.996	.996	.994	-.995	-.996	-.993	.999	.999	---
10	-.998	-.998	-.998	.999	.999	.998	-.996	-.996	-.995
11	-.997	-.998	-.998	.999	.999	.998	-.996	-.996	-.995
12	-.998	-.998	-.998	.999	.999	.998	-.996	-.996	-.995
13	.994	.994	.993	-.994	-.993	-.993	.996	.996	.997
14	.996	.995	.995	-.995	-.995	-.994	.998	.998	.998
15	.998	.998	.997	-.998	-.998	-.997	.996	.996	.997
16	-.687	-.692	-.700	.681	.692	.706	-.671	-.671	-.648
17	-.730	-.734	-.740	.724	.735	.746	-.715	-.715	-.693
18	-.659	-.663	-.670	.652	.664	.677	-.643	-.643	-.618

Item Nr.	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
01	-.998	-.997	-.998	.994	.996	.998	-.687	-.730	-.659
02	-.998	-.998	-.998	.994	.995	.998	-.692	-.734	-.663
03	-.998	-.998	-.998	.993	.995	.997	-.700	-.740	-.670
04	.999	.999	.999	-.994	-.995	-.998	.681	.724	.652
05	.999	.999	.999	-.993	-.994	-.997	.692	.735	.664
06	.998	.998	.998	-.993	-.994	-.997	.706	.746	.677
07	-.996	-.996	-.996	.996	.998	.996	-.671	-.715	-.643
08	-.996	-.996	-.996	.996	.998	.996	-.671	-.715	-.643
09	-.995	-.995	-.995	.997	.998	.997	-.648	-.693	-.618
10	--	.999	.999	-.994	-.996	-.999	.685	.730	.657
11	.999	--	.999	-.994	-.996	-.999	.682	.726	.653
12	.999	.999	--	-.994	-.996	-.999	.685	.730	.657
13	-.994	-.994	-.994	--	.997	.996	-.651	-.695	-.621
14	-.996	-.996	-.996	.997	--	.997	-.657	-.703	-.629
15	-.999	-.999	-.999	.996	.997	--	-.657	-.703	-.628
16	.685	.682	.685	-.651	-.657	-.657	--	.992	.994
17	.730	.726	.730	-.695	-.703	-.703	.992	--	.995
18	.657	.653	.657	-.621	-.629	-.628	.994	.995	--

Table 4: Means and Standard-Ranges for 18 Items, Sample N = 20 male and female

Item	Mean	Standard-Range	Item	Mean	Standard-Range
01	9,0000	10,53845	10	9,1111	10,29500
02	8,9444	10,59119	11	9,0556	10,23530
03	9,5000	10,36538	12	9,1111	10,29500
04	9,0556	10,23530	13	9,1111	10,68748
05	9,2222	10,41241	14	8,0556	11,41965
06	9,6111	10,35908	15	7,4444	12,01578
07	8,1667	11,64802	16	6,2778	9,63941
08	8,1667	11,64802	17	5,2222	10,09109
09	8,1667	11,48400	18	4,6667	10,50490

Table 5: Varimax explains variance for 3 components on 18 items as variables.

component	peculiar values (pv, also sv: scree value)			sum rotation squared loadings
	Σ pv	variance %	cumulated %	pv
F I	16,509	91,718 %	91,718 %	13,333
extracted:		74,074 %	74,074 %	
F II	1,447	8,037 %	99,754 %	4,622
extracted:		25,680 %	99,753 %	
F III	0.017	0,093 %	99,847 %	0,017
extracted:		0,094 %	00,847 %	

F I and F II appear significantly, as pc > 1, and explain 99,753 % of E-T-E by N = 20: a *general ethic-Factor I ~ 74 % of variance, the smaller Factor II (authoritarianism, F-syndrom) 25 %,* also to be shown at components – transformation - matrix in table 6 a bi-polarily difference between empirical „general ethic" und F-syndrome; (a not significant rest – faktor III, shows pv < 1).

Table 6: Components'-Transformation-Matrix

Component	F 1 (Empirical Ethics)	F 2 (Autoritarianism)
F1	.888***	-.459*
F2	-.459*	.888***

Litterature:

Adorno, Th. W. et al., 1950: Studies in Prejudice. Deutsch: Der autoritäre Charakter. Studien über Autorität und Vorurteil. Bd. I und II. De Munter, Amsterdam, 1968, 1969.

Laufs, K.-W., 1997: Der Ethik Test (D-E-T), deutsch. {Structuralistic Test on Ethics (S-E-T), English Version, anew beworked}. VRI Mönchengladbach, 1997. Beschrieben in: Lukesch, H., 2000: Handbuch psychologischer und pädagogischer Testverfahren. PSYTKOM, ZPID, Trier; Nachfolger: Leibnitz-Gesellschaft, PSYNDEX, ZPID, Trier.

Nie, N.H., Hull, C.H., Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K., Bent, D.H., 1975: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences -SPSS-. 2nd ed. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1975.

Schweitzer, A., 1923: Kultur und Ethik. Mohr. Tübingen.

Abstract: Deduction logical psychological value and attitude research shows in an after actional field research in psychological fields with 18 items after "Lebens-Auffassung", "Prinzipien-Treue" and "Welt-Anschauung" for a dichotomous-binarily structural 8 factor model of ethics with high item selectivities for a sample of N = 20 sane people, (standard error after Guilford for testvalue dimensions < + 2). Cronbach a ~ .999 reliability, factorial validity shows two main-components above scree-value > 1; a main factor of general ethics (74%)*** and a fascistoid-authoritarianism (25 %)*.

Terms: psychology, clinical psychology, cultural psychology, social psychology, values, attitudes, factors of ethics, authoritarianism, structuralism, information-theory, classical testing-theory, ranking scales, objective, reliably, high selectivities, factoral validity.