

Researching Authoritarian Personality with Q Methodology Part I: Revisiting Traditional Analysis

James C. Rhoads, Ph.D.

Westminster College

***ABSTRACT:** Research into authoritarianism has focused almost exclusively on the scaling instruments designed to measure the phenomenon. Rarely do researchers get beyond this fascination with the scale, and consequently authoritarianism becomes reduced to a score on a scale predetermined to measure the concept. This study utilizes Q methodology to explore authoritarianism, by factor analyzing the scale responses of conventionally defined authoritarians. The analysis produced 3 factors, 2 of which would go unnoticed by researchers using traditional psychometric methods, and which run contrary to conventional understandings of authoritarianism.*

Introduction

In more than 50 years since the publication of *The Authoritarian Personality*, perhaps no single work in the social sciences has spawned so much interest, theoretical consideration, and published literature. The study was co-authored by Theodor Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel J. Levison, and R. Nevitt Sanford, who collectively have come to be called the Berkeley Group, because Berkeley was the location for most of the research. The researchers created a Fascism Scale, or F Scale, and reported 9 manifestations of the fascist character (1950, 255):

- 1) Conventionalism: rigid adherence to conventional middle-class values
- 2) Authoritarian Submission: submissive, uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities of the in-group
- 3) Authoritarian Aggression: tendency to be on the lookout for, and to condemn, reject, and punish people who violate conventional values
- 4) Anti-intraception: Opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tender-minded
- 5) Superstition and Stereotypy: the belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate and the disposition to think in rigid categories

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): 68-85.

- 6) Power and Toughness: Preoccupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension; identification with power figures; overemphasis upon the conventionalized attributes of the ego; exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness
- 7) Destructiveness and Cynicism: Generalized hostility; vilification of the human
- 8) Projectivity: The disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outwards of unconscious emotional impulses
- 9) Sex: Exaggerated concerns with sexual “goings-on”

These varying traits all play a part in the development of the authoritarian personality. The authors look to childhood to provide some clues as to how and why an individual may assume these character traits. Via interviews with high and low scorers on the F Scale, the researchers found that those who scored high often were reared in an environment in which discipline was not only severe but arbitrary. Coupled with the accompanying fear, the arbitrary use of severe discipline led many high scorers to express feelings of victimization. The consequent belief that they are always subject to the whim of powerful forces helps to explain their reliance on conventional religious doctrines and unwavering attachment to fate and the supernatural. This set of circumstances creates a paradoxical relationship: the authoritarian simultaneously exhibits a punitive attitude toward the out-group and a willing submissiveness toward the in-group.

Despite the enormous breadth of *The Authoritarian Personality*, it has received criticism from many quarters on many different fronts that has been chiefly technical in nature. Hyman and Sheatsley (1954), for example, faulted the research for its lack of respondent representativeness. Bass (1956) and others have worried about response-set acquiescence and item wording in measuring scales, and Altemeyer (1988) has questioned the susceptibility of psychoanalytic propositions to testing. Numerous traditional factor analysts (R-mode) have discussed the number and nature of dimensions underlying authoritarianism (Kline and Cooper 1984; Struening and Richardson 1965; Camileri 1959; Hofstaetter 1952), and whether the diversity of factors justifiably can be combined into a single type (Hofstaetter 1952). Others have attempted to broaden some themes of the original study — e.g., whether there is an authoritarian of the left (Shils 1954; Eysenck 1954; Lipset 1959; Heaven and Connors 1988), and whether authoritarianism can be distinguished from closed-mindedness (Rokeach 1960). Ray (1976) has expressed doubts as to whether there is a connection between authoritarian attitudes and authoritarian behavior. It is notable that most of these citations are of an older vintage. Recent study of this area has been sparse, largely because of a perceived inability to further advance knowledge. A voluminous literature has evolved

that purports to test the theories and practices of the Berkeley Group, yet these studies rarely get beyond a fascination with the F Scale as being synonymous with the authoritarian dynamic.

Samelson (1964) has stood virtually alone in expressing doubts about the adequacy of scaling procedures (specifically the Likert format) for capturing the dynamic processes that were central to the original research of the Berkeley Group. According to Ackermann, “The progress of science is really the progress of instruments and techniques” (1985, 50). With this statement, he reminds us of the inherent relationship between instruments of observation and the “data domains” they produce from which we derive theories. Central to Ackermann’s thesis is the notion that scientific progress may be premised not on more data, but on new instruments that can highlight new dimensions and characteristics of the phenomenon under study.

A recent study by Rhoads and Sun (1994) hints at where such an approach might lead. These workers administered Altemeyer’s Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) Scale to more than 200 respondents in the United States and Taiwan, initially to see if any cross-national differences existed. Submitting the responses of the 66 persons with the highest authoritarian scores to Q factor analysis yielded surprising results. One general factor emerged on which all respondents had significant loadings — the expected “authoritarian” factor that presumably underlies the RWA scale. However, a significant bipolar factor also emerged which served to distinguish Chinese from American respondents, the former demonstrating anti-authoritarian attitudes, and the latter marked tendencies toward sexual liberation. This second factor is suggestive of a dynamic that has not been included in conventional understandings of authoritarianism, even though the respondents were the “most” authoritarian of those surveyed. The importance of the finding is that it reveals a dimension that would have gone unnoticed using a conventional approach to the subject. Q analysis (by-person factor analysis), as in the Rhoads and Sun study, permits the introduction of a “new probabilistic” that arises when there is no averaging (Stephenson 1990, 116-7). Rather than average responses into a single score, the items are permitted to retain their individuality, and the pattern among them becomes a new focus of attention and inquiry.

Part I of this study follows the same procedures introduced in the 1994 work on a broader sample of American respondents. Only the responses of the individuals who were in roughly the highest quartile were selected for Q analysis in this study. The purpose of this approach is to demonstrate that, even with the conventional kind of data normally at the disposal of students of authoritarianism (i.e., scales), there are interesting dynamics which are hidden from view due to the procedural steps taken and methodological presuppositions guiding their selection.

The purpose of this part of the study is to examine data from individuals Altemeyer would have labeled as undifferentiated high authoritarians based on the RWA scale, and, using Q factor analysis, demonstrate how and to what extent respondents differed from each other. Part II of this study will illustrate how deeper probes can be made using procedures present in Q method, which were largely unavailable at the time of the Berkeley studies.

Methods

Part I of this study involves 157 students at a small, private, Eastern liberal-arts college. The RWA Scale developed by Altemeyer in 1986 and used in his 1988 work was administered. The 41 respondents who scored in the highest quartile were selected for Q factor analysis. Respondents were asked to score each statement on a scale of 1-9 to indicate the level of agreement/disagreement with each item. The points on the scale were defined as follows:

- 1) If you *very strongly disagree* with the statement
- 2) If you *strongly disagree* with the statement
- 3) If you *moderately disagree* with the statement
- 4) If you *slightly disagree* with the statement
- 5) If you feel exactly and precisely *neutral* about a statement
- 6) If you *slightly agree* with the statement
- 7) If you *moderately agree* with the statement
- 8) If you *strongly agree* with the statement
- 9) If you *very strongly agree* with the statement

The RWA Scale is a balanced scale, comprised of 30 statements, half of which are written in a *protrait* and half in a *contrait* manner. The scale measures the level of authoritarianism present in an individual by virtue of responses presupposed to capture accurately the underlying dynamics of the authoritarian personality. Therefore, it becomes a simple task to add the scores for the 30 items, and, in keeping with Altemeyer's conceptualization, label the highest 25% of scorers as "authoritarians."

For methodological purposes, this was a necessary starting point. A decision was made to administer the RWA in a conventional scale format rather than use the 30 statements directly in a Q sort, the intent being to show that the subjectivity at issue is already available to students of authoritarianism who use ordinary psychometrics to study it, and that it always has been. The evidence has been right under their noses, so to speak, but largely concealed by the measuring devices used to examine it.¹ The results from this process

¹ The reader may wonder if the data would be different had the subjects Q sorted the statements in a more traditional procedure. Brown points out the differences between forced and free distributions to be statistically insignificant (1980, 288-9). A recent paper by Rohrbaugh (1997), *How Crucial is Q Sorting to Q Methodology?*, is also directly related to the issue.

were subjected to Q factor analysis using the QMethod computer program (Atkinson 1992).

Results

Three unrotated factors were obtained from Q factor analysis of the data. A general factor on which all respondents had a significant loading apparently reflects what underlies Altemeyer's RWA Scale. Two other statistically significant factors emerged that are less powerful, but nonetheless significant, voices that would otherwise be muted by a typical scale approach. These secondary factors could help give deeper understanding to the authoritarian personality. Loadings greater than 0.47 are statistically significant at the 0.01 level.² All subjects loaded significantly on Factor A at the 0.01 level, except subjects 1 and 8, whose loadings were significant at the 0.05 level.

Unrotated Factor Loadings

Subject	A	B	C	Subject	A	B	C
1	0.40	-0.24	(-0.39)	22	0.71	-0.29	-0.06
2	0.58	0.11	0.22	23	0.70	-0.29	-0.06
3	0.64	0.17	-0.22	24	0.82	-0.13	0.26
4	0.76	0.06	-0.03	25	0.78	0.28	-0.12
5	0.62	0.27	0.04	26	0.65	0.05	-0.27
6	0.78	-0.08	-0.18	27	0.74	(-0.39)	0.09
7	0.54	0.32	-0.30	28	0.71	-0.08	-0.19
8	0.46	0.24	0.08	29	0.62	-0.12	0.19
9	0.56	0.01	(0.41)	30	0.62	-0.06	-0.12
10	0.65	-0.13	0.23	31	0.60	-0.11	(0.46)
11	0.73	-0.12	0.28	32	0.80	0.05	0.12
12	0.72	-0.23	-0.12	33	0.72	-0.20	-0.11
13	0.69	0.08	0.34	34	0.75	-0.32	0.01
14	0.56	-0.20	-0.13	35	0.86	0.12	-0.03
15	0.72	-0.29	-0.24	36	0.68	-0.12	-0.00
16	0.71	(0.43)	0.11	37	0.77	0.05	-0.28
17	0.68	-0.28	-0.01	38	0.82	(0.39)	-0.14
18	0.50	-0.16	0.06	39	0.81	0.20	0.18
19	0.74	0.07	-0.00	40	0.60	-0.07	-0.29
20	0.72	0.02	-0.16	41	0.66	-0.02	0.27
21	0.75	(0.43)	0.12				

Loadings in parentheses for Factors B and C are significant at the 0.05 level.

² The formula for determining the statistically significant threshold for a factor loading at the 0.01 level with 30 statements is $2.58(1/\sqrt{30}) = 0.47$ (0.36 for the 0.05 level).

Factor A: The Authoritarian Factor

All of the respondents loaded significantly on Factor A, ranking the following statements of the RWA Scale most positively. Factor scores for each statement are reported in normalized form.

Factor A: Most Positive Loadings

No.	Statement	Z-score
6	It may be considered old-fashioned by some, but having a decent, respectable appearance is still the mark of a gentleman and, especially a lady.	1.64
22	If a child starts becoming unconventional and disrespectful of authority, it is his parents' duty to get him back to the normal way	1.51
9	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 save our moral standards and preserve law and order.	1.48
12	Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.	1.21
1	The way things are going in this country, it's going to take a lot of "strong medicine" to straighten out the troublemakers, criminals, and perverts.	1.20
16	Some of the worst people in our country nowadays are those who do not respect our flag, our leaders, and the normal way things are supposed to be done.	0.86

The RWA Scale is designed to measure the 3 most salient characteristics of the authoritarian personality, according to Altemeyer — aggression, conventionalism, and submission. It is clear that conventionalism is an important theme to these respondents. Statements 6 and 22, which receive the highest scores, are primarily concerned with this dynamic. Statements 1 and 9 seem to be associated with the aggression component and receive high scores as well.

Adherence to conventional standards is again borne out by examining the statements with which respondents most disagreed. Perhaps this concern with conventional behavior should come as no surprise given the age cohort of these subjects. Peer pressure is an enormous influence on the lives of college students. The authoritarian's need to be accepted as part of the in-group drives this concern with conformity. Typically, college students are searching to fit into a new environment, and college-aged authoritarians would surely attach greater psychological importance to their desire to be accepted.

Factor A should not be surprising to students of authoritarianism. It is a reflection of Altemeyer's RWA Scale. The concern with conventionalism has

been noted, but that would be discovered easily through the conventional scaling process as well. What is different about this Q factor-analytic approach to studying authoritarianism is that other important themes can be examined by discovering the viewpoints expressed in the other factors. While the first factor is dominant, other factors reveal different issues of concern to some in our sample of authoritarians.

Factor A: Most Negative Loadings

No.	Statement	Z-score
21	The courts are right in being easy on drug users. Punishment would not do any good in cases like these.	-1.81
7	The sooner we get rid of the traditional family structure, where the father is the head of the family and the children are taught to obey authority automatically, the better. The old-fashioned way has a lot wrong with it.	-1.80
10	There is nothing immoral or sick in somebody being a homosexual.	-1.58
4	People should pay less attention to the Bible and other traditional forms of religious guidance and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.	-1.42
13	Rules about being "well-mannered" and respectable are chains from the past, which we should question very thoroughly before accepting.	-1.30
29	Students in high school and university must be encouraged to challenge their parents' ways, confront established authorities, and in general criticize the customs and traditions of our society.	-0.89

Factor B: The Heterosexual Liberation Factor

Factor B represents a secondary viewpoint that emerges in addition to the orthodox authoritarian view expressed in Factor A. Factor B is bipolar in that some individuals have positive loadings while others have negative loadings. This signifies that there is disagreement over the salient themes of Factor B. The positive pole is designated B+ and the negative pole B-.

Turning to the statements that received the highest scores in Factor B, the strongest themes appear to be those of heterosexual liberation (B+) and support for limited dissent from accepted social norms (B-). Factor B+ seems concerned with sexual issues. The viewpoint supports premarital sex (Statement 8), considers mores "regarding modesty and sexual behavior" as "customs" (24), and argues for developing one's "own personal standards of what is moral and immoral" (4). In addition to issues of sexuality, there appears to be a punitive streak to the view of Factor B+. There is an

endorsement of “good old-fashioned physical punishment ... to make people behave properly” (30), and the belief that “it will be the duty of every patriotic citizen to help stomp out the rot” once the authorities condemn certain elements (14). Despite this rather harsh perspective, elements of the democratic ethos, such as “free speech” (15), are supported.

Factor B+: Most Positive Loadings

No.	Statement	Z-score
8	There is nothing wrong with premarital sex.	3.18
4	People should pay less attention to the Bible and other traditional forms of religious guidance and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.	1.41
30	One reason we have so many troublemakers in our society nowadays is that parents and other authorities have forgotten that good old-fashioned physical punishment is still one of the best ways to make people behave properly.	1.02
24	A lot of our rules regarding modesty and sexual behavior are just customs that are not necessarily any better or any holier than those which other people follow.	0.76
15	“Free speech” means that people should even be allowed to make speeches and write books urging the overthrow of the government.	0.66
14	Once our government leaders and authorities condemn the dangerous elements in our society, it will be the duty of every patriotic citizen to help stomp out the rot that is poisoning our country from within.	0.64

It appears that the Factor B+ view is endorsing a greater degree of individual liberty, particularly as it pertains to private behavior, as long as society maintains some control over public behavior. There seems to be a confidence in the individual to pursue his or her own personal pleasures without posing a danger to society. Yet, action that does “threaten” society in some way must be punished severely. These themes can also be seen when examining the statements that received the most negative scores in Factor B.

Factor B+ rejects censorship of magazines and movies (Statement 5), and endorses “free speech” in the abstract (15), sexual liberation of a heterosexual nature (8, 24, 10), and “personal standards of what is moral and immoral” (4). While there seems to be a preoccupation with individual freedom, the view in Factor B+ is not libertarian. Factor B+ appears to want society to hold the line against public displays of dissent. The attitude is comparable to that expressed in a recent controversy involving a professional basketball player who refused to stand during the playing of the National Anthem, citing religious beliefs, a decision that provoked criticism and led to a subsequent fine. Eventually the

player agreed to stand, but made clear that while doing so he would be contemplating the history of oppression in America (*Los Angeles Times*, March 15, 1996, p. M-4). This proved satisfactory, as those whom he offended did not seem to care what he did *privately*; his *public* defiance of tradition was the source of irritation.

Factor B+: Most Negative Loadings

No.	Statement	Z-score
5	It would be best for everyone if the proper authorities censored magazines and movies to keep the trashy material away from youth.	-2.59
11	It is important to protect fully the rights of radicals and deviants.	-1.27
10	There is nothing immoral or sick in somebody being a homosexual.	-1.18
2	It is wonderful that young people today have greater freedom to protest against things they don't like and to “do their own thing.”	-1.05
20	The self-righteous “forces of law and order” threaten freedom in our country a lot more than the groups they claim are “radical” and “godless.”	-1.03

As Factor B is bipolar, the statements given the most negative scores by Factor B+ are those Factor B-most agreed with, and the statements given the highest positive scores by factor B+ are those most disagreed with by Factor B-. Keeping this in mind, it is easy to see that Factor B- appears to reflect a more tolerant view of public dissent, however, one that is more skeptical of individual morality, particularly as it pertains to sexual relations. It may be that the Factor B- view is supporting the tenets of the democratic ethos, yet is concerned about a culture that may promote hedonistic individualism. Factor B- may be rejecting a society seeking individual pleasures at the expense of a communitarian view. So, while public dissent is upheld as a virtue in a democratic society, Factor B- seems to be rejecting the notion that democracy means unfettered individual liberty. This view may be of particular salience in a time of widespread drug abuse and the near epidemic spread of sexually transmitted diseases that were particular focal points of public policy debate (and continue to be so) in the subjects' formative years, the 1980s.

Statements that Distinguish Factor B from Factor A

Factor B+

A clearer view of Factor B may be obtained by contrasting it with Factor A, which is a reflection of the conventional understanding of authoritarianism as

presupposed by the RWA Scale. Because the subjects in this study all received high scores on the authoritarianism scale developed by Altemeyer, they all loaded strongly on Factor A. If Factor B is different than Factor A (and it is), in what ways do they differ?

Once again, the endorsement of private, individual behaviors is clear in Factor B+. Even statement 15, which appears to be threatening public order, can be seen in light of a private right to advocate potentially system-endangering beliefs. However, Factor B+ types might resolve the inherent conflict an authoritarian personality must feel (about living in a country that celebrates a democratic tradition) by siding with a fundamental right to dissent, within the context of individual liberty, but draw the line when public, mass challenges are raised. Here, Factor B+ types see “speech” as different from “action.”

Greatest Absolute Differences (Δ) between Factors A and B+

No.	Statement	Z-score		
		A	B+	Δ
8	There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual intercourse.	-0.42	3.18	3.60
4	People should pay less attention to the Bible and other traditional forms of religious guidance and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.	-1.43	1.41	2.83
24	A lot of rules regarding modesty and sexual behavior are just customs which are not necessarily any better or holier than those which other people follow.	-0.58	0.76	1.34
15	“Free speech” means that people should even be allowed to make speeches and write books urging the overthrow of the government.	-0.54	0.66	1.20

Factor B-

In examining the statements that received the greatest absolute differences in factor scores for Factor B- when compared to Factor A, a clearer picture also emerges of how different the Factor B- view is from the conventional authoritarian view.

Clearly, the view of Factor B- is more tolerant of individuals who are at the margins of society (i.e., homosexuals, radicals, deviants) and appears to be skeptical of anyone presuming to tell others how to live. Yet, as we have seen before, the Factor B- view is consistent with a call to personal responsibility. This view does not seem to coincide with a modern viewpoint espoused by the Christian Coalition — i.e., a return to “traditional family values,” etc. The

Factor B- view seems reluctant to find a sense of certainty in sticking to past practices (Statement 13) yet eschews the notion that individuals can pursue their own happiness without regard for the consequences of such actions.

Greatest Absolute Differences (Δ) between Factors A and B-

No.	Statement	Z-score		
		A	B-	Δ
10	There is nothing immoral or sick in somebody being a homosexual.	-1.58	1.18	2.76
13	Rules about being “well-mannered” and respectable are chains from the past which we should question very thoroughly before accepting.	-1.30	0.71	2.01
20	The self-righteous “forces of law and order” threaten freedom in our country a lot more than most groups they claim are “radical” and “godless.”	-0.80	1.03	1.83
11	It is important to protect fully the rights of radicals and deviants.	-0.44	1.27	1.71

It is important to remember that the subjects in this phase of the study are the most authoritarian in the original sample, as indicated by the highest scores on Altemeyer’s RWA Scale. Yet, within Factor B, there is support for themes (e.g., sexual liberation) that are inconsistent with a conventional understanding of authoritarianism. According to Altemeyer:

The right-wing authoritarian’s attitudes toward sexual behavior are strongly influenced by his religious principles. Sex outside marriage is basically sinful. Nudity is sinful. Homosexuality is sinful and a perversion. Many sexual acts, even between married partners, are perversions. (1981, 154)

These secondary views, Factors B+ and B-, would therefore go unnoticed by following a conventional psychometric approach involving the averaging of all responses to the scale.³ Q methodology facilitates direct observation of other dynamics at issue within the authoritarian personality.

Factor C: The Youth Liberation Factor

The major themes associated with Factor C revolve around issues of freedom, particularly for young people. Bipolar, like Factor B, Factor C+ tends to support statements that endorse challenges to authority, particularly emanating from the young. The Factor C+ view supports young people who “challenge their parents’ way, confront established authorities” (Statement 29), feel that it

³ Recently, Altemeyer (1996) has presented results that unmarried authoritarians have more permissive attitudes about premarital sex. The Rhoads and Sun (1994) study presented a similar finding among a sample of authoritarian American college students.

Factor C+: Most Positive Loadings

No.	Statement	Z-score
15	“Free speech” means that people should even be allowed to make speeches and write books urging the overthrow of the government.	2.48
29	Students in high school and university must be encouraged to challenge their parents’ ways, confront established authorities, and in general criticize the customs and traditions of our society	1.71
2	It is wonderful that young people today have greater freedom to protest against things they don’t like and to “do their own thing.”	1.17
3	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.	1.00
26	The <i>real</i> keys to the “good life” are obedience, discipline, and sticking to the straight and narrow.	0.88
7	The sooner we get rid of the traditional family structure, where the father is the head of the family and the children are taught to obey authority automatically, the better. The old-fashioned way has a lot wrong with it.	0.81

is “wonderful” that today’s youth may protest (2), and feel the “traditional family where...children are taught to obey authority automatically” has outlived its usefulness (7). Paradoxically, Factor C+ also believes that “it is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities” (3), and the “*real* keys to the good life are obedience, discipline, and sticking to the straight and narrow” (26). An answer to this anomaly can be found by examining the statements most disregarded with by Factor C+. These statements support traditional religions and a degree of social control.

Factor C+ rejects censorship as it applies to keeping “trashy material away from youth” (5), and corporal punishment as an answer to our troubled society (30), hinting again at a concern for youth. Significant support for traditional religions is evident as well (18, 4); which may help to explain the agreement with Statement 3. The statement explicitly mentions religious leaders and it may be that part of the statement that has saliency for Factor C+. It appears that the Factor C+ view is skeptical about protest and protesters generally, but enthusiastic about dissent from established authorities by youth. This factor may well represent a strain of the much-discussed “Generation X” phenomenon. We have been told *ad nauseum* that “20-somethings” are an alienated group in conflict with their 1960s generation parents. The conventional wisdom is that the Generation X group has been overwhelmed by the sheer numbers of “Baby-boomers,” and that their reaction to this

situation has been to disconnect themselves from society. Perhaps the preoccupation with youth in Factor C+ is a reflection of that much written-about generational conflict. On the other hand, this confidence in youth may be a reflection of a much older phenomenon — the natural hubris of youth.

Factor C+: Most Negative Loadings

No.	Statement	Z-score
5	It would be best for everyone if the proper authorities censored magazines and movies to keep the trashy material away from youth.	-1.86
18	Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.	-1.52
11	It is important to protect fully the rights of radicals and deviants.	-1.47
30	One reason we have so many troublemakers in our society nowadays is that parents and other authorities have forgotten that good old-fashioned physical punishment is still one of the best ways to make people behave properly.	-1.20
4	People should pay less attention to the Bible and other traditional forms of religious guidance and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.	-1.07
29	It is best to treat dissenters with leniency and an open mind, since new ideas are the lifeblood of progressive change.	-0.97

Although Factor C- endorses the notion of censorship (5) and corporal punishment (30), the predominant theme is tolerance of dissent. Factor C- is tolerant of atheists (18), radicals and deviants (11), and dissenters (27), and believes individuals should “develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral” (4). However, Factor C- does not believe in free speech that includes making speeches and writing books “urging the overthrow of the government” (15). Most significantly, Factor C- is skeptical of the need for young people to challenge their parents and other authorities (2, 7, 29).

Statements that Distinguish Factor C from Factor A

In looking at the statements that distinguish Factor C+ from Factor A, we can get a clearer picture of how different Factor C+ is from the conventional understanding of authoritarianism. These statements again demonstrate the importance Factor C+ types put on youth and how this emphasis is inconsistent with conventional understandings of the authoritarian dynamic as explained by Altemeyer and others. The salience of Statement 15 is also powerful evidence of the emotional appeal and the privileged status that “free

speech” enjoys in our society, apparently among even some of the most authoritarian types among us.

Turning to those statements that show the greatest differences in factor scores and thus help to distinguish the Factor C- view from the orthodox authoritarian view of Factor A, we again see evidence of a general level of tolerance for outgroups not consistent with authoritarianism.

Greatest Absolute Differences (Δ) between Factors A and C+

No.	Statement	Z-score		
		A	C+	Δ
29	Students in high school and university must be encouraged to challenge their parents’ ways, confront established authorities, and in general criticize the customs and traditions of our society.	-0.89	1.71	2.60
7	The sooner we get rid of the traditional family structure, where the father is the head of the family and the children are taught to obey authority automatically, the better. The old-fashioned way has a lot wrong with it.	-1.80	0.81	2.61
15	“Free speech” means that people should even be allowed to make speeches and write books urging the overthrow of the government.	-0.54	2.47	3.01
2	It is wonderful that young people today have greater freedom to protest against things they don’t like and to “do their own thing.”	0.19	1.17	0.98

Greatest Absolute Differences (Δ) between Factors A and C-

No.	Statement	Z-score		
		A	C-	Δ
4	People should pay less attention to the Bible and other traditional forms of religious guidance and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.	-1.43	1.07	2.50
18	Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.	-0.56	1.52	2.08
10	There is nothing immoral or sick in somebody being a homosexual.	-1.58	0.34	1.92
11	It is important to protect fully the rights of radicals and deviants.	-0.44	1.47	1.91

The obvious pattern of these statements is the tolerance expressed in Factor C- for outgroups (atheists, homosexuals, radicals and deviants). Additionally, support is given to developing individual standards of morality (4). The bipolar views of Factor C in various respects contradict the traditional understanding of authoritarianism as measured by the RWA Scale. It is becoming clearer that diversity exists among these authoritarians.

Statements that Distinguish Factor C from Factor B

Two viewpoints have emerged, albeit of a secondary nature, which are independent of and different from conventional authoritarianism. It has been demonstrated that Factors B and C are different from Factor A, the authoritarian factor. But, how do Factors B and C differ?

Because both Factors B and C are bipolar, it will be useful to illustrate the differences by selecting a few statements that represent each pole of the factors but are of little import to the other. In this way, it is possible to demonstrate what salient themes are unique to each factor.

Selected Distinguishing Statements Associated with Factors B and C

No.	Statement	Factor Z-scores			
		B+	B-	C+	C-
8	There is nothing wrong with premarital sex.	3.18*	-3.18	0-.72	0.72
10	There is nothing immoral or sick in somebody being a homosexual.	-1.18	1.18*	-0.34	0.34
15	“Free speech” means that people should be allowed to make speeches and write books urging the overthrow of the government.	0.66	-0.66	2.47*	-2.47
29	Students in high school and university must be encouraged to challenge their parents’ ways, confront established authorities, and in general criticize the customs and traditions of our society.	-0.07	0.07	1.71*	-1.71
18	Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.	-0.16	0.16	-1.52	1.52*

* Loadings are significant at the 0.05 level and distinguish the factor.

In looking at the statements and their respective factor scores within each factor, it is clear that the view of Factor B+ is concerned with sexual issues and the rejection of Statement 10 by B+ indicates that the anti-authoritarian

notions of sexual liberation are not extended to homosexuals. Conversely, Factor B- disagrees that there is something “immoral or sick” in being a homosexual (10), but does not approve of premarital sexual intercourse. Two statements were selected as representative of a Factor C+ view that gained little support in Factor B. Factor C+ gives voice to support for “free speech” and dissent; particularly challenges to established authorities, while Factor C- gives support to established religions and disagrees with “atheists and others who have rebelled” (18). In short, Factor B revolves around issues of sexuality and Factor C is concerned with issues of dissent and authority.

Part I Summary and Conclusions

It is important to pause and note what has been accomplished in this first part of the study. The data presented here have been instructive in demonstrating that salient views are present among these authoritarians other than simply the classic view reflected in Altemeyer’s scale. This work shows how a different data analysis procedure, Q factor analysis, permits us to see other themes that may be important to a new understanding of the authoritarian personality. There are at least 2 other views that exist simultaneously with that of the traditional authoritarian and can be explored to complement our concept of authoritarianism. Factor B is primarily concerned with sexual “goings-on,” but not in the Berkeley Group’s sense. Factor B+ is interested in heterosexual liberation, and this interest is not compatible with the traditional view of a prudish authoritarian. Factor B+ also gives support to some of the tenets of democracy (free speech, individual liberty) that are anathema to traditional authoritarians. Such support for at least part of the democratic ethos further helps to distinguish Factor B+ from classic notions of authoritarianism. Factor B- gives support to “outgroups” in society and is dubious of established rules for living. These are also ideas that run contrary to conventional understandings of the authoritarian dynamic. Factor C+ supports challenges to the established norms and authorities by young people, while Factor C- is tolerant of dissent by societal outgroups. Factor C, like Factor B, is not representative of orthodox authoritarianism.

Factors B and C are real and contrast sharply with the view of authoritarianism reflected in Factor A that has been relied on for the past 50 years. Q analysis uncovered different levels of thinking — different viewpoints — which the *most* authoritarian individuals in our study have rendered operant. The significance of discovering these other themata and nuances is not merely to suggest creating new scales to measure them. Rather, the real significance of these findings is to call into question once again, more generally, the use of the scaling technique itself. These themes have gone unnoticed in the traditional psychometric approach, and the picture commonly associated with authoritarianism consequently has been incomplete.

Q methodology returns us to the primary focus of the Berkeley Group, which was to study the dynamics of authoritarianism. The Berkeley Group considered the F Scale merely a shorthand convenience to determine which subjects would make the most compelling case studies for intensive analysis. However, the interviews conducted by Frenkel-Brunswick have come under severe criticism from scholars who argue that her technique lacked clarity. For example, Altemeyer (1981; 1988) has taken to task the entire psychoanalytic approach. It is almost as if Frenkel-Brunswick was criticized for going on a “fishing expedition” in trying to come up with plausible explanations for the development of the authoritarian dynamic in an individual. It is remarkable after all these years that most of the criticism leveled at her is not in *what* she discovered but in *how* she discovered it. Most scholars of authoritarianism acknowledge the main focus of Frenkel-Brunswick’s work — the central role played by parents and other authorities in the development of authoritarianism in children.

Q methodology now permits us to approach intensive analysis with a precision that the Berkeley Group lacked. Interviews can be conducted with those authoritarians associated with the views of Factors B (and/or C) to gain additional insight into the personality syndrome. Two Factor B+ subjects were interviewed at length to see whether their narratives could add further to our understanding of authoritarianism. Further exploration of the underlying nature of authoritarianism is the objective in Part II of this study, where one subject used statements from his narrative as a vehicle for deeper self-reflection.

References

- Ackermann, R.J. 1985. *Data, instruments, and theory*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D., and Sanford, R.N. 1950. *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper.
- Altemeyer, B. 1981. *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- 1988. *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- 1996. *The Authoritarian Specter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Atkinson, J. 1992. *Q Method*. (A computerized statistical program). Kent, Ohio: Kent State University.
- Bass, B.M. 1956. Development and evaluation of acquiescence set for authoritarianism. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology* 53:296-9.
- Brown, S.R. 1980. *Political subjectivity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Camileri, S.F. 1959. Factor analysis on the F-scale. *Social Forces* 37:316-23.
- Eysenck, H.J. 1954. Review of W. Stephenson, The study of behavior: Q technique and its methodology. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 45:374-6.
- Heaven, P.C.L. and Connors, J. 1988. Politics and toughmindedness. *Journal of Social Psychology* 128:217-22.
- Hofstaetter, P.R. 1952. A factorial study of prejudice. *Journal of Personality* 21:228-39.
- Hyman, H.H. and P.B. Sheatsley. 1954. The authoritarian personality: A methodological critique. In *Studies in the scope and method of the authoritarian personality*. Ed. R. Christie and M. Jahoda. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Kline, P. and Cooper, C. 1984. A factorial analysis of the authoritarian personality. *British Journal of Psychology* 75:171-6.
- Lipset, S.M. 1959. Democracy and working-class authoritarianism. *American Sociological Review* 24:482-501.
- Ray, J.J. 1976. Do authoritarians hold authoritarian attitudes? *Human Relations* 29:307-25.
- Rhoads, J.C. and Sun, T.W. 1994. Studying authoritarianism: Toward an alternative methodology. *Southeastern Political Review* 22:159-70.
- Rokeach, M. 1960. *The open and closed mind: Investigations into the nature of belief systems and personality systems*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rohrbaugh, M.J. 1997. How Crucial is Q-Sorting to Q-Methodology? Paper presented at the meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Krakow, Poland, July 22, 1997.
- Samelson, F. 1964. Agreement set and anticontent attitudes in the F Scale: A reinterpretation. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 68:338-42.
- Shils, E. 1954. Authoritarianism: "right" and "left." In *Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality*. Ed. R. Christie and M. Jahoda. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Stephenson, W. 1953. *The study of behavior: Q technique and its methodology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1990. Fifty years of exclusionary psychometrics: 1. Q technique. *Operant Subjectivity* 13:105-20.
- Struening, E.L. and Richardson, A.H. 1965. Factor analytic exploration of the alienation, anomie, and authoritarian domain. *American Sociological Review* 30:768-76.

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.¹

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).

¹ 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

Q Sort	Condition	X	Y	Z
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 Riesman'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 circumbiambient 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

No.	Statement	X	Y	Z
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

No.	Statement	Z-score
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.²

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

² 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

No.	Statement	Z-score
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

No.	Statement	Z-score
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

No.	Statement	Z-score
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

No.	Statement	Z-score
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

No.	Statement	Z-score
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

No.	Statement	X	Y	Z
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 multi-dimensional. 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.