THE AUTHORITARIAN PERSONALITY i: PRELIMINARY PERSPECTIVES AND STUDIES

William Bergquist and Kevin Weitz

> Man would fain be great and sees that he is little; would fain be happy and sees that he is miserable; would fain be perfect and sees that he is full of imperfections; would fain be the object of the love and esteem of men, and sees that his faults merit only their aversion and contempt. The embarrassment wherein he find himself produces in him the most injust and criminal passions imaginable, for he conceives a mortal hatred against that truth which blames him and convinces him of his faults
>
> Pascal, *Pensees*

There has been a longstanding interest in the phenomenon of authoritarian commitment. This is the uncritical acceptance of the subjective and emotional. It is the restriction and limitation of that which is perceived and conceived. It is the rejection of that which is abstract and indefinite and the distortion of that which is to serve as a belief or motivation in the service of an ill developed ego. For many years this phenomenon has occupied the minds of historians, philosophers and, more recently, psychologists and sociologists.

By the 1950s, the phenomenon of authoritarianism commitment dissociated from its environmental context. It was now viewed as a manifestation of particular personality types. It was a prejudicial act or ideological construct that was divorced from the particular situation and the respective ethnic, religious or racial group or groups involved. Only with the concern of psychologists and sociologists was there anything approximating an expression of a universal characteristic: the need for an insecure individual to direct their hatred and frustration arising from disillusionment, feeling of inferiority, rejection, etc. to the outside, adhering to a particular external object - be it belief or cause.

The Precursors

This new interest elicited in the· social scientists was largely the result of the witness of two major world conflicts. Within a span of thirty years—conflict which served as rationalizations for some of the most brutal and inhumane acts committed by man in his long evolution. These events abruptly destroyed the psychologists' previous conceptions of man as a being driven purely by instinctual, libidinal needs, or at the other extreme, of man as a purely rational being.

Man is indeed not purely instinctual, yet it is precisely those refined noninstinctual capacities which he uniquely possesses—that is. his ability to reason, which he distorts and so adroitly applies against himself. Man, given the freedom to transcend and evaluate the time-space continuum, experiences the anxiety accompanying this freedom ---the experiential "abyss" or *Angst* which existentialists so vividly describe—and seeks to escape from his freedom via total obedience or commitment to a state, cause or

other belief-disbelief system. Freud attempted to account for this phenomenon by means of a death instinct, *Thanatos*; later theorists (Fromm, Sartre, and Hoffer), however, .attributed it instead to an "authoritarian" personality syndrome.

Erich Fromm

The most influential and extensive of these theoretical studies was made by the neo-Freudian, Eric Fromm. According to Fromm, man's prime mechanism of escape from freedom is the abdication of one's self-independence and the "symbiotic" fusion of one's self with somebody or something outside o:f oneself in order-to acquire the strength which the individual self is lacking. These "secondary bonds" substituted for primary bonds, are most commonly found in the striving for submission and domination, i.e. masochism and sadism.

The sado-masochistic symbiosis, or union of beings, is the basis for the "inhibiting" or "irrational" authoritarianism which is to be differentiated from rational acceptance of authority. The latter form of authority-acceptance, an inter-personal relationship in which one person, justifiably, looks upon another as somebody superior to himself, is a productive inequality which. tends to dissolve itself as the subordinate gains strength or knowledge from the superordinate. The irrational type, on the other hand, is characterized by an exploitive relationship in which distance between super- and sub-ordinant becomes intensified through its long duration. In the rational situation love, admiration, and gratitude are prevalent, in the 1rrat1onal, resentment, hostil1ty (e1ther overt or repressed) and anxiety are evident. An acceptance - even worship - of fate, and a belief in magical helpers are frequently concurrent with this sadomasochism.

A strong, irrationa1¢onscience (the 'super-ego of Freud) is also attributable to the authoritarian syndrome. The authoritarian's radical obedience of- authority becomes internalized in response to a threat of rejection by the authority, while his feeling of personal productiveness ..,,,-which is the source of his strength, freedom, and happiness - and his assertion of will are repressed under the force of guilt. Such an internalization of authority - a much more efficient and less costly form of control than external authority—is, according to Fromm, a profoundly influential result, if not objective, of Protestantism, having only lost its eminence in recent years in lieu of the "anonymous" authority of "market-orientation" or societal adjustment.

Jean Paul Sartre

A second major work of the post-World War II era., *Anti-Semite and Jew*, was written not by a social scientist but by a versatile man of literature and philosophy Jean Paul Sartre. This essay created a tremendous stir in France in 1946 largely through its very incisive portrayal of the French anti-Semite: a man obsessed by a savage "passion". This is a passion which is transformed into the hostility directed against the Jew and into the inherent sense of physical repulsion toward the Jew which "enters the body from the mind." Furthermore, Sartre states that if the Jew did not exist, the anti-Semite would invent him, thus attempting, as Fromm did, to disassociate the antisemitic feeling from the particular ideological content. 'While not empirical in itself, this sort of analy1ais is conducive to such endeavors.

Eric Hoffer

A third significant portrait was drawn by Eric Hoffer in his book, *The True Believer*. Hoffer pictured the fanatic in contemporary society - the individual who will readily accept any cause, and, if necessary,

sacrifice his life for the cause and the beliefs constructed in connection with the cause. Hoffer does not maintain that all causes. or mass movements are identical, but only that these movements share certain essential characteristics· which give them a family likeness. All mass movements generate in their adherents a proclivity for united action; they all, irrespective of the doctrine that is preached and the program that is perfected, breed fanaticism, enthusiasm, fervent hope, hatred and intolerance; they are all capable of releasing a powerful flow of activity in particular departments of life; they all demand a blind faith and a single-hearted allegiance, i.e.:

> All movements, however different in doctrine and aspiration, draw their early adherents from the same types of humanity; they all appeal to the same types of mind.

These "types" are the individuals who: {l) try to recover a lost faith in themselves by seeking a transcendent faith; (2) find nothing meaningful in their own life, hence, have a critical, yet dependent, preoccupation with other people's lives; (3) hold an intense fear that life is slipping away from them; and (4) need a substitute for individual hope, being a member of a society imbued with the idea of progress and concerned with the future. Mass movements are usually accused of doping the member with the hope of the future in lieu of enjoyment in the present. However, to the frustrated individual, the present is irremediably spoiled. Comforts and pleasures cannot alter this situation. Consequently, real hope can only arise in the prospects of the future.

The Authoritarian Personality

 A fourth study, conducted by the University of California Institute of Social Research, stands as the most significant and influential among the many which have been reported. While the three previously mentioned authors, Fromm, Sartre, and Hoffer, based their hypotheses upon subjective observation and speculation, the University of California group based its conclusions upon empirical data and operationally controlled experimentation. This empirical study credited primarily to Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, and Sanford was instigated in an attempt to demonstrate that an individual's attitudes toward minority groups are inter-related, forming a consistent pattern and that these attitudes are an expression of basic character trends which, considered as a: whole, may be termed the "Authoritarian Personality."

One phase of their work was based on a series of scales. constructed to measure attitudes dealing with three broad areas of social concern, i.e. ethnocentrism, anti-Semitism, and anti-democratic trends. The authors guided themselves in the construction of these seal.es by the definite assumption that the economic, political, and social views of an individual form a coherent and describable pattern. In constructing these scales, the University of California's investigative team relied on an analysis of the probable content and organization of the attitudes in question.

They prepared questions on anti-Semitic sentiment which they felt bore on the leading ideas: {1} The "offensiveness" of Jews, (2) the "threatening" character of the Jews, (3) the need to segregate the Jew in regards to employment, education, residence:, etc., (4) the Jew's "intrusiveness", i.e. his tendency to over-imitate and assimilate, and (5) an antithetical view, the Jew's "seclusiveness," i.e. his refusal to assimilate to the ways of the wider community. The scale consisted or five sub-parts, each of which dealt with one of the views just described. In   form the scales were of the type first presented by Rensis Likert.

The question of major interest was: do individuals display a readiness to accept anti-Semitic ideology as a whole? Apparently they do, for substantially high correlation was found between the subscales (ranging from .74 to .85). Particularly interesting was the quite high correlation between the antithetical subparts that dealt respectively with Jewish "seclusiveness" and the need to segregate and restrict the Jew. Additionally, a reliability of .92 was found between the particular items on the total scale and between .7 and .89 on the subscales. As a result of these Adorno et al (195C, p. 75) concluded that anti-Semitism is a cohesive attitude the parts of which are in close relation. Furthermore, the

> . . . imagery of Jews as personally offensive and as socially threatening, attitudes of restriction; exclusion and the like, the view that Jews are too assimilative and yet too clanni.sh - these see111. to be various factors of a broad ideological. pattern. An individual's stand with regard to one of these issues tends to be very similar in direction and degree to his stand with regard to the others

Finally, anti-Semitism is observed to be an ideology, a way of thinking about certain "unclear ideas" that, once established, attract numerous specific opinions to form a system.

Having established an apparently a¢c:11rate scale which measures antisemitic: attitude, Adorno and associates attempted an interpretation of the content of the attitudes of highly anti-Semitic individuals by examining the content of the statements they endorsed. The California group found that the intolerant individual tended to agree with those statements which were stereotyped, which rigidly adhered to middle-class values, which tended to regard one's own group as morally pure in contrast to the immoral out-group, which opposed and exaggerated sensuality, which emphasized dominance and power, e.g. fear of Jewish power and desire for Gentile power, which expressed a fear o:fmoral contamination and of being overwhelmed and victimized, which expressed the desire to erect social barriers in order to separate one group :from an- other, and which maintained the morality and the dominance o:f one's own group.

The successful investigators were now ready to determine whether these findings were confined to views about a particular minority group, the Jews, or whether they were applicable to all out-groups and part of a more inclusive, universal attitude o:f rejection of the external group. To answer this question, Adorno and associates constructed another scale w:hioh dealt with "ethnocentrism," i.e. hostility toward numerous other minorities. They administered this newly devised scale to the subjects used in the original study and compared the results.

The Ethnocentric scale consisted of several sub---scales: (1) the Negro (N) scale, (2) the minority (M) scale which dealt with minorities other than Jews and Negroes, and (3) a "pseudo patriotism" scale which contained items dealing with international relations and which described the United States as an in-group in relation to other nations described as the out-groups. This scale proved to be highly reliable (.91 on the total scale, from .80 to .-91 on the subscales); additionally, the intercorrelation between the subscales ranged from .74 to .84. Most importantly the correlation between the Ethnocentric Scale and the Anti-Semitism Scale a significant .80; in addition, the subparts of the two scales correlated substantially with each other. In fact, these correlations were only slightly less than the intercorrelations among the parts of the same scale.

These results - the high reliability of the two main scales, the intercorrelation of the subparts, and particularly the inter- correlation between the scales - appear to point to a common factor among them.

Consequently Adorno, like Sartre, Fromm, and Hoffer, postulated a universal prejudicial factor. Adorno concluded that one can speak of a general attitude of out-group rejection and acceptance, of which attitudes toward particular groups are a part. Authors of *The Authoritarian Personality* (1950, p. 122) concluded that "it is the total ethnocentric ideology, rather than prejudice against any single group, which requires explanation."

To the investigators, however, it soon became evident that ethnocentrism itself, far from being an independent category had its roots in the deeper psychological dispositions of the personality. Thus, in postulating a universal prejudice one is immediately confronted with the problem of finding or hypothesizing the linking underlying factor which motivates this prejudice. The California group sought the nature of this psychological disposition by employing clinical studies; they extensively interviewed those individuals who scored either very high -or very low on the A-Sand E Scales.

Drawing upon interpretations derived from these interviews, Adorno, et al, undertook to construct a scale which dealt with matters· of a general, less-directed content, which might be significantly related to the earlier scales-and which could lay bare the styles of feeling· and thinking responsible for prejudice and tolerance. They constructed an F (Fascism) scale, the aim of which was to touch upon the personal roots of anti-democratic trends. The authors postulated various components which made up the Fascistic or anti-democratic syndrome.

These assumed components were: (1) *Conventionalism*: the superficial and rigid adherence to conventionality based not upon conviction but instead \ upon external adoption of prevailing values in response to social pressure; (2) *Authoritarian submission*: a syndrome component similar to the irrational authoritarianism postulated by Fromm, i.e. an emotional need to be subservient to a strong superior in lieu of the establishment of an inner source of authority and autonomy. As Fromm postulated, hostility displacement. upon others often arises from such a situation, hence the next component; (3) *Authoritarian aggression*: arising not only from the hostility concurrent with submission but also from hostility inherent in the all-too-strict confines of conventionality; (4) *Devaluation of the human and* animate and an overevaluation of physical things and that which is inanimate; (5) *Superstition*: a tendency to assign responsibility, for events to external, frequently supernatural, causes; and (6) *Destructiveness and Cynicism*: arising .from the individual's lack of self-esteem and need to externalize his self-hatred.

The resulting scale developed by the California group turned out to be as reliable as the Anti-69mitio and. Ethnocentric scales (r .78). Its correlations with the ethnocentrism scale and with the anti-Semitism scale were positive but rather low (r=.77). Later studies on the correlation between the E and F scales varied a great deal as to results. We can therefore only tentatively speak about a common factor between Authoritarianism and Ethnocentrism. and cannot at   this time speak about any definite factors.

The important questions to be answered after these scales were established and found to be interrelated were: How did these attitudes arise and why do some individuals from the same social, economic, political, and religious background as the equalitarian become authoritarian and prejudiced? Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, and Sanford attempted to deal with these inquiries. They selected two extreme groups on the basis of the various scales they developed and studied these individuals in great detail, making use of clinical interviews. The investigators upon com- piling the data concluded

that a fundamental difference between these extreme groups lay in the process or awareness-repression.

The highly prejudiced individual is generally less adept at acknowledging the presence in himself of impulses and tendencies which he personally feels are unacceptable. The low prejudiced group on the other hand could recognize the existence of this dichotomous situation and refused, consciously or unconsciously, to repress the disturbing state. The tendencies which the former strive to keep out of awareness are mainly fear, weakness, passivity, sexual impulses, and aggressive felling's against authoritative figures, especially the parents. The need not to confront these facts about the $8lf produces in the extreme high group a rejection of self-examination and a restriction of psychological imagination about the self and others.

The individual becomes authoritarian, according to the autn6rs, as a result of the experiences of childhood. The high scoring (authoritarian) individual tended to come from a strict, restrictive environment. He experienced harsh, threatening discipline, at home; was forced to form an idealistic, non-objective, conception of his parents; was told that sex is immoral and exploitive, that power is the essential factor of esteem and influence; and was a member of a fixed, rigid family status structure based upon age and gender. To borrow some of Fromm's concepts, the authoritarian, in his youth, was in a situation in which he could not develop the self-esteem nor self-love needed for a productive, creative life. In order for one to love and show empathy for another he must first gain an esteem and love for himself; only then can he direct himself to an external object.

The individual who does not respect himself, as a result of the harsh, non-supportive environment de-scribed above, becomes alienated from himself and soon sets up goals which were once means to the goals of happiness and productivity. For example, the alienated. or authoritarian individual will not consider the acquisition of property a. means to an end, happiness or productivity, and subordinate property to such an end, but will consider the acquisition of property an end in itself.

The alienated individual will also be unable to develop an "I-Thou" relationship with other individuals but will instead treat them as objects ta be used as a means to an end, i.e. will develop an "I-it' relationship with other people; hence, the formation of ideologies which use other individuals as scapegoats or "psychological cushions." While this description regarding the genes of authoritarianism is all too brief, it should suffice as a basis upon which the particular causes of each individual case of authoritarianism can be founded•

What did Adorno and associates accomplish in their extensive research and theorization? Did this study succeed in describing the content and genesis of certain important attitudes and the relationship between these attitudes? In many respects: the Adorno studies did accomplish a great deal. While Sartre, Fromm, and Hoffer all wrote interesting and apparently insightful descriptions of the prejudiced, fanatic individual, they did not base such descriptions upon empirical, experimentally- controlled data. The Adorno group was the first to employ the effective statistical and public opinion tools developed by such psychometricians as Likert and Thurstone.

While Adorno's findings may not be accurate, they at least provided the impetus for further studies on prejudice and authoritarianism. Secondly, we cannot disregard the fact that the scales show high reliability and appreciable correlations with ·one another. Apparently, Adorno has isolated certain psychological factors which are closely interrelated and appear to be closely connected with certain

ideological stands which are basically discriminatory, distortive, and hostile in nature. Finally, the Adorno study arrives at many of the same conclusions which its philosophical and historical counterparts have expanded. in nonempirical manner, and hence has bolstered the findings of these studies with the buttress of clinically and experimentally derived evidence.

Criticism of the California Studies

Considerable criticism was directed for many years against the Adorno study. The most prominent of these critiques offered in *Studies in the Scope and Methods of "The Authoritarian Personality"* that was edited by Richard Christie and the noted psychologist, Marie Jahoda. In the introductory chapter, Jahoda notes that there is poor alignment between the application of a clinical interviewing process to the study of a specific personality trait—such as authoritarianism. When engaged from a psychodynamic perspective (such as was embraced by the California Study group) , a clinical interview hopefully leads to an understand of the whole person--not just one trait.

Jahoda suggests that authors of *The Authoritarian Personality* were trying to focus on a specific social/political trait but were doing so by applying a broad psychological analysis--though it should be noted that the California Study group also use focused psychometric tools. Jahoda's critique seems to be directed not to the "objective" results obtained through use of the psychometric scales, but to much more speculative accounts regarding the potential sources of authoritarian personality traits and to ways in which these traits are activated and sustained under specific conditions of stress and uncertainty.

In a later chapter, Richard Christie reviewed the work that has been done since the original book came out. He proposes that the authors over-emphasize the personality structures of fascism and ethnocentrism. Christie noted that they offered too little analysis regarding the social structures and social-political context within which authoritarianism operates.

A particularly important and influential chapter was prepared by Edward Shils, a noted sociologist. He criticizes the focus on what he identified as "right wing nativist fundamentalist ideology". The California Study Group did not offer an analysis of authoritarianism as it exists at all points on the political ideological spectrum.

Shils points out that the primary questionnaire (F Scale) being used by this study group was intended not to identify and measure authoritarianism, but rather to portray the primary extreme of the right wing along with antisemitic ideology and practices. Shils suggests that authors of *The Authoritarian Personality* are assuming that political ideology exists on a uni-dimensional scale, with the extreme left end of the spectrum being completely opposite of the extreme right end. In fact, according to Shils, the two extremes share much in common. This should be the focus on any study of authoritarianism.

Many of the criticisms offered in Christie and Jahoda's book are echoed in the observations made by other psychologists, sociologists and political sciences during the remainder of the 1950s. Specifically, while most of the critics of this study acknowledged the positive aspects of *The Authoritarian Personality* they felt that it could be improved by (1) a change of methodology, (2) further research to refine the measurement of the variables used and to discover additional variables that might affect the prejudicial condition, and (3) discussion of the adequacy of the theoretical assumptions (Simpson & Yinger, 1958, pp. 95-96).

Sampling Biases

First, many critics claimed that the methodology of the California Study was faulty in that the authors paid little attention to sampling iaws; hence their findings can be questioned as applicable only to the particular sample which they tested {Simpson & Yinger, 1958, p. 96). Christie, and Garcia (1951) pointed out that the California Public Opinion Study was based primarily upon data collected from the residents of California, hence was of only limited generality. In California during this period of time a broad spectrum of attitudes were overtly expressed so that an individual in such an environment was exposed to a great variety of ideologies regarding groups. Therefore, people could choose those ideologies, either consciously or unconsciously, which were compatible with their psychological need for outlets for aggressive impulses.

In such an environment, the greater the authoritarianism, the greater the acceptance of ethnocentrism. However, would this relationship hold in a subculture which is marked by a relative homogeneous, legally sanctioned ideology regarding minority groups? Under such conditions the ideological range of group influence would be limited, hence affording less of an option for individual choice.

Christie and Garcia compared such a sub-culture (a Oklahoma city in which there was at the time legalized discrimination against Negroes and strong non-legal prejudice against other minority groups such as Jews) with the California group. They found a significantly higher acceptance of items on both the E and F scale by the Oklahoma group, thus indicating greater prejudice toward minority groups and greater acceptance of authoritarian ideology.

Christie and Garcia (1951, p. 469) concluded that the

> paucity of ideological stimulation is believed largely responsible for the higher scores manifested on the F scale by the Southwest City students, and they doubted whether early child rearing practices *per se* could be invoked as the relevant variable.

We may, therefore, criticize the California study for not taking these factors into consideration.

Methodological Limitations and Demographics Not Considered.

A second major criticism concerning methodology was tendered. Can the memories of childhood, which the California group obtained from the interviewees, be considered necessarily accurate records of past events? Additionally, such variables as education, group membership, sex, and intelligence can make a difference. They were not being controlled on the California studies. These variables might have served as critical factors (Simpson &c Yinger, 1958, p. 96).

The final factor to be considered is the general inadequacy of questionnaires. As Kelly, Ferson, and Holtzman (1958, p. 315) have pointed out:

> The Questionnaire approach involves recall and discussion of social interaction, both of which are subject to unconscious or deliberate distortion to maintain self-consistency.

If the experimenter is to obtain an accurate, undistorted statement of an individual1s attitude, he must disguise his questions in such a way as to make them appear unrelated to this attitude. That is the

person doing the interview cannot inquire about the individual's attitude directly but must ask questions which indirectly indicate the attitude.

However, the evaluation of the answers to such indirect questions is very difficult. One can never be sure that the indirect question would really elicit a response similar to that elicited by an ac- curate expression of opinion on the direct question. Additionally, there is no way in which one can correlate the responses to the direct and indirect question, for in doing so we run into the same initial problem, i.e. how accurate is the direct response? Hence, an unresolvable dilemma.

The California group's control of variables, or, more accurately, their recognition of variables was open to much criticism—particularly by Bass, and by Sullivan, and Adelson. Bass postulated that the California study failed to recognize the phenomenon of "acquiescence" in their authoritarian subjects. Sullivan and Adelson suggested that "misanthropy" must be taken into consideration as an influential factor on the responses elicited.

Acquiescence

in a study conducted in the early 1950's, Bass (1954, p. 616), hypothesized that:

> Performance on the F scale has less to do with the content validity of the items than with *the response set to acquiesce to any generalizations about social issues - authoritarian or egalitarian.* ·

Bass set about proving this hypothesis by creating a G scale which was composed of' statements opposite to those given in the F scale. The degree to which each of the statements was in opposition to its mate was determined, and those mates which were found to be not the antithesis of each other were thrown out. Response set to acquiescence was measured by obtaining each individual's tendency to support both F and G scale statements.

An analysis of variance disclosed that, if the individual's fluctuations from one scale to another are ignored, then, the individuals tend to differ significantly from each other in the tendency to acquiesce. Additionally, it appeared that response set to acquiesce increased as items became more ambivalent, and that. after a factor analysis was run on the data, approximately three--fourths of the reliable variance of the F scale was associated with an acquiescence factor while only one-fourth was attributable to a content factor of authoritarianism. These results tended to substantiate those found by T. S. Cohn several years before. (Cohn found a correlation of .41 between F scale scores and the tendency to respond "yes" to MMPI items.)

Misanthropy

Sullivan and Adelson (1954) presented "misanthropy" as a variable which hadn't been considered by Adorno and associates. Misanthropy, defined as a generalized hatred of mankind, is believed by these authors to be the factor, rather than a particularized ethnic prejudice, which is measured on the California E scale. They attempted to verify these beliefs by rewriting 29 items on the existing E scale so that the terms "people, "most people" or "human{s}" were substituted for the specific minorities originally designated. The scale thus constructed (termed M) was found to be correlated .43 with a 20 item version of the E scale.

From these results the authors concluded that a "middle position" should be taken. On the one hand, misanthropy. is associated with ethnic attitudes, as is witnessed by the correlation obtained. On the other hand, the correlation is certainly not large enough to demonstrate that· prejudice is isomorphic with an underlying misanthropy or that designation of particular minorities as objects of hate is adventitious, i.e. free from social pressure.

These conclusions, therefore, leave unresolved the conflict between two schools of social psychology. There are those who believe prejudice is primarily, if not entirely, determined by personality dynamics. If minority groups did not exist inner needs would invent them. Those in the second school believe that prejudice is primarily a cultural, environmental phenomenon which arises from the traditions, backgrounds, and needs of the particular sub-society. This argument appeared and reappears throughout the 1950s and 1960s studies of authoritarianism and prejudice.

Sullivan and Adelson attempted to provide some reasons for the development of a generalized hatred of mankind. They described the high-scoring, misanthropic individual as one whose only "in-group" is the self—all else being considered the "out-group." The potentially misanthropic individual, as he becomes more frustrated and withdrawn, draws in his in- group/ out-group dichotomization closer to himself, confining the in-group sphere to a smaller area around himself and enlarging the out-group sphere to encompass all other people. The extreme example of this exclusionistic individual would be the paranoid-schizophrenic who sees all that is external of self as threatening and of a hostile nature. Hence, the in-group out-group dicotomization of the California test is invalid when considering the exclusionistic high scorers.

Alternative Versions of the Authoritarian Personality

Discussion arose during the following decade as to the adequacy of the theoretical assumptions made by Adorno, et al. Many critics offered alternative theoretical structures and scales which encompassed the good points of the Authoritarian study yet incorporated new elements (showing fairly high correlation with the F and/or E scale). The most notable of these theorists and researchers were Bass, Sullivan, and Adelson, Campbell and McCandless, Guba and Getzels, Kaufman, Srole and Roberts—and most notable of all, Milton Rokeach. The first three of these theorists Bass, and Sullivan, and Adelson have already been considered. Bass postulated the alternative theory of "acquiescence" and Sullivan and Adelson spoke of the need to consider· the phenomenon of "misanthropy."

Xenophobia

Campbell and McCandless (1951) described a generalized hatred and fear of strangers and strange objects and labeled such a fear, "Xenophobia." Campbell and McCandless felt that Xenophobia indicated generalized prejudice much as the Ethnocentrism (E) scale did. However, Campbell's Xenophobia scales dealt only with hostility toward out-groups while, according to the authors, the Ethnocentric scale dealt with both out-group hostility and in-group loyalty. Consequently, concluded Campbell, the Xenophobia scale was to be distinguished from the Ethnocentric scale and, furthermore, was more appropriate than the latter scale.

The Xenophobia scale (X) was based upon responses to 125 items which were sub-divided into 25 separate five-item scales representing attitudes toward five ethnic groups (English, Negroes, Japanese, Jews, end Mexicans) on five separ11.te topics (Social Distance, Blaming, Capability, Morality, and Affection). In criticism of Xenophobia, we can point to the comments of Sullivan and Adelson on the

frequent irrelevance of the in-group out-group dicotomization due to the exclusionistic attitude of high-scorers, and to the general criticisms directed against all questionnaire-based scales.   ·   ·

Other-Directedness

Guba and Getzels (1954) constructed an "other-directedness" scale and considered suggestibility to be the prime factor of influence on attitude scales. Guba submitted nineteen "inner- directed" and nineteen "outer-directed" slogans which were associated with opposing behavior tendencies to a group of subjects. The subjects tended to accept slogans of either direction or reject both types of slogans. The tendency to accept any type of slogan also correlated significantly with scores on the F scale. The authors concluded that both of their scales demonstrated that scales on the F scale were associated with the tendency to be suggestible.

One major point of criticism may be directed against Guba and Getzel's work. The authoritarian scale is primarily a measurement of right-winged conservative attitudes, i.e. fascistic attitude; it was not designed to test left-winged, liberal authoritarianism, which as Rokeach states, is an inadequacy of the authoritarian test. Therefore, a high rate of disagreement with the items on the F or E scale can be an indication of a liberal authoritarianism as would acceptance of statements antithetical to those on the F and E scale.

Consequently, acceptance of both extreme positions could be an indication of a generalized authoritarianism rather than suggestibility. A second alternative explanation, probably even more feasible, would be Bass' acquiescence, i.e. the positive acceptance of all statements by the authoritarian individual. Hence, the findings of Guba and Getzel do not necessarily support the hypothesis of suggestibility but could be construed as evidence for the hypothesis of either a generalized "liberal-conservative" authoritarianism or acquiescence.

Status Concern

The fifth alternative theory to be presented was advocated by Walter C. Kaufman in a 1957 issue of the *American Journal of Sociology*. Kaufman began by stating that "the hope that the California research would validate a genetic 'dynamic' approach to the explanation of prejudice has not been fulfilled." Kaufman believed that the California researchers had failed to consider concern with status which he believed to be more closely related to anti-Semitism than is authoritarianism. Further, he believed that the relationship between authoritarianism and anti-Semitism may be largely explained by their mutual relationship to concern with status.

In order to substantiate these beliefs Kaufman constructed an attitude scale which measured concern with status and correlated the results on this test with those on the F and A-S scales. The questionnaire included such items as: (1) Man's ambition indicates good character, (2) Betterment of self is meritful, and (3} Ambition is the most important factor in determining success in life. This (Status-Concern) Scale correlated .71 with F, and .66 with A-S. The F scale correlated .53 with the A-S scale; hence, the concern with status appears to be the dominant dimension. This supports many findings Kaufman cited relating prejudice to mobility and attitudes about status.

Kaufman runs up against the problem of socio-economic class standards when he writes of status concern. It seems that status concern is closely linked to middle class standards and value systems. Can we be sure therefore that concern or lack of concern for status is a personality factor—rather than being

a result of class membership? Consequently, how do we know whether anti-Semitism and fascism are closely related to social class or to social concern or to a combination of the two. Admittedly, just the recognition of the close interrelationship between fascism, intolerance, anti-Semitism and either social class or status concern is significant.

Anomie

Leo Srole {Roberts, 1956) presented a paper to the meeting of the American Sociological Society in 1951, in which he introduced the idea of *Anomie,* a phenomenon variously referred to as social dysfunction, social disorganization, group alienation, and demoralization. Srole believed that such an anomic state of affairs comprised "one of the prime forces on the urban scene contributing to the formation of patterns of distance, discrimination, and rejection toward out-groups in general and toward minority groups in particular." Srole pointed to the vast amount of literature relating this sense of isolation, i.e. anomie, to political movements (both right and left) to many contemporary religious movements as well as to other prevalent social movements.

Many alternative responses may be seen as particular ways of attempting to deal with anomie: why then couldn't our knowledge of prejudice benefit by the study of anomie (Simpson & Yinger, 1958, p. 99)? Srole sampled 401 white, native-born adults in an eastern city. He asked them to complete a questionnaire which included: (1) five questions concerning the degree of racial and religious prejudice; (2) five questions from the F scale; and (3) five questions measuring feelings of anomie or isolation from others.

A significant correlation was found between authoritarianism, anomie and scores on the prejudice scale. By means of partial correlation, Srole further discovered that the degree to which authoritarianism was correlated with prejudice when the effect of anomie was held constant and the degree to which anomie was correlated with prejudice when the effect or authoritarianism was held constant was .12 and .35 respectively, Hence, the sense of isolation appears to be more closely associated with anti-minority views than is authoritarianism (Simpson & Yinger, 1958, pp. 99--100).

Roberta (1956) attempted to replicate this experiment having removed some of the apparent flaws. Roberts found that:

> Both anomie and authoritarianism correlated about equally highly with prejudice. There is a higher correlation between authoritarianism and prejudice with anomie held constant (r=.53) than between anomie and prejudice with authoritarianism held constant {r=.37). As a result of these findings, Roberts concluded that anomie should be considered a relevant variable, but certainly not one which supersedes authoritarianism as Srole thought.

Clearly, Srole and many other social psychological researchers and theorists wanted to "hitch a ride" on the very influential (and controversial) findings of The Authoritarian Personality. No other book about personality traits at the time—and since this time—has evoked such a concerted effort to modify or expand on the basic notion of authoritarian perspectives and practices.

The Open and Closed Mind

The final critic of the Adorno Authoritarian Study to be considered is Dr. Milton Rokeach of Michigan State. Dr. Rokeach criticized the authoritarian personality Studies first of all for its lack of consideration

of general mental rigidity and in- flexibility of mind, which Rokeach considers to· be a very important element of the Authoritarian construct. Secondly, like Edward Shils, he states that both the Ethnocentrism Scale and the Fascistic Scale measure only right-winged authoritarianism and neglected the authoritarianism on the left.

Additionally, Rokeach felt that there was an element which encompassed authoritarianism (as measured on the F scale) and intolerance (as measured on the E scale). This element would also encompass something that was not measured by the California study group—this is the presence of a closed cognitive systems. He called this element *Dogmatism* and constructed a D (Dogmatism) Scale which was free of particular ideological constructs Hence, the D Scale served to test both left and right authoritarianism. It took the place of both the E and F scale.

Cognitive Rigidity

Rokeach (1954, 1956) went beyond the study of dogmatism. He introduced the notion of cognitive rigidity and differentiated between rigidity and dogmatism. According to Rokeach, dogmatism refers to the total cognitive organizations of ideas and beliefs into relatively closed ideological systems. By contrast, rigidity refers to a intrapsychic boundary which prevents communication between neighboring regions, or to the way a person or animal attacks, solves, or learns specific tasks and problems. Dogmatism is considered, a higher-order and a more complexly organized form of resistance to change. While dogmatism may well lead to rigidity, the converse is not necessarily the ease. Rokeach uses as an example the feeble-minded rat which may be considered rigid but hardly may be considered dogmatic.

Rokeach offers another important distinction between rigidity and dogmatism. When one is rigid, everything in their world is treated as an object—leading the rigid person to form a distant "I-It' relationships with virtually everything in their world. By contrast, dogmatism is manifest almost solely in those situations which involve interpersonal relationships and communication. Put simply, rigidity tends to refer to the problem- solving situation, dogmatism to the inter-human communicative situation. Finally, dogmatism applies to the broader scope of authoritarianism and intolerance and incorporated these concepts within its rubric. Rigidity can only be considered as an entity which is closely associated with authoritarianism yet is never a part of it.

Rokeach provides more precision. He defines rigidity as "the inability to restructure a field in which there are alternative solutions to a problem in order to solve that problem more efficiently." This rather operational definition evolves from observation of the *Einstellung* phenomenon as produced by Luchin's Water Jar Problems and other similar tests (Denny Doodlebug Test, Binet's Progressive Line Study, etc.). In the Luchin test, the subject is given a series of problems to solve which involve three jars, holding three different quantities of water. The subject is required to measure out a certain amount of water using only these three jars.

The first problems can be solved in only one rather complex manner. The remaining problems, however, can be solved in not only this complex manner but also in an easier, quicker manner. Luchin and other subsequent experimenters have found that many of the subjects continued to solve the problem in the complex manner, overlooking the manner by which they could solve the problem with greater facility. Rokeach proposed that those subjects who did not change the procedure they used illustrated his definition of rigidity. Rokeach went on to note that rigidity is an aspect of authoritarianism and should correlate with ethnocentrism. The results he obtained indicated that the ethnocentric individual did

tend to rigidly continue to use the more complicated method when completing the Luchin test. Rokeach, 1954)

A little later, Jackson, Messick, and Solley (1957) found that rigidity on Luchin's test was correlated not only with the F scale but also with the Reverse-F scale. Their results supported Bass' contention about acquiescence. They cautioned us once more regarding the flaws of questionnaire-based studies. Additionally, Brown (1953) found that the correlation between ethnocentrism or authoritarianism and rigidity was dependent upon the factor of ego-involvement. If the subject was in an anxious, competitive situation, as he was in Rokeach s experiment (using the Luchin test), a correlation between authoritarianism and rigidity would be significant, if a competitive situation did not exist, if the subject took the tests in a relaxed, informal setting, the correlation would not be significant.

While Brown's study did not get much attention, it pointed to a very important distinction to be made between the authoritarian personality as a trait and as a state. If it is a trait, then authoritarian perspectives and practices should show up in virtually all situations. If authoritarian perspectives and practices are only manifest in specific situations (states) then they should be inconsistently displayed. Brown's results suggest that state rather than trait might be of greatest importance when studying authoritarianism and related factors—at least when it comes to the impact of competition and stress on these perspectives and practices.

Dogmatism

Rokeach also provides more precision regarding dogmatism as well as rigidity. Dogmatism is defined by Rokeach as a relatively closed cognitive organization of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality which are centered around a cluster of beliefs about absolute authority. This closed cognitive organization, in turn, provides a framework for specific patterns of intolerance and qualified tolerance toward other people.

Rokeach characterizes the closed cognitive belief-disbelief system as one in which logically contradictory beliefs co-exist. It is like George Orwell's "double think". There is minimal perception of similarities between belief and disbelief systems and minimal knowledge o:f disbelief systems. Rokeach proposes that in this system there is also minimal perception of similarities between adjacent disbelief systems. Rokeach points to the Liberal or nonbeliever's inability to· discriminate between Neo-orthodoxy and Fundamentalism. Most importantly, the belief-disbelief system is quite narrow in scope. The world is perceived through a very confining set of lenses.

This system—identified as the "closed mind"-- is to be found in both the case of liberal and conservative authoritarianism. According to Rokeach, it is about as difficult to alter leftist or so-called tolerant attitudes in the direction of the right or "intolerance" as it is to move rightist or "intolerant" attitudes in the direction of the left or "tolerance". According to Rokeach, the only difference between the two processes is the person's group stereotype. In the former case, Capitalists and Fascists, in the latter case, Negroes and Jews. Hence, Rokeach considered the Adorno studies inadequate and in response constructed his own scale for dogmatism which he believed to be disassociated from any particular ideological constructs.

Additionally, the concept of dogmatism is not limited to the political and economic sphere as is the authoritarian study. Rather, according to Rokeach, the phenomenon of dogmatism is applicable to many other spheres, e.g. philosophy and religion. We run into the problem at this point of differentiation between the prejudiced and nonprejudiced when we realize that liberalism is not necessarily tolerance.

"Who is tolerant?". Is tolerance nothing more than noncommittal apathy? These questions were commonly heard among those who read Rokeach's work.

Rokeach (1951). however, said that high and low prejudices are a discernible phenomenon and are not just indications of apathy. The highly prejudiced person thinking about given groups is more frequently rooted in the concrete individual objects comprising such groups. By contrast, the low-prejudiced person's thinking should be more frequently in terms of the abstract principals for which the given group stands. The high-prejudiced individual thinks of concrete objects, e.g. Catholic, Protestant, Fascist, or Communist; the low prejudiced individual thinks of abstractions, e.g. Catholicism, Protestantism, Fascism, or Communism.

Opinionation

Rokeach was not satisfied with this definitive study of Dogmatism. While he was concerned. with interpersonal relationship as an aspect of the closed-minded individual's rejection of other people, he also wanted to examine the other end. What the people who hold the beliefs with which he does agree. Rokeach called this new component of general intolerance or close-mindedness *Opinionation*. Rokeach presents an "Opinionation Scale" in his book, *Open and Closed Mind*.

He differentiates between "opinionated rejection" and "opinionated acceptance". The former refers to a class o:f statements made by a speaker which imply that the speaker rejects a particular belief and at the same time the people who accept it. For example, one questionnaire statement reads: "Only a simple-minded fool would say that God exists". The opionation acceptance category refers to a class of' statements implying that the speaker believes something and, along with this, accepts others who believe it too. For example: "Any intelligent person will tell you God exists."

In the Opinionation Scale, like in the Dogmatism Scale, Rokeach tried to remove ideological biases. Since every opinionated statement must end up with same sort of content, Rokeach didn't attempt to remove ideology, *per se* . but rather attempted to obtain a "balanced·content". Half of the items were worded in such a way that agreement with them indicated left or Liberal opinionation. The other half were worded in such a way that agreement with them indicated right or conservative opinionatlon. Six more variables were measured when Rokeach formulated this scale: (1) Total opinionation, (2) Left opinionation, (3) Right opinionation, (4) Opinionated rejection, (5) Opinionated acceptance, and (6} Conservatism-liberalism (right minus left opinionation). Scores on the Opinionation Scale were subsequently frequently found to be significantly correlated with scores on the E and F scales as well as the D scale.

Rokeach's Limitation

In summary, Rokeach criticizes the authoritarian studies for their neglect of the distinguishable factor, rigidity, which he believes is highly correlated with authoritarianism and intolerance; and for their dual E and F scale and their neglect of left-wing authoritarianism. As a consequent of recognition of these latter inadequacies, Rokeach ran studies in which he sought to prove that there is a relationship between rigidity and authoritarianism, though possibly only in an ego-involved situation. He created Dogmatism and Opinionation scales to replace the E scales and outmoded" F.

Rokeach's theory of rigidity as well as dogmatism was soon highly regarded in psychological circles and consequently influenced evolving concepts regarding authoritarian perspectives and practices.

Rokeach's major theoretical statements and experimental findings have rather firmly stood the test of time. One important criticism (or at least limitation) can be offered. Rokeach lacks a statement about the origins of dogmatism, opinionation, and rigidity.

Like many other psychologists he is only interested or at least feels competent only in describing a phenomenon. He does not venture to say anything about the possible genesis of that which he describes. This is where the California Study Group ventured forth—and drew considerable criticism. Applying their own psychodynamic insights (along with a dose of Marx), Adorno and his associates sought to discover and say something about the origins of authoritarianism – and perhaps Rokeach's closed mind. It would be fascinating to know if the extreme Liberal comes from a home and society that in any way parallels that of the right-wing ideologue.

Conclusions

Another major point of possible criticism can be offered that involves not just Rokeach, but virtually all of those following up on the California Study. This criticism concerns a basic way to view the world that is not so easily corrected. It involves a subtle bias, implicit in Rokeach's work and work of many other social psychologists, which is based on the Aristotelian/scientific assumption regarding the value of rationality and logical consistency of systems—a value that is aligned with open-ended and tolerant belief systems. Unlike Fromm, and possibly Adorno, Rokeach is unappreciative of the possible validity of irrational, paradoxical forms of logic or illogic. Frequently. two contradictory beliefs, especially in emotionally charged (ethical, political, racial) situations, must be held in paradoxical tension, if the most adequate solution or use of the beliefs is to be achieved.

Premature resolution or "closure" of contradiction is not a sign of open-mindedness. It is a sign of authoritarianism. Furthermore, in terms of communication, knowledge can often be only expressed in terms of paradox. As Lao-tse has stated: "Words that are strictly true seem to be paradoxical." The critiques of paradox offered by linguists are often justified. The "truth" described by Lao-tse is often no more than a misunderstanding of terms - a semantic difficulty - or may be a semantic maneuver for the sake of dramatics. Nevertheless, a wholesale invalidation of paradox will eliminate some of the most profound and inspirational poetic, literary, philosophical and theological statements made by human beings.

The closed-minded individual is precisely the one who cannot deal with these abstractions and ambiguities. Fromm (l956, p. 79) pointed out that paradox, at least in certain cultural contexts, can serve to increase the tendency towards tolerance and the transformation of society: Since one's "right truth" can be arrived at subjectively, i.e. non-logically, and two "rights" can coexist paradoxically, two contradictory belief-disbelief systems are mutually acceptable. Furthermore, the major concern is with "acting right" since the emphasis is not on "thinking right" which is always relative.

Hence, there is a pervasive ethical, revolutionary concern when the focus is on acting rather than just thinking "right.". Such a proposal, however, is not without problems. Paradoxical modes of thought, while potentially leading to openmindedness, are not easily sustained, nor made applicable, by the conceiving individual. One can easily fall into a subjectivism, hence into an emotionality and fanaticism. This is the essence of authoritarianism.

While these factors must all be addressed, the important point to be drawn from this criticism of Rokeach and other social psychologists interested in authority-related issues is the need to delve

empirically into even more basic, sub-rational (not necessarily irrational) modes of perception and conception to find the ground of authoritarianism. Is there a cluster of correlated traits composing a sub-ideological, sub-rational authoritarian syndrome?

One of several hierarchical systems of behavior or action (Klein, Parsons, etc.) can serve to synthesize this syndrome with other ongoing behavioral processes. The empirical studies of perception and cognition as related to authoritarianism which was initiated by Rokeach in his use of the Luchin water jar test suggests a possible basis or starting point for such syndrome, and some of the "environmental" or social factors such as ego- and task- involvement which are shown to be influential in these studies indicate possible areas of interplay between various levels of the behavioral hierarchy.

All of these matters will be addressed in the companion essay which looks back on the 1950s and 1960s from the perspective of mid-21st Century social psychology and contemporary displays of authoritarianism, ethnocentrism, rigidity, dogmatism, misanthropy –and anomie. Tragically, these perspectives and practices have not gone away during the intervening sixty plus decades. They might have even become more prevalent and pernicious as we face the realities of contemporary societal volatility, uncertainty, complexity, ambiguity, turbulence and contradiction.

_____

Bibliography

Adorno, T. W , et.al.. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper & Bros., 1950.

Bass, Bernard, "Authoritarianism or Acquie1ccence?", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, v. 49, 1954, pp. 246- 250.

Brown, Roger, "A Determinant of the Relationship Between rigidity and Authoritarianism, Journal of Abnormal and· Social Psychology. v. 48, 1953, pp. 469-76.

Campbell, Donald and McCandless, Boyd., "Ethnocentrism, Xenophobia, and Personality," Human Relations, IV, No. 2, 1951, pp. 185-191.

Christie, Richard and Garcia, John, "Subcultural Variation in Authoritarian Personality," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. v. 46, 1951, pp. 457-469

Christie, Richard and Marie Jahoda (Eds) (1954) *Studies in the Scope and Methods of "The Authoritarian Personality"* Glencoe Illinois. The Free Press.

Fromm, Erich (1941) Escape from Freedom. New York: Rinehart & Co.

Fromm, Erich (1955) The Sane Society. New York: Fawcett.

Fromm, Erich. The. Art of Loving. New York: Harper Colophon, 1956.

Guba, E.B., and Getzel, J .W., "The Construction of an Other directedness Instrument, with Some Preliminary Dita on Validity, American Psychologist, v. 9, 1954, pg. 385.

Hoffer, Erich. The True Believer. New York: New American Library, 1951.

Jackson, D. N,, Messick, S. J., and Solley, C .IL, "How 'Rigid'' is the Authoritarian'?"; Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, v. 51, 1957, pp. 137-140.

Kaufman, Walter C. "Status, Authoritarianism, and Anti-Semitism ", American Journal of Sociology. v. 62, 1957,. pp. 379-382.

Kelly, James G., Ferson Jean., and Holtzman, Wayne H., ''The Measurement of Attitudes towards the Negro in the South", Journal. of Social Psychology, v. 48, 1958, pp. 307-315.

Roberts, Alan and Rokeach Milton, "Anomie, Authoritarianism, and Prejudice,11'American Journal of Sociology, v. 61, 1956, pp. 350-355.

Rokeach, Milton, ''Generalized Rigidity as a Factor in Ethnocentrism, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 1948, pp. 259-278.

Rokeach, Milton. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Rokeach, Milton and Fruchter, Benjamin, "A Factorial study of Dogmatism and Related Concepts, 11" Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, v. 53, 1956, pp. 353--357.

Sartre, Jean Paul. Anti-Semite and Jew. New York: Grove Press, 1946.

Simpson, George Easton, and Yinger, J. Milton. Racial and Cultural Minorities. New York: Harper Bros., 1958.   -

Sullivan, Patrick L., and Adelson, Joseph·, "Ethnocentrism and misanthropy", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, v. 49, 1954, pp. 246-250.   ·