

379
NBI
No. 3286

A COMPARISON OF SCORES ON A TEST CONSTRUCTED TO
MEASURE AUTHORITARIAN PERSONALITY WITH
SCORES ON THE F-SCALE AND ON SIX
ATTITUDINAL STATEMENTS

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

Donald T. Matlock, B. S.

Denton, Texas

January, 1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Theoretical Background	
Review of Related Studies	
Statement of Problem	
Statement of Hypotheses	
II. METHOD	13
Subjects	
Instruments	
Procedure	
Statistical Treatment	
III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	21
Results	
Discussion	
IV. SUMMARY	29
APPENDIX	32
BIBLIOGRAPHY	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Coefficient of <u>PA-Scale</u> Scores in a Test-Retest Situation	21
II. Means and Standard Deviations of the <u>PA-Scale</u> , <u>F-Scale</u> , and Attitudinal Statements	22
III. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients Among the <u>PA-Scale</u> , the <u>F-Scale</u> , and the Attitudinal Statements	23

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There has existed for a long time a desire on the part of the social scientist, particularly the psychologist, to be able to classify human beings into behavior types. Such attempts at classification, while they may lead to a clearer understanding of the dynamics of personality, may, on the other hand, cloud the issue by hiding some important aspects of individual personality behind a categorical label. It would seem more useful for the psychologist to be able to describe the individual for the purpose of better understanding behavior. In any event, whichever view the psychologist takes, it behooves him to use the most accurate and most discerning instruments in the measurement of personality. It is the purpose of this study to investigate the possibilities of a new instrument designed to measure one of these personality types--authoritarianism.

Theoretical Background

Probably the single most important work dealing with authoritarian personality structure is The Authoritarian Personality, by Adorno and others (1). The prominence of The Authoritarian Personality does not stem entirely from the fact that it represents an early formulation of the

personality type labeled as authoritarian. Certainly others, in particular Maslow (13), have made prior statements concerning the nature of the authoritarian personality type. The special status attributed to the particular approach to authoritarian personality taken by Adorno and others is largely the result of their contribution to the measurement of authoritarian personality structure. Out of the studies reported in The Authoritarian Personality came the California F-Scale (1, pp. 252-262). The F-Scale is probably the most widely used measurement of authoritarianism of the instruments available. The prominence of the F-Scale has much to do with the wide acceptance of the concept of authoritarianism which is expressed in The Authoritarian Personality. It is almost mandatory that a researcher who uses the F-Scale as a tool in his research define the concept in the same terms as the developers of the instrument. This is a strong indication of the importance of measurement instruments in the theoretical formulation of a personality type. Greenberg and Fare (6) have attempted to assess the usefulness of the F-Scale as a tool in psychological research and reached the conclusion that it is an important contribution to psychology (6, p. 164).

Through investigation of prejudice, ethnocentrism, and anti-Semitic attitudes, the authors of The Authoritarian Personality arrived at a definitive statement of what they believed authoritarianism to be. In writing of the

implications of the study in regard to the behavior of the authoritarian in society they say:

The most crucial result of the present study, as it seems to the authors, is the demonstration of close correspondence in the type of approach and outlook a subject is likely to have in a great variety of areas, ranging from the most intimate features of family and sex adjustment through relationships to other people in general, to religion and to social and political philosophy. Thus a basically hierarchical, authoritarian, exploitive parent-child relationship is apt to carry over into a power-oriented, exploitively dependent attitude toward one's sex partner and one's God and may well culminate in a political philosophy and social outlook which has no room for anything but a desperate clinging to what appears to be strong and a disdainful rejection of whatever is relegated to the bottom (1, p. 971).

In light of this description it appears that there exists a personality type--the authoritarian personality--embodied in an individual who feels threatened by life and who must seek the security of authority, either imposed from above by authority figures or directed downward toward subordinates. This concept of authority is expressed in certain characteristics (see Appendix A) which are consistent with such a definition of authoritarianism.

The authoritarian, then, is not just a list of traits, he is a living human being who can be identified by certain behavioral patterns. Hartley (7, pp. 62-63) linked authoritarianism with anxiety; however, he did not exclude the fact that nonauthoritarians are also characterized by anxiety. He distinguished between the two, not on the basis of the kind of anxiety, but on the basis of how the individual copes with

his anxiety. Whether one conceives of authoritarianism as based upon anxiety, or "threat orientation," as it is used by Newcomb (14), or some other determinant of human personality, the validity of one's conceptions rests upon an approach which views the particular determinant in question as a factor which affects the total personality of the individual. Authoritarianism should not be viewed as some kind of entity within the individual which shows up only on a personality test and has no effect upon everyday behavior.

This approach to authoritarian personality as an all-pervading aspect of the whole individual is followed in the early formulations of authoritarianism as stated by Fromm (4). Somewhat contrary to Hartley's use of anxiety, Fromm bases authoritarian personality on what he sees as man's desire to be controlled by fate; however, he too places the emphasis on the whole individual rather than on some separate and distinct trait. "The attitude of the authoritarian character toward life, his whole philosophy, is determined by his emotional strivings" (4, p. 171). The individual's behavior is colored by his personality; thus the authoritarian behaves in a certain unique manner.

That authoritarianism is expressed in the behavioral patterns of the individual can be most clearly seen by considering one of the variables with which it is thought to be most closely associated. Simpson and Yinger (15, p. 90), in their discussion of authoritarianism as the basis for prejudice

stated that "prejudice is tied in a functional way to many other personality trends, to particular styles of politics, religion, and sex behavior." Even if one does not accept the linking of authoritarianism and prejudice as justifiable (though Simpson and Yinger present a strong case for the conditional acceptance of such a connection), the implication is still clear; the presence of authoritarian tendencies makes itself known through the behavior of the individual.

That authoritarianism is expressed through the whole personality is one of the important assumptions made in connection with this study. The importance of this assumption lies in the nature of the test constructed for this study.

In keeping with the nature of the personality type as it has been described, the measuring instrument was designed with the intention of measuring authoritarianism indirectly-- that is to say, through the use of what are commonly called everyday experiences. The test as it was given is described more fully in Chapter II, and is reproduced in its entirety (see Appendices C and D); therefore, it will suffice for a discussion of the theoretical foundation leading up to the test, to note that the test is somewhat projective in nature. The subject is exposed to what is defined as an everyday experience, in the form of a short story. The story is purposefully made as ambiguous as possible in order that the subject may be free to read into the story any implications which his

personality dictates. The actual measurement is accomplished by having the subject respond to a list of statements about the story, chosen for their relation to authoritarian personality structure. It was felt that in this way a valid measure of authoritarianism could be gained without the danger of acquiring a biased response on the part of the subject due to some desire on his part to disguise his authoritarian tendencies. It is felt that there is a strong advantage to the use of indirect measurement of personality. The personality, being such as it is, is rather closely guarded by the individual; thus a negative reaction may be elicited by any direct attempt to measure the personality. This situation is particularly acute when dealing with the authoritarian with his insecure, defensive attitude toward the world.

Review of Related Studies

The list of studies approaching authoritarian personality structure from this particular standpoint is not long; however, there are numerous studies which have attempted to assess the nature of authoritarianism and to relate the personality type to some different aspects of life. It is interesting to note that most of the studies concerning authoritarianism have utilized the F-Scale in some way.

Among the studies which point out the effects of authoritarianism on the functioning of the individual in his life situation was the research done by Lang and Lang

(10, pp. 281-283) dealing with the relationship between authoritarianism and individual behavior as a follower in a group. Their approach was similar to the kinds of studies, typified by Lippitt and White (12), which considered the functioning of the authoritarian personality as a leader.

Further effects of authoritarianism in individuals were illustrated by DeSoto, Kuethe, and Wunderlich (2) in their study of the relationship between authoritarianism and social perception and self-perception. Dwarin and Wyant (3) considered the effects of authoritarian tendencies in the mothers of schizophrenics. Both of these studies stressed the impact of the authoritarian characteristics on the life of the individual.

The authoritarian's relations with other people are affected by his personality as illustrated by Frymier's (5) study of the rejection of authoritarians on sociometric questionnaires. Harvey and Beverly (8) pointed out the fact that the authoritarian is most strongly influenced by information or suggestions which he perceives as coming from a high status source, and they stressed that the authoritarian's concern with status of information sources is greater than the concern exhibited by the nonauthoritarian. How an authoritarian deals with and is dealt with by people depends in large part upon his authoritarian characteristics.

Kauffman (9) has demonstrated that the effects of authoritarianism extend into family relationships as well. He found that there were significant negative correlations between authoritarianism and ratings on Child-Parent Relations, and on Child-Peer Relations.

Still in the area of interpersonal relations, Lipetz (11) found that authoritarians showed a marked lack of ability to assess the attitudes of others when given relevant information as compared to nonauthoritarians given the same information. It can readily be seen that this lack of ability would be a handicap in interpersonal relations.

Singer and Feshbach (16) found significant relationships between authoritarian tendencies, as measured by the F-Scale, and manifest anxiety. They also reported reliable differences between authoritarians and nonauthoritarians regarding reaction to frustration. These reactions were classified as "constructive" or "non-constructive."

Ziller (17), in a study utilizing a military training situation, found a definite reluctance on the part of those subjects scoring high on the F-Scale to accept responsibility for group action when the outcome of a given endeavor was in doubt. Although this reluctance was present to some degree in almost all subjects, there was a positive correlation between F-Scale scores and degree of reluctance.

In general these studies emphasize the impact of the authoritarian personality type on the behavior of the

individual. It is this impact which forms the basis for the attempt made in this study to measure authoritarianism with a test which attempts a more concrete, more reality-oriented approach to the phenomenon. It is important to note that all of the studies cited except that by Kauffman (9) utilized the F-Scale as a valid measure of authoritarianism. It is not then the intention of this study to deny the validity of the F-Scale as a measure of authoritarianism. On the contrary, the F-Scale forms the basis for the scale constructed for this investigation. The aim is to assess the possibility of a somewhat different approach to the measurement of authoritarian tendencies--an approach which would have utility in situations which make the use of a scale such as the F-Scale difficult. Such a scale would not only have value as an alternate to the F-Scale, but might contribute some new knowledge to the area of authoritarian personality structure. Such a scale might also have the advantage of uncovering some aspects of authoritarianism previously hidden to more direct measurements.

Statement of Problem

In light of the previously stated assumptions it is felt that three important relationships must be established for a test of authoritarian tendencies, as described, before it can be declared useful as a research tool in this area. These three relationships are concerned with the reliability

and validity of the test and should consist of (1) a positive relationship between the new scale and the F-Scale, (2) a positive relationship between the new scale and some attitudinal measure of authoritarianism, and (3) a positive relationship on a test-retest situation with the new scale. In addition, it is felt that as a further check there should be a positive relationship between the F-Scale and the attitudinal measure used. In order to establish these relationships the four hypotheses listed below were tested.

Statement of Hypotheses

Hypothesis I: Two sets of scores on the PA-Scale will be significantly correlated, in a positive direction, on a test-retest situation.

Hypothesis II: Scores on the new scale, designated PA-Scale, will be significantly correlated, in a positive direction, with scores on the F-Scale.

Hypothesis III: Scores on the PA-Scale will be significantly correlated, in a positive direction, with scores received on six statements constructed so as to constitute an attitudinal measure of authoritarian tendencies. (See Appendix F.)

Hypothesis IV: Scores on the F-Scale will be significantly correlated, in a positive direction, with scores received on the six statements constituting the attitudinal measure.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adorno, T. W., Else Frenkel-Brunswik, D. J. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1950.
2. DeSoto, C., J. L. Kuethe, and R. Wunderlich, "Social Perception and Self-Perception of High and Low Authoritarians," Journal of Social Psychology, LII (1960), 149-155.
3. Dwarin, J. and O. Wyant, "Authoritarian Patterns in the Mothers of Schizophrenics," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XIII (1957), 332-338.
4. Fromm, Eric, Escape from Freedom, New York, Rinehart, 1941.
5. Frymier, J. H., "The Relationship of Authoritarianism to Rejection," Journal of Educational Research, LIII (1959), 33-34.
6. Greenberg, Herbert, and Don Fare, "An Investigation of Several Variables as Determinants of Authoritarianism," Journal of Social Psychology, LII (1960), 159-164.
7. Hartley, Eugene, Problems in Prejudice, New York, King's Crown Press, 1946.
8. Harvey, O. J., and G. D. Beverly, "Some Personality Correlates of Concept Change Through Role Playing," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXIII (1961), 125-130.
9. Kauffman, J. H., "Interpersonal Relations in Traditional and Emergent Families Among Midwest Mennonites," Marriage and Family Living, XXIII (1961), 247-252.
10. Lang, Kurt, and Gladys Engel Lang, Collective Dynamics, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1961.
11. Lipetz, M. E., "The Effects of Information on the Assessment of Attitudes by Authoritarians and Nonauthoritarians," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LX (1960), 95-99.

12. Lippitt, Ronald, and Ralph K. White, "An Experimental Study of Leadership and Group Life," from Readings in Social Psychology, edited by E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley, New York, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1958.
13. Maslow, A. H., "The Authoritarian Character Structure," Journal of Social Psychology, XVIII (1943), 401-411.
14. Newcomb, Theodore M., "Autistic Hostility and Social Reality," Human Relations, I (1947), 69-86.
15. Simpson, G. E. and J. M. Yinger, Racial and Cultural Minorities, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1958.
16. Singer, R. D. and S. Feshbach, "Some Relationships Between Manifest Anxiety, Authoritarian Tendencies and Modes of Reaction to Frustration," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIX (1959), 404-408.
17. Ziller, R. G., "Leader Acceptance of Responsibility for Group Action Under Conditions of Uncertainty and Risk," Journal of Psychology, XLVII (1959), 57-66.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

The population utilized in this investigation was divided into two separate groups, one for use in the test of reliability, the other for use in the test of validity. The group used for the test of validity was composed of students registered for three undergraduate courses at North Texas State University. The classes were a freshman English class, a sophomore English class, and an advanced geography class. Their classifications ranged from freshmen to graduate students (including one doctoral student). All persons who were present the day the test was administered were included. This group totaled seventy-one students.

The group used for the test of reliability was composed of students from a sophomore history class at North Texas State University. Their classifications ranged from sophomores to seniors. All persons who took the test both times were included. This group totaled twenty-three students.

No student was included in both groups. All students were volunteers in that before the tests were administered the students were told that they need not respond to the tests unless they wished. No student refused to take the test.

Instruments

PA-Scale

An original test constructed for this study (see Appendices C and D), the PA-Scale (for projective authoritarianism) consists of a six-page short story, written so as to contain little or no plot. At the same time it provides for the subjects a common frame of reference which closely approximates an everyday life situation. The measurement itself consists of thirty statements to which the subjects respond. The responses of the subjects are in terms of a five point scale ranging from highly likely to highly unlikely.

The thirty items of the PA-Scale were selected from an initial list of sixty items. (See Appendix B.) The items used were chosen so as to bear heavily on the concept of authoritarian personality which was presented in Chapter I. Each item represented an attempt to give the subject the opportunity to project into the story any feelings which he might have which would be covered by the definition in Chapter I and the list of characteristics used. (See Appendix A.) This initial list of items was compiled using much the same criteria as was used by the authors of The Authoritarian Personality--"the item should have a maximum of in-directness," . . . "each item should achieve a proper balance between irrationality and objective truth," . . . "it was required of each item that it contribute to the structural

unity of the scale as a whole" (1, pp. 241-242). As a guide to the selection of the initial sixty items, a list of characteristics of the authoritarian personality was drawn up. (See Appendix A.)

In order that the items used in the scale might not be such a reflection of individual bias, the aid of a group of judges was enlisted. Six doctoral candidates from the School of Education at North Texas State University were asked to help in the selection of the items. Only those persons in the field of counseling and guidance were used, and all judges had completed thirty hours or more beyond the master's degree.

Each judge was given a copy of the story to be used in the measure, a copy of the initial sixty statements, and the list of characteristics of authoritarian personality. Each statement was to be placed in one of the three following categories: (1) closely related to authoritarian personality structure, (2) moderately related to authoritarian personality structure, and (3) little or no relation to authoritarian personality structure. Eighteen of the statements were stated in such a manner as to elicit a negative response from the authoritarian subject. These eighteen statements were marked, and the judges were asked to take into account the direction of response the statement was expected to elicit when placing it in a category.

Using the numbers of the categories, a score was determined for each statement on the basis of which category it was placed in by the six judges. The scores, thus obtained, ranged from six to eighteen, with a low score of six indicating complete agreement on the part of the judges that a statement was closely related to authoritarian personality structure. Thirty of the statements were found to have scores of six, seven, or eight--these were the thirty statements chosen for the final form of the scale. Eleven of these thirty were those expected to elicit a negative response from an authoritarian person. It was felt that as a result of this procedure these thirty statements could be considered to possess a certain amount of construct validity (2, pp. 158-163)--that is to say authoritarianism represents a construct which is defined in this study. The use of that definition in the construction of the PA-Scale gives the scale construct validity.

F-Scale

A slightly revised form of the F-Scale (form 40-45) was used in this study. (See Appendix E.) Twenty-nine items from the refined form of the F-Scale, as derived by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, and Sanford (1, pp. 255-257), were included as a measure of authoritarian personality. The only change made in the scale consisted in having the subjects respond to the statements in terms of a five point

scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, instead of the regular six point scale as originally used.

The F-Scale was devised as the result of a series of studies done at the University of California (1, p. 225). The measure in its original form was intended to measure prejudice in an indirect manner (1, p. 222); however, the authors recognize that it measures more than just prejudice, and it is the most commonly used measure of authoritarian personality.

Attitudinal Measure

An attempt was made to arrive at some measure of authoritarian tendencies which is more directly related to attitudes and beliefs. To accomplish this end six statements were constructed (see Appendix F) which represented opinions on more or less current events. Such areas as race relations and the John Birch society were used. In selecting the statements, the same criteria were used as those mentioned in connection with the PA-Scale (1, pp. 241-242). Two of the six statements were stated in such a manner as to elicit negative responses from authoritarian individuals. (See Note in Appendix F.)

The subjects were to respond to the statements in terms of the same five point scale of agreement as was used with the F-Scale. Allowance was made for the two negative statements, as it was with the negative statements in the PA-Scale,

by reversing the number assigned to them by each subject-- for example a one became a five or a four became a two.

Procedure

Reliability

The PA-Scale alone was given to the class comprising the reliability group. The test was given to the same class twice on two separate days one week apart. Regular class time was used to administer the test. No information about the nature of the test was given other than the fact that it was being given in connection with a master's thesis, and the subjects were not told that they would be asked to take the same test twice. The second time the subjects were told that they would be taking a quite similar test. All students agreed to take the test, and all finished in twenty minutes or less. Only those students who were present both days were included in the study. The instructions were given as printed on the PA-Scale (see Appendices C and D) except that the students were asked to put their names on the answer sheets.

Validation

The PA-Scale, the F-Scale, and the attitudinal statements were administered to the three classes comprising the validation group. The tests were administered during regular class periods. The subjects were told only that they were being asked to help with some tests connected with a

master's thesis. No information about the nature of the test was given. All students who were present at the time agreed to take the tests. All students finished the three parts in forty-five minutes or less.

Instructions for each of the three parts were given as printed on each part (see Appendices D, E, and F), with the added verbal instructions that no one need put their name on the tests. The PA-Scale and the complete answer sheet were passed out first, then the instructions explained. The students were told to complete the PA-Scale, then to turn in all but the answer sheet at the same time picking up both the F-Scale and the attitudinal statements. When everyone had finished the last two parts, all the remaining papers were taken up.

Statistical Treatment

The means and standard deviations were obtained for the two sets of scores obtained from the reliability test group. A Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient was obtained for these two sets of scores. The correlation was tested for significance and a test of significance for the difference between means was run.

The mean and standard deviation were obtained for each of the three tests given to the validation group. Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficients were obtained between each of the possible pairs of sets of scores. Each of these was then tested for significance.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adorno, T. W., Else Frenkel-Brunswik, D. J. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1950.
2. Selltiz, C., M. Jahoda, M. Deutsch, and S. W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Means and standard deviations were computed for the two sets of scores which were obtained from the reliability group tested with the PA-Scale only. A correlation coefficient between the first and the second set of test scores was obtained. These data are presented in Table I. A test of significance was made on the correlation, and it was found to be significant beyond the one per cent level ($> .01$). The means of the two sets of test scores were found not to be significantly different.

TABLE I
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND CORRELATION
COEFFICIENT OF PA-SCALE SCORES
IN A TEST-RETEST SITUATION

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Correlation Coefficient
Test 1	103.41	14.22	.60
Test 2	106.41	14.63	

As a basis for comparison of the sets of scores obtained on the three different tests, the means and standard

deviations were computed from the validation group. These data are presented in Table II. As can be seen, the means

TABLE II
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF
THE PA-SCALE, F-SCALE AND
ATTITUDINAL STATEMENTS

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
<u>PA-Scale</u>	107.51	13.60
<u>F-Scale</u>	93.31	13.16
Attitudinal Statements	18.92	4.19

and the standard deviations for the PA-Scale and the F-Scale are almost the same. The two tests have almost the same number of items, thirty and twenty-nine respectively, and are scored using the same five point scale. The attitudinal statements have a much lower mean in that there are only six statements used with the same five point scale of response.

In order to test the first three hypotheses listed in Chapter I, correlation coefficients were computed between scores on the PA-Scale and the F-Scale, the PA-Scale and the attitudinal statements, and the F-Scale and the attitudinal statements. These data are presented in Table III. These correlations were tested for significance. The correlations

TABLE III

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS
 AMONG THE PA-SCALE, THE F-SCALE, AND
 THE ATTITUDINAL STATEMENTS

Variables	Correlation Coefficient
<u>PA-Scale</u> and <u>F-Scale</u>18
<u>PA-Scale</u> and Attitudinal Statements11
<u>F-Scale</u> and Attitudinal Statements33

between the PA-Scale and the F-Scale, and between the PA-Scale and the attitudinal statements were not significant. The correlation between the F-Scale and the attitudinal statements was significant at better than the one per cent level (> 0.01).

Discussion

The data cited above represent a test of the four hypotheses discussed in Chapter I. The results of these tests have some strong implications for personality measurement and in particular for the measurement of authoritarian personality structure.

The first hypothesis predicted a positive relationship between the two sets of scores on the PA-Scale obtained in a test-retest situation with the reliability group. This hypothesis was borne out by the data, in that there was indeed a positive correlation which proved to be significantly different from zero.

The second hypothesis predicted a positive correlation between the PA-Scale and the F-Scale. The scores obtained on these two tests from the validation group show a positive correlation as predicted; however, this correlation is such that it is likely to be the result of chance, as shown by the test of significance. There appears to be little or no relationship between the PA-Scale and the F-Scale.

The third hypothesis predicted a positive correlation between the PA-Scale and the six attitudinal statements. Again, while there was demonstrated a positive correlation between the two sets of scores as obtained from the validation group, a test of significance showed this correlation to be not significantly different from zero. The predicted relationship is once more lacking.

The fourth hypothesis predicted a positive correlation between the F-Scale and the six attitudinal statements. Once more the correlation obtained from the actual data was positive but low; however, in this case the test of significance indicated that there was a good chance that the relationship was indeed greater than zero. From these findings one would expect a relationship between the F-Scale and the six attitudinal statements.

In light of these findings, several conclusions might be drawn. Hypotheses II and III were rejected--the common factor here being the PA-Scale scores correlated with some

other variable. These two results connected with the low, but significant, positive correlation between the two variables with which the PA-Scale does not correlate, would seem to indicate that the PA-Scale is not measuring the same thing measured by the F-Scale and the six behavioral statements.

The empirical findings suggest a degree of reliability on the part of the PA-Scale; thus, although it is probably safe to assume that the PA-Scale does not measure the same phenomenon as the F-Scale and the attitudinal statements, it does seem likely that the PA-Scale is measuring some phenomenon. The determination of just what that phenomenon is, and how it is measured is not nearly so simple a matter as determining that it is measuring something.

Although there is no empirical data to support the proposition, it would seem a fruitful area of investigation to study the projective nature of the PA-Scale as opposed to the more direct and open nature of the F-Scale and the attitudinal statements. Analysis of these differences might shed some light on the lack of relationship demonstrated in this study. It should be noted also that while the correlation between the F-Scale and the attitudinal statements was significant it was nonetheless low. Accounting for this low relationship might also lead to a better understanding of the PA-Scale.

It would not be wise to assume that whatever the PA-Scale is measuring is not connected with authoritarian personality. While it may not measure the same thing as the F-Scale, little enough is known about the area of authoritarian personality that it would be dangerous to limit its scope to that measured by the F-Scale. One of the problems of the F-Scale as well as some other measures of authoritarian personality is that authoritarianism is usually equated with conservative or "right-wing" attitudes (1, p. 97). This assumption was made to some extent in the formulation of the six attitudinal statements and probably accounts in part for the relatively high correlation between these statements and the F-Scale. This tendency appears to be more a case of mental set on the part of social scientists than it is a firm assumption which is a part of any theories of authoritarianism. This tendency probably stems from the nature of the studies which led to the formulation of the F-Scale. The authors of The Authoritarian Personality were concerned with fascist attitudes and this emphasis has carried over into current authoritarian theory. In reality it could be that an extreme "left-wing" attitude can be just as compatible with authoritarian attitudes as an extreme "right-wing" attitude. Such a tendency might account for the low correlations between the PA-Scale on the one hand, and the F-Scale and the attitudinal statements on the other. The more indirect measurement afforded

by the PA-Scale may have scored some "left-wing" people high on authoritarianism who were not scored high by the F-Scale or the six statements. While there is no empirical proof that such a factor is operating, such a concept might provide a fruitful basis for further research.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Simpson, G. E. and J. M. Yinger, Racial and Cultural Minorities, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1958.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

This study was concerned with the problem of measurement of authoritarian personality structure. A consideration of the approaches currently in use found the F-Scale to be the most widely used and accepted of the measures available. In conjunction with a view of authoritarian personality as permeating the whole of the individual's personality, a scale was devised, designed to approach authoritarianism through the individual's perception of and reaction to everyday life situations.

This scale, designated the PA-Scale, consisted of a six page short story written so as to have little or no plot and to be as unstructured as possible in order that the subject would be as free as possible to react to the situation presented in the story.

The actual measurement of authoritarian tendencies was accomplished by the use of thirty statements connected with the story, but constructed so as to allow as wide a range of response as possible. The final thirty statements were chosen through the use of ratings made by six doctoral candidates in the School of Education at North Texas State University. The judges rated sixty statements chosen on the

basis of the criteria stated above. Then on the basis of these ratings as to the degree to which the judges believed the statements were related to authoritarian personality, thirty statements were chosen for the final form of the scale.

In order to validate this scale it was given to seventy-one students at North Texas State University. At the same time, these students took the F-Scale mentioned above, as well as a short six-statement scale designed to measure authoritarian tendencies as related to actual opinion and behavior.

As a measure of reliability, the PA-Scale was given to a class of twenty-three undergraduate students at North Texas State University in a test-retest situation. There was a one week interval between testing sessions.

Four hypotheses were tested in the investigation: (1) the two sets of scores on the PA-Scale, obtained from the reliability group, would correlate positively, (2) the PA-Scale and the F-Scale would correlate positively, (3) the PA-Scale and the six attitudinal statements would correlate positively, and (4) the F-Scale and the six attitudinal statements would correlate positively. Of these four hypotheses two were rejected and two were accepted. The PA-Scale did not correlate significantly with either the F-Scale or the six behavioral statements. The F-Scale and the behavioral

statements correlated significantly in a positive direction, and the two sets of scores on the PA-Scale were correlated significantly in a positive direction. All correlations were positive but only the latter two were significant.

It was concluded that the PA-Scale did not appear to be measuring the same phenomenon as the F-Scale and the attitudinal statements; however, it was felt that the PA-Scale does represent a reliable measure of some phenomenon as indicated by the significant correlation obtained on the test-retest data. An investigation into the nature of the phenomenon measured by the PA-Scale would appear to be in order and might well shed some light on the area of authoritarian personality structure in that the low correlation between the PA-Scale and the F-Scale does not preclude the possibility that the PA-Scale measured some other facet of authoritarianism.

APPENDIX A

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AUTHORITARIAN PERSONALITY

Suspicious outlook toward world in general

A highly competitive approach to life

Rigid behavior patterns

A limited scope of activity

An intolerance of ambiguity

Highly in-group oriented

Blind acceptance of in-group standards

Highly egocentric

Complete and ready acceptance of clear-cut authority figures

Ready acceptance of stereotypes

Feelings of devaluation for those judged inferior

Basic distrust of human nature

Strong, overt desire to maintain the status quo

Belief in a highly-structured society

APPENDIX B

DIRECTIONS FOR SUBJECTS

On the separate answer sheet provided, respond to these statements by checking one of the five answers provided.

- (1) highly likely
- (2) likely
- (3) uncertain
- (4) unlikely
- (5) highly unlikely

These are not statements of fact which can be determined from the story itself, but should represent judgments on your part as to how likely you think each statement is. If at all possible, avoid completely the use of the #3 "uncertain" category. This should be used only when it is impossible for you to make any judgment about the statement. Make no marks on this paper.

1. Murry was afraid that Mr. Cooley had discovered some mistake or shortcoming in his work.
- * 2. Murry accepted the idea that, on the whole, people are basically good.
3. Murry was Frank's superior since he wore a coat at work and Frank did not.
- * 4. Murry would never resort to physical punishment to discipline his child.

*Note: In these statements the value assigned by the subjects will be reversed in the scoring. For example a two will become a four, or a five will become a one.

5. Murry was confused by Mr. Cooley's friendly attitude when he was expecting a reprimand.
- * 6. Murry and the doorman must have been on good terms as equal friends since the doorman spoke to him.
7. Murry only visited his wife's parents because he felt it an obligation to do so about once a month.
- * 8. Murry would have felt free to express his opinions to Mr. Cooley even though they might have run counter to Mr. Cooley's own opinions.
9. Murry would have whipped his son without taking him into the house if the positions had been reversed.
10. The unkempt lawn at Murry's house reflected his general untidiness.
11. Murry resented Mr. Cooley's talking about his family when he should have been discussing a business matter.
12. Billy Turner looked frightened because he was afraid of his father.
- * 13. Murry, although a businessman, did not subscribe to the idea that the business world is "dog eat dog."
14. Jackson sought to better his position in the eyes of the boss by running down Murry's ability.
- * 15. Murry probably enjoyed helping his wife with some of the chores around the house.
16. Murry resented having to receive his new assignment from Mr. Cooley's secretary.
- * 17. Bill Turner and Murry usually got along well, even though they had different backgrounds.
18. Murry felt that his son might compare unfavorably with Billy Turner.
- * 19. Murry occasionally found it helpful to seek out and follow the advice of his subordinates at the office.
20. Murry felt worse about being caught wasting time than Frank, because he was Frank's superior.
21. Murry probably would not have spoken to the doorman if the doorman had not spoken first.

22. Murry sought to protect himself by insinuating that he could tell Jackson's superior about his being late.
23. Murry resented Turner's derogatory remark about "pencil pushers."
- * 24. Murry was not particularly surprised that his wife accepted the invitation to the Turners without first asking him.
25. Murry felt out of place eating in the Turner's back yard.
26. Jackson was Murry's superior because he occupied the desk ahead of Murry's.
- * 27. Murry would not be averse to trying out a new method of handling an account at the office.
28. Murry would be unlikely to allow his wife to work since the woman's place is in the home.
29. Murry feared that the new job would not be as important as the one on which he had been working.
30. That Murry was a poor accountant is proven by the papers scattered over his desk when he came to work.
31. Murry did not approve of his wife's wearing shorts to visit friends.
- * 32. Murry was relieved to find Mr. Cooley in such a friendly mood, even though he had expected a reprimand and was confused by not getting one.
- * 33. Murry probably relied more on modern day "child psychology" than on physical punishment in dealing with his children.
- * 34. Mr. Cooley probably felt free to ask Murry's advice on even those business matters with which he had no direct connection.
- * 35. Murry would probably accept as an equal a fully-qualified woman accountant.
36. Murry probably would not have associated with Bill Turner except that he hoped to gain from the influence Bill would someday have.

37. Murry felt that the Turners were of a lower station because Bill Turner worked in a factory.
- * 38. Murry was glad to see his friend Bill Turner move up in the world even though Bill's beginning had been much more humble than his own.
- * 39. Murry had come to expect Mr. Cooley to treat him as an equal, and admired him for it.
40. Murry was reluctant to visit the Turners because he felt the Turners were inferior to his family.
41. Bill Turner's desire to work with his hands is an indication of his backwardness.
42. Murry resented Mr. Cooley's interference with his work when he took him off one job to put him on another.
43. Murry was assistant office manager or held a similar position since his desk was the second in the row.
44. Both Murry and Frank felt guilty at being caught wasting time.
45. Murry's son would not have hit a younger child because he knew his father would punish him.
46. Murry resented having the doorman speak to him because he looked down on the doorman's station in life.
47. Murry showed his weak character by allowing his wife to plan their evening without consulting him.
48. Murry resented Frank's remark about his golf game as a slur on his ability.
49. Murry was reluctant to get the children ready for the visit because he felt that this was his wife's job.
50. Mr. Cooley questioned Murry about his family in order to cause him to lower his guard before questioning him about his current assignment.
51. Murry resented Miss Simmons because of the special privileges she had as Mr. Cooley's secretary.
52. Murry resented the fact that the Turners were able to buy a new home while he was not.

53. Murry worked late because he was afraid he might not do the job fast enough for his boss.
54. Murry had not bought a new car lately because he was not sure of his job.
- * 55. Murry probably enjoyed a certain amount of personal friendship with Mr. Cooley as well as a business relationship.
- * 56. Murry preferred to work fairly independently with as little direction from his superiors as possible.
57. Murry was upset when his wife made decisions without consulting him.
58. Murry felt that Bill Turner did not have enough control over his son.
- * 59. Mr. Cooley probably had visited Murry's home before and had met his wife and children.
60. Murry cared more for his son than he did for his daughter.

APPENDIX C

Please read through the following story, then respond to the accompanying statements about it.

The elevator whirred to a stop at the eleventh floor. Five or six office workers emerged from the sliding door to disperse to their various desks in the large room which made up the bulk of the office space occupied by Martin, Bennett, and Cooley, Accountants.

James Murry walked to the second desk in a row of four which faced the north wall of the room. Removing his hat and coat, Murry seated himself before the desk, which was partly covered by stacks of papers.

"Hey, Jim, are you going to be able to make it for golf Saturday?" called the tall, thin man in shirt sleeves, seated at the desk directly across from Murry's in the next row.

"No, Frank, I guess I'll have to pass it up this time. We have to go up to see my wife's parents this week end. It's been two months since we were up there."

"That's too bad. I was counting on you to make my score look good."

"Don't kid yourself, boy. You'll never see the day that you can top me," replied Murry.

"Say, are you two goldbricking this early in the morning?"

Both men glanced up quickly at the large, heavy-set man who was just seating himself at the desk in front of Murry's.

"At least Frank and I were on time, Jackson. We didn't come in twenty minutes late."

"I could leave twenty minutes early and still get more work done than the two of you put together."

At that moment a well-dressed young woman approached Murry's desk from one of the doors which opened into the main office.

"Mr. Murry, Mr. Cooley would like for you to bring the figures on the Scott Metal Works account to his office."

"Thank you, Miss Simmons. I'll be there right away."

After the secretary returned to her office, Murry hurriedly assembled a sheaf of papers. "I wonder what old Cooley wants with these now?"

"Probably found out you can't add," replied Jackson with a chuckle.

As Murry entered the large paneled office, a tall, grey-haired man rose from his seat at the desk. "Come in, Jim. Have a seat. How are the wife and kids?"

"Oh, they're fine, Mr. Cooley."

"Good, good. I wanted to go over the Scott papers with you and see where we stand on them."

"Well, I'm almost finished. We should be through with them by the first of next week."

"That's fine. I'm going to take you off that job. We want to get it out as soon as possible, but I have something else I want you to do first. United Electric Manufacturing

is planning to expand their local plant, and they want some figures before they start."

"Yes, sir. Do you want these papers on Scott now?"

"Just give them to Miss Simmons on your way out. She will have some of the United Electric information for you."

"Thank you, sir. I'll get right on it."

Murry spent the remainder of the day working at his desk, with only a short break for lunch. A little after five, he took the elevator down to the main floor and started out the door.

"You're working a little late this afternoon, aren't you, Mr. Murry?" asked the uniformed doorman.

"Oh hello, Joe. I guess I am. Got a big job to finish."

"Well, hope you get it done."

Murry went to the parking lot where he got into his three-year-old Ford and started for home.

The Murry home was a white frame house in a subdivision on the outskirts of the city. Its lawn was just a little overdue for mowing.

"Hi, Daddy!" Two young children came running around the corner of the house as Murry stopped the car in the driveway and got out.

"Hi, kids," said Murry as he stooped to pick up the smaller of the two, a boy about five. "Where's your mother?"

"She's in the house," yelled the little girl, grabbing his free hand. "We're going to have a barbeque."

"Well, let's go see about this."

"June, where are you?" called Murry as he entered the house.

"I'm in the kitchen, dear."

"Oh, there you are. What are you doing?"

"I'm making some potato salad. The Turners have invited us over for a cookout."

"Did you tell them we would come?"

"Yes, I thought you would want to go. Did you have something else planned?"

"No, but I thought I would get a little work done tonight."

"We need to get out and do something. Besides, Margaret and Jimmy get along so well with the Turner kids."

"Yes, I guess they do," said Murry, "but I think Billy Turner is a little big for Jimmy to play with."

"He's only a year older than Jimmy."

"Yes, but he's in school and Jimmy's not. That makes a difference," replied Murry. "Oh, well, what time are we supposed to be there?"

"Don't worry, you have plenty of time to get ready. I was just making the potato salad so it would get cold. Go on up and change, then you can get the kids ready while I change."

"O. K., but don't take all night on that potato salad. I'm getting hungry."

After he had changed into slacks and a sport shirt, Murry helped the children get ready. He had just finished when his wife came down, dressed in shorts and a blouse.

"You sure took long enough. Bill Turner will have all the food eaten before we get there."

"Well, let's go then."

The Turners lived in a low, one-story house about six blocks away. When the Murrays pulled up into the driveway, they were greeted by a friendly wave from the back yard.

"Hi, folks, Come on around," called big Bill Turner who was standing over a brick grill in the center of the yard.

"Let me put that into the refrigerator, June," said Martha Turner, taking the bowl of potato salad from Murry's wife.

"Pull up a lawn chair, Jim," said Bill Turner, waving a brawny arm in the general direction of some chairs. "The hamburgers will be done in a minute."

"How are things down at the plant, Bill?" asked Murry.

"Oh, we're still turning out the merchandise," said Bill, "but it's not like it used to be when a man could work with his hands--now it's all machines. How are things with you pencil pushers?"

"Pretty rough. We don't have all those nice machines to do the work for us."

Just then the two women returned from the house. "Jim," called Murry's wife, "did Bill tell you the news? They're moving to a new house."

"Oh, really? When did this happen, Bill?"

"Well, we just signed the papers Monday, but we've been wanting to get a place with more room for the kids for a long time."

"And that's not all, Jim. Martha has a job," continued Murry's wife.

"Well, I knew Bill was a slave driver, but I didn't know that he would put you to work too, Martha. Where will you be working?"

"There's a doctor's office near where we are moving. I'll be his receptionist. Now that all the children are in school, I have so much time on my hands that I wanted something to do."

"Mommy! Mommy!" Jimmy Murry's small, young form came scampering from a corner of the yard where the children had been playing. "Mommy, he hit me!"

"Who hit you, son?" asked Murry.

"Billy did."

"Billy, come here," called Bill Turner.

Billy Turner appeared, looking sheepish and frightened.

"Billy, did you hit little Jimmy?" asked the boy's father.

"Yes . . . yes, sir."

"All right, come into the house with me."

The father and son disappeared into the house as Martha Turner turned to the Murrays. "I'm sorry about this. I don't know what got into Billy."

"That's all right, Martha. No harm's done," said Murry's wife.

APPENDIX D

PA-SCALE

On the separate answer sheet provided, respond to these statements by checking one of the five answers provided:

- (1) highly likely
- (2) likely
- (3) uncertain
- (4) unlikely
- (5) highly unlikely

These are not statements of fact which can be determined from the story itself, but should represent judgments on your part as to how likely you think each statement is. If at all possible, avoid completely the use of the #3 "uncertain" category. This should be used only when it is impossible for you to make any judgment about the statement. Make no marks on this paper.

1. Murry accepted the idea that, on the whole, people are basically good.
2. Murry would never resort to physical punishment to discipline his child.
3. Murry would have felt free to express his opinions to Mr. Cooley even though they might have run counter to Mr. Cooley's own opinions.
4. Murry would have whipped his son without taking him into the house if the positions had been reversed.
5. Murry resented Mr. Cooley's talking about his family when he should have been discussing a business matter.
6. Billy Turner looked frightened because he was afraid of his father.

7. Murry, although a businessman, did not subscribe to the idea that the business world is "dog eat dog."
8. Jackson sought to better his position in the eyes of the boss by running down Murry's ability.
9. Murry probably enjoyed helping his wife with some of the chores around the house.
10. Murry felt that his son might compare unfavorably with Billy Turner.
11. Murry probably would not have spoken to the doorman if the doorman had not spoken first.
12. Murry was not particularly surprised that his wife accepted the invitation to the Turners without first asking him.
13. Murry would be unlikely to allow his wife to work since the woman's place is in the home.
14. Murry probably relied more on modern day "child psychology" than on physical punishment in dealing with his children.
15. Mr. Cooley probably felt free to ask Murry's advice on even those business matters with which he had no direct connection.
16. Murry would probably accept as an equal a fully-qualified woman accountant.
17. Murry probably would not have associated with Bill Turner except that he hoped to gain from the influence Bill would someday have.
18. Murry felt that the Turners were of a lower station because Bill Turner worked in a factory.
19. Murry was glad to see his friend Bill Turner move up in the world even though Bill's beginning had been much more humble than his own.
20. Murry had come to expect Mr. Cooley to treat him as an equal, and admired him for it.
21. Murry was reluctant to visit the Turners because he felt the Turners were inferior to his family.

22. Murry resented Mr. Cooley's interference with his work when he took him off one job to put him on another.
23. Murry was assistant office manager or held a similar position since his desk was the second in the row.
24. Murry resented having the doorman speak to him because he looked down on the doorman's station in life.
25. Murry resented Frank's remark about his golf game as a slur on his ability.
26. Murry was reluctant to get the children ready for the visit because he felt that this was his wife's job.
27. Mr. Cooley questioned Murry about his family in order to cause him to lower his guard before questioning him about his current assignment.
28. Murry worked late because he was afraid he might not do the job fast enough for his boss.
29. Murry was upset when his wife made decisions without consulting him.
30. Murry felt that Bill Turner did not have enough control over his son.

APPENDIX E

F-SCALE

Read each of the following statements and indicate on the answer sheet the amount of agreement or disagreement by checking one of the following answers:

- (1) strongly agree
- (2) agree
- (3) uncertain
- (4) disagree
- (5) strongly disagree

Answer only on the answer sheet. Make no marks on this paper.

1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
2. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.
3. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
4. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.
5. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
6. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.
7. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.
8. What the youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
9. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places.

10. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around and mix together so much, a person has to protect himself especially carefully against catching an infection or disease from them.
11. An insult to our honor should always be punished.
12. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
13. It is best to use some prewar authorities in Germany to keep order and prevent chaos.
14. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, are a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.
15. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.
16. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.
17. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.
18. Some day it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.
19. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
20. Wars and social troubles may someday be ended by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world.
21. Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked, and feeble-minded people.
22. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.
23. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.
24. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.

25. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.
26. The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.
27. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.
28. Familiarity breeds contempt.
29. Nobody ever learned anything really important except through suffering.

APPENDIX F

Read the following statements, and on a separate sheet indicate the amount of your agreement with each statement by marking one of the following five answers:

- (1) strongly agree
- (2) agree
- (3) uncertain
- (4) disagree
- (5) strongly disagree

1. Though I do not agree with some of their methods, I do believe that the members of the Ku Klux Klan have the right to protect their customs and beliefs even if they have to go to extremes to do it.
- * 2. I feel that there is a great need for a change in the immigration policy of the United States in order that some of the foreign immigrants who are barred under the present quota system could enter this country.
3. I am very much opposed to any move on the part of the federal government which would provide funds for medical treatment of private citizens.
4. I believe that there is a great danger in ignoring the warnings of such groups as the John Birch Society when they attempt to expose the many communists who hold positions of public trust.
- * 5. I believe that the Negro, due to the many injustices he has received in the past, should have immediate equality in all areas, both public and private.
6. I believe that strong measures such as expulsion and criminal proceedings should have been used to quell the recent student riots such as the one in California.

*Note: In these statements the value assigned by the subjects was reversed in the scoring. For example a two became a four, or a five became a one.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Adorno, T. W., Else Frenkel-Brunswik, D. J. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- Fromm, Eric, Escape from Freedom, New York, Rinehart, 1941.
- Hartley, Eugene, Problems in Prejudice, New York, King's Crown Press, 1946.
- Lang, Kurt, and Gladys Engel Lang, Collective Dynamics, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1961.
- Lippitt, Ronald and Ralph K. White, "An Experimental Study of Leadership and Group Life," Readings in Social Psychology, edited by E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley, New York, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1958.
- Selltiz, C., M. Jahoda, M. Deutsch, and S. W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959.
- Simpson, G. E. and J. M. Yinger, Racial and Cultural Minorities, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1958.

Articles

- DeSoto, C., J. L. Kuetho, and R. Wunderlich, "Social Perception and Self-Perception of High and Low Authoritarians," Journal of Social Psychology, LII (1960), 149-155.
- Dwarin, J. and O. Wyant, "Authoritarian Patterns in the Mothers of Schizophrenics," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XIII (1957), 332-338.
- Frymier, J. R., "The Relationship of Authoritarianism to Rejection," Journal of Educational Research, LIII (1959), 33-34.

- Greenberg, Herbert, and Don Fare, "An Investigation of Several Variables as Determinants of Authoritarianism," Journal of Social Psychology, LII (1960), 159-164.
- Harvey, O. J. and G. D. Beverly, "Some Personality Correlates of Concept Change Through Role Playing," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXIII (1961), 125-130.
- Kauffman, J. H., "Interpersonal Relations in Traditional and Emergent Families Among Midwest Mennonites," Marriage and Family Living, XXIII (1961), 247-252.
- Lipetz, M. E., "The Effects of Information on the Assessment of Attitudes by Authoritarians and Nonauthoritarians," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LX (1960), 95-99.
- Maslow, A. H., "The Authoritarian Character Structure," Journal of Social Psychology, XVIII (1943), 401-411.
- Newcomb, Theodore M., "Autistic Hostility and Social Reality," Human Relations, I (1947), 69-86.
- Singer, R. D. and S. Feshbach, "Some Relationships Between Manifest Anxiety, Authoritarian Tendencies and Modes of Reaction to Frustration," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIX (1959), 404-408.
- Ziller, R. C., "Leader Acceptance of Responsibility for Group Action Under Conditions of Uncertainty and Risk," Journal of Psychology, XLVII (1959), 57-66.