Masters Theses & Specialist Projects   Graduate School

6-1993

The Relationship of the Authoritarian Personality & Social Identity Theory

James Lindsey
Western Kentucky University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses

Part of the Psychology Commons

Lindsey,

James Steven

1993

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE AUTHORITARIAN PERSONALITY

AND SOCIAL IDENTITY THEORY

A THESIS

PRESENTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

BOWLING GREEN, KENTUCKY

.

In Partial Fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Master of Arts

by

James Steven Lindsey

June 1993

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF THESIS

Permission is hereby

☒ granted to the Western Kentucky University Library to make, or allow to be made photocopies, microfilm or other copies of this thesis for appropriate research for scholarly purposes.

☐ reserved to the author for the making of any copies of this thesis except for brief sections for research or scholarly purposes.

Signed: *James Steven Lindsay*

Date: 6/28/93

Please place an "X" in the appropriate box.

This form will be filed with the original of the thesis and will control future use of the thesis.

The Relationship of The Authoritarian Personality

And Social Identity Theory

Date Recommended _June 7, 1993_

Director of Thesis

College Dean 6-10-93
Date

Graduate Studies 6-10-93
Date

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Sam McFarland for the time and energy spent on helping me as the director of my thesis. I would also like to thank Dr. John Bruni and Dr. Jackie Pope for their assistance in reading and revising my material and helping to bring my thesis to completion. I would especially like to thank my wife, Joan, for the support and patience extended to me throughout this whole process. And finally I would like to express my gratitude to my children, Steven, Kasey, and Mark, for the time I was allowed to work on this project which I would have spent with them.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Appendices

ABSTRACT

Since social identity theory and authoritarian personality theory have been presented as opposing theories of discrimination, the present experiment explored whether authoritarianism could explain discrimination in social identity theory's minimal group paradigm. High, high average, low average, and low authoritarians were given three measures of in-group favoritism in minimal groups (two point-distribution tasks and a group-rating task). An authoritarianism main effect and an authoritarianism by order interaction on the point-distribution tasks indicated that authoritarianism significantly enhanced discrimination, but only when these tasks followed the group-rating measure. This interaction indicates that authoritarianism has greater influence on discrimination as in-group/out-group distinctions are made more salient. Authoritarianism did not influence discrimination in group ratings. Social identity theory proposes that individuals use discrimination to enhance their self-esteem, but only high authoritarians appeared to do so in this study.

The Relationship of The Authoritarian Personality and

Minimal Group Situational Bias

Introduction

Proponents of two opposing views have tried to account
for in-group favoritism and out-group discrimination. With
the publication of The Authoritarian Personality, Adorno and
his colleagues (Adorno, Frenkl-Brunswik, Levinson, &
Sanford, 1950) presented research supporting individual
personality dynamics as a principal reason for this
favoritism and discrimination. According to social identity
theory, however, in-group favoritism and discrimination
against outgroups are not based on individual personality
differences but are situationally-determined biases related
to the processes of group identification. Social identity
theorists have argued that modern intergroup destructiveness
and genocide, such as the war on the Kurds by Iraq and the
ethnic cleansing of the Bosnians in what was Yugoslavia, are
the product of intergroup dynamics. They have argued that
those approaches which try to reduce these horrors to the
dynamic of the individual (as authoritarian personality
theory appears to do) are of little value. Concerning
social identity theory, Hogg and Abrams (1988) stated, "The
principal and explicit aim was to forge a non-reductionistic
social psychology...social identity theory has developed as
a spearhead of this attack on individualism in social
psychology" (p. 13).

While each of these approaches has produced fruitful research, they have rarely been pitted against one another in explicit experiments designed to determine whether one or both of these approaches are needed to explain intergroup discrimination. The goal of the present study is to examine this issue by means of a laboratory experiment.

Literature Review

Authoritarianism

In Europe during the 1930's the growing popular support for dictatorships led Erich Fromm to describe those who scorn freedom, are attracted to dictators, and display hatred and aggression toward outgroups as "authoritarian" (Fromm, 1941). At about the same time, because of the persecution of the Jews in Nazi Germany, Adorno and his colleagues (Adorno et al., 1950) sought to find psychological causes of anti-semitism; this search led eventually to the first empirical definition and studies of authoritarianism, published as the classic The Authoritarian Personality (Adorno et al., 1950). Empirical studies of anti-semitism revealed that anti-semitism was a facet of a larger cluster of prejudices which the Adorno group labeled ethnocentrisim. Clinical studies contrasting high and low ethnocentric individuals suggested that ethnocentrism's origins lay in a personality syndrome of nine interrelated components:

Conventionalism: Rigid adherence to conventional

values; <u>Authoritarian Submission</u>: Submission,
uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities
of the in-group; <u>Authoritarian Aggression</u>: Tendency to
be on the lookout for, and to condemn, reject, and
punish people who violate conventional values;
<u>Anti-intraception</u>: Opposition to the subjective, the
imaginative, the tender-minded; <u>Superstition and</u>
<u>Stereotypy</u>: The belief in mystical determinants of fate
and the disposition to think in rigid categories; <u>Power</u>
<u>and Toughness</u>: Preoccupation with the dominance-
submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension;
identification with power figures; ...exaggerated
assertion of strength and toughness; <u>Destructiveness</u>
<u>and Cynicism</u>: Generalized hostility, vilification of
the human; <u>Projectivity</u>: The disposition to believe
that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the
projection outward of unconscious emotional impulses;
<u>Sex</u>: Exaggerated concern with sexual "goings-on."
(Adorno et al., 1950, pp. 255-257)

The Fascism or F-scale was designed to measure these nine
attributes which were cumulatively called "the authoritarian
personality." Adorno et al.'s (1950) F-Scale has probably
been used and revised more than any other scale used for the
purpose of measuring individual differences in personality.

The <u>Authoritarian Personality</u> was criticized quickly
for both methodological and theoretical shortcomings

(Altemeyer, 1981; Christie & Jahoda, 1954; Dillehay, 1978).
Methodologically, since all items on the authoritarian,
ethnocentrism, and anti-semitism scales were worded in the
pro-authoritarian direction, these scales are confounded
with a tendency to acquiesce; this tendency could inflate
greatly the correlations among these scales and between them
and other measures. Many balanced authoritarianism scales
have been developed to address this criticism; among them,
Altemeyer's (1981, 1988) 30-item Right-Wing Authoritarianism
Scale (RWA) has the most thorough evidence of internal
consistency and construct validity. In Altemeyer's studies
(Altemeyer, 1981), the RWA had alpha reliabilities of .86 to
.89.

From Adorno et al. (1950) to the present, the
authoritarian personality has consistently predicted a
general tendency toward strong in-group favoritism and
discrimination against outgroups. Adorno et al. (1950)
found that on large, adult samples the F-scale correlated
.73 with anti-semitism and .80 with general ethnocentrism.
As noted earlier, however, these correlations may be
inflated because all of the Adorno et al. scales contain
only positively worded items. Using balanced scales,
Altemeyer (1981) found that his RWA and his own measure of
general prejudice correlated only .43, much less than in the
original Adorno et al. studies. However, later studies
using balanced scales have reported correlations in the

.60's (see Meleon, Hagendoorn, Raaijmakers, and Visser, 1988
for a summary). Authoritarianism also predicts
discrimination based on sex (against women), nationality,
and political or moral ideology. In recent work in the
Soviet Union (McFarland, Ageyev, & Abalakina, 1992), a
Russian-language RWA scale predicted nine prejudices
measured by balanced scales ranging from .34 (against women)
to .74 (against those who favor democracy); the unrotated
general factor scores obtained from a principal components
analysis of these nine prejudices correlated .82 with RWA.

Social Identity Theory

To social identity theorists, the problem of in-group
favoritism and out-group discrimination is strongly based in
group membership instead of individual personality dynamics
(Tajfel, 1970). It is group membership which initially
confers on one a social identity, and this social identity
is, in turn, the root of major elements of self-esteem.
Group membership, per se, leads to a cognitive accentuation
of differences, even if the groups are composed merely of a
continuous series of eight lines with the four shorter
simply labeled "A" and the latter labeled "B" (Tajfel &
Wilkes, 1963). When applied to ingroups and outgroups, this
cognitive categorization leads to an exaggeration of
similarity of members within one's group and of differences
from other groups. Further, this cognitive accentuation is

exacerbated by the universal human need for self-esteem, which, whenever group categorization is made salient, strengthens in-group favoritism. Social identity theory suggests that the mere categorization of subjects into groups leads to an orientation of relative in-group favoritism. Social identity theory also suggests that subjects will discriminate in favor of their own group even when the group definitions are artificial and when there is no competitiveness or conflict between the groups.

Following this logic, Tajfel (1970) introduced the "minimal group paradigm" as a central method for testing social identity theory. In the minimal group paradigm cues used to make group differences salient are kept as minimal as possible. In Tajfel's (1970) first study, participants who knew each other were asked to make a judgment as to the number of dots in dot clusters flashed on a screen. The participants next were divided into groups on the basis of these judgments. They were then asked to divide points worth a nominal amount of money between a member of their own group (other than themselves) and a member of the other group. This simple group differentiation induced significant in-group favoritism. In a second study, 48 boys were shown six reproductions of paintings by Paul Klee and six by Wassily Kandinsky without their signatures. The participants were then randomly assigned to one of two groups according to which artist's paintings they preferred.

The participants then circled one pair of numbers from each of eighteen matrices. The numbers represented a nominal amount of money to be given to a member of their own group (other than oneself) and a member of the other group. The matrices were designed so that participants could assign points on four different bases: equality; the largest possible joint profit to both people; the largest possible award to a member of the ingroup; or the largest possible difference in favor of the in-group member. The following matrix is an example:

<u>2081 Overestimator</u>   19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 9 8 7

<u>2418 Underestimator</u>   1 3 5 7 9 11 13 15 17 19 21 23 25

Participants were required to circle a pair of points (such as 15/9, above) that represented points they wanted to give to the in-group and out-group members. In this example, participants could use the principle of equality (13/13), maximum in-group profit (19/1), or maximum joint profit (7/25). The numbers 2081 & 2418 are fictitious codes to make it appear they represented specific individuals of each group. Tajfel's version used in the present study contains 12 matrices and is found in Turner, Brown, and Tajfel (1979). According to Tajfel's results:

> . . .when the subjects had a choice between maximizing the profit for all and maximizing the profit for members of their own group, they acted on behalf of their own group. When they had a choice between profit

for all and for their own group combined, as against their own group's winning more than the outgroup at the sacrifice of both of these utilitarian advantages, it was the maximization of difference that seemed more important to them. (pp. 101-102)

So it appears that discrimination can occur whenever there is a minimal distinction of group membership. In subsequent research (Brewer & Silver, 1978), some randomly assigned subjects were led to believe they were divided according to their ratings of 12 paintings as in Tajfel's (1970) study; others were told their ratings were so similar that they had to be divided randomly. In the last instance, care was taken to make the two groups not appear dissimilar. The subject's ratings were still biased in favor of the ingroup.

This in-group bias in minimal group situations not only appears to be evident in tasks assigning points for a reward but in ratings of social and intellectual characteristics. In a study by Locksley, Ortiz, and Hepburn (1980), subjects randomly assigned to two groups were asked to rate members of both groups on socially desirable (i.e., good-natured, trustworthy, sincere) and undesirable (i.e., unpredictable, self-centered, unfriendly) characteristics. The summed trait ratings revealed that subjects were significantly more likely to rate the ingroup in a sociably desirable direction than they were the outgroup, $\underline{t}(16) = 2.22$, $\underline{p} < .05$.

Furthermore, as social identity theory proposes, several studies have indicated that in-group favoritism is based in part on the need to enhance self-esteem. In a study by Oakes and Turner (1980), minimal group participants who showed in-group favoritism reported higher self-esteem than control subjects. In a study by Meindl and Lerner (1985), subjects whose self-esteem was artificially lowered by a clumsy embarrassment discriminated more against an outgroup than did a control group. Finally, Lemyre and Smith (1985) demonstrated that the very act of discriminating in the minimal group appears to enhance self-esteem.

Relation of Authoritarianism and In-group/Out-group Bias

Not all participants in minimal groups studies show in-group favoritism. In the original Tajfel (1970) study, 41% of the subjects distributed points equally and did not show any discrimination between the ingroup and outgroup. This finding indicates that other factors such as personality differences may actually determine who discriminates in minimal groups. The authoritarian personality is the most likely personality difference to cause this discrimination. Since authoritarianism predicts a general tendency to discriminate against outgroups, it may be that discrimination against minimal outgroups is largely a function of the authoritarianism of the participants. In addition, if authoritarianism explains discrimination

against minimal groups, and if this discrimination is used to enhance self-esteem, it plausibly follows that only high authoritarians will use minimal group discrimination for self-esteem enhancement.

Only one study has examined the possible relationship between authoritarianism and discrimination in minimal or artificial groups. Downing and Monaco (1986) randomly assigned 227 skiers at a resort to two groups for identical skiing instruction. Participants within each group were exposed to one of three different levels of intergroup contact (i.e., minimal, moderate, maximum). Examining each level of authoritarianism separately, subjects above the mean in authoritarianism rated in-group members as better skiers and out-group members as worse skiers than did subjects who were below the mean, and only those above the authoritarianism mean displayed an in-group minus out-group bias. For high authoritarians, increased contact resulted in greater bias. Those low in authoritarianism showed no in-group favoritism regardless of the level of intergroup contact.

These results do not support the need for social identity theory. If only high authoritarians discriminate, then the minimal group paradigm explains nothing and the authoritarianism personality explains all favoritism and discrimination. Just as high authoritarians discriminate against outgroups in the real world, they also discriminate

against artificial outgroups. Finally, if only high authoritarians discriminate in minimal or artificial groups, and if this discrimination is used to enhance self-esteem, it follows that a correlation between discrimination and self-esteem will be found only for high authoritarians.

However, the Downing and Monaco (1986) study used only one manipulation, one sample, and one dependent measure of discrimination and is far too limited to offer sweeping condemnation of social identity theory and of the minimal group paradigm. The present study offers a conceptual replication with different bases for group discrimination and several dependent measures.

Hypotheses

From the preceding logic and research, two hypotheses are proposed. First, discrimination in minimal groups will be positively related to the authoritarianism of the participants. In the present study, participants will be divided into low, low average, high average, and high authoritarians in an analysis of variance design. A main effect for authoritarianism is predicted, with high authoritarians displaying the greatest in-group favoritism and low authoritarians displaying the least. Second, authoritarianism will be positively related to the degree that participants use in-group favoritism for self-esteem maintenance. Experimentally, the correlation between self-esteem and in-group favoritism should be greatest for

high authoritarian participants and least for the low authoritarians.

Method

Subjects

Participants for this study were 153 college students (92 females and 61 males) from 100-level psychology classes at Western Kentucky University. These students attended out-of-class sessions and received course credit for participating.

Data Collection

This experiment was run in eight sessions of 15 to 30 participants each. In each session, participants were given a series of tasks lasting approximately one hour. To insure consistency in data collection, instructions were standardized and identical copies were used by the two experimenters conducting the study. For reasons made clear below, two experimenters were necessary in each session.

Procedure

In order not to bias the study, at the beginning of each session the students were informed that all details would not be explained and that they were free to discontinue their participation at any time. To insure anonymity, the students were instructed not to put their names on any of the materials. Participants were asked to write a 4-digit code followed by M or F (male or female) on each packet of material. All tasks were handed out in

written form and the instructions were read orally by the experimenters.

Subjects were first given an "overestimator-underestimator task" of estimating several different quantities of displayed or known items: A) the number of beans displayed in a clear glass jar, B) the distance in feet of the walkway around the Downing University Center, C) the weight in pounds of a lead bar, D) the number of cups of water it would take to fill a pan, and E) the number of seconds they were asked to sit with their eyes closed. The students recorded their estimates on a prepared answered sheet (see Appendix A). The answer sheets were collected, and the students were told their answers would be scored in a nearby room by a group of graduate students.

While these were being "scored," a second experimenter administered Altemeyer's (1981, 1988) Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale (see Appendix B). The first experimenter and a confederate returned with the rest of the tasks and a list of approximately half of the students' four-digit codes. A confederate graduate student was used to make it appear reasonable that a group of graduate students had scored the first task. The list of four-digit codes was read aloud and the individuals who used these codes were asked to accompany one of the experimenters to a nearby room.

After the two groups were separated, both groups were

told that previous research indicated that people tend to consistently either overestimate or underestimate different quantities. Each group was told they were overestimators. By doing so, it was implied but not stated that those in the other room were underestimators. All implications of competition, of other psychological qualities associated with over or underestimators, or of any superiority-inferiority were carefully avoided to keep the groups truly "minimal."

Three dependent measures of minimal group discrimination were next introduced. First, using the original Tajfel (1970) measure (see Appendix C), participants selected one pair from 13 pairs of numbers as described above.

A second similar task by Brewer and Silver (1978) was also used (see Appendix D). An example of the Brewer and Silver task follows:

	Payoff		
Group	0	1	Answers
2418 Overestimator	7	8	A1____
2081 Underestimator	9	4	

In this Brewer and Silver matrix participants could choose either payoff pair 0, which would give a member of their own group (other than oneself) 7 points and a member of the other group 9 points or payoff pair 1, which would give 8 points to a member of their own group and 4 points to a

member of the other group. The Brewer and Silver measure had 8 payoff pairs. This measure was used because of ongoing dispute about possible confounding in the Tajfel measure (Bornstein et al., 1983a, 1983b; Brewer & Silver, 1978; Turner, 1983a, 1983b). Because of this dispute, Lemyre and Smith (1985) also used both of these measures. In order to give meaning to these tasks, the participants were told that a block of twenty movie tickets from a local theater would be distributed to a particular member of their group and to a particular member of the other group depending upon the proportion of points each person received in the point-assignment tasks.

A third dependent measure of a different type was adapted from Thompson and Crocker (1990), who asked participants to rate how true each of 16 traits were for the average person in both the ingroup and the outgroup. In the present study, three positive and three negative traits reflected a social dimension (i.e., friendly, self-centered) and three positive and negative traits reflected an intellectual dimension (i.e., creative, stupid; see Appendix E). The discrimination score on each trait for each participant was the difference between the ratings for the ingroup and outgroup, and the sum of these 12 differences comprised a trait-rating discrimination score.

To control for possible fatigue and interactive effects of the two types of tests, the three dependent measures were

presented in two orders. Order 1 started with the Tajfel
task, followed by the Brewer and Silver task, and then the
trait rating task. Order 2 began with the trait-rating
task, followed by the Tajfel and Brewer-Silver tasks. The
Brewer and Silver task always followed the Tajfel task.

Finally, the Sherwood self-esteem scale was
administered (Robinson & Shaver, 1973; see Appendix F).
This 15-item scale used item pairs such as self
confident-lack of self confidence and with 11 spaces between
each opposing pair.

A sample item is as follows:

Calm :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: Anxious
Each participant marked an X in one of the spaces provided
between each pair of opposing traits to express how they
felt about themselves.

Before beginning the study, participants were
instructed that debriefing would be held in their regular
classrooms after all data had been collected. This was done
so that knowledge of the true nature of the study would not
influence those who had as yet not participated. Debriefing
was carried out by one of the experimenters except in a few
instances where the teachers stated their classroom schedule
was too busy for a formal debriefing. In these cases the
teachers were instructed in the study so they could relay
the debriefing information at their own convenience.
Participants were given brief overviews of the authoritarian

personality, of social identity theory, and of the minimal group paradigm. They were explained the false division of groups and the hypotheses of the study. A short question and answer period then gave the participants the opportunity to ask further questions about the study and its purpose.

Results

Each item on the Tajfel and Brewer-Silver tasks was scored for the degree of discrimination in favor of the ingroup. The Tajfel and Brewer-Silver measures had internal consistencies of .78 and .74, respectively. Further, these two measures were highly correlated, $r(152) = .59$, $p < .01$ suggesting little differential validity. The revised Thompson and Crocker measure was reduced from 12 to 11 items because one social-negative item ("inconsiderate") was accidentally omitted when the questionnaire was printed. The alpha for the remaining 11 items was only .44. By deleting 3 items with very low item-total correlations ("intuitive," "insightful," and "slow problem-solver"), the alpha for the remaining 8-item scale was raised to .54. This revised Thompson and Crocker measure correlated with the Tajfel and Brewer-Silver measures only .15 and .05, ns in both cases. Across all participants, the Tajfel and Brewer-Silver measures showed substantial in-group favoritism. On the Tajfel measure about 30% maximized in-group favoritism, and another 22% maximized equality with most of the others choosing between these two ideals. The

results of the Brewer and Silver task were similar; 18%
maximized equality and 41% maximized in-group advantage.
The rest of the participants chose between these two ideals.
The trait-rating task showed only a slight tendency toward
in-group favoritism of 2.63 for the entire scale, or about
.25 of a point for each of the eight 7-point rating scales.
The means, standard deviations and alphas are presented in
Table 1.

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Alphas

	$\overline{X}$	SD	Alpha
Authoritarianism	110.74	22.26	.90
Tajfel Task	89.33	22.51	.78
Brewer/Silver Task	2.64	1.41	.74
Trait Ratings(8 items)	2.63	6.59	.54
Self-esteem	94.83	11.12	.65

The major independent measure for this study was the
four levels (high, high average, low average, low) of
authoritarianism. Those one standard deviation above and
below the mean were grouped as high and low authoritarians,
respectively, those between one standard deviation below the
mean and the mean were grouped as low average, and those
from the mean to one standard deviation above the mean were
grouped as high average. Since the Tajfel and Brewer-Silver
results were so highly correlated and analysis of variance
on these two measures yielded the same significant effects,

the sums of their standardized scores were used as a simplified standardized dependent variable. The alpha for this combined scale, based on the standardized item scores from all items of the Tajfel and Brewer-Silver tasks, was .82.

The standardized cell means are presented in Table 2. In support of the first hypothesis, with overall standardized means of -.34, .10, .06, and .53 for the low, low average, high average, and high authoritarians, the main effect for authoritarians was significant, F (3, 152) = 3.66, p <.02, Eta^2 = .057, indicating that authoritarianism significantly influenced in-group favoritism on the Tajfel and Brewer-Silver tasks. There was no main effect for order of presentation, F (2, 152) = .421, ns. Contrary to hypothesis 1, an authoritarianism X order interaction, F (3, 152) = 3.16, p <.03, Eta^2 = .038, indicated that the effect of authoritarianism was much stronger when these two measures followed rather than preceded the trait-rating task.

However, despite the significant main effect, authoritarianism actually influenced discrimination only in the second order. One-way analyses of variance within each order indicated no authoritarianism effect in order 1, F < 1.0, eta^2 = .02, but a strong effect for order 2, F (3, 85) = 5.4339, p <.002, Eta^2 = .17. Correlational analysis within each order supported these results: In order 1 there was no

Table 2

Standardized Means of In-group Favoritism by Level of

Authoritarianism and Order of Presentation.

	Order	
	1	2
Authoritarianism:		
Low	.03	-.63
	(13)	(17)
Low average	.38	-.04
	(15)	(30)
High average	.06	.05
	(26)	(27)
High	.13	.96
	(13)	(12)

Note: In order 1, the Tajfel and Brewer/Silver tasks
preceded the group rating tasks. In order 2, these tasks
followed the group rating task. The numbers in the ( ) are
the number of subjects in each situation.

correlation between authoritarianism and discrimination on
the Tajfel task, the Brewer-Silver task, or the standardized
scores, r = -.05, .02, -.02, respectively. However, in
order 2 authoritarianism was correlated significantly with
the Tajfel task, $r(85)$ = .31, p <.01; the Brewer-Silver
task, $r(85)$ = .37, p <.001; and the standardized scores,
$r(85)$ = .38, p <.001.

The sample on the trait-rating task tended slightly

toward in-group favoritism. However, neither authoritarianism, F (3, 152) = 1.89, p <.13, nor the authoritarianism by order interaction, F (3, 152) = 1.49, p <.22, was significant.

Hypothesis 2 was partially supported, in that in-group favoritism correlated with enhancement of self-esteem only for high authoritarians. The standardized Tajfel and Brewer-Silver in-group favoritism measure correlated with the Sherwood self-esteem, r(24) = .41, p <.05, for high authoritarians. For the remaining three groups, this standardized score correlated with self-esteem r = .00, -.22, and -.10, ns, for low, low average, and high average authoritarians, respectively.

Discussion

The current results indicate that authoritarianism accounts for part, but by no means all, of the tendency toward in-group favoritism in minimal groups and that it does so only in certain circumstances. When the Tajfel and Brewer-Silver tasks were presented before the trait rating task, authoritarianism did not account for any variance in in-group favoritism. However, when these tasks were presented after the trait-rating task, authoritarianism accounted for 14.5% of the in-group favoritism variance.

While authoritarianism had an influence on the Tajfel and Brewer-Silver tasks it had no influence on the trait-rating task. The low reliability of the trait-rating task

undoubtedly contributed to the absence of significant effects. Had the alpha for the trait-rating task been comparable to the alphas for the other tasks, the influence of authoritarianism on the trait-rating task probably would have been significant also. Even with an alpha of .54, the main effect with authoritarianism approached significance.

The following post-hoc interpretation for this order effect seems plausible. In the present study, while the trait-rating task showed no authoritarian effects, this task probably served to make the group distinction more salient for the respondents prior to engaging in the Tajfel and Brewer-Silver tasks. Thus, when presented in the second order, authoritarianism significantly influenced in-group favoritism. Consistent with Downing and Monaco's (1986) result cited earlier, it appears authoritarianism has more influence on discrimination as group differentiation becomes more salient; when the trait-rating measure was presented first it appears to have provided a salience cue for group distinction. Perhaps, as in the real world, if the group distinctions were made even more salient, authoritarianism would explain even greater proportions of variance in discrimination.

However, while discrimination occurred in both orders and at all levels of authoritarianism, there were consistent individual differences in discrimination within each condition. Participants in both orders across all levels of

authoritarianism had good internal consistency on both the Tajfel and the Brewer-Silver tasks. Alphas in the 16 task-condition combinations (2 orders x 4 levels of authoritarianism x 2 tasks) ranged from .66 to .85, with a median of .82. Even though in order 1 this discrimination was not explained by authoritarianism, the internal consistency of discrimination within each condition means that some unidentified individual difference was clearly operative.

The implication of this finding is that, contrary to social identity theory, discrimination is not based on group identity per se, but on individual differences in reactions to group identification. The social identity theory assumption that discrimination is due only to identity with the in-group for all individuals is not supported. Since discrimination was due to authoritarianism and to some other form of individual difference, individual differences theories appear to be most useful.

The results of this study offer limited support for the social identity theory view that in-group favoritism is used to enhance self-esteem. However, since discrimination was related to self-esteem only for high authoritarians, the data supports this view only for those individuals. For the rest of the participants, the degree of in-group favoritism was unrelated to self-esteem.

A major limitation of this result is that self-esteem

was only measured after the discrimination tasks. By not also using a pretask measurement of self-esteem, the actual change in each individual's self-esteem ratings was not measured. The discrimination/self-esteem correlation obtained for the high authoritarians is therefore only a crude indicator that discrimination enhanced self-esteem for high authoritarians.

The post-hoc suggestion that saliency enhances the authoritarian-discrimination relationship can be tested directly. By systematically increasing saliency across several experimental conditions, the amount of discrimination due to authoritarianism in these conditions can be assessed. For example, in a four-levels of salience experiment, saliency in the first condition could be truly minimal, with groups only given a name but no description of the groups. In a second condition a paragraph could be read describing each group, but still without any suggestion of superiority-inferiority or of group competition. In a third condition the groups could be described and future competition between the groups implied. And, in a fourth condition, the groups can be described and take part in a competitive task prior to the discrimination tasks. An appropriate hypothesis is that as group saliency increases, discrimination will be more a function of authoritarianism.

The question arises whether minimal-group discrimination, like authoritarianism, is predictive of

prejudices in the real world. An interesting study would be to use both authoritarianism and minimal-group discrimination as predictors of discrimination against real-world outgroups. Regression analysis could determine if minimal-group discrimination contributes any unique variance beyond authoritarianism in real-world discriminations. Despite the publicity social identity theory has received, there is no evidence to date that discrimination in minimal groups is at all related to discrimination in the real-world.

References

Adorno, T. W., Frenkl-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. J., &
Sanford, R. N. (1950). The authoritarian personality.
New York: Harper and Row.

Altemeyer, B. (1981). Right-wing authoritarianism.
Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Altemeyer, B. (1988). Enemies of freedom: Understanding
right-wing authoritarianism. San Francisco and London:
Jossey-Bass.

Bornstein, G., Crum, L., Whittenbraker, J., Harring, K.,
Insko, C. A., & Thibaut, J. (1983a). On the measure-
ment of social orientations in the minimal group
paradigm. European Journal of Social Psychology, 13,
321-350.

Bornstein, G., Crum, L., Whittenbraker, J., Harring, K.,
Insko, C. A., & Thibaut, J. (1983b). Reply to
Turner's comments. European Journal of Social
Psychology, 13, 369-381

Brewer, M. B., & Silver, M. (1978). In-group bias as a
function of task characteristics. European Journal of
Social Psychology, 8, 393-400.

Christie, R., & Jahoda, M. (Eds.). (1954). Studies in the
scope and method of "The Authoritarian Personality."
Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Dillehay, R. (1978). Authoritarianism. In H. London and
J. Exner, Jr. (Eds.). Dimensions of personality (pp.
85-128). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Downing, L. L., & Monaco, N. R. (1986). In-Group/out-
group bias as a function of differential contact and
authoritarian personality. Journal of Social
Psychology, 126, 445-452.

Fromm, E. (1941). Escape from freedom. New York:
Rinehart.

Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1988). Social identifications:
A social psychology of intergroup relations and group
processes. London: Routledge.

Lemyre, L., & Smith, P. M. (1985). Intergroup
discrimination and self-esteem in the minimal group
paradigm. Journal of Personality and Social
Psychology, 49, 660-670.

Locksley, A., Ortiz, V., & Hepburn, C. (1980). Social
categorization and discriminatory behavior: Extinguish-
ing the minimal intergroup discrimination effect.
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39,
773-783.

Meleon, J. D., Hagendoorn, L., Raaijmakers, Q., & Visser, L.
    (1988). Authoritarianism and the revival of political
    racism: Reassessments in the Netherlands of the
    reliability and validity of the concept of
    authoritarianism by Adorno et al. Political
    Psychology, 9, 413-429.

McFarland, S. G., Ageyev, V. S., & Abalakina, M. A. (1992).
    The authoritarian personality in the U.S.A. & U.S.S.R.:
    Comparative studies. In W. F. Stone, G. Lederer, & R.
    Christie (Eds.). Strengths and weaknesses: The
    authoritarian personality today (pp.199-226). New York:
    Springer-Verlag.

Meindl, J. R., & Lerner, M. J. (1985). Exacerbation of
    extreme responses to an out-group. Journal of
    Personality and Social Psychology, 47, 71-84.

Oakes, P. J., & Turner, J. C. (1980). Social
    categorization and intergroup behavior: Does minimal
    intergroup identification make social identity more
    positive? European of Social Psychology, 10, 295-301.

Robinson, J. P., & Shaver, P. R. (1973). Measures of
    social psychology attitudes. Ann Arbor: Institute of
    Social Research.

Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimina-
    tion. Scientific American, 223(2), 96-102.

Tajfel, H., & Wilkes, A. L. (1963). Classification and
     quantitative judgement. British Journal of Psychology,
     54, 101-114.

Thompson, L. L., & Crocker, J. (1990). Downward social
     comparison in the minimal intergroup situation: A test
     of a self-enhancement interpretation. Journal of
     Applied Social Psychology, 20, 1166-1184.

Turner, J. C. (1983a). Some comments on. . .'the
     measurement of social orientations in the minimal group
     paradigm. European Journal of Social Psychology, 13,
     351-367.

Turner, J. C. (1983b). A second reply to Bornstein, Crum,
     Whittenbraker, Harring, Insko and Thibaut on the
     measurement of social orientations. European
     Journal of Social Psychology, 13, 383-387.

Turner, J.C., Brown, R.J., & Tajfel, H. (1979). Social
     comparison and group interest in in-group favoritism,
     European Journal of Social Psychology, 9, 187-204.

APPENDIX A

Task to Separate Participants into Artificial Groups

Below are several questions concerning different types of measurements. Please make the best estimate you can make.

1)   Make your best estimate of the number of beans in the jar on the desk. _____

2)   Make your best estimate, in feet, of the distance of the walkway around the Downing University Center (student center). _____

3)   Make your best estimate of the weight, in pounds, of the lead bar that is lying on the desk. _____

4)   There is a cup and a large pan on the desk. Make your best estimate of the number of cups of water it would take to fill the pan. _____

5)   _____ (estimate of the number of seconds asked to sit with closed).

APPENDIX B

Altemeyer's (1981) Right Wing Authoritarian Scale

A Survey of Attitudes and Opinions

Please read each of the following statements and rate your agreement or disagreement with each statement by marking the appropriate number on the answer sheet. Please use the following scale in giving your response to each statement:

-3 = I strongly disagree with this statement.

-2 = I moderately disagree with this statement.

-1 = I slightly disagree with this statement.

+1 = I slightly agree with this statement.

+2 = I moderately agree with this statement.

+3 = I strongly agree with this statement.

Please circle the number which best represents your belief on the answer sheet. Please do not write your name on the answer sheet, and please be sure you respond to every statement. Your answers will be anonymous.

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.

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."

3. It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the rabble-rousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people's minds.

4. People should pay less attention to the Bible and to the other old traditional forms of religious guidance and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.

5. It would be best for everyone if the proper authorities censored magazines and movies to keep trashy material away from youth.

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.

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.

8. There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual intercourse.

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.

10. There is nothing immoral or sick about somebody's being a homosexual.

11. It is important to protect fully the rights of radicals and deviants.

12. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.

13. Rules about being "well-mannered" and respectable are chains from the past which we should question very thoroughly before accepting.

14. Once our government leaders and the authorities condemn the dangerous elements in our society, it will be the duty of every patriot citizen to help stomp out the rot that is poisoning our country from within.

15. "Free speech" means that people should even be allowed to make speeches and write books urging the overthrow of the government.

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.

17. In these troubled times laws have to be enforced without mercy, especially when dealing with the agitators and revolutionaries who are stirring things up.

18. Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.

19. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.

20. The self-righteous "forces of law and order" threaten freedom in our country a lot more than most of the groups they claim are "radical" and "Godless".

21. The courts are right in being easy on drug users. Punishment would <u>not</u> do any good in cases like these.

22. If a child starts becoming unconventional and disrespectful of authority, it is his parents' duty to get him back to the normal way.

23. In the final analysis the established authorities, like parents and our national leaders, generally turn out to be right about things, and all the protesters don't know what they're talking about.

24. A lot of our rules regarding modesty and sexual behavior are just customs which are not necessarily any better or holier than those which other people follow.

25. There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps.

26. The <u>real</u> keys to the "good life" are obedience, discipline, and sticking to the straight and narrow.

27. It is best to treat dissenters with leniency and an open mind, since new ideas are the lifeblood of progressive change.

28. The biggest threat to our freedom comes from the Communists and their kind, who are out to destroy religion, ridicule patriotism, corrupt the youth, and in general undermine our whole way of life.

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.

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.

APPENDIX C

Tajfel Test for Minimal Group Discrimination

In the sets of tables on the following pages, please circle
the set of two numbers (one over the other) you would like
to give to the person in your group (overestimator or
underestimator) and the person in the other group. The
numbers represent the number of points that each person will
gain.

An Example:

Overestimator	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20
Underestimator	20	18	16	14	12	10	8	6	4	2

Table 1

Overestimator	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7
Underestimator	1	3	5	7	9	11	13	15	17	19	21	23	25

Table 2

Underestimator	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7
Overestimator	1	3	5	7	9	11	13	15	17	19	21	23	25

Table 3

Overestimator	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Underestimator	25	23	21	19	17	15	13	11	9	7	5	3	1

Table 4

Underestimator	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	8	19
Overestimator	25	23	21	19	17	15	13	11	9	7	5	3	1

Table 5

Overestimator	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Underestimator	1	3	5	7	9	11	13	15	17	19	21	23	25

Table 6

Underestimator	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Overestimator	1	3	5	7	9	11	13	15	17	19	21	23	25

Table 7

Overestimator	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7
Underestimator	25	23	21	19	17	15	13	11	9	7	5	3	1

Table 8

Underestimator	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7
Overestimator	25	23	21	19	17	15	13	11	9	7	5	3	1

Table 9

Overestimator	26	25	24	23	22	21	20	19	18	17	16	15	14
Underestimator	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14

Table 10

Underestimator	26	25	24	23	22	21	20	19	18	17	16	15	14
Overestimator	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14

Table 11

Overestimator	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
Underestimator	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2

Table 12

Underestimator	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
Overestimator	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2

Note: Each table was presented individually on separate half
sheets of paper.

APPENDIX D

Brewer and Silver
Minimal Group Discrimination task

On the following pages you will see several tables (A1,A2;
B1,B2; C1,C2; D1,D2). In each table you will be asked to
distribute points to a particular person in your group
(overestimator or underestimator) and to a person in the
other group. In each table there are two individuals
identified by their 4 digit codes and by their groups. To
the right of the two persons there are two pairs of numbers.
The numbers represent the number of points you may assign to
the two persons. Either choose payoff pair 0 or payoff pair
1. In Table A1, for example, payoff pair 0 would assign 7
points to the overestimator and 9 points to the
underestimator; pair 1 would assign 8 points to the
overestimator and 4 to the underestimator. For each table,
mark either 0 or 1 in the space provided at the far right of
the page, depending on which set of points you wish to give.

<u>Payoff</u>

Group	0	1	Answers
A1			
____Overestimator	7	8	A1____
____Underestimator	9	4	
A2			
____Overestimator	7	8	A2____
____Underestimator	9	12	
B1			
____Overestimator	6	7	B1____
____Underestimator	8	3	

APPENDIX D

Brewer and Silver
Minimal Group Discrimination task

On the following pages you will see several tables (A1,A2;
B1,B2; C1,C2; D1,D2). In each table you will be asked to
distribute points to a particular person in your group
(overestimator or underestimator) and to a person in the
other group. In each table there are two individuals
identified by their 4 digit codes and by their groups. To
the right of the two persons there are two pairs of numbers.
The numbers represent the number of points you may assign to
the two persons. Either choose payoff pair 0 or payoff pair
1. In Table A1, for example, payoff pair 0 would assign 7
points to the overestimator and 9 points to the
underestimator; pair 1 would assign 8 points to the
overestimator and 4 to the underestimator. For each table,
mark either 0 or 1 in the space provided at the far right of
the page, depending on which set of points you wish to give.

Payoff

Group	0	1	Answers
A1			
_____Overestimator	7	8	A1____
_____Underestimator	9	4	
A2			
_____Overestimator	7	8	A2____
_____Underestimator	9	12	
B1			
_____Overestimator	6	7	B1____
_____Underestimator	8	3	

B2

    ____Overestimator   6   5   B2____

    ____Underestimator   8   4

C1

    ____Overestimator   6   7   C1____

    ____Underestimator   4   10

C2

    ____Overestimator   6   7   C2____

    ____Underestimator   4   1

D1

    ____Overestimator   7   9   D1____

    ____Underestimator   5   12

D2

    ____Overestimator   7   6   D2____

    ____Underestimator   5   7

Note: Each section, A1-D2, were given separately on half
sheets of paper.

APPENDIX E

Trait-Ratings Task

Below is a list of personality characteristics. For each characteristic circle the number at the right which you believe would best describe the average individual of the group listed (either overestimator or underestimator).

1=never or almost never true.
4=equally true and untrue.
7=always or almost always true.
Circle one number for each characteristic.

Average Individual of Group _____

1)	Good-natured	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2)	Self-centered	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3)	Trustworthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4)	Unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5)	Considerate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6)	Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7)	Uncreative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8)	Insightful (X)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9)	Intuitive (X)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10)	Illogical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11)	Slow Problem-Solver (X)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Note: The three items with an (X) following them were deleted because they lowered the internal consistency of the scale.

APPENDIX F

Self-esteem measure

Below there are pairs of opposite terms. Please mark the line between the terms at the point which best describes <u>you</u>. As an example, are you shy or outgoing? If you are very shy, you would mark this pair as follows:

shy :<u>X</u>:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__: outgoing

If you are very outgoing, however, you would mark it this way:

shy :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:<u>X</u>: outgoing

Finally, if you are equally shy and outgoing, you would mark:

shy :__:__:__:__:<u>X</u>:__:__:__:__: outgoing

Please mark the following lines at the point which best describes you:

self confident	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	lack of confidence
tolerant of others	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	critical of others
unable to do most things well	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	able to do things well
dishonest	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	honest
enthusiastic	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	un-enthusiastic
not likeable	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	likeable
cooperative	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	competitive
follower	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	leader
immoral	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	moral
satisfied	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	frustrated
intelligent	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	unintelligent
unfriendly	:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	friendly

```
        calm  :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:  anxious

     useless  :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:  useful

know myself                                 don't under-
        well  :__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:__:  stand myself
                                            at all
```