

Council.
Statistical abstract
ington, DC: U. S.
Justice Statistics.
statistics 1988.
ng Office.
90). New York:

READING 4

The Other "Authoritarian Personality"

Bob Altemeyer • University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada

Pull up from your memories those haunting, spectacular scenes of the Nuremberg rallies. A huge crowd of ardent Nazis fills the stadium on Party Day, while on the podium Adolf Hitler feasts on their adoration. "To see the films of the Nuremberg rallies even today is to be recaptured by the hypnotic effect of thousands of men marching in perfect order. The music of the massed bands, the forest of standards and flags . . . the sense of power, of force, of unity was irresistible" (Bullock 1962, p. 379).

A decade after all that power, force, and unity awed the world, the worst war in history and a Holocaust later, many of the Nazi leaders stood trial in Nuremberg for crimes against humanity. As the world learned of the horrors ravaged upon Europe by the Third Reich, people trying to grasp the barbarity and the millions of deaths asked, "Why?"

A psychoanalyst, Erich Fromm (1941), had already given an answer. He argued that the Nazi regime arose from a sickness in the German people. The leaders on the podium at the Nuremberg rallies and the vast crowds of faithful followers before them allegedly manifested the two faces of the sadistic-masochistic personality. This one illness drove both groups, Fromm proposed, locking them into a dominance-submissive authoritarian embrace.

This explanation and psychoanalytic theory in general helped shape the famous "Berkeley" research program on authoritarianism (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950).

While Sanford and his team did not include an "authoritarian domination" trait in their model of the prefascist personality to complement the "authoritarian submission" trait that *did* appear, it is clear from several items on the Fascism Scale that the research team thought the authoritarian personality would both submit *and* dominate. Adorno's still-cited metaphor of the bicycle rider who bows from the waist up and kicks from the waist down sums it up (if you overlook the fact that one does not kick at anything when pedaling a bicycle).

I. The Submissive Personality

But a funny thing happened to research on authoritarianism after 1950. It almost never studied domination, but instead focused on the many people in our society who seem ready to submit to a Hitler. This focus makes sense in that wanna-be tyrants in a democracy are just comical figures on soapboxes when they have no following. So the real fascist threat lay coiled in parts of the population itself, it was thought, ready someday to catapult the next Hitler to power with their votes. So investigators studied the submitters.

Research has since painted a fairly clear picture of those most vulnerable to the appeal of "a man on horseback." As measured by the Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) scale (Altemeyer, 1981, 1988, 1996; see Exhibit 1 for the latest version), right-wing authoritarians believe strongly

in submission to established authorities and the social norms these authorities endorse. They also believe in aggressing against whomever these authorities target. This personality structure, observable by early adulthood and better explained by social learning than by psychoanalytic theory, is thought to develop during adolescence from earlier training in obedience, conventionalism, and aggression, as modified by the individual's subsequent experiences.

Adult authoritarians tend to be highly ethnocentric and heavy users of the "consensual validation pill" (Newcomb, 1961). They travel in tight circles of like-minded people so much, they often think their views are commonly held in society, that they are the "Moral Majority" or the "Silent Majority." It has been hard to miss the evidence

that certain kinds of religious training have sometimes helped produce their ethnocentrism and authoritarianism.

High RWAs' thinking, based more on memorization of what authorities have told them than on independent, critical appraisal, tends to be unintegrated, highly compartmentalized, and rife with inconsistencies. Authoritarians harbor many double standards and hypocrisies—seemingly without realizing it—which lead them to "speak out of both sides of their mouths" from one situation to another. For example, they will proclaim their patriotism and love of democracy at the drop of a hat. But they also seem ready to chuck most of the Bill of Rights, and no matter how many times they say the Pledge of Allegiance, they never seem to notice its coda, "with liberty and justice for all."

EXHIBIT 1. The 1997 Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale

This survey is part of an investigation of general public opinion concerning a variety of social issues. You will probably find that you *agree* with some of the statements, and *disagree* with others, to varying extents. Please indicate your reaction to each statement by blackening a bubble on the bubble sheet, according to the following scale:

Blacken the bubble labeled	-4 if you <i>very strongly disagree</i> with the statement.
	-3 if you <i>strongly disagree</i> with the statement.
	-2 if you <i>moderately disagree</i> with the statement.
	-1 if you <i>slightly disagree</i> with the statement.
Blacken the bubble labeled	+1 if you <i>slightly agree</i> with the statement.
	+2 if you <i>moderately agree</i> with the statement.
	+3 if you <i>strongly agree</i> with the statement.
	+4 if you <i>very strongly agree</i> with the statement.

If you feel exactly and precisely *neutral* about an item, blacken the "0" bubble.

You may find that you sometimes have different reactions to different parts of a statement. For example, you might very strongly disagree (-4) with one idea in a statement, but slightly agree (+1) with another idea in the same item. When this happens, please combine your reactions, and write down how you feel "on balance" (i.e., a -3 in this case).

1. The established authorities generally turn out to be right about things, while the radicals and protectors are usually just "loud mouths" showing off their ignorance.
2. Women should have to promise to obey their husbands when they get married.
3. Our country desperately needs a mighty leader who will do what has to be done to destroy the radical new ways and sinfulness that are ruining us.
4. Gays and lesbians are just as healthy and moral as anybody else.*
5. It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rabble-rousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people's minds.
6. Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.*
7. The only way our country can get through the crisis ahead is to get back to our traditional values, put some tough leaders in power, and silence the troublemakers spreading bad ideas.
8. There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps.*
9. Our country *needs* free thinkers who will have the courage to defy traditional ways, even if this upsets many people.*
10. Our country will be destroyed someday if we do not smash the perversions eating away at our moral fiber and traditional beliefs.
11. Everyone should have their own lifestyle, religious beliefs, and sexual preferences, even if it makes them different from everyone else.*
12. The "old-fashioned ways" and "old-fashioned values" still show the best way to live.
13. You have to admire those who challenged the law and

"servative" economic attitudes, and they tend to be hierarchical contexts, too. High RWAs tend to hold "conservative" psychological sense based on their submission to the perceived established authorities in society. But it turns out the phrase applies in its economic/political contexts, too. High RWAs tend to hold "conservative" psychologists, I am using the phrase in a social authoritarians, I call them "right-wing" authoritarians. When I call them "right-wing" authoritarians "right-wing induced hostilities as "God's Designated Hitlers," This self-righteousness *disinhibits* their aggressive impulses, and releases them to act out their fear-guilt evildoers (such as going to confession). Their religious training, and some very effient preception consideration aided by self-deception, more moral and upstanding than others—a self-highly self-righteous. They think themselves much better than them. Second, right-wing authoritarians tend to be less fearful. This fear appears to *instigate* aggression in hence. This fear of self-destruction from evil and violence on the brink of self-destructive tendencies to be the world as a dangerous place, as society teeters "highly in them. They are hostile toward so many permutations. First, high RWAs are scared. They see factors have been blessed more than others by external forces as a con-trait item, for which the 1-9 scoring key is reversed.

Note. Only items 3-32 are scored. Items 1 and 2 are "false-positives" to help familiarize the respondent with the subject matter and the 4+ response format.

32. Once our government let leaders give us the "go ahead" in their own "rules" to govern their behavior *
31. It is wonderful that young people today have greater freedom to protest against things they don't like, and to make dom to prove that young people belong to the past. *
30. A "woman's place" should be wherever she wants to be. The days when women are submissive to their husbands troublemakers and got us back to our true path.
29. The situation in our country is getting so serious, the iron-gear methods would be justified if they eliminated the holier than those which other people follow. *
28. A lot of our rules regarding modesty and sexual behavior are just customs which are not necessary any better or save our moral standards and preserve law and order.
27. The facts on crime, sexual immorality, and the recent public disorders all show we have to crack down harder on deviant groups and troublemakers if we are going to turn the tables on them. *
26. It's better to have nasty magazines and radical pamphlets in our communities than to let the government have the power to censor them. *
25. What our country needs most is discipline, with everyone following our leaders in unity.
24. Some of the best people in our country are those who are pathogens, for animal rights, or to abolish school prayer. *
23. Our country will be great if we honor the ways of our ancestors.*
22. There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual relations, do what the authorities tell us to do, and get rid of the "route applies" who are running everywhere.
21. There is no "ONE right way" to live life; everybody has to create their own way. *
20. There is no "ONE right family values" to live life; everybody has to create their own way. *
19. It would be best for everyone in the proper authorities to "normal way things are supposed to be done." *
18. There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual relations, hands on trashy and disgusting material.
17. It would be best for everyone in the proper authorities who break them must be strongly punished.
16. God's laws about abortion, pornography, and marriage are censored magazines so that people could not get the norning the "normal way things are supposed to be done." *
15. Challenging our government, criticizing religion, and fighting the "normal way things are supposed to be done." *
14. What our country really needs is a strong, determined leader who will crush evil, and take us back to our true path.

1. Some groups of people are simply not the equals of others.

2. Some people are just more worthy than others.

3. This country would be better off if we cared less about how equal all people were.

4. Some people are just more deserving than others.

5. It is not a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others.

6. Some people are just inferior to others.

7. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on others.

8. Increased economic equality.*

9. Increased social equality.*

10. If people were treated more equally we would have fewer problems in this country.*

11. If people are treated with respect, they will be more successful.

EXHIBIT 2. The Fourteen-Item Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) Scale

On the other hand, the test rang up some very impulsive correlations (usually over .50) with measures of nationalism, patriotism, cultural elitism, a rejection of noblesse oblige, and anti-Black racism. Correlations with other relevant attitudes (e.g., social policies regarding the poor, racial politics, women's rights), support of the Gulf War, suppression of capital punishment, and various measures of political conservatism proved all most as high.

Thanks to the energy of its inventors, the SDO scale has already been used in many studies. In particular, SDO relationships with ethnic prej-

Center Felicia Pratto and Jim Sidanius, Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, and Malle (1994) created the Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) scale (Exhibit 2) to tap "a general attitude of orientation toward intergroup relations, reflecting whether one generally prefers such relations to be equal, versus hierarchical" (p. 742). Carefully developed over 12 studies, the SDO scale was built upon 12 student studies, the SDO scale both authoritarianism and individualism and authoritarianism and interpersonal dominance. Accordinly, 4 in the one sample that answered both (not statistically significant) scales correlated .25, usually nonsignifi-
cantly, with the Dominance scales from the California Personality Inventory (Gough, 1987) and the Jackson Personality Research Form (Jack-
son, 1987).

Like the Fascism Scale before it, the RWA Scale contains items that both submissively and dominantly measure facets of authoritarian dominance; it was constructed more to capture the psychology of the measurement." But the RWA Scale has never been a good after all, they are "proper authorities in government; individuals, one imagines—concur with such views; that some lawmakers—not at all submissive individuals, one imagines—concur with such views; that is in government . . ." So we cannot be surprised better to trust the jndge men of the proper authority persons could endore: for example, "It is always better to trust the jndge men of the proper authority to trust the jndge men of the proper authority.

III. The Dominant Personality

concentrated on the political "right." In fact, studies of most of the legislatures in Canada and nearly all the state legislatures in the United States have found that Canadian Conservative/Canadian Reform/Republican politicians, like their supporters in the voting booths, zoom higher on the RWA Scale than Canadian New Democrats/Canadian Liberals/Democrats do.

High RWA lawmakers also score higher in freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right of assembly, and other freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. They want to impose strict limitations on abortion, they favor capital punishment, and they oppose tougher gun control laws. Finally, politicians answer the RWA Scale with extraordinary levels of internal consistency; it appears the scale provides our most powerful measure of the liberal-conservative dimension in politics.

nothing else has dominance either. Sidanius, Pratto, & Siers (1994) created the SDO scale (External orientation) to test whether one scale could be equal, vertically developed, and the scale was built from both social dominance and SDO scales correlated with gendered both (not SDO). SDO scores were usually nonsignificant from both the RWA (Gough, 1987) and the Jack-

dice, sexism, militarism, punitiveness, and conservatism usually appeared as predicted when the scale was tested in Canada, China, Israel, Mexico, New Zealand, and Taiwan (Pratto, Liu, Levin, Sidanius, Shih, & Bachrach, 1996). In another study, persons riding commuter trains were cleverly involved in an experiment that confirmed student-based findings that people would hire High SDOs for positions that serve the interests of privileged groups, and Low SDOs for jobs that serve oppressed groups. Independently of this, subjects also tended to hire men for the "hierarchy-enhancing" roles, and shunted women into hierarchy-diminishing positions (Pratto, Stallworth, Sidanius, & Siers, 1997). Many studies have found that men score higher than women on the SDO scale in almost every culture tested thus far.

Because Felicia Pratto shared some of her preliminary results with me, I quickly discovered that the SDO scale dominated the RWA Scale when it came to explaining prejudice. In a March 1993 study involving 187 undergraduates at my school, RWA correlated .48 with answers to the Manitoba Ethnocentrism scale—a 20-item instrument measuring hostility toward aborigines, Arabs, Asians, Blacks, Francophones, Jews, and so on, that I con-

sidered my best measure of general prejudice among "white" Manitobans (Exhibit 3). But an early 18-item version of the SDO scale banged out an eye-popping .71 with the sum of such prejudices! RWA and SDO correlated .38. Put in my place and impressed—if not stunned—I never considered what the two scales could do together.

A. The McFarland and Adelson (1996) Study

Enter Sam McFarland and Sherman Adelson, who employed 438 Kentucky students and 283 nonstudent adults in a grand pitting experiment featuring 22 different psychological measures. Three of these assessed prejudice against Blacks, women, and homosexuals, and a fourth scale tapped patriotic attitudes. Abbreviated versions of 18 personality tests that had shown some connection with prejudice, including the RWA and SDO scales, composed the rest of the longish booklet. The researchers wanted to see how much of the "target" prejudice/patriotism scores could be explained by these personality tests.

EXHIBIT 3. The 1997 Manitoba Ethnocentrism Scale

1. If we don't watch out, Asians will control our economy and we'll be the "coolies."
2. We should take in more refugees fleeing political persecution by repressive governments.*
3. Arabs are too emotional, and they don't fit in well in our country.
4. If Sikhs who join the RCMP want to wear turbans instead of the usual hat, that's fine.*
5. It is good to live in a country where there are so many minority groups present, such as Blacks, Asians, and aborigines.*
6. There are entirely too many people from the wrong sorts of places being admitted into Canada now.
7. "Foreign" religions like Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam are just as good as Christianity, all things considered.*
8. As a group aboriginal people are naturally lazy, dishonest, and lawless.
9. The more we let people from all over the world into our country, the better.*
10. Black people are, by their nature, more violent and "primitive" than others.
11. Jews can be trusted as much as everyone else.*
12. The people from India who have recently come to Canada

have mainly brought disease, ignorance, and crime with them.

13. Every person we let in from overseas means either another Canadian won't be able to find a job, or another foreigner will go on welfare here.
14. Canada should guarantee that French language rights exist across the country.*
15. It is a waste of time to train certain races for good jobs; they simply don't have the drive and determination it takes to learn a complicated skill.
16. Canada has much to fear from the Japanese, who are as cruel as they are ambitious.
17. There is nothing wrong with intermarriage among the races.*
18. Aboriginal people should keep protesting and demonstrating until they get just treatment in Canada.*
19. Many minorities are spoiled; if they really wanted to improve their lives, they would get jobs and get off welfare.
20. It is a sad fact that many minorities have been persecuted in our country, and some are still treated very unfairly.*

*Note. ** indicates a con-trait item, for which the scoring key is reversed.

As for explaining prejudice with personality measures, the results strongly replicated McFarland and Adelsohn's findings. The SDO scores had the best overall relationships with the four largest measures, leaving the RWA scale some distance behind. A regression analysis of the sum of Sam McFarland's four tests ("Sum of Sam"), after standardizing the scores to control for unequal means and variances, found that SDO and RWA as a package accounted for 50% of overall prejudice. (That is, their multiple r equaled .71.) Subiect's sex came in third, with males again showing more prejudice than females. Gender raised the multiple r to .76. The remaining scales could add only pennies to this accounting.

If you broaden the basis for generalization by adding the standardized Ethnocentrism, Aborigi-

nal, and Quebec scores to the targets, and drop Partitism with its questionable validity in this sample, you get the same results for the "Sum of SIs". First came SDO, then RWA. Their multiple of .70 again explained most of the reliable vari-

Table 4.1 presents the psychometric properties of the measures used, and the relationships of central interest. Most of the scales posted good internal consistency, and the reliabilities of central items were of a test as well as its internal consistency, bounded about quite a bit.

Results

pp. 24-25) and homogrown measures of attitudes toward aborigines and Quebec followed these, to test for further relevance. Role's (1956) Attomie scale and a demographic survey ended the booklet. With minimal need for instructions, it took most students 40-50 minutes to answer this booklet. All of the tests were answered on a -4 to +4 basis except the value type scales, which solicited 0 to 9 responses, and the self-righteousness measure, which requested 0 to 6 replies. The students identified only by a "secret number" of their own choosing, served in groups of about 150 in a lecture hall during an afternoon 75-minute slot in the university timetabling. As usual, the students answered virtually everything. The largest data loss occurred with the Psychotherapy Scale, which two participants failed to complete.

1.00 g Hg (SO₄)₂

Fascinated, I quickly involved 354 Maitlooba in-traductory psychology students in a two-session experiment during which they answered the full versions of most of the tests McFarland and Adelson had used, plus a few others. In the first session the booklet began with a Religious Fun-damentalism scale (Alitemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992), followed by the 1996 version of the RWA scale and the SDQ measure. Then Rubin and Peplau's (1973) just World scale appeared, and all 26 of the items in Schwartz's (1992) measure of "value types." Schaller, Boddy, Yohannes, and O'Brien's (1995) Need for Structure scale fol-lowed, then Rosemberg's (1963) Self-Esteem in-statement, Eysenck and Eysenck's (1976) strument, Eysenck and Eysenck's (1976) Psy-choticism measure ended the booklet. With instructions, it took most students 30–60 minutes to answer all these tests.

The second booklet, completed two days later, began with a survey of environmental attitudes unrelated to our concerns here. Then students swered a revision of my Dangerous Scale (Crocker's, 1992) Collective Self-Esteem instru-ment followed, as did Fletcher, Danilovacs, Fernandes, Peterson, and Reeders' (1986) Attributional Complexity scale. Then came the four target variables: McFarland's measures of prejudice against homosexuals, Blacks, and women, and his Partiotism scale. The 1996 Maitlooba Ethnocentrism scale (Alitemeyer, 1996

B. The September 1996 Manitoba Student Study

The results which could have been quite similar proved utterly simple in both samples. SDQ scores correlated about .50 with McFarland and Adelsohn's index of overall prejudice, while RWA answers touched a .47. The two tests barely interconnected (.21 and .07), so when you plunked them into a regression analysis, they explained different segments of overall prejudice and served up a multiple of .64 in each sample. None of the other scales had their say. In fact, gender entered the equation next among the students, ahead of all the personality tests that mattered much once these two remained scales (with males being more prejudiced than females).

of attitudes
ed these to
56) Anomie
the booklet.
t took most
; booklet,
a -4 to +4
ch solicited

isness mea-
he students,
of their own
50 in a lec-
te slot in the
students an-
est data loss
; which two

properties of
hips of cen-
osted good
eing the Just
d the target
phas, which
s its internal
it.

personality
replicated
. The SDO
ips with the
A scale some
s of the sum
n of Sam'),
control for un-
at SDO and
% of overall
under raised
scales could
calization by
m, Aborigi-
s, and drop
idity in this
the "Sum of
their multiple
etiable vari-
to .75.

TABLE 4.1. Results of the September 1996 Study

Scales	No. of items	Psychometric properties		Prejudice toward						"Sum of Six"	Corr. with social dom.	Corr. with RWA
		Mean inter-item corr.	Alpha	Homosex.	Blacks	Women	Patriotism	"Sum of Sam"				
Social Dominance Orientation	14	.29	.84	.42	.52	.49	.28	.59	.59	—	.22	—
Right-Wing Authoritarianism	30	.29	.92	.61	.30	.38	.14	.51	.49	.22	—	.12
Just World	16	.08	.59	-.05	-.07	-.08	.07	-.03	-.03	-.02	.06	.34
Need for Structure	12	.31	.84	.11	.09	-.01	.04	.10	.10	.08	.07	.01
Self-Esteem	10	.37	.84	.04	-.05	.07	.07	.05	.05	.08	.07	.01
Psychoticism	25	.10	.72	.28	.35	.43	.03	.38	.38	.34	.07	-.01
Collective Self-Esteem	16	.29	.86	-.07	-.20	-.17	.12	-.12	-.14	-.08	.04	—
Attributional Complexity	28	.26	.91	-.23	-.27	-.31	-.17	-.33	-.31	-.19	-.17	—
Value:												
Conformity	4	.42	.74	.08	.02	-.04	.02	.03	.04	.00	.40	—
Security	7	.23	.66	-.04	.00	-.11	.14	-.01	.03	.02	.17	—
Power	5	.44	.80	.22	.26	.21	.29	.34	.33	.43	.09	—
Achievement	6	.37	.77	-.08	.00	-.08	.07	-.03	-.03	.00	.01	—
Hedonism	2	.48	.64	-.11	.07	-.01	.21	.06	.07	.17	-.25	—
Stimulation	3	.48	.73	.00	.06	.06	.10	.07	.09	.10	-.09	—
Self-Direction	6	.32	.73	-.28	-.09	-.18	-.06	-.21	-.19	-.13	-.27	—
Universalism	8	.32	.79	-.35	-.17	-.32	-.16	-.34	-.33	-.31	-.17	—
Benevolence	7	.42	.83	-.10	-.10	-.21	-.10	-.18	-.17	-.20	.19	—
Traditionalism	5	.35	.72	.16	.15	.05	-.02	.13	.12	.04	.51	—
Spirituality	4	.26	.56	.04	-.02	-.01	-.12	-.02	-.02	-.08	.26	—
Religious Fundamentalism	20	.35	.92	.44	.18	.22	-.04	.28	.26	.04	.77	—
Dangerous World	14	.29	.85	.24	.08	.03	-.05	.10	.17	.00	.49	—
Self-Righteousness	8	.46	.87	.47	.19	.23	.11	.34	.34	.13	.63	—
Anomie	5	.24	.60	.15	.22	.09	-.06	.13	.21	.01	.20	—
Subject's Sex	—	—	—	.42	.24	.54	.10	.45	.45	.29	.09	—
Prejudice toward Homosexuals	10	.62	.94							.42	.61	—
Blacks	8	.29	.74							.52	.30	—
Women	8	.42	.85							.49	.38	—
Patriotism	10	.15	.63							.28	.14	—
Ethnocentrism	20	.33	.90							.58	.30	—
Attitudes toward Aboriginals	20	.42	.94							.45	.28	—
Attitudes toward Quebec	14	.28	.85							.19	.20	—

Notes. "Sum of Sam" = sum of standardized scores on Prejudice toward Homosexuals, Blacks, Women, and Patriotism scales. "Sum of Six" = sum of standardized scores on Prejudice toward Homosexuals, Blacks, Women, Ethnocentrism, Aboriginals, and Quebec scales. Subject's sex was coded 0 = female, 1 = male.

prejudice, High SDOs also resemble High RWAs in being politically conservative. The students in this study who favored the Reform Party of Canada averaged 48.0 on the Social Dominance Scale, and those who supported the Conservative had a mean average of 43.9. While the Liberal and NDP enthusiasts obtained in two 1994 studies of Canadian legislation, similar findings with social dominance were shared by lawmakers in between.]

[Shared with other measures, overpopulation and discovery, should it reappear in other populations and with other measures, overpower one. For if you want to explain the many kinds of prejudice exposed in this situation, they are largely matters of personality. And only two kinds of persons are basically involved: the social dominator and the right-wing authoritarian.

The implications of McFarland and Adleson's

study are basic. And only two kinds of persons are basically involved: the social dominator and the right-wing authoritarian.

We shall go galloping down these trials later, but first let us stand social dominators and authoritarians side by side and size them up. Be-

"Compare and Contrast . . ."

enjoy practical jokes that can sometimes really hurt other people to be afraid of you?" and "Do you like connections with such items as "Would you like Louis Psychology Scale was mostly based on SDO and "AUTHORITY (the right to lead and command)." In turn, the .34 correlation with the CIAL POWER (control over others, dominance) valuing Power—assessed by such items as "So-

You get more than a suggestion if you look at that interpersonal dominance is involved. You find no SDO correlations with dominance scales from two personality omnibus. But one of the probable that high SDOs would also be high in keeping this prototype in mind, does it not seem that high SDOs do in the max, right? You found no SDO correlations with dominance scales from two personality omnibus. But one of the probable that high SDOs would also be high in interpersonal dominance? True, Pratto et al. (1994) found no SDO correlations with dominance scales from two personality omnibus. But one of the probable that high SDOs would also be high in interpersonal dominance? True, Pratto et al. (1994)

that high SDOs need to step on others". Suggests

items on the SDO scale ("To get ahead in life, it is

from two personality omnibus. But one of the

probable that high SDOs would also be high in

keeping this prototype in mind, does it not seem

that high SDOs need to step on others", suggests

items on the SDO scale ("To get ahead in life, it is

from two personality omnibus. But one of the

probable that high SDOs would also be high in

keeping this prototype in mind, does it not seem

that high SDOs need to step on others", suggests

items on the SDO scale ("To get ahead in life, it is

from two personality omnibus. But one of the

probable that high SDOs would also be high in

keeping this prototype in mind, does it not seem

EXHIBIT 4. The Economic Philosophy Scale

First of all, the key findings from the earlier study held a reunion. SDO and RWA correlated only .08, but both predicted ethnocentrism (.55 and .27, respectively). And hostility toward homosexuals (.08, but especially .28 and .70). Together they explained 36% of the variance of the sum of standardized scores from these two prejudice scales, with RWA taking the lead because of its strong relationship with attitudes toward homosexuals. (This is not surprising, as it mentions homosexuals in several items, whereas the SDO scale piles up its correlations with names any particular group.) Social dominance orientation did not correlate with religious fundamentalism (.04) nor with RWA placed on religion while growing up (-.17), but RWA did, .65 and .58. Once again, social dominance cropped up more among guys (.30), but nance studies have shown that introductory authority did not (.11).

Results

The Other "Authoritarian Personality" ■ 93

First of all, the key findings from the earlier studies held a reunion. SDO and RWA correlated only .08, but both predicted ethnocentrism (.55 and .27). With these findings in hand, I administered another set of surveys under "secret number" conditions to 116 more Manitoba students. The booklet began with the Religious Fundamentals scale, My Attitudes toward Homosexuals, and Economic Philosophy (Exhibit 4) scales followed. Then students encountered the 1996 Manitoba Ethnocentrism scale, a revised the RWA and SDO measures. My Attitudes toward Homosexuals, and Economic Philosophy hypothesis drive for personal power, meanness, and domination, and a demographic survey ended my inquiries.

Past studies have shown that introductory authoritarianism did not (11). In a poll, Most Canadians of the Alberta Liberals (1994) had a mean score of the Religious Fundamentals scale, and Economic Philosophy (Exhibit 4) scales followed. Then students encountered the 1996 Manitoba Ethnocentrism scale, a revised the RWA and SDO measures. My Attitudes toward Homosexuals, and Economic Philosophy began with the Religious Fundamentals scale, My Attitudes toward Homosexuals, and Economic Philosophy (Exhibit 4) scales followed. Then students encountered the 1996 Manitoba Ethnocentrism scale, a revised the RWA and SDO measures. Some items punished as youngsters. Once again, social dominance is linked to religious fundamentalism. Some items about how often they had been physically harassed or threatened, and a question about their standard of living in a way that the whole country has benefited. Government programs should run a debt when necessary to create jobs and protect our social programs. They have established the rights of workers and raised their standard of living in a way that the whole country has benefited. Government programs must stop trying to increase efficiency in our country by making government interfere with the natural forces of the economy. Such items are doomed to fail.

1. Anything that government agencies can do, private enterprise should be encouraged. They have established the rights of workers and raised their standard of living in a way that the whole country has benefited. Government programs must stop trying to increase efficiency in our country by making government interfere with the natural forces of the economy. Such items are doomed to fail.

2. Labor unions should be encouraged. They have established the rights of workers and raised their standard of living in a way that the whole country has benefited. Government programs must stop trying to increase efficiency in our country by making government interfere with the natural forces of the economy. Such items are doomed to fail.

3. Government programs should run a debt when necessary to create jobs and protect our social programs. They have established the rights of workers and raised their standard of living in a way that the whole country has benefited. Government programs must stop trying to increase efficiency in our country by making government interfere with the natural forces of the economy. Such items are doomed to fail.

4. The more government interferes with private enterprise, the worse things will get in our country. And more government interference with private enterprise, the worse things will get in our country.

5. The government should be allowed to run like businesses in our economy to produce greater equality for disadvantaged groups in our country.

6. Public agencies should be run like businesses: no waste, no bleeding hearts, and no deficits.

7. There should be higher taxes on businesses in this country.

8. Governments should sell all their operations ("privatize") to the RWA scale. Still, a distributional study complete in itself.

9. The wealth of our country should be spread out much less causes.

10. Government agencies should be forced by law to have balanced budgets. Otherwise they just throw money away on worthless causes.

11. Government-created jobs are usually "do nothing" jobs that cost the taxpayers millions.

12. People who say we should run government the way business does forget how many companies fail. The pri-

notes. "Public agencies only mess things up when they get involved in the economy, and spend money like drunken sailors," and "Balanced budgets are good. When ever possible I begin the scale with the following key is re-

20. Government agencies can do many jobs better than private enterprise.

17. People should be willing to pay higher taxes to protect our medical programs, education, and the unemployed.

18. Labor unions only hold us back, making us less efficient.

19. "Do-gooders" must stop trying to increase efficiency in our country by making government interfere with the natural forces of the economy. Such items are doomed to fail.

20. Government agencies can do many jobs better than private enterprise.

16. If we let private enterprise take over ("privatize") lots of the big losers. Companies do not care about the public good, * what others have earned.

15. Only businesses can create wealth. Governments just spend merciful, and concerned with everyone's welfare.*

14. We should run government, as always, as public institutions, not like businesses, as always.

13. The best way to solve the government's deficit problem is to cut back on our expensive social programs, which spend money as if it grows on trees.

12. If we let private enterprise take over ("privatize") lots of the big losers, the poor and the public will be

11. If we let private enterprise take over ("privatize") lots of

10. If we let private enterprise take over ("privatize") lots of

9. The wealth of our country should be spread out much less causes.

8. Governments should sell all their operations ("privatize") to the RWA scale. Still, a distributional study complete in itself.

7. There should be higher taxes on businesses in this country.

6. Public agencies should be run like businesses: no waste, no bleeding hearts, and no deficits.

5. The government should be allowed to run like businesses in our economy to produce greater equality for disadvantaged groups in our country.

4. The more government interferes with private enterprise, the worse things will get in our country.

3. Government should run a debt when necessary has benefited.

2. Labor unions should be encouraged. They have established the rights of workers and raised their standard of living in a way that the whole country has benefited.

1. Anything that government agencies can do, private enter-

EXHIBIT 4. The Economic Philosophy Scale

Results

Spence and Women scale, .47 with these, .45 and .55, and together of the sum of

relationships appear higher SDO than no such difference (.00). The two either variance scores came less educated O had no relationship. Finally, high church more (-.13).

study

comparisons of so-called authoritarians parents of about 1000 in October can be answered authoritarianism, SDO, and the Left-Wing his test measures minorities dedicated," aggression to the Attitudes of Radicals ethnocentrism. It was asked if he prejudiced red with the then poked ; meanness, actions to a of Canada's use "it gives ographers, er, 1996, p. t sentences cited of spit-

ting on a premier, of muggings, and of heroin dealing. Burt's (1980) Rape Myth Acceptance Scale and a demographic survey ended the booklet.

Results. The SDO and RWA scores of the 239 parents who answered Booklet A correlated .50 and .41, respectively, with ethnocentrism, and .41 and .57 with hostility toward homosexuals. Interconnecting .17, they accounted for 51% of the variance of the combined standardized prejudice scores. As in earlier studies, High RWAs did not think they would prove more prejudiced than others ($r = .02$). But high SDOs, to some extent, knew they would (.28).

What about the other measures? Social dominance and authoritarianism correlated .20 and .35 with willingness to help persecute "radicals," .12 and .32 with sentences handed out in the Trials situation, .24 and .32 with acceptance of myths about rape, and .20 and .57 with willingness to repeal Canada's Bill of Rights. While all these pointed in the expected direction, the RWA relationships emerged significantly stronger in all cases except Rape Myth. Let's put that in the back of our minds for a moment, along with the relationships with the remaining variables in this questionnaire, and go on to the second booklet.

2. Booklet B

Answered by 243 parents, Booklet B began with the Religious Fundamentalism, RWA, SDO, Eco-

nomic Philosophy, and Left-Wing Authoritarianism Scales. Next came an anti-Semitic "Militia" scale, which I developed after the Oklahoma City bombing (Exhibit 5). I tried out some other personal power, meanness, and domination items. Then I presented four situations in which High RWAs had shown double standards in the past: abuse of power during an election by a left-wing or a right-wing provincial government (Altemeyer, 1981, p. 323). Quebec's right to leave Canada versus Montreal's right to leave a seceding Quebec, sentencing a prohomosexual or an antihomosexual activist who led an attack upon opponent demonstrators, and sentencing either a panhandler or an accountant who attacked the other after a sidewalk argument. (Accordingly, two versions of Booklet B were distributed to homes. In one, parents judged the seriousness of a conservative government abusing its power, Quebec's right to leave Canada, an antihomosexual who led an attack on homosexuals, and a panhandler who attacked an accountant; in the other version of Booklet B parents judged the opposite cases.) The booklet ended with the Religious Emphasis scale and the question about being physically punished while growing up. A demographic survey wrapped up the task.

Results. Mean responses to the 12 Militia items indicated these parents put little stock overall in the premise of a Jewish-led conspiracy in the federal government to take away everyone's guns and impose a left-wing dictatorship on the country. But

EXHIBIT 5. The Militia Attitudes Scale

1. Highly placed people in the national government are planning to impose a Communist-type dictatorship soon.
2. The federal government is *NOT* plotting to destroy freedom in our country.*
3. **Our country is basically controlled by Jewish-owned financial institutions.**
4. If people knew the truth, they'd know that Jews are causing most of the corruption and suffering in our country.
5. The federal government is *NOT* taking away our rights, nor is it conspiring to destroy democracy in our country.*
6. There is an international Jewish conspiracy that is trying to dominate the world through control of banks, the news media, the movie industry, and so on.
7. It is ridiculous to think that some group of Jews or anyone else is planning on selling our country out to the United Nations or some mythical "world conspiracy."*
8. Jews are not trying to take over the world. That is simply a myth spread by bigots to make people fear and hate Jews.*
9. Our national government has been taken over by homosexuals, radical feminists, atheistic Communists, and especially, by Jews.
10. Our country is a much better place because of the Jews who live in it.*
11. Powerful elements of our government, led by Jews, want to take all the guns and spirit from the people so they can enslave us.
12. We have more freedom than almost anybody else on earth, and no group of Jews or feminists or "left-wingers" is plotting to take it away from us.*

*Note.** indicates a con-trait item, for which the scoring key is reversed.

Homosexuality scale; and high RWAs know they allow them to go hog-wild on the Autitudes toward religious teachings that God hates homosexuality compared to most people. On the other hand, main compared to the other hand, and they do not realize how ethnocentric they are, and "right critics", inflict a certain self-blindness, Ethnocentrism scale. But their self-righteousness often grew up in a religious environment. Usually Take our central concern, prejudice. High RWAs social dominators acted like right-wing authoritarians. Mostly, I think they did not. I designed this study primarily to see how much

producing an alpha of .84. Holding conservative old finding), the average intercorrelation of .21 gaized among parents than among students (an respondents. Economic attitudes proved better or- SDO and RWA scores correlated .18 over all 482

3. Scales Present on Both Booklets

High RWA nor High SDO parents were seemingly spanked or otherwise struck more than others. Den's in the October 1996 study did. But neither punished slightly more as children than the stu-

These parents reported having been physically

.08 and .18.

parents for Social Domination Orientation equalled religious fundamentalism (.71). But the same comm- groups (.45), and they were quite inclined toward items tended to come from strong religious back- forced previous findings. Right-wing authoritar- The correlations with religious variables rem- crime. But high SDOs did not.

they did an accountant found guilty of the same inced the pamphlet to a longer prison term than double standard. Finally, high RWAs also sen- over gay rights. But high SDOs harbored no such garter versus an antihomosexual one in the attack double standard in sentencing a homosexual insti-

wing authoritarians displayed the predictable and less than that found in the high RWAs. Right- double standard regarding sexcessions, but equally and high Social Domination showed the same RWAs (a replication of previous results). Both low Quebec than Quebec had to succeed from a breakaway had more of a right to be ruthless at times." They did both high and low RWAs parents thought Montreal scenario—a failure to replicate for the RWA Scale, but the double standard erupped larger among high RWAs (a replication of previous results). Both low Quebec than Quebec had to succeed from a breakaway had more of a right to be ruthless at times." They did both high and low RWAs parents thought Montreal

As for the four double-standard situations, nei-

tradiotion in a bit.)

(.62). We shall make sense of this seeming con- (.43), and especially left-wing authoritarianism orientation (.31), right-wing authoritarianism and SDOs did (.37); SDO scores proved uncon- low RWAs went to church more than and SDO. High RWAs went to church more than associations of .17 and .11, respectively, with RWA and SDO. Left-wing authoritarianism had als in Booklet A). Left-wing authoritarianism had centrism and .29 with hostility toward homosexuals. 43 with SDO scale scores (and .34 with ethno- economic opinions correlated .18 with RWA and some people believed this, and responses to the

I have yet to find a single "Socialist/Communist" who scores highly on absolute terms on the LWA Scale. Shills may have been right about this-type", while scores highly on contrarian terms on the LWA Scale. These seemingly contradictory people proved to top quartile on both the RWA and LWA scales, tenly appeared in my studies who landed in the hand, a mysterious group of "high-hogies" consists as scarce as hens' teeth in my samples. On the other hand, but the "authoritarian on the left" has been his era, but the "authoritarian on the left" has been as scarce as hens' teeth in my samples. On the other hand, a mysterious group of "high-hogies" consists- tenually appear on both the RWA and LWA scales. These seemingly contradictory people proved to be highly prejudiced, and quite hostile in general.

I hoped that calling the Establishment "right-wing", and the revolutionaries "left-wing" would keep people who thought the Establishment was controlled by left-wing Jews, Communists, and so on from scoring highly on the LWA Scale—while coaxing all of Shatz's left-wing authoritarians into view. To nail down this frame of reference, I put two "table-setters" at the beginning of the LWA scale that gave proper names to the "revolutionary movement": "Communism" and "Establishment". The basic idea of overthrowing the right-wing Establishment and giving its wealth has its flaws, but the basic idea of overthrowing the poor is still a very good one"; and "Socialism will never work, so people should treat left-wing revolutionaries as the dangerous troublemakers they are".

I developed the LWA Scale to test Shils's (1954) hypothesis that Comunitarian types as fast as first-types could be authoritarian. Accordingly, I tried hard to create this frame of reference for re-spondents by developing a preamble to the LWA scale that reads: "In the items that follow, the Es-tablishment refers to the people in our country who have traditionally had the most power, the wealthiest control over the economy. That is, the wealthier people, the large corporations and banks who are often called the RIGHT-WING forces in Canada. Whereas a revolutionary movement de-notes a LEFT-WING movement dedicated to over-throwing the Establishment, and taking away its power."

When they believe the "real" established authority (e.g., inherit readings of God's will, or the Constitution) has been usurped by left-wing Jews, feminists, homosexuals, and so on (Allmeyer 1996, p. 9). And indeed, RWA scores correlated solidly with Multi-dimensional scales responses in this study. But some social dominators also held militaria sentiments, and left-wings authoritarianism scores roared out the highest relationship of all. What is the name of the

I call persons who reject the normal established authorities in society right-wing authoritarians

5. The Militia Scale

I attribute high RWAs, frequent use of double standards to the way they acquired many of their ideas: by copying authority figures (Altmeier, 1996, Chapter 8), they do not spend much time checking them for internal consistency. But high SDOs showed almost no double standards, strengthenning the perception that right-wing authoritarians and social dominators usually differ in many ways.

Even when the two scales correlated similarly, you will recall, with the Rape Myth measure, they did so for somewhat different reasons. High RWAs did most bought into myths that condoned rape vicims on moral grounds: "When women go around in necking or pettling and she lets things get out of hand, it is her own fault if her partner forces sex on her." But high SDQs blamed rape victims more for letting themselves fall into the power of the attacker. "A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex," and "Women who get raped

For another contrast, high RWAs showed more hostility on the Posse and Trials measures than high SDOs did. Again, I think this reflects the different roots of aggression in the "submissive" and the "dominating". In the Posse and Trials situations established authority sanctioned punishment, and that means a lot more to authoritarians than it does to social dominators.

High RWAs also agreed significantly more to abolishings constitutional guarantees of civil rights because "hiding behind them." But high SDOs were "hid-

dislike homosexuals more than most people do (Allmeyer, 1988, p. 188). But high SDQs do not typically have religious reasons for "low balling" their answers to the Ethnocentrism scale, nor to pump up their dislike of homosexuals. Nor do they seem highly self-righteous. So they do know to a certain extent that they are more presudiced than most. They just do not care apparently.

I called these puzzling people "Wild-Card Authoritarians," and the Militia scale provides the key to understanding many of them.

The present study indicates most Wild-Card Authoritarians have anti-Semitic militia-like sentiments. Of the 25 high RWAs—high LWAs in the sample that answered Booklet B, 17 (68%) also scored in the top quartile on the Militia scale. So most of these "wild-cards" seem to be right-wing authoritarians who overrode the preamble and table-setters to the LWA Scale because they "know" the Establishment is composed of Jews and their accomplices who control an oppressive, plotting, gun-grabbing government. Accordingly, the LWA scale's scan for revolutionary authoritarianism uncovered such authoritarianism in the anti-Semitic militia-oriented High RWAs.

Moving beyond the mystery of the Wild-Card Authoritarians, which seems more understandable now, who overall harbors anti-Semitic militia sentiments? Of the 60 respondents who scored in the top quartile on the Militia scale, 20 were High RWAs, 14 were High SDOs, and an additional 10 were both. So right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance—the two major consorts of prejudice in our society it seems—provided 73% of the anti-Semitic Militia types in this study.

G. The November 1996 Student Studies

Both the parent studies indicated that SDO-RWA results obtained with student samples had broader validity. So I prepared another booklet for some yet-unsurveyed Manitoba introductory psychology students, which 185 of them completed in November under "secret number" conditions. However, circumstances dictated that this questionnaire had to be answered on a 48-hour "take-home" basis. As this can produce sloppy responding, I attached a slip of paper to each booklet that read, "It is a condition of this study that you will answer carefully and honestly. So do not participate if you cannot do a conscientious job." I stressed this precondition when describing the experiment in the students' class.

The booklet began with the Religious Fundamentalism, Right-Wing Authoritarianism, and Social Dominance Orientation scales. Then Christie and Geis's (1970) Machiavellianism ("Mach IV") scale appeared, followed by some

"Mach-type" items of my own invention. An updated version of the Manitoba Ethnocentrism scale once again provided a broad-band measure of prejudice; it ended by asking respondents how prejudiced they thought they would be compared with the rest of the sample. I then presented my choicest assortment of personal power, meanness, and dominance items. A demographic survey ended the task.

The results proved considerably stronger than I had any right to expect, so I gave essentially the same booklet to another untested class on the same take-home basis. Their 177 sets of answers simmered down the earlier findings when stirred in, and I shall present the results from the merged samples.

Results: Old Tricks and New Tricks

SDO and RWA correlated .11 with each other, but .67 and .40, respectively, with Ethnocentrism. Together they explained 54% of the prejudice scores—obviously due mostly to the social dominance measure. As usual, high RWA students seldom realized they would prove more prejudiced than average (−.02), but high SDOs usually knew they would (.44). As before, right-wing authoritarians tended to be religious fundamentalists (.80), to accept the teachings of their home religion (.52), and to attend church (.53). But high SDOs had no such leanings (−.02, −.15, −.08). Males popped up more often than females among the socially dominant (.39) but not among the high RWAs (.03).

Now for some new tricks. The Machiavellianism scale had a low mean interitem correlation of .11 and an alpha = .72. Whatever its items measure, its summed score correlated .54 with SDO and −.18 with RWA. The hefty relationship with social dominance got its heft from such "Mach" items as "The biggest difference between most criminals and other people is that criminals are stupid enough to get caught"; "The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear"; "Never tell anyone the real reason you did something unless it is useful to do so"; and "All in all, it is better to be humble and honest than important and dishonest" (with which High SDOs disagree).

The suspicion that high social dominators tend to be Machiavellian (in the generic sense) was reinforced by the Mach-type items I wrote, nearly all of which correlated with SDO scores. The stron-

Notes. — indicates a common pattern shared by all the PP-MAD scale studies included in this table, the internal consistency of the PP-MAD scale is higher than its reliability, for which the keying is reversed.

13. Charity (i.e., giving somebody something for nothing) is admirable, not stupid.*

14. Would you like to be known as a gentle and forgiving person?*

15. Do you enjoy taking charge of things and making people do things your way?*

16. Would it bother you if other people thought you were mean and pitiless?*

17. Do you like other people to be afraid of you?*

18. Do you hate to play practical jokes that can sometimes really hurt people?*

19. It would bother me if I intimidated people, and they were afraid about what I might do next!*

20. I will do my best to destroy anyone who deliberately blocks my plans and goals.

EXHIBIT 6. The Personal Power, Meanness, and Dominance Scale

to others. As we surmised earlier, they not only believe some people were meant to dominate others, they personally want to do the dominating. Whining is the only thing for them. They want power and relish using it, to the point of being relatively ruthless, cold blooded, and venomous. They enjoy making other people afraid of them, and worried about what they might do next. They would not mind being considered mean and pitiless. More than most people, they say they will destroy anyone who deliberately blocks their plans. I think these revelations expose the separate roots of RWA and SDO prejudice. Right-wing authoritarians, who do not score high on PP-MAD, seem to be highly prejudiced mainly because they were raised to travel in high, enhancementic circles; and they fear that authority and conventionalism are crumbling so quickly that civilization will collapse and they will be eaten in the resulting jungle. In contrast, high SDOs already see life as "dog eat dog" and—compared with most people—are determined to do the eating. High RWAs also see themselves as "highneous dudes", to the point of being quite self-righteous, and this disinhibits their aggression. But we have seen that high SDOs do not need this release, and we can now see why.

12. It's a dog-eat-dog world where you have to be ruthless at dealing with others than to have money and power.*
11. It is much more important in life to have integrity in your dealings with others than to have money and power.*
10. Do you enjoy having the power to hurt people when they anger or disappoint you?
9. It is much better to be loved than to be feared.*
8. Do money, wealth, and luxuries mean a lot to you?
7. Life is NOT governed by the "survival of the fittest". We should let compassion and moral laws be our guide.*
6. Would you be cold blooded and vengeful, if that's what it took to reach your goals?
5. If you have power in a situation, you should use it however you have to get your way.
4. The best way to lead a group under your supervision is to show them kindness, consideration, and treat them as fellow workers, not as inferiors.*
3. "Wining is not the first thing; it's the only thing." In need*
2. Would you like to be a kind and helpful person to those some people were meant to dominate others.
1. It's a mistake to interfere with the "law of the jungle".

H. Connecting the Dots

mentality" among university students? The 12 Can one find traces of an anti-Semitic "militia 1988, pp. 42–45).

people answer surveys a second time (Altemeyer, 1988, pp. 42–45). Generally they proved stronger in Janu- ary than in the fall, but that usually happens when prejudice. Such as SDQ and RWA connected with students, such as SDQ and RWA established with tions of relationships already established with these There is no point in scrutinizing the new edi- MAD scales.

only with parents, the anti-Semitic Militia and E- spaced among them were two tests previously used SDQ, Ethnocentrism, and PP-MAD measures. But posedly as part of a "test-retest reliability study of the scales involved," re-presented the RWA, The first booklet, answered by 24 students sup- serving anomalyously.

"two-day, take-home" format with the participants tulum surveys. All three investigations used the 1997, revisiting classes that had answered my au- I conducted three more student studies in January

J. The January 1997 Student Studies

If you sense that scores on the new Exploratory Manipulative Moral Dishonesty scale (Exhibit 7) are going to slip nearly into place in this inter- twining nest of traits, you are right. Responses to its 20 items intercorrelated .29 on the average, giving an alpha of .88. High E-MAD parents were usually PP-MAD as well, the Mad-Mad correla- tion being .71. Such parents also scored higher on SDQ (.53), pooh-poohed sexual harassment issues (53), and proved more ethnocentric (.39). But again, they were *not* likely to be high RWAs (.11).

Manipulative Moral Dishonesty scale (Exhibit 7) usually PP-MADs (.55), economic conservatives (.49), PP-MADs (.55), economic conservatives (.49), persons who minimized sexual harassment issues tended to be ethnocentric (.51), high SDQs (.29), persons who minimized sexual harassment (.29), besides the expected correlation with gender (.82). Besides the average, yielding an alpha = .22 on the average, —a con-trait) inter- connected .22 on the average; "Sexual intimidation is a serious social problem"—a con-trait) inter- natural for a man to make sexual advances to a woman he finds attractive"; "Sexual intimidation (17). The sexual harassment items (e.g., "It is only gender proved more subdued among the parents

orientation. But the PP-MAD association with though its relationship with social dominance PP-MAD predicted ethnocentrism (.45), chiefly being power hungry, mean, and dominance (.15). Again, RWA scores were minimally connected to den's reappeared among these parents (.59). But MAD relationship with SDQ obtained with stu- erage, creating an alpha of .88. The strong PP- The PP-MAD items intermeshed .29 on the av- be high SDQs (.33) and high RWAs (.20).

prejudiced (.40), due in part to their tendency to live economic attitudes again proved likely to be than among students). Parents holding conservative and RWA correlate a little higher among parents than had an r of .24 in this sample; in general, SDQ explained 48% of its variance. (The two predic- substanially with Ethnocentrism, and together Once more, Social Dominance Orientation (.61) and Right-Wing Authoritarianism (.46) correlated "type" items used earlier.

worked up from Machiavellianism and "Mach- items presented in Mazer and Perceval (1989) was tucked in, along with an ad hoc Exploitive Ma- sexual Harassment scale (mainly composed of MAD scales. In addition, a balanced 16-item items presented in Mazer and Perceval (1989) was swiped a booklet containing the Economic Phi- thus far. For example, 31 parents oligigingly and wide to challenge and pursue the findings captured Christmas holidays I lunged questions far and As soon as students returned from their 1996

I. The January 1997 Parent Study

So is there any mystery as to why many Social Domi- nant, and for dominating others. For being provide easy targets for exercising power, for being gital dominators are prejudiced? Weak minorities down to what you can get away with." So is there any mystery as to why so many so- cause they tend to reject equality in general. It is on the SDQ scale more than most people do be- nators are social dominators? They reject equality is there any mystery as to why many Social Domi- sonal motivation.

beliefs, more than most people. "There really is no such thing as 'right' and 'wrong,' it all boils down to what you can get away with."

EXHIBIT 7. The Exploitive Manipulative Amoral Dishonesty (E-MAD) Scale

My second student study in January 1997 arose from my earlier-stated opinion that Hitler was a very high SDO type. To test whether others saw him the same way, I invited students in an introductory psychology class to answer a booklet containing the RWA, SDQ, PP-MAD, and E-MAD scales as they thought Adolf Hitler would, "if he were to tell the truth about how he really felt." That amounts to 86% of the maximum possible total of 270 (which no one to my knowledge has ever scored). The students thought Hitler would be even more Social Dominance Oriented, giving him a mean of 116.2 (or 92% of the maximum of 126). Hitler was also seen as being highly PP-MAD, averaging 108.7 (or 91% of the maximum 120). His maximum 180.

So Adolf Hitler's image produced a definite "profile" on these four measures: Extraordinarily high. This supports these scales' validity for Hitler, and it seems to have been an extremely right-wing au-

Militia items intercorrelated .39 and had an alpha of .88—the same values obtained with parents in October. Militia scores connected .35 with RWA, .42 with SDQ, .62 with Ethnocentrism, and .30 with PP-MAD responses. As with the parents, a solid majority (65%) of the 54 students who landed in the top quartile of Militia scores were either High RWAs (.11), High SDOs (.14), or both (.10). The 20 E-MAD items served up a mean correlation of .35 and an alpha of .91—imperfectly better than the parent results. E-MAD somewhat better than the parent results, E-MAD SDQ, and .42 with Ethnocentrism. High RWAs proved significantly unlikely to display E-MAD sentiments (.19). "Militaratypes" proved mildly E-MADish (.29).

To summarize, just as the January parent survey backed up parent-based outcomes, this study very reinforcingly elicited student results, this study bore one to watch findings from these different populations continue to touching for one another, they do assure the scared investigator that he is not picking at some extremely tiny nit.

Once again, none of the four measures correlate, and .13. Three had significant negative correlations with social dominance orientation: Martlowe-Crowne (-.25), Impression Management (.21), and Denial (-.23). But the supposed most reliable SDQ correlations was actually assembled by John Duckitt, who wondered if the "nest" of SDQ correlations was actually assembled by some mean, personally domineering, exploitative, manipulative, moral, and dishonest person.

The third January student study was prompted by John Duckitt, who wondered if the "nest" of SDQ correlations was actually assembled by some mean, personally domineering, exploitative, manipulative, moral, and dishonest person.

K. Summing Up What We Have Learned in these Studies about the Social Dominator

Looking back, what do the nine studies reported in this paper tell us about High SDQs? First, social dominators appear quite religious, but usually they seem pretty indifferent. It would not astound me if high SDQs in general tend to fall among the "extremely safe and easygoing" (1996) thought he spotted in the news, whose religion was "strictly utilitarian"; useful to the self in gratifying safety, social standing, solitude and enjoyment for one's chosen way of life (p. 455). If high SDQs are relatively "principled" chalcenegetes, how did they pass the double standards test? Do they strive for personal integrity after all, or ends— and do so fairly knowingly and nonchalantly, just as they often know that they are relatively prejudiced, but do not care.

Do high SDQs threaten democracy? In their defense, they proved much less inclined than right-wingers authoritarian to overturn constitutional guarantees of liberty. But they proved just as likely to relatively prejudiced, but do not care.

They answers to the E-MAD scale notwithstanding, their answers to the B-MAD scale now withstand tests? Do they pass the double standards test? Do they strive for personal integrity after all, or ends— and do so fairly knowingly and nonchalantly, just as they often know that they are relatively prejudiced, but do not care.

If high SDQs are relatively "principled" chalcenegetes, how did they pass the double standards test? Do they strive for personal integrity after all, or ends— and do so fairly knowingly and nonchalantly, just as they often know that they are relatively prejudiced, but do not care.

What about religion? A few social dominators

are aggressive.

We cannot color them dark, dark authoritarian situations. So however prejudiced they may be, as right-wing authoritarians in the Trials of Posse in prejudiced. But they did not act as aggressively in prejudiced. They did not attack the High RWAs in this paper tell us about High SDQs? First, social dominators outperformed even the High RWAs in preju-

dicacy.

SDQs may

really be related. In this light, high SDQs may

not be more prejudiced than others, nor more PPs.

Mad, E-MAD, accepting of rape myths, and so

on, but merely less defensive.

Since all of my respondents served annoy-

tionsnaire?

The usual approach has been to develop surveys that assess people's attitudes to say "good-
ness" & Martlowe, 1964) comes to mind, and (Crowne & Martlowe-Crowne scales
goody" things about themselves and deny "nasty-
that assesses people's tendencies to say "good-
ness" & Martlowe-Crowne scales
However, High RWAs, who ought to rank up big numbers on measures of social desirability because of their conventionalism, and who we know from experiments are highly defensive and reluctant to admit bad news about themselves to themselves have never scored highly on such instruments.

Nevertheless, I distributed a booklet containing

three measures (Form 60A) to 206 students. The three measures, Marlowe-Crowne, and Paulhus's

the RWAs, SDQ, Marlowe-Crowne, and Paulhus's

Enhancement (0.9) and Denial (.14) fell discreditable

(mean item correlation = .13). Impression Management did better (.19).

Marlowe-Crowne had poor internal consistency

(mean item correlation = .82, .82, .66, and .77, respectively).

The alphas of the four measures

equaled .82, .82, .66, and .77, respectively.

Nevertheles, I distributed a booklet containing

three measures (Form 60A) to 206 students. The three measures, Marlowe-Crowne, and Paulhus's

the RWAs, SDQ, Marlowe-Crowne, and Paulhus's

Enhancement (0.9) and Denial (.14) fell discreditable

(mean item correlation = .13). Impression Management did better (.19).

Marlowe-Crowne had poor internal consistency

(mean item correlation = .82, .82, .66, and .77, respectively).

The alphas of the four measures

equaled .82, .82, .66, and .77, respectively.

Political Orientation

measures of prejudice. Similarly, the capitalists in the October 1996 parent study topped all others in social dominance, ethnocentrism, and hostility toward homosexuals.

Moving from economic to political orientation, every study I have done with the SDO scale has found that persons who favored the Reform Party scored higher in social dominance than did Canadians scored higher in social dominance than any other party's supporters. Those who liked the Conservatives always scored next highest. Then came the Liberals and NDPers, usually in that order.

If you do the same analysis for the 832 students who served in the fall 1996 experiments, 65% of the Republicans, 64% of the Tories, 46% of the Liberals, and 31% of the NDPers turned out to be high performers, while 35% of the Conservatives or both. Similarly, study after study has found that Reform Party enthusiasts are more prejudiced than any others, followed by the Conservative supporters, Liberals, and NDPers.

One supposes that relatively authoritarian, domineering-oriented, and prejudiced people prefer the Conservative parties, because they endorse these parties' leaders' share their outlooks. And so they do. Reform and Tory politicians also tend to be more right-wing authoritarian, socially dominant, and predisposed than Liberal and NDP politicians.

Incidetnally, the SDO-Economic Philosophy connection explains another group that, along with "Wild-Card Authoritarians," displayed a ton of hostility in many of my earlier studies. I frequently have asked respondents to indicate the nature of their most important outlook in life. Among the nine alternatives, I offer, "A capitalist social per-
sonality; a capitalist theory of how society should operate"; (Other possibilities include "a religious outlook", "a scientific outlook", a "socialist out-
look", and so on). Self-declared capitalists con-
sistently racked up such high scores on the Ethno-
centrism, Attitudes toward Homosexuals, and
Powe-Radical measures that in 1996 I wrote, "The
three tests it this had been the Authoritarian Hos-
pital Olympics" (p. 213).

Capitalists would have won the gold medal in all
other groups on the Social Dominance Orientation
and Ethnocentrism scales. In the 1996 student-
parent study, "capitalists" scored higher than any
of the present investigations. In the October 1995
slipped the "most important outlook" ques-
tion into the demographic survey used in several
of the present investigations. In the Demographic Survey
based replicates outperformed all others on SDO
(1996), capitalists outperformed all Adelson
and McFarland and the 1996 student-

This opposition finds expression in their economic philosophy. The persons most advocating privatization, reduction in social spending, weakening of unions, balanced budgets, lower taxes for businesses and the rich, less government involvement in the economy, and so on generally score high in social dominance. They also admit they oppose a more even distribution of wealth in their country. Economic rationales are frequently offered for these stands. But if you think social minorities care an awful lot about their own well-being, it seems likely that their economic views are wrong.

Economic Orientation

hold anti-Semitic "militia sentiments". And can one view persons persecuted against women, of Asian ancestry, Latin-Americans, Quebecois, and others as model citizens? High SDOs, by virtue of their answers to the SDQ scale itself, seem opposed to one of democracy's central values: equality.

One can get excited about Prato et al.'s (1994) social dominance construct for many reasons. It has produced an extraordinary measure of preju- dice, indeed, with some help from the RWA scale this is test explains most of the prejudice in the samples studied thus far. That amazes me. Also the SDO scale provides the best measure we have of the missing link in the dominance-submission authoritarian social system—a link I never realized was missing. Furthermore, high SDOs certainly was missing. Finally, a social study in their own right. And most of the confusion findings that have popped up thus far in research using the RWA Scale.

M. Some Further Observations

more or less right-wing authoritarian as they go through life. Accordingly, I asked the students who served in my last November 1996 survey, at the end of the booklet, "Why do you think you are competitive, personally ambitious, and determined to beat the other fellow?" How did you get that way? Can you name two or three experiences you had that were particularly important in getting you to want power over others in life? Do you have a model like this that you want to be like? Or does none of this apply to you?" Comparing the answers of the High SDOs with those of other students, social dominators more often said such things as, "This is the way the world works; people want to get ahead of others"; "Everyone is taught that you have to be competitive and be in control of your future in today's society"; "This is the only way you will ever achieve in this world." So social dominators certainly picked up these cultural messages clearly. They also seemed to have engagued in competitive sports more often than most people, where they described the thrill of victory and (especially) the agony of defeat; "It's because of the rush I get every time I lose"; "I hate losing"; "I like the feeling of winning and maybe more wins"; "I absolutely hate losing"; "I will do anything to not lose"; and "I'm really get off when my team wins".

Although it tells us nothing about nature versus nurture scripting, an "SDO inheritance" can be traced from one generation to the next in my studies. I asked the students whose parents answered the October 1996 survey to put their own "secret number" on their parents' bubble sheets. This led to matchups for 104 students with 89 of their mothers and 95 of their fathers. Daughers ($N = 60$) had social dominance correlated .16 with their mothers and .37 with their fathers. Sons ($N = 44$) were responsive to specific coefficients came in at .11 and .45. Combining the offspring's father's SDO proved significantly more predictive of their children's SDO ($.40$) than did the mother's ($.45$), but as usual, the males had higher levels of similar levels of social dominance, by the way (Alemeyer, 1988, p. 64), with neither parent appearing more influential. In this study the mother-child RWA hand-me-down was .40, and the father-child RWA resemblance equaled .36.

To focus on the "nurture" side of the issue, we have identified many experiences that make people and fewer of the punishing ones.

Where do high SDQs come from? The smart money will bet on the interaction of genes and environment. We should take the genetic perspective quite seriously. Virtually all animal societies are built around dominance systems and humans have been able to breed aggressive, dominant behavior in some species, and generally reduce it in others. Hence cock and bull fights; hence our police lab rats.

But social learning almost certainly plays a strong hand, too, even if we have had to release phycically punished one of the usual suspects—being for the moment one of the few who have known since Bandura, Ross, and Ross (1963) that children find social power attractive, and imitate those who have it. And few things can be as reinforcing as holding power, because it means you have the Law of Effect in a hammer lock. Reduced to its essence, having power means getting more of the rewards in life, and fewer of the punishments.

L. Origins of Social Dominance Orientation

s they go
lents who
ey, at the
you are as
d 'deter-
are? How
o or three
ly impor-
others in
you want
you?"

DOs with
ore often
he world
rs"; "Ev-
ncompetitive
society";
chieve in
ly picked
hey also
orts more
cribed the
ny of de-
ry time I
n wins";
be more
"; "I de-
se"; and
often said
es to be
ed more
models

s (1994)
asons. It
of preju-
A scale
e in the
ne. Also
we have
mission
realized
certainly
ht. And
explain
popped
ale.

For example, Richard Christie and I were surprised that RWA did not associate highly with scores on his Machiavellianism scale. In fact, it usually correlated negatively. Now I see that we were "carriers" of a misconception that goes back to Erich Fromm. We expected just one kind of personality to play a role in authoritarianism, when in fact the Machiavellianism associated with dictatorial behavior appears to come from high SDOs, not high RWAs.

David Winter and I were similarly mystified when his TAT-based measure of need-Power (Winter, 1973, 1988) proved uncorrelated with RWA. Want to bet I was not again confusing dominators with submitters? High RWAs may usually be content to bow to those above them, but high SDOs are driving to rise in the ranks.

For a final Ancient Mystery of the RWA Scale, the positive correlation between left-wing and right-wing authoritarianism also surprised me. Now it appears that the "Wild-Card Authoritarians" detected in those data were mainly hostile high RWA and high SDO "militia-types" who interpreted the Establishment as Jews, homosexuals, feminists, and other "left-wingers."

N. Are High SDOs "Authoritarians"?

This paper is entitled "The Other 'Authoritarian Personality.'" Why the qualification? Are not high SDOs authoritarians? Yes and no. I would say they are in the sense that "authoritarian" connotes "dictatorial." I think you can count on high SDOs dictating to others when they have the social authority to do so.

But social authority probably does not produce dominance in high SDOs, the way it triggers submission in high RWAs. Instead, high SDOs will probably try to dominate others in general, legitimately or otherwise. If some group landed in a *Lord of the Flies* wilderness and social authority evaporated, I think the high SDOs would quickly start snarling and scheming to become the alpha animal. So I would not call social dominators "authoritarians, pure and simple." They do not have the reverence for established authority that right-wing authoritarians have, aside from its being a means to their end. They are social dominators, pure and simple. But they will produce authoritarian social systems with the support of high RWAs

if they become legitimate authorities.

Why then do high SDOs tend to end up on the "high RWA end" on many social issues? I can offer three reasons. First, social dominators tend to hold conservative economic and political philosophies. Second, experiments have shown that high RWAs (but not lows) will trust untrustworthy people who tell them what they want to hear. So if—no offense intended—you believe that "one of the most useful skills a person should develop is how to look someone straight in the eye and lie convincingly," where will you find your easiest sell on the political spectrum? Whom do you sidele on up to and praise the Lord? The right-wing authoritarians.

Third, some social dominators could express strong belief in submitting to the established authorities on the RWA scale if they consider themselves (now or someday) the authorities *others* should submit to. Hitler would seem to have been such a person, and the students who role-played his beliefs produced extremely high scores on both the SDO and RWA scales. Such "High SDO-High RWAs" are somewhat rare, as the correlation between the two measures only comes in around .20. But about 8% of my samples did score in the upper quartiles of both the RWA and SDO distributions. These "dominating right-wing authoritarians" proved distinctive in another way. In every study, they had the highest prejudice scores of any group in the sample. They are thus the most worrisome persons I have found in my investigations.

O. Improving the Social Dominance Orientation Scale

Just as I constantly tinker with my own measures, I have tried to improve the internal consistency of the SDO scale. Adding the following 6 statements to the 14 original ones shown in Exhibit 2 raises the mean interitem correlation (and the test's relationship with prejudice) a small but useful amount: "Some people are just much better than everyone else, and deserve to have power and control over others"; "This country would be better off if inferior groups stayed in their place"; "The best people should *not* be expected to accept others as 'equals'"; "We should strive with our mightiest efforts to increase equality and social justice in our country" (con-trait); "The poor and the weak

REFERENCES