

## **Researching Authoritarian Personality with Q Methodology Part II: An Intensive Study**

**James C. Rhoads, Ph.D.**

*Westminster College*

***Abstract:** In Part II, intensive analysis was conducted with a subject who loaded highly on both Factor A (authoritarian) and Factor B+ (heterosexual liberation) in Part I. This study demonstrated the emergence of various “selves” in relationship to salient other individuals and groups in the subject’s life. Q methodology revealed the discovery of 3 selves associated with Reisman’s ideas concerning the bases of social conformity (1950; 1952). Finally, an argument is made for adopting the promising features of Q methodology, to explore the authoritarian personality within a clinical setting. The more general purpose of the intensive probes in this study is to demonstrate the advantages of approaching authoritarianism from a methodological position that has not yet been explored, despite a 1953 invitation by William Stephenson to do so.*

### **Introduction**

One of the most persistent themes in authoritarian research has been the unidimensional nature of the dynamic. Scales have been administered and high scorers have been labeled authoritarian, without differentiation. The factor analysis in Part I demonstrated that there is variety among even the most authoritarian individuals in the sample. The next stage in the research required in-depth interviews with a subject from Part I. These interviews highlighted some of the areas that distinguished the subject from classic notions of authoritarianism, and pointed to themes that reinforced the general association with the phenomenon.

In light of these findings, it is possible that a single authoritarian will demonstrate different “selves” under different conditions. That is to say, probing farther into the life space of an authoritarian may show that the unidimensional understanding of authoritarianism will not withstand scrutiny. An intensive Q study of an individual may be useful in uncovering a multidimensional nature of authoritarian personality.

As McKeown and Thomas have pointed out, the “terms ‘extensive’ and ‘intensive’ are defined contextually” (1988, 37).

---

Author’s address: Department of Political Science and Sociology, Westminster College, New Wilmington, PA 16172-0001; JRHOADS@Westminster.edu.

*Operant Subjectivity*, 2001 (January), 24 (2): 86-103.

A survey of 50 subjects, for example, likely would be intensive according to R-based criteria but extensive in Q. Also, the nature of subjectivity under investigation is a factor. Typically, studies of 'intersubjectivity,' ... are extensive because the intent is to determine the variety of views on an issue. Therefore, 50 to 100 people may perform Q-sorts with the same Q-sample under an identical condition of instruction. An intensive study, on the other hand, reflects interest in 'intrasubjectivity,' that is, in an in-depth examination of one person who sorts the Q-sample under many different conditions of instruction. Hence, what is small or large, single or many, intensive or extensive ultimately depends upon the nature and purpose of the study.

The study in Part I can be described as extensive (in Q methodological terms), as 157 individuals "sorted" the statements, and the interest was in "intersubjectivity" – the discovery of the variety of views. In Part II of this research, further probing was undertaken with 1 individual (intrasubjectivity) representing an example of the complexity of the authoritarian personality.

Stephenson (1953; 1961; 1974; 1994;) advanced the scientific soundness of single-case methodology, and introduced Q as a primary analytic tool in studies of this sort.

Intensive analysis is a logical extension of basic Q-methodological principles. The purpose of an intensive study is to explore the dynamics of intrapersonal subjectivity discovered in the extensive analysis. 'Intensive' may mean an 'n of 1' but is not limited to the single case; several people can be examined in detail" (McKeown and Thomas 1988, 40).

Intensive studies have had a rich tradition within the Q literature. Brown (with Baas 1973; 1974; 1980; 1981), Baas (1997), Goldstein (1989), Kvalsund (1998), and Thomas (1979), among others, have all used this approach in their studies. Thomas's 1979 study of political ideology is illustrative of this general approach: moving from an extensive survey to the selection of "specimens," (i.e., individuals representing factor viewpoints), to intensive analyses of these individuals.

Returning to the study of authoritarianism, Laing (1969) reminds us that a case study of an individual is incomplete without accounting for the impact of others in the formation of the personality.

Moreover, even if we win the position whereby it is possible to give an apparently undistorted account of "a person," we still have the task of giving an account of what happens *between* two or more persons. That is to say, if we consider the person alone, even as in "object-relations" theory, wherein one considers the person in relation to his "objects," "internal" or "external", we will have to consider the person as person-to-the-other, *acted upon* by the others in his world. As the others are there in this situation also, the person does not act or experience himself in a vacuum. *He is not the only agent in his "world."* How he perceives and acts toward the others, how they perceive and act towards him, how he perceives them as perceiving him, how they

perceive him as perceiving them, etc., are all aspects of “the situation” pertinent to an adequate understanding of the one person’s total participation in it. (p. 70)

Laing’s analysis points to the significance of how an individual believes others who play a significant role in his life see him. It is important, in order to further our understanding of the subject, as an example of an authoritarian personality, to explore other central experiences that help to explain his personality.<sup>1</sup>

The purpose of this intensive part of the study is to use Q methodology as the strategy to observe the subjective perceptions of one authoritarian personality regarding how he is viewed by important others in his life. A more general purpose of the work is to demonstrate the advantages of approaching this particular subject area from a methodological angle that has not yet been explored, despite the fact that Stephenson pointed the way more than 45 years ago (1953, 228-32).

## Methods

“Rich” (pseudonym), the subject for the intensive study, is a white, Roman Catholic male who loaded highly on the general authoritarian factor (Factor A) in Part I, but also loaded positively on the heterosexual liberation factor (Factor B+). Factor A reflects Altemeyer’s RWA Scale, while Factor B+ endorses themes of sexual liberation (albeit of a heterosexual nature) and dissent from accepted norms. The opinions expressed by Factor B+ thus run contrary to conventional understandings of authoritarianism. At the time of the interviews, Rich was 19-years old, a college sophomore, and a varsity athlete competing in football. Following a series of interviews, Rich was given an opportunity for self-reflection and a means to model his thoughts. Q methodology enables the measurement of subjectivity, and provides the instrument for viewing the emergence of different “selves,” which may exist. The depth interviews provided the stimulus and materials for this Q study, in which Rich is presented with his own words and asked to model his perception of himself and how he believes he is perceived by others.

In structuring the Q sample for this study, a factorial design based on the 1950 work of Lasswell and Kaplan was utilized. In *Power and Society*, these authors maintain that persons in politics *demand* values on the basis of *identifications* and *expectations*:

A demand statement is one expressing a valuation by the maker of the statement. A symbol of demand is one used in demand statements to refer to the value (p. 17).

---

<sup>1</sup> Schematically, Laing describes this psychic interaction as “the way the own person (p) sees the other’s (o) view of him (p) p → (o → p)” (p. 172).

A person might utter a vague preference (“I like being accepted for the kind of person I am.”) or issue a strong demand (“Respect me or else.”). Demands can be made not only for respect, but also for a variety of other values, such as wealth, power, safety, etc.

An identification statement is one specifying the ego with which a given ego identifies. A symbol of identification is one referring in identification statements to an ego or egos. (p. 12)

Hence, Rich might identify with the varsity football team, or with men generally, or with Ronald Reagan specifically: these symbols accrete to the ego to form the self. Demands are typically made in terms of others with whom one is identified, as when changes in policy are demanded on behalf of workers, students, or Americans.

An expectation statement is one symbolizing the (past, present, or future) occurrence of a state of affairs without demands or identifications. A symbol of expectation is one used in expectation statements to characterize the state of affairs. (p. 21)

Beliefs and “facts” are of this kind — as when Rich expresses his belief about what the 1960s were like, or about what will happen if we continue to be tolerant about homosexuals, etc. These symbols (of demand, identification, and expectation) are salient for every political actor, whether authoritarian or democratic, and are simply included to provide breadth in the Q sample and to help conceptualize Rich’s relationship to his social and political context.

### *Q Sample Structure for the Intensive Study*

<i>Effects</i>	<i>Levels</i>			<i>N</i>
<i>Symbols</i>	(d) demand	(i) identification	(e) expectation	3
<i>Values</i>	(P) power (R) respect	(A) affection (D) rectitude		4

*M* = 2 replications, *N* = (2)(3)(4) = 24 statements

According to Lasswell and Kaplan (1950, 55), “Values are the goal-events of acts of valuation,” which means that they are those things which individuals pursue. Values focus on 2 main categories: welfare and deference. The former are “those whose possession to a certain degree is a necessary condition for the maintenance of the physical activity of the person,” including wealth, enlightenment, well-being, and skill. These are not irrelevant to authoritarians; however, deference values are more pertinent, i.e., “... those that consist of being taken into consideration (in the acts of others and of the self),” including power, affection, respect, and rectitude. Deficits in consideration of the child as a person during crucial growth phases presumably contribute to the tendency to be authoritarian and to try to dominate others.

The 24 statements were culled from Rich's responses during the interviews to form the sample for the Q study. The statements, all in Rich's own words, were typed onto cards and given to him along with a scoring form containing a condition of instruction and an envelope. After completing the Q sort, he returned the cards along with the score sheet in the sealed envelope, and then received another set of statements, envelope, and scoring form with a different condition of instruction. In all, Rich performed 12 such Q sorts over a 3-week period under the following conditions of instruction:

- 1) What is *your* view of yourself?
- 2) What kind of view would your *father* like you to have?
- 3) What kind of view would your *mother* like you to have?
- 4) What do your *close buddies* think your view is?
- 5) What do *female students* who are acquainted with you think your view is?
- 6) What would *members of the varsity football* team think your view is?
- 7) What was your view before you came to college?
- 8) What would your *parish priest* think your view is?
- 9) If you had known him, what would *John F. Kennedy* have thought your view to be?
- 10) What would your *favorite high school teacher* think your view is?
- 11) What do you think your view will be in 20 years?
- 12) If you had known him, what would *J. Edgar Hoover* have thought your view to be?

The conditions of instruction were based on analysis of the depth interviews, and were chosen to present the opportunity for exhibiting different "selves." During the course of the interviews, it was evident that both parents were of considerable importance to him, as were his peer relationships, his Church, etc. The intensive study was designed to incorporate his relationships to these and other salient individuals and groups. A 3-factor solution was obtained when the Q sorts were factor analyzed, and the results rotated judgmentally to maximize loading on Rich's own Q sort (Sort 1). This decision was made in order to sharpen the distinction between Rich's own viewpoint and his perception of how others saw his viewpoint.

A Q sort factor array can be derived to model the view of a particular factor. These data demonstrate that the defining sorts for Factor X are 1) Rich's own view, 2) the kind of view he believes his mother would like him to have, and 3) what he believes his view will be in 20 years. Factor Y is defined by those sorts that represent what Rich thinks his close buddies and his female friends believe his view to be, and what he believes his view was prior to coming to college. Finally, Factor Z is defined by those Q sorts that represent what Rich believes his parish priest and fellow members of the varsity football

**Factor Loadings**

<i>Q Sort</i>	<i>Condition</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>
1	Rich's View	0.81*	-0.14	-0.01
2	Father	0.53*	-0.34	0.58*
3	Mother	0.80*	-0.07	0.30
4	Buddies	0.19	0.55*	-0.00
5	Female Friends	0.22	0.80*	-0.13
6	Football Players	-0.06	0.02	0.56*
7	Before College	0.33	0.55*	-0.31
8	Parish Priest	0.32	-0.16	0.57*
9	J. Edgar Hoover	0.18	0.03	0.12
10	John F. Kennedy	0.56*	0.41	-0.19
11	Favorite Teacher	0.50	-0.33	0.39
12	Rich in 20 years	0.55*	0.18	-0.24

\*  $p < 0.01$

team think his view is. Factor loadings in excess of 0.53 are statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

Riesman (1950; 1952) traced the effects of society on individual political actors, contending that a complete understanding of individual political behavior must be seen through the prism of larger cultural forces. While the idea is not unique, the development of his models of social conformity was a contribution to social psychology. The powerful effects of conformity, present in every society, create great pressures on the individual psyche. Riesman contended that societies are typically *tradition-directed*, *inner-directed*, or *other-directed*. While he acknowledged that elements of each model could be present in varying degrees in society, he maintained that each society has a principal mode of conformity. In fact, it is his position that a society will evolve from the tradition-directed type to the inner-directed type and then evolve further to the other-directed type. His ideas about the bases of social conformity are instructive as attempts are made to explicate the factors in the present study. What is relevant here is the degree to which Rich's 3 factors correspond to Reisman's model. For example, Factor X appears related to the inner-directed type as described in that author's work (1952,6).

What is central, however, to the concept of inner-direction is that one's whole life is guided, for good or ill, by very generalized goals — such as wealth, fame, goodness, achievement — which were implanted early by identification with and modeling upon one's parents and other influential adults. One may be torn among these goals, fail to achieve them, or fight their tug; but one never doubts that life is goal-directed and that the inner voice is the principal source of that direction. Metaphorically, one may think of such

people as *gyroscopically* driven — the gyroscope being implanted by adults and serving to stabilize the young even in voyages occupationally, socially, or geographically far from the ancestral home.

The inner-directed type results from the role of the parents and the family-unit in instilling conformity in the child. As the Q sort array shows, Rich's Factor X is defined in part by his parents; moreover, the fact that his self-view (Q sort 1) also defines Factor X suggests that parental expectations have been incorporated into the self. Strong association with the family, particularly the parents, characterizes the inner-directed type.

Rich also has a Factor Y self that resembles Riesman's description of the other-directed type, whose conformity the author says:

... rests not so much on the incorporation of adult authority as on sensitive attention to the expectations of contemporaries. In the place of lifelong goals toward which one is steered by a gyroscope, the other-directed person obeys a fluctuating series of short-run goals picked up (to continue with the metaphor) by a *radar*. This radar, to be sure, is also installed in childhood, but the parents and other adults encourage the child to tune in to the people around him at any given time and share his preoccupation with their reactions to him and his to them.

Factor Y is concerned with a sense of conformity based on relationship to peers (female friends, buddies) in addition to his view before college.

Finally, Factor Z is closely identified with Riesman's tradition-directed type, which rests largely on a sense of conformity growing out of an attachment to a group. Association with the group and acceptance of its established customs and mores are central to the tradition-directed type. He offers the following description:

In the type of society depending on tradition-direction, social change is at a minimum, though upsets in personal life may be violent and catastrophic. Conformity is assured by inculcating in the young a near-automatic obedience to tradition, as this is defined by the particular social role toward which the individual is headed by his sex and station at birth. That obedience, with all its gratifying rewards, is taught by the large circumbiant clan and, after childhood, usually by members of one's own sex group. In this way one learns to master increasingly admired and difficult techniques and to avoid the shame that befalls the violator of the given norms.

Recall that Factor Z is defined by what Rich thinks his priest and fellow members of the football team believe his view to be. In describing Factor Z, attempts will be made to tie in the 2 groups with that tradition-directed aspect.

### **Factor X: The "Inner-Directed" Factor**

Rich's own view helps to define Factor X. In fact, the factors were judgmentally rotated in order to maximize the loading for Q sort 1 on a single

*Q Sort Array for the Intensive Study*

<i>No.</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>
1	I think we should try to keep some of the old rules — they keep us in line.	1	-2	3
2	You've got to have tradition in the family: it helps establish who you are.	3	0	-1
3	A lot of respect is being lost in today's society.	2	1	1
4	It makes me sad that so much crime goes on.	-2	1	2
5	I admire the customs and traditions of society.	-1	-3	2
6	I don't think premarital sex is a crime or anything. No one's actually getting hurt.	0	2	-3
7	Kids should be given more attention by their mothers and fathers.	3	0	1
8	Ambition — that's something I like to see in people.	1	0	-1
9	You can't shut people out who are thinking about change.	1	2	0
10	Rules about being well-mannered and respectable should be questioned.	-1	1	-1
11	I make my own judgments. I'm really not influenced that much.	-2	2	-2
12	Just because some people are atheists doesn't mean they're bad.	-2	2	-2
13	There's not enough kindness.	-1	0	-2
14	By the time you get to college you know enough and it's okay to challenge your parents' ideas.	-3	-3	-3
15	Things are getting out of hand now because people aren't sticking to traditional values.	0	-3	0
16	I never really neglected an obligation to my family.	2	3	3
17	There are things in our society that should be changed.	2	3	-3
18	Parents have to take a more active role in showing their kids respect and discipline.	3	-2	0
19	Belonging to an established religion doesn't necessarily mean anything. It depends on how well you follow it.	-1	-1	-1
20	Traditions and customs help build character.	1	-1	2
21	Anyone can make babies: Raising them is the hard part.	0	3	0
22	I don't really care that much about politics. I'm more laid back: whatever happens, happens.	-3	-2	0
23	Homosexuality: it's just stuck in my head that it's wrong. It's like a religious thing	-3	-1	3
24	It's important to listen to authorities.	0	-1	1



factor. This is in keeping with the underlying methodological premise behind this approach to studying Rich's personality. It was deemed appropriate by the investigator to see, after Rich's own view had been taken into account, what would distinguish that attitude from how he believes others perceive his view.

Conclusions from Factor X are that Rich's view is similar to the one he thinks his mother would like him to have, and related to what he believes his view will be in 20 years. The lower factor loading for Q sort 12 suggests that his view might not be as strongly associated with Factor X in 20 years.

***Factor X: Most Agree***

<b><i>No.</i></b>	<b><i>Statement</i></b>	<b><i>Z-score</i></b>
7	Kids should be given more attention by their mothers and fathers.	1.70
18	Parents have to take a more active role in showing their kids respect and discipline.	1.70
2	You've got to have tradition in the family: it helps establish who you are.	1.35
16	I never really neglected an obligation to my family.	1.34

Clearly there is an emphasis on the family in Factor X. Statements 7 and 18 bear on the responsibilities of parents, but all of the statements that were scored most positively relate to the family. Rich's family oriented view is apparently mother-centered, as the condition of instruction for Sort 3 was "What kind of view would your mother like you to have?" although his father also has a significant, but smaller, factor loading on Factor X. Also, to some extent, Factor X is associated with what Rich believes his favorite teacher thinks, and what President John F. Kennedy would think is Rich's view.<sup>2</sup>

The importance of family to Rich was a recurring theme throughout the intensive analysis. Many of his responses to the original RWA Scale items focused on family issues. A sample of Rich's responses during the intensive analysis related directly to his ideas about the role of family:

I think that means parents have to take a more, more active role in, uh, showing their kids respect and discipline. ... I guess nowadays there's not two parents, that a kid don't get that much attention from their mothers and fathers, and something has to be done. ... maybe that the father was always the head of my household and I figure I turned out all right. ... I think that children should learn, like, when they're younger to, uh, respect things.

Related themes recur in statements that received the most negative scores in Factor X. Rich rejected the notion that college-aged students know enough

---

<sup>2</sup> During the interview phase of the intensive analysis, Rich selected both President Kennedy and former FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover as individuals that he admired. See Q sorts 10 and 11.

to challenge their parents' ideas, an idea consistent with the family orientation of this factor. Rich also insisted that he cares about politics. During the interview, he described himself as "very interested" in politics. In Statement 12, Rich rejected atheism. At first glance, his apparent acceptance of homosexuality may seem inconsistent. Recall that Rich loaded on Factor B+ in Part I of this study, the Heterosexual Liberation factor, signifying his association with a view that endorsed heterosexual sex, but had a negative attitude toward homosexuality. His negative response to Statement 23, however, indicates that his opposition to homosexuality is not based on his Roman Catholic religious affiliation. His position is consistent with the family and parental orientation of Factor X. The emphasis on family, and particularly, parents is directly related to Riesman's inner-directed type whose conformity is tied to boundaries established by parental authorities.

***Factor X: Most Disagree***

<i>No.</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Z-score</i>
22	I really don't care that much about politics. I'm more laid back; whatever happens, happens..	-1.63
14	By the time you get to college you know enough and it's okay to challenge your parents' ideas.	-1.62
23	Homosexuality: it's just stuck in my head that it's wrong. It's like a religious thing	-1.17
12	Just because people are atheists doesn't mean that they're bad.	-1.16

**Factor Y: The "Other-Directed" Factor**

Q sorts that represent how Rich believes his peers (buddies, female friends) see him, and what he believes his view was before college define Factor Y.

***Factor Y: Most Agree***

<i>No.</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Z-score</i>
17	There are things in our society that should be changed.	1.64
16	I never really neglected an obligation to my family.	1.53
21	Anyone can make babies: Raising them is the hard part.	1.51
11	I make my own judgments. I'm really not influenced that much.	1.40
6	I don't think premarital sex is a crime or anything. No one's actually getting hurt.	1.10
9	You can't shut people out who are thinking about change.	1.03

Statements in Factor Y with the highest scores reflect a more receptive view toward change. Rich agreed “there are things in society that should be changed” (17), and those who advocate change can’t be “shut out” (9). In addition, Rich claimed that he “never” neglected a family obligation (16), and that he makes his “own judgments” (11). These statements affirm an autonomy and maturity that surely are valued among his college-aged peers.

Finally, sexual issues are again prominent in Factor Y, with a permissive attitude toward premarital sex (6), while at the same time acknowledging the responsibility inherent in a sexual relationship (21). Clearly, these issues occupied an important position with Rich and his peers.

It is important to note the implicit peer-related character of Statements 17, 21, 6, and 9. In contrast to the theme of Factor X, these statements make no reference to parents. Only Statement 16 is related to family concerns. The lack of reference to family in Factor Y is significant. It is the salience of peer relationships that is the defining characteristic of Factor Y.

***Factor Y: Most Disagree***

<i>No.</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Z-score</i>
14	By the time you get to college you know enough and it’s okay to challenge your parents’ ideas.	-1.77
5	I admire the customs and traditions of our society.	-1.25
15	Things are getting out of hand now because people aren’t sticking to traditional values.	-1.12
1	I think that we should try to keep some of the old rules — they help keep us in line.	-1.00

Although this view is more tolerant of change than that of Factor X, Factor Y also rejects the idea that college students should “challenge their parents’ ideas” (14). During the intensive analysis, Rich commented on this statement:

By the time you get to college, I figure, like, you know enough that, I mean, and you can challenge your parents’ ideas because maybe they’re not as, I mean, maybe not as educated as you are. You can see now, see things different, but you still got to have, you know, tradition in the family because that helps establish who you are.

This comment helps to explain the placement of Statement 14 in the constellations of both Factors X and Y. Rich is supporting the idea of family, while simultaneously acknowledging that students might be more educated on a given issue than their parents. The reverse is also true — the conflict between Factors X and Y helps explain the contradictions in Rich’s comment. However, the Factor Y “self” rejects the traditional rules and mores of society. Rich, in Factor Y, does not “admire the customs and traditions of our society” (5), nor does he “think we should try to keep some of the old rules” (1), and he

refutes the notion that a lack of “traditional values” is creating a breakdown in society. This lack of adherence to tradition is in keeping with a peer-oriented, other-directed view. Riesman argues that the other-directed type “is prepared to cope with fairly rapid social change” (1952, 6).

### **Factor Z: The “Tradition-Directed” Factor**

Factor Z is defined by the sorts that represent what Rich believed members of the college varsity football team and his parish priest believe to be his view. This factor appears to revolve around a dedication to tradition: Statements 1, 5, and 20 all endorse support for the traditions and customs of society. In addition, homosexuality is condemned (23), obligations to the family are seen as important (16), and the crime rate is a source of concern (4).

#### *Factor Z: Most Agree*

<i>No.</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Z-score</i>
23	Homosexuality: it's just struck in my head that it's wrong. It's like a religious thing.	1.91
16	I never really neglected an obligation to my family.	1.60
1	I think that we should try to keep some of the old rules — they help keep us in line.	1.60
4	It makes me mad that so much crime goes on.	1.26
20	Traditions and customs help build character.	0.93
5	I admire the customs and traditions of our society.	0.63

Factor Z rejects premarital sex (6) and social change (17), and condemns atheists (12). Statement 14 is rejected, as it was in the other 2 factors. It is easy to see why this would be the case in Factor Z: this statement expresses a challenge not only to family, but also by extension, to the larger society as well. Factor Z disagrees with the view that “I make my own judgments. I'm really not influenced that much” (11). This sentiment is no doubt related to the overall dynamic that defines the factor. The varsity football team and the Catholic Church, as represented by the parish priest, are both tradition-based entities. The team and the Church have defined rituals, mores, and roles for members. Indeed, the success of the different enterprises rests on the concerted efforts of the individuals that comprise the groups. The Catholic Church places primacy on community. It was, of course, this insistence on fealty to community and tradition that led to the Protestant Reformation. The football team also operates in a hierarchical environment where the coach is the leader. Team members are taught various skills, and those who are most able gain great status within the group. Rich was a 3-year letterman and a valuable member of the squad. The football team had a rich history at the College, with only 1 losing season in more than 40 years. This climate undoubtedly created

enormous stresses on Rich and other team members, as they were often reminded of past glories.

**Factor Z: Most Disagree**

<i>No.</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Z-score</i>
6	I don't think premarital sex is a crime or anything. No one's actually getting hurt.	-1.60
17	There are things in our society that should be changed.	-1.28
14	By the time you get to college you know enough and it's okay to challenge your parents' ideas.	-1.28
11	I make my own judgments. I'm really not influenced that much.	-1.26
12	Just because some people are atheists doesn't mean they're bad.	-0.98
13	There's not enough kindness.	-0.97

The disagreement with Statement 13 is more curious. It is easy to see how Rich's association with the football team would lead him to reject the idea that "there's not enough kindness" as football is not a "kinder, gentler" sport. Perhaps more important in this discussion, Rich believes the football team sees him as embracing the ethos of the squad. One might wonder, however, why Rich's association with the Church would lead him to reject Statement 13. His insistence on order and the need for the Church and other authorities to "keep us in line" helps to explain the placement of this statement. In this context, "kindness" can be seen as "license," which Rich rejects.

Riesman's description of the tradition-directed type once again offers a powerful explanatory tool for the "self" that emerges in Rich's Factor Z. The passage that describes this type and states, "... in this way one learns to master increasingly difficult techniques and to avoid the shame that befalls the violator of the given norms" is relevant to this discussion (p. 164-5). Riesman is making the claim that fear of shame is a potent motivation upholding the tradition-directed type. Breaking the mores of the football team (losing one's starting position, not putting forth the effort, refusing to "play with pain," etc.) can bring shame to the football player. Breaking the mores of the Church (sinning) can bring shame to the individual. Adherents go to confession to atone and purge themselves of the shame of sin. Exclusion from Church rituals for violations of religious regulations was more common in times past, but there are still remnants of this practice present in Church today. For example, divorced persons may not remarry in the Church. In fact, shame is associated with Factor Y as well, but it seems particularly related to Factor Z. Failure to meet goals established by the ego-ideal results in shame. For Rich, failure to

live up to the idealized expectations he holds for himself, both within his church and the football team, results in shame.

Factor X appears concerned with "guilt," where Factor Z emphasizes "shame." Gerhart Piers summarizes the differences between guilt and shame:

Whereas guilt is generated whenever a boundary (set by the Super-Ego) is touched or transgressed, shame occurs when a goal (presented by the Ego-Ideal) is not being reached. It thus indicates a real "shortcoming." Guilt anxiety accompanies transgression; shame, failure. (1953, 11)

It is also important to note that sexual issues are prominent. Factor Z strongly condemns homosexuality and disapproves of premarital sex. Once again, Church teachings seem significant in this area.

### **Distinguishing Statements**

Through examining the statements that distinguish the factors, a more complete understanding of the character of each factor emerges. The statements that distinguish Factor X from the other factors reinforce the imbedded family theme. Statements 7, 18, and 2 all revolve around issues of the family; and all refer to the significance of the parent-child relationship. Rich is interested in parents taking a "more active role" with their children, and giving them "more attention." Statement 4 is more difficult to understand in the context of the inner-directed character of Factor X. Given the orientation of this factor, Rich is likely more disappointed than angry at the amount of crime. Factor X is distinguished from the other factors by the importance of parental expectations and the internalization of those ideals by Rich.

#### *Selected Distinguishing Statements for Factor X*

<i>No.</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>
7	Kids should be given more attention by their mothers and fathers.	1.70	-0.39	0.33
18	Parents have to take a more active role in showing their kids respect and discipline.	1.70	-0.90	-0.28
2	You've got to have tradition in the family: it helps establish who you are.	1.35	-0.35	-0.33
4	It makes me mad that so much crime goes on.	-0.81	0.74	1.26

All the distinguishing statements for Factor Y are implicitly peer-related, reinforcing an other-directed orientation. It endorses the idea of change in social norms and mores (10, 17), and agreement with Statement 12 suggests some tolerance for atheists. Statements 6 and 21 refer to sexual themes and are significant within the peer group. Together these statements express both support for premarital sex, and understanding of the potential consequences.

**Selected Distinguishing Statements for Factor Y**

No.	Statement	X	Y	Z
17	There are things in our society that should be changed.	0.81	1.64	-1.26
21	Anyone can make babies: Raising them is the hard part.	0.27	1.50	0.31
12	Just because some people are atheists doesn't mean they're bad.	-1.16	0.37	-0.98
10	Rules about being well-mannered and respectable should be questioned.	-0.72	0.23	-0.67

The tradition-directed nature of Factor Z is buttressed by examining the distinguishing statements. Support for Statements 1 and 5 as well as condemnation for Statement 17 all indicate the importance of tradition and custom in Factor Z. Additionally, the rejection of both homosexuality and premarital sex (23, 6) is consistent with traditional Church teachings.

**Selected Distinguishing Statements for Factor Z**

No.	Statement	X	Y	Z
23	Homosexuality: it's just stuck in my head that it's wrong. It's like a religious thing.	-1.17	-0.53	1.91
1	I think that we should try to keep some of the old rules — they help to keep us in line.	0.54	-1.00	1.60
5	I admire the customs and traditions of our society.	-0.46	-1.25	0.64
6	I don't think premarital sex is a crime or anything. No one's actually getting hurt.	-0.34	1.10	-1.60
17	There are things in our society that should be changed.	0.81	1.64	-1.28

The distinguishing statements for each factor provide additional evidence of the interpretations offered. For Factor X they reinforce the centrality of family, and support the peer-related orientation of Factor Y. Finally, the distinguishing statements for Factor Z give additional evidence of the importance of tradition in that factor. The emergence of these selves, associated with Riesman's types, is contradictory to the traditional view that authoritarianism is a unidimensional trait that the individual possesses in degree, much like body temperature. In fact, variety exists not only among the most authoritarian in our sample, but *within* a single authoritarian.

## **Part II Summary and Conclusions**

Rich presented 3 “selves” associated with Riesman’s tradition-directed, inner-directed, and other-directed types. All 3 are responses to conformity, a concept inextricably bound up with authoritarianism. Rich’s inner-directed self responds to family (particularly parental) pressures to conform, his other-directed self to peer pressures, and his tradition-directed self to the pressures of group associations. The presence of these 3 selves within the constellation of Rich’s psyche is not suggestive of some type of dissociative disorder, but rather more indicative of the degree to which conformity (or submission) is ingrained in his personality. While this submission is certainly consistent with classical notions of authoritarianism, psychometricians would not predict the multidimensional nature of his personality (or the salience of particular attitudes toward his self-concept). In fact, this complexity might well be inconceivable to them in light of a half-century of research predicated on a single authoritarian type.

Believing that authoritarianism is too complex a phenomenon to be captured through a score on a scale that has been determined in advance to measure the concept, Q methodology was utilized to point to underlying themes in the scale that call into question the validity of the instrument as a unidimensional measure of authoritarianism. A group of 157 college students responded to Altemeyer’s (1988) RWA Scale, which was selected as illustrative of the psychometric approach to studying authoritarianism. This extensive analysis produced 41 students defined as highly authoritarian. Their scores were subjected to Q factor analysis, and 3 independent factors emerged. The first general factor (Factor A) tapped into the components that seemingly underlie Altemeyer’s scale. However, 2 secondary factors (Factors B and C) also emerged to give voice to views inconsistent with previous understandings of the authoritarian dynamic. Factor B is bipolar and concerns issues of heterosexual liberation and limited protest and dissent. Factor C is also bipolar and is chiefly concerned with issues of increased personal freedoms, particularly for young people. Factor C+ supports challenges by youth to established authorities. Pursuing the methodological decision to have students first respond to Altemeyer’s RWA Scale, and then to subject those responses to Q factor analysis, demonstrates that the results discovered and discussed are available to students of authoritarianism who utilize a conventional psychometric approach to studying the dynamic.

Additionally, an intensive study was conducted in which the subject’s own words, derived from an interview protocol, provided the statements for further Q analysis. The subject was a student who loaded highly on both Factors A and B+ in the first part of this work therefore could be assumed to be both highly authoritarian, by Altemeyer’s definition, and somewhat multidimensional. This strategy permitted a deeper understanding of the individual



by creating 12 experimental conditions of instruction under which the significance of important others to the formation of the subject's personality structure could be revealed. The utility of Q methodology in studies of this sort is particularly relevant here, because it places the emphasis on the respondent and the respondent's understanding of the Q sample. Once again, no theories are assumed *a priori*. This methodological premise is strengthened by the use of the subject's own language in the intensive study.

This study revealed 3 independent factors, each related to Riesman's ideas concerning the sources of conformity in society. Evidence presented here gives support for the emergence of different "selves." The personality structure was made operant under various conditions of instruction in the Q analysis. However satisfying the tie to Riesman's work may be as an explanatory tool, the very emergence of these selves is of greater importance. The Q sort data demonstrate the need to reexamine the conceptualization of authoritarianism as a unidimensional construct in favor of a more multifaceted personality dynamic.

This 2-part study contributes to the field of authoritarian research in at least 2 important areas. First, the demonstration again of inadequacies of scale measurement may lead to more insightful intensive analysis. Additionally, the application of Q methodology to the study of authoritarianism permitted deeper probes into the dynamics of the personality. We have a tool that makes possible the empirical testing of the psychoanalytic propositions first outlined by the Berkeley Group. An increased awareness that more than 50 years of researching authoritarianism with Likert scales has proven unsatisfactory, coupled with the promising features of Q methodology in unraveling mysteries endemic to the research, may provide the necessary impetus for a real change in this vitally important area of research.

## References

- Altemeyer, B. 1988. *Enemies of Freedom: Understanding Right-wing Authoritarianism*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Baas, L. and Brown, S.R. 1973. Generating rules for intensive analysis: The study of transformations. *Psychiatry* 36:172-83.
- Baas, L. 1997. The interpersonal sources of the development of political images: An intensive, longitudinal perspective. *Operant Subjectivity* 20:117-42.
- Brown, S.R. 1974. Intensive analysis in political research. *Political Methodology* 1:1-25.
- . 1980. *Political subjectivity: Applications of Q methodology in political science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- . 1981. Intensive analysis. In *Handbook of political communication*. Ed. D.D. Nimmo and K.R. Sanders. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Goldstein, D.M. 1989. Q methodology and control systems theory. *Operant Subjectivity* 13:8-14.
- Kvalsund, R. 1998. A theory of the person. Doctoral dissertation, Norwegian University of Science and Technology. Trondheim.
- Laing, R.D. 1969. *Self and others*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Lasswell, H.D. and Kaplan, A. 1950. *Power and society*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- Piers, G. 1953. Shame and guilt: A psychoanalytic study. In *Shame and guilt: A psychoanalytic and a cultural study*. Ed. G. Piers and M.B. Singer. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Rhoads, J.C. 2001. Researching authoritarian personality with Q methodology Part I: Revisiting traditional analysis. *Operant Subjectivity* 24(2) 68-85.
- Riesman, D. 1950. *The lonely crowd*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- . 1952. *Faces in the crowd*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- Stephenson, W. 1953. *The study of behavior: Q technique and its methodology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1974. Methodology of single case studies. *Journal of Operational Psychiatry* 5(2): 3-16.
- . 1994. *Quantum theory of advertising*. Columbia: Stephenson Research Center, School of Journalism, University of Missouri.
- Taylor, P., Delprato, D.J. and Knapp, J.R. 1994. Q-methodology in the study of child phenomenology. *Psychological Record* 44:171-83.
- Thomas, D.B. 1979. Psychodynamics, symbolism, and socialization. *Political Behavior* 1:243-68.