

**Central European University  
Nationalism Program**

**Anti-Jewish and Anti-Gypsy Attitudes in Hungary and  
Yugoslavia : Social And Psychological Determinants**

- ~~PhD~~ MA dissertation -

*by Bojan Todosjević*

Supervisors: Professor Andras Kovacs, Nationalism Program  
Professor Zsolt Enyedi, Political Science Department

**Budapest, June, 1998☺**

---

## *Acknowledgements*

I wish to express gratitude to my supervisors Professor Andras Kovacs and Professor Zsolt Enyedi, who inspired this work and helped in many ways. In the following text they can find some of my reactions to their work and our discussions.

I am particularly indebted to my colleagues from the Department of Psychology, University in Novi Sad. Without their help this research could be hardly completed. Above all, I owe thankfulness to Professor Ignjat Ignjatović for his continuous support.

One's ability to help is, unfortunately, limited by capabilities of the recipient of the help, what is obvious from the weaknesses of this work.

## *Table of content*

List of tables .....	ii
Table of figures .....	iii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
<i>Choice of countries and prejudices</i> .....	3
<i>Notes on Terminology</i> .....	4
PERSONALITY APPROACH: AUTHORITARIANISM.....	5
<i>Critique 1: Neglect of Socio-Economic Factors</i> .....	8
Answer: Multivariate Approach .....	10
<i>Critique 2: Authoritarianism - Personality or Ideology</i> .....	10
Solutions: Methodological and Theoretical.....	14
SOCIAL LEARNING PERSPECTIVE.....	18
GROUP-CONFLICT AND SOCIAL-IDENTITY APPROACH.....	19
<i>Resume of the introduction</i> .....	22
RESEARCH PROBLEM: CAUSAL MODELLING OF ANTI-GYPSY AND ANTI-JEWISH PREJUDICE.....	23
HYPOTHESES .....	26
METHOD .....	27
<i>Hungarian Sample</i> .....	27
Variables .....	27
<i>Yugoslavian Sample</i> .....	29
Variables .....	29
METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS AND GRAPHICAL PRESENTATION.....	30
RESULTS .....	30
<i>Preparatory analyses</i> .....	30
Antisemitism (AS) scale.....	30
Anti-Gypsy (AG) scale .....	32
Authoritarianism scale, Hungarian students.....	34
Authoritarianism scale, Hungarian parents .....	37
Authoritarianism scale, Yugoslavian sample .....	40
Libido fixations scale FR3, Yugoslavian sample.....	43
CAUSAL MODELLING: HUNGARIAN SAMPLE.....	48
<i>Causal Model of anti-Jewish attitudes in Hungary</i> .....	49
<i>Causal Model of anti-Gypsy attitudes in Hungary</i> .....	52
CAUSAL MODELLING: YUGOSLAVIAN SAMPLE .....	55
<i>Causal Model of anti-Jewish attitudes in Yugoslavia</i> .....	55
<i>Causal Model of anti-Gypsy attitudes in Yugoslavia</i> .....	59
DISCUSSION.....	61
FINAL INTERPRETATIVE RESUME .....	65

**List of tables**

Table 1 Antisemitism scale, with item means of students and parents, Hungarian sample	31
Table 2 Communalities and loadings on the 1st principal component of the antisemitism scale, samples from Hungary and Yugoslavia	32
Table 3 Anti-Gypsy scale and item means for parents and students, Hungarian sample	33
Table 4 Loadings on the 1st PC and communalities for the anti-Gypsy scale, samples from Hungary and Yugoslavia	33
Table 5 Eigenvalues, raw and cumulative percentages of explained variance by the three extracted factors of the Authoritarianism scale, sample of Hungarian students	35
Table 6 Authoritarian submissiveness, students from Hungary	35
Table 7 Authoritarian Aggressiveness; Hungarian students	36
Table 8 Authoritarian conventionalism, Hungarian Students	36
Table 9 Correlation coefficients between authoritarianism factors, Hungarian student sample	37
Table 10 Eigenvalues and percentages of explained variance by the three extracted factors of the Authoritarianism scale, sample of Hungarian parents	38
Table 11 : Authoritarian Submissiveness: structure of the first Oblimin rotated factor; Hungarian parents	38
Table 12 Authoritarian Aggressiveness : structure of the second Oblimin rotated factor; Hungarian parents	39
Table 13 Authoritarian Conventionalism: structure of the third Oblimin rotated factor; Hungarian parents	39
Table 14 Correlation coefficients between authoritarianism factors, Hungarian Parents	40
Table 15 Eigenvalues and percentages of explained variance for Authoritarianism scale, Yugoslavian sample.	41
Table 16 Authoritarian Submissiveness - structure of the first Oblimin rotated factor from the Authoritarianism scale, Yugoslavian sample	41
Table 17 Authoritarian Aggressiveness - structure of the second Oblimin rotated factor from the Authoritarianism scale, Yugoslavian sample	42
Table 18 Conventionalism - structure of the third Oblimin rotated factor from the Authoritarianism scale, Yugoslavian sample.	42
Table 19 Correlations between the three extracted Authoritarianism factors.	43
Table 20 Libido fixations scale FR3: Structure of the 6 Oblimin factors	44
Table 21 Correlation coefficients between factors of libido fixations	47
Table 22 Summary of regression equations for the causal model of antisemitism in Hungary.	49
Table 23 Summary of regression equations for the causal model of anti-Gypsy attitudes in Hungary	53
Table 24 Summary of regression equations for the causal model of anti-Gypsy and anti-Jewish attitudes in Yugoslavi (continued in Table 25)	56
Table 25 Summary of regression equations for the causal model of anti-Gypsy and anti-Jewish attitudes in Yugoslavia (continuation of the Table 24).	57

## ***Table of figures***

<i>Figure 1 Order of variables based on the survey in Hungary</i>	24
<i>Figure 2 Order of variables based on the survey in Yugoslavia</i>	25
<i>Figure 3 Causal model of anti-Jewish attitudes in Hungary</i>	50
<i>Figure 4 Causal model of anti-Gypsy attitudes in Hungary</i>	54
<i>Figure 5 Causal Model of anti-Jewish attitudes in Yugoslavia</i>	55
<i>Figure 6 Causal Model of anti-Gypsy attitudes in Yugoslavia</i>	60

# Anti-Jewish and Anti-Gypsy Attitudes in Hungary and Yugoslavia : Social And Psychological Determinants

- MA dissertation -

by *Bojan Todosijević*

Supervisors: Professor Andras Kovacs, Nationalism Program  
Professor Zsolt Enyedi, Political Science Department

*Our principle was: Kill'em all.*

American Vietnam veteran, Interview shown at CNN, 1998

## ***Introduction***

In the contemporary sociological and psychological literature there are different theories attempting to explain the phenomenon of ethnic, racial, gender and other types of prejudice (e.g., Brown, 1995, Vivian and Brown, 1994). These comprehensive theories assume that certain general principles are applicable to various specific prejudices, including antisemitism and anti-Gypsy attitudes. They also allow different variations in the phenomenology of various specific prejudices, depending on a number of specific social, historical and cultural factors.

In this thesis various aspects of some of these theories are examined, particularly in relation to antisemitic and anti-Gypsy attitudes in Hungary and Yugoslavia. On the basis of the obtained results it is attempted to construct causal models explaining the role of social and psychological variables in the examined ethnic prejudices.

Causal modelling is based primarily on the three main socio-psychological approaches to prejudice - personality, social learning, and group-conflict approach. According to the personality perspective, individual differences in susceptibility to prejudice can be largely explained by individual differences in personality structure. The paradigmatic example of this approach is famous study by Adorno et al. *The Authoritarian Personality* (TAP) (1950; see also Stone et al., 1993). Social learning approach sees prejudice primarily as learned via socialization (e.g., Dollard et al, 1939; Miller and Dollard, 1941). The main assumption of the group conflict perspective, including social identity theory, is that prejudice results from mere group membership or even more regularly, from conflicts, real or imagined, between groups (e.g., Brown, 1995, Tajfel, 1981).

A set of predictions is derived from these theories taking into account their applicability to anti-Gypsy and antisemitic prejudices, and the accessibility of suitable variables in the available data sets. The role of three main groups of variables is examined. Indicators concerning socio-economic background are taken as possibly relevant variables

for the role of socio-economic group membership. Prejudices of parents and their relationship to prejudices of students are treated as indicating processes of social learning. Authoritarianism and, in the Yugoslavian sample, questionnaire dealing with libido fixations represent psychological variables in the causal models.

Although it is attempted to derive specific hypotheses from the examined theories and to test them against the empirical data, this work should not be understood as confirmatory in the strict sense of the word. The main reasons for this are difficulties in deriving unequivocal hypotheses testable via survey methodology, and in deriving hypotheses which could differentiate the predictive validity of the examined theories. Namely, in many instances two or more theories have the same predictions and consequently it is difficult to distinguish their relative contribution to the understanding of prejudices. Therefore, this study is primarily explorative in character. It should be understood as relatively open-ended search, with somewhat prolonged excursion into the psychological realm, for the most suitable approximation between the data and theory.

Another feature of the study is its comparative nature. It is based on samples from Hungary and Yugoslavia. The Hungarian sample includes students and their parents, while the Yugoslavian contains only students. Multiple comparisons are performed. Firstly, causal models are constructed separately for anti-Jewish and anti-Gypsy prejudices. Their comparison should reveal whether these prejudices are related in the same way to various social and psychological factors. The other comparison is between models for these two ethnic prejudices constructed on the basis of data from Hungary and from Yugoslavia. Similarities and differences are discussed in the light of possible influence of cultural, political and historical differences between the two countries. Finally, survey in Yugoslavia included some additional psychological variables. Test of their relevance for the explanation of individual differences in prejudice is relevant for examination of the explanatory power of personality perspective of prejudice.

In order to clearly delineate the topic of the present study it is important to emphasise that the focus is not on Gypsies and Jews but on *prejudices* against them, therefore on non-Jews and non-Gypsies. For this reason details about the history and present conditions of Jews and Gypsies in Yugoslavia and Hungary will be taken into account only to the extent needed for the appropriate interpretation of results.

Secondly, it is important to note that the aim of the study is not the explanation of the phenomenon of prejudice in general, or explanation of the existence and phenomenology of anti-Gypsy and anti-Jewish prejudice. The focus is on *individual differences* in these prejudices and on the role of social and psychological variables in their explanation. In simple words, the question this study attempts to answer is not *Why do anti-Jewish and anti-Gypsy prejudices exist in Hungary and Yugoslavia?*, but rather *Why certain individuals are more prejudiced than others against Jews and Gypsies in Hungary and Yugoslavia?*

Although the study is primarily theoretically oriented in the sense that it attempts to answer some important problems of theories of prejudice, particularly the personality theories, it also has another important contribution. Namely, while in Hungary antisemitic

and anti-Gypsy prejudices are quite thoroughly researched topic (e.g., Kovacs, 1996, 1998, Enyedi, 1998), there are very few studies conducted on the topic in Yugoslavia. Thus, this study aims at also at filling this gap.

### **Choice of countries and prejudices**

Although it seems superfluous to particularly justify analysis of any specific prejudice, a few notes will be made about this particular choice. In this case the choice of prejudices and countries has been interdependent. One of the reasons for this particular choice is that the collapse of socialist system has been followed, among other things, by the apparent increase in ethnic conflicts and prejudice. Not infrequently in both countries Jews and particularly Gypsies have been targets of the majority group's hostility, whether verbal or 'practical'.

Important similarities and differences between history and experiences of Gypsies and Jews in Yugoslavia and Hungary makes their comparison also interesting. In case of Gypsies for example, their history in both countries is similar in many respects. Nevertheless, in different historical periods Gypsies in Yugoslavia (Serbia more specifically) enjoyed more favourable treatment by the majority than in most of the neighbouring countries at the time (see Crowe, 1995). Presently, likewise in Hungary, prejudices against Gypsies are widespread and they are relegated to the margins of society. Recent violent attacks of Belgrade's skinheads on young Gypsies perhaps have shaken the self-deceiving belief of many Serbs in their supposedly extraordinarily benevolent treatment of Gypsies.

Perhaps, due to the fact that Serbs throughout history have had other, more important 'national enemies', like Turks, Germans, Croats or Albanians, Serbia is known to be relatively non-antisemitic place (for contemporary report on antisemitism see *Antisemitism World Report 1993*). Also, Serbia has always had a proportionally smaller Jewish population than Hungary. This, according to the group conflict approach, should have resulted in less antisemitic attitudes.<sup>1</sup> During the socialist period, although Yugoslavia's official policy was similar to policy of other socialist countries towards Israel, antisemitism was not encouraged. For example, Moshe Pijade was Tito's closest collaborator until his death in the fifties (Andrejević, 1993). However, stereotypes about Jews are widespread, and in certain right-wing publications it is possible occasionally to find more or less open antisemitic texts (*Ibid.*). Unfortunately, there are very few publications on anti-Jewish and anti-Gypsy prejudices in Yugoslavia.

---

<sup>1</sup> In present -day Hungary there are approximately 100.000 Jews (Kovacs, 1996). In Yugoslavia (i.e. Serbia) there are 2500-3000 Jews, mainly in Belgrade (*Antisemitism World Report 1993*). Before the Second World War, entire former Yugoslavia had 68.00 Jews (0.5% of the total population), while in Hungary there are 444.000 Jews, or 5.1% of the total population (Lendvai, 1971)

## Notes on Terminology

Prejudice is defined as a special kind of attitudes, namely as “logically ungrounded, stubbornly maintained and by intensive emotions accompanied attitudes towards objects and classes of objects” (Rot, 1989, p. 381). Thereby, terms antisemitism, anti-Jewish prejudice and anti-Jewish attitudes are used synonymously here, denoting a set of negative and derogatory attitudes towards Jews as a group. The term antisemitism is used here in a restricted meaning, i.e., not denoting a developed political ideology.

Also, anti-Gypsy attitudes and anti-Gypsy prejudices are used interchangeably. While definitional delineation between prejudice and stereotypes is relatively clear, namely stereotypes representing more cognitive aspect, the applied attitudinal scales could be also treated as indicators of the acceptance of stereotyped views of Jews and Gypsies. Nevertheless, most of the items are formulated in relatively extreme manner, so it can be assumed that agreement with such statements indeed indicated the existence not only of stereotypes but also of prejudice.

In the empirical part, clear operational definitions of these and other concepts used in the analysis will be given in the form of the corresponding attitudinal scales. Therefore, these operational definitions strictly and clearly circumscribe domain and meaning of the obtained results.

In the following sections are briefly presented relevant theoretical approaches, derived certain predictions from them and tested against the available data.

### ***Personality Approach: Authoritarianism***

Personality approach to prejudice, especially the psychoanalytically inspired *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno et al., 1950), will be presented in more details than the other two approaches because of the special emphasis on personality variables in this research.

Different constructs in personality psychology are developed in attempts to explain individual differences in prejudice and in other social and political attitudes. For example, Eysenck (1954; Eysenck and Wilson 1978) proposed tough-mindedness as a relevant concept. Tough-minded people are generally in favour of more harsh and tough social measures, including rejection of ethnic and other minorities. In this view, tough-mindedness is a result of the projection of psychoticism, a basic personality trait, onto social field. Because basic personality traits are significantly genetically determined (approximately two-thirds of variance is attributed to inheritance), social attitudes are seen as partly genetically determined (Eysenck, 1982). Rokeach (1956) developed a concept of dogmatism as a more cognitive counterpart to psychoanalytically based authoritarianism. A more recently developed concept is sociobiologically based Social Dominance Orientation, developed and elaborated by Sidanius and his co-workers (e.g., Sidanius et al., 1994, Pratto et al., 1994). However, in the field of prejudice research, the most widely known and

studied is the concept of authoritarianism, primarily elaborated by Adorno et al. (1950; see also Stone et al., 1993a).<sup>2</sup>

Characteristic for this approach is that it sees prejudices as being rooted in deep psychological, often unconscious, processes.<sup>3</sup> Adorno *et al.* found that authoritarian personalities are particularly inclined to accept general ethnocentric and specific antisemitic attitudes. According to this theory, development of the authoritarian character is rooted in family relationships during early childhood. Insistence on strict control of children, on their obedience and respect for rules and regulations, together with the lack of warmth and genuine affection, is seen as instilling the authoritarian and anti-democratic tendencies in children. The authors used Freud's psychoanalytic personality theory as their primary theoretical framework.<sup>4</sup> Hence, they laid emphasis more on concepts like Oedipus complex and defence mechanisms than on learning and conscious motivation.<sup>5</sup>

The Berkeley Group started from the general hypothesis that "an individual is most receptive to those ideologies which afford the fullest expression to his over-all personality structure" (Frenkel-Brunswick et al., 1947, p.536) in order to assess the potential for Fascism or other 'antidemocratic ideologies' in the United States. Through the application of various methodological tools, like questionnaires, interviews, projective techniques, they found that there exist a stable ideological orientation, consisting of antisemitism, ethnocentrism and conservatism, which strongly correlate with certain pattern of personality traits, named authoritarianism.

According to the authors, there are nine traits characterising authoritarian personality: 1) Conventionalism, defined as rigid following conventional, middle-class values; 2) Authoritarian submission, manifested in submissive, uncritical attitudes towards idealised authorities of the in-group; 3) Authoritarian aggression - expressed in condemnation and rejection of those who violate conventional values, and in request for their severe punishment; 4) Anti-intraception - opposing to everything subjective, imaginative, not dealing with own inner psychic life and experience; 5) Rigid thinking, Superstition and stereotypy - tendency to think in rigid categories and belief in mystical causes of the individual's fate; 6) Power and "toughness" - identification with those who own power, exaggeration of the importance of strength, toughness, discipline; 7) Destructiveness and cynicism - rejection of humane and empathy, generalised hostility; 8) -

---

<sup>2</sup> According to Meloen (1993), after 1950 appeared more than 2000 publications on authoritarianism.

<sup>3</sup>This is the most widely held view of the Adorno et al's contribution (e.g., Brown, 1995). It is rather simplistic view, but it is out of the scope of this paper to discuss the problems with this view. For the recent account of the state of authoritarianism research, see the volume by Stone et al., 1993a.

<sup>4</sup>Sometimes authoritarianism theory is presented as an example of frustration-aggression, 'displacement' or scape-goat theories (e.g., Brown, 1995) which is basically inaccurate. Adorno et al. explicitly rejected this view (1982, p. 163).

<sup>5</sup> Alternative conceptualisations of authoritarianism have also been developed. The most elaborated is the one developed by Altemeyer (1981, 1988). He based his theory primarily on social learning perspective rather than on psychoanalysis.

Projectivity - projection of inner unconscious impulses onto the outer world, belief that world is dominated by secret and dangerous forces; and 9) Sex - overemphasised interest in sexual deviations, false morality (Adorno et al, 1950).

Development of this personality type is claimed to be rooted in family relationships, especially child upbringing patterns. Fathers are described as domineering, mothers as punitive, both requiring strict discipline and obedience through the manipulation with the expression of parental love, punishments and threatening. The consequence is insecure, fearful and dependent child, with ambivalent attitude towards parents. On the one side is its dependence, and on the other is accumulated aggression towards parents. Intrapsychical conflict is resolved through repression of aggressive impulses and uncritical idealisation of parents. In psychoanalytic terms, authoritarianism would be a consequence of particular resolution of the Oedipal stage of psycho-sexual development, with consequently emphasised the role of father.

Personality features developed in early childhood latter find expression in specific individual's relation to the social world: submissiveness towards up and aggressiveness toward down. Or, in the authors' words:

"Thus a basically hierarchical, authoritarian, exploitively dependent parent-child relationship is apt to carry over into a power-orientated, exploitively dependent attitude toward one's sex partner and one's God and may well culminate in a political philosophy and social outlook which has no room for anything but desperate clinging to what appears to be strong and a disdainful rejection of whatever is relegated to the bottom. The inherent dramatization likewise extends from the parent-child dichotomy to the dichotomous conception of sex role and of moral values, as well as to a dichotomous handling of social relations as manifested especially in the formation of stereotypes and of ingroup-outgroup cleavages. Conventionality, rigidity, repressive denial, and the ensuing breakthrough of one's weakness, fear and dependency are but other aspects of the same fundamental personality pattern, and they can be observed in personal life as well as in attitudes toward religion and social issues" (Adorno et al., 1950, p.971).

Ethnic minorities and various other underprivileged or negatively stereotyped groups are particularly suitable targets for expressing repressed hostility, while preserving positive self-image.<sup>6</sup>

Concerning the empirical validity of the relationship between authoritarianism and ethnocentrism and prejudice, including antisemitism, there is an impressive supportive evidence both over time and across countries (e.g., for an extensive review see Stone et al., 1993a, particularly Meloen, 1993; see also Enyedi, 1998; Fabian, 1998; Kindervater, 1997; Todosijević, 1995, 1998; Scheepers et al., 1990; Billing and Cramer, 1990; Van Ijzendoorn, 1989; Altemeyer, 1988; Rot and Havelka, 1973). As an illustration of the frequent findings

---

<sup>6</sup> Note the similarity to the social identity theory.

can be mentioned study by Kindervater (1997). She found that different measures of authoritarianism are significantly related to her seven-item antisemitism scale. For example, antisemitism correlated with 'general authoritarianism' ( $r=.52$ ), with 'core authoritarianism' ( $r=.44$ ), with 'respect for state authority scale' ( $r=.57$ ), but somewhat less with 'authoritarian family structure scale' ( $r=.18$ ) (all coefficients  $p<.05$ ). The obvious hypothesis to be examined here is that authoritarianism is directly related to antisemitic and anti-Gypsy prejudices even after controlling for other variables, and that the relationship exists in both Hungarian and Yugoslavian samples.

### **Critique 1: Neglect of Socio-Economic Factors**

Adorno et al.'s study has been criticised on various methodological and theoretical grounds (e.g., Eysenck, 1954; Christie and Jahoda, 1954; Rokeach, 1956; Snyder and Ickes, 1985, Rot, 1989, Vivian and Brown, 1994). Discussion of all these criticisms would require special volume, so only several points will be made relevant for the present research.

It has been objected that Adorno et al. created a theory and explanation of ethnocentrism reducing it to the psychological maladaptation, i.e., that they neglected the role of social and historical factors (e.g., Ferrarotti, 1994, Asch 1987, Forbes, 1985). According to Ferrarotti, "Racism... implies the existence of a racist community" (1994, p.116), i.e., it is not enough to possess certain personality traits, society has to fill these traits with certain content. This critique is relevant for comparison of the authoritarianism approach with the other two approaches examined presently, which at least implicitly include reference to social, and historical processes (e.g., history of conflicts between Jews and gentiles, or socialization into cultural stereotypes about the Jews).

The main contra-argument is that, on the one hand, Adorno et al. were aware of the role of social and historical factors in prejudices and frequently emphasised their importance throughout the volume. They were interested, for an illustration, "whether personality structure alone is sufficient to establish a selection from among existing ideologies, e.g., prejudice, or if, in addition to that, a special socio-economic history and conditions of the family is required for, or especially conducive to, the acting out of difficulties in the social sphere" (Adorno et al., 1982, pp. 238). For that purpose interviews included quite extensive sets of questions about income and social status (*Ibid.*, 238-240). On the other hand, the goal of that particular study was to explore *psychological* aspects of susceptibility to fascism and prejudice (cf. Stone et al., 1993a, or Forbes, 1985). Hence, the accusation of psychologism stands on shaky ground, though it is applicable to the *reception* of their study. Moreover, Adorno's works on the critique of the contemporary western culture emphasise particularly the relationship between social and historical circumstances and ideology.

Contemporary writers of psychoanalytic orientation also emphasise the role of external factors, though they concentrate on psychodynamic aspects. For example, Bohleber (1995) writes:

"Xenophobia, anti-Semitism, and nationalism are complex, multifariously determined phenomena, that can only be explained within the framework of interdisciplinary cooperation. Although these phenomena are socially determined and get their dynamics mainly from social processes, a psychoanalytical description is needed to understand the attraction which they have for the individual and the extraordinary strong affects that are connected to them. Anti-Semitism and xenophobia are a "social disease" that has deep-seated roots in the unconscious." ( p.332) Or: "What is strange and what is ethnic are socially defined concepts and are exposed to complex social dynamics." (p. 334-5)

In this connection could also be mentioned study by Fromm and Maccoby in Mexico (1970). Fromm had a very important role in the early development of the concept of authoritarianism, even before the California study (see Samelson, 1993). Fromm and Maccoby's conclusion that different character-types of Mexican villagers are basically adaptive to the general mode of production and their place in the division of labour, clearly indicates towards the interdependent relationships between personality and social structure. Therefore, it is problematic to interpret studies in tradition of authoritarianism as pure psychologism, though it surely is appropriate to *some* of such studies.

### ***Answer: Multivariate Approach***

Authoritarianism approach could be, on the one hand, defended by claiming that the above outlined criticism is not really valid. As has been shown, this approach has not been blind to the role of social, economic and cultural factors in prejudice. In addition, it is important to be aware of the domain to which personality theories of prejudice are applicable, namely primarily to the individual differences within certain socio-economic framework.

On the other hand, the sociological critique can be incorporated in this general approach. One way to do it is to apply multivariate methodology, and therefore to simultaneously examine the relevance of different factors. Causal modelling, applied in this research, is one possible way for handling these problems, especially due to the lack of and difficulties in conducting controlled longitudinal research which could in even better way illuminate the development of individual differences in prejudice.

### **Critique 2: Authoritarianism - Personality or Ideology**

Another fundamental objection to the authoritarianism approach is that it is not clear whether authoritarianism, as operationalized by the famous F scale, really measures personality trait in the narrower sense of the term, or a set of social and political attitudes. In the latter case, explaining prejudice by reference to authoritarianism would mean explaining one aspect of ideology by another.<sup>7</sup> The explanation would be obviously rather

---

<sup>7</sup> Bergman (1998) found that antisemitism in Germany is related to authoritarianism, and found it problematic that the explanation is based on 'ideological factors', apparently treating authoritarianism as an ideological or attitudinal construct.

circular. It would be than needed to explain why these 'ideological elements' so regularly 'go together'. This objection has been made by various authors. Rot and Havelka (1973) after the first extensive application of the F scale in Yugoslavia and obtaining extremely high average scores, concluded that the scale actually measured the acceptance of beliefs characteristic for patriarchal environment, not the degree and existence of some stable personality traits. <sup>8</sup> The same objection has been reiterated in literature by different authors. For example, John Ray claims that the F Scale is only an imperfect measure of conservatism, i.e., that it measures "primarily and old fashioned orientation' and support of Victorian values", not any personality trait (e.g., Ray, 1988, also 1990a, 1985a). These conclusions are mainly based on his own measures of authoritarianism (Ray Balanced F Scale, in: Ray, 1972a; Ray Directiveness Scale, in: Ray, 1989, 1973). On other occasions the same author proposed different, more psychological concept as replacements for authoritarianism: assertiveness and directiveness (e.g., Ray, 1986) and need for achievement (e.g., Ray, 1984, Ray and Kiefl, 1984, Heaven, 1987), concluding also that "authoritarianism is a personality variable only" (Ray, 1982, abstract). However, it is open to doubt that directiveness or need for achievement have many things in common with the original description of the authoritarianism as a "general disposition to glorify, to be submissive to and remain uncritical toward authoritative figures of the in-group and to take an attitude of punishing outgroup figures in the name of some moral authority" (Adorno et al., 1982, pp. 157). If nothing else, this demand for understanding authoritarianism resulted in the increased supply of its alternative psychometric operationalizations offered at the scientific market. <sup>9</sup>

In spite of such contradictory claims, the problem is an important one. So called 'pure' personality traits are usually unrelated or weakly and inconsistently related to prejudice and other social attitudes. Heaven (1976), for example, did not find correlation between Cattell's 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire and antisemitism. Wilson and Brazendale (1973) found weak relationship of ethnocentrism and intolerance of minority groups only with neuroticism from the Eysenck's EPQ questionnaire. Such findings could be interpreted in the sense that 'pure' personality traits are not related to prejudice, and that authoritarianism correlates with prejudice because it measures attitudes or ideology. Another interpretation could be that authoritarianism is a cluster of personality traits, or personality 'type' which is specific for highly prejudiced individuals. In this sense, authoritarianism could be seen as 'contextualised' personality construct, result of interaction between more basic personality traits and social environment.

The problem of the meaning of authoritarianism has been approached in different ways. One has been mentioned, namely the proposal of alternative measures of authoritarianism and different concepts as alternatives. Auxiliary hypotheses have also been suggested. Some inconsistencies in the obtained relationships between prejudice and

---

<sup>8</sup>Stankov (1977) offered the same interpretation of unusually high average scores on the F Scale of Yugoslavians.

<sup>9</sup> Ray (1984) reviewed 37 different scales developed as alternative measures of authoritarianism!

personality have been interpreted following the example of Pettigrew (1959) who argued that in circumstances where prejudices are more pervasive part of social reality they are simply transmitted through socialization regardless of specific family environment and personality traits.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, the auxiliary hypothesis would be that the less a society approves certain prejudice the stronger role is played by personality. If this is so, and if we assume that antisemitism and anti-Gypsy prejudices are less prevalent in Yugoslavia, it should be expected that authoritarianism correlate with these prejudices more in Yugoslavia, other things being equal.

However, the problem why would *Victorian values* be related to ethnocentrism in Yugoslavia, for example, is still unanswered if the role of personality is refused. One solution to this problem is to retain the concept of authoritarianism but to adopt different theoretical conceptualisation. For example, Smither (1993) proposed interpretation of authoritarianism and its origin based in evolutionary psychology. But, the most known reinterpretation of authoritarianism is done by Altemeyer, who conducted perhaps the most systematic series of studies in authoritarianism after the Berkeley group. He clearly accepts the approach of social learning theorists, especially of Albert Bandura (Altemeyer, 1981, 1988; see also Lewis, 1990).

In his view, three related *attitude clusters* received replicated confirmation as the dimensions of authoritarianism: *conventionalism*, *authoritarian submission* and *authoritarian aggression*<sup>11</sup>. The first is described as “a high degree of adherence to the social conventions that are perceived to be endorsed by society and its established authorities”, the second as “a high degree of submission to the authorities who are perceived to be established and legitimate in the society in which one lives”, and the last as “a general aggressiveness, directed against various persons, that is perceived to be sanctioned by established authorities” (Altemeyer, 1988, p. 2).

So, Altemeyer's interpretation could be termed as 'ideological package' theory, in the sense that both authoritarian *attitudes* and various prejudices and ethnocentrism are learned together because they repeatedly occur in media, public discourse and other socializing agents. From this would also follow that psychological studies of prejudices should be replaced by studies in political socialization. If Altemeyer's approach is interpreted in this way, what is possible to do, his theory would then belong to the socialization theories, not personality ones. However, it is still not clear how to explain differences in prejudice between individuals with relatively similar socializing experiences.

In fact, although Altemeyer repeatedly refutes the *theory* of the Berkeley Group, he finally arrives to strikingly similar conclusions and rather psychological explanation. After noticing that authoritarian aggressiveness is mostly responsible for relationship between

---

<sup>10</sup> For contradicting evidence see Duckitt (1993), whose results show that in South Africa anti-Black prejudice particularly strongly correlate with authoritarianism.

<sup>11</sup> Ray (1985b) also criticized Altemeyer's RWA Scale in the same way as the F Scale - that it is only an additional measure of conservatism.

prejudice and scores on his RWA (Right Wing Authoritarianism) scale, he tries to find explanation for the relationship and for the development of authoritarian aggressiveness (Altemeyer, 1988). The first examined candidate, namely socialisation within family appeared as a weak explanation. Correlations between students' and parents' scores on the RWA scale were on average "about .20" (*Ibid.*, p.145). This was interpreted as a not too strong support for direct socialisation and the role of early childhood in development of authoritarianism.<sup>12</sup> In addition, he found that right wing authoritarianism "does not become organised until adolescence" (p. 57), and that university education, especially in arts and humanities, decreases authoritarianism. This has been interpreted as evidence against the theory of Adorno et al., and the role of personal experiences is emphasised. However, if socialisation consists of *personal experiences*, than individualised system of reinforcements does not allow formulation of a more general theory. Being at least implicitly aware of this problem, Altemeyer then tries to find typical experiences which could account for individual differences in authoritarianism. Various possibilities have been examined, like the role of "aggressive defence" (p. 147), "envy of sinners", guilt and aggression as a reaction to it, and 'self-righteousness', meaning basically the belief in one's own superior morality (Altemeyer, 1988). The search is concluded by finding that primarily *fear of a dangerous world* and *self-righteousness* are consistently related to RWA scores (*Ibid.*). If this reasoning is examined more carefully, it is obvious that again psychological or personality explanations entered at the back door, because both concepts are rather psychological in nature. Of course, development of personality traits can be explained through social learning, and it is indeed a part of every personality theory unless it belongs to pure genetic determinism.

What is even more interesting is that these Altemeyer's concepts, self-righteousness and fear of a dangerous world, quite resemble some descriptions from *The Authoritarian Personality*. For example, Adorno et al. say that "this theory [TAP] helps to explain why the aggression is so regularly justified in *moralistic terms*" (1982, p. 162, emphasis added). Or: "Conventionalism, authoritarian submission, and authoritarian aggression all have to do with the moral aspect of life - with standards of conduct, with the authorities who enforce these standards, with offenders against them who deserve to be punished" (*Ibid.*, p. 162-163). So, evidently Altemeyer discovered by himself what has been written in the TAP, namely that feelings of insecurity and rigid, punitive morality have something to do with authoritarianism. The difference is that in his theory these concepts have explanatory status, while in Adorno et al.'s theory, they are only elements of the syndrome which is than explained by psychoanalytical developmental concepts. In this regard, i.e., concerning the further explanation of the fear of dangerous world and self-righteousness, Altemeyer has little to offer, except that it is learned via socialization. If Adorno et al.'s theory is not more 'correct' than Altemeyer's, it is at least more comprehensive.

---

<sup>12</sup> Studies examining the family antecedents of authoritarianism generally failed to find strong support for Adorno et al.'s claim, though in majority of cases the applied research designs have been highly inappropriate (cf., Todosijevi}, 1997, for a review, and results in Yugoslavia).

From the point of view of the present paper, Altemeyer's theory is problematic because it obviously can not be treated just as a personality theory or just as socialization theory. But, as it will be discussed later, it may be seen as an advantage in this area.

### ***Solutions: Methodological and Theoretical***

First counter-argument to the above criticism could be that the problem was caused primarily by the studies following TAP. Namely, in most of the later studies authoritarianism has been operationalized only via the single score on the F or similar scale, not infrequently consisting only of several items. In this way originally complex concept has been largely narrowed and lost much of its meaning.

Partial methodological solution to the problem of psychological meaning of authoritarianism could be the use of factor analysis of the applied scales. In this way it may be possible to differentiate between more personality and more attitudinal components of the authoritarian syndrome. This approach seems important especially because authoritarianism is originally conceived as a complex set of different traits (see above), but in most of the later studies it has been operationalized only via single score on the F or some other, usually shortened, scale.

Indeed, a number of factor-analytical studies have been performed on various operationalizations of authoritarianism with not particularly consistent results (e.g., O'Neil and Levinson, 1954; Kerlinger and Rokeach, 1966; Kline and Cooper, 1984; Goertzel, 1987; Raden, 1981; Billings and Guastello, 1993; in Yugoslavia: Đurić, 1987; Majstorović *et al.*, 1994; Todosijević, 1995, 1998).

It is difficult to generalize on the basis of these studies, due to a wide diversity in the applied methodologies, questionnaires, samples and ways of data analysis. However, it seems that the above results tend to support Altemeyer's three-component model of authoritarianism, consisting of *conventionalism*, *authoritarian submission* and *authoritarian aggression* (1981, 1988). Probably, the other traits from the original account were more sensitive to temporal changes in social climate, and/or more difficult for questionnaire operationalization. Also, previous results suggest that aggressive component of authoritarianism is the most responsible for its correlation with ethnocentrism and prejudices (e.g., Todosijević, 1995, 1998).

However, in spite of all these considerable efforts, the most appropriate approach to the problem of psychological meaning of authoritarianism, and to the status of its psychoanalytical interpretation would be to examine its relevant theoretical aspects. As it has been argued in Stone *et al.*, (1993), most of studies following *The Authoritarian Personality* concentrated on the F scale with little attention devoted to the underlying theory. In this paper, and this is perhaps its most (or the only) original contribution, it will be attempted to explore some of the psychoanalytic hypothesis about the formation of authoritarian personality

However, if this were an easy task psychoanalysis would not still have ambiguous status after a hundred years of its existence. Authors of TAP are partly responsible for

these problems, for they did not clearly spell out the general theory of the development of authoritarian character. Chapters that deal with this issue are mostly those dealing with interpretations of individual case studies, so it is not clear how generally are various interpretations applicable. Motives which frequently reoccur are primarily those related to Oedipal complex and those related to features of the so called 'anal character'. For example, interview schedules on childhood dealt with "structure of the Oedipus-Complex: major identifications, loves, hates in relationships to parent-figures and -surrogates" (Adorno et al., 1982, p. 247). In addition, "an attempt was also made to probe into pre-Oedipal fixations, that is, to pay attention to the "orality" and "anality" of the subject and especially to the defence mechanisms with which these and other instinctual problems had been handled" (*Ibid.*, p. 246). Part of the final elaboration of the *authoritarian syndrome* seems worth citing a bit more extensively:

"This Syndrome comes closest to the over-all picture of the high scorer as it stands out throughout our study. It follows the "classic" psychoanalytic pattern involving a sadomasochistic resolution of the Oedipus complex, and it has been pointed out by Erich Fromm under the title of the "sadomasochistic" character. According to Max Horkheimer's theory in the collective work of which he wrote the sociopsychological part, external social repression is concomitant with the internal repression of impulses. In order to achieve "internalization" of social control which never gives as much to the individual as it takes, the latter's attitude towards authority and its psychological agency, the superego, assumes an irrational aspect. The subject achieves his own social adjustment only by taking pleasure in obedience and subordination. This brings into play the sadomasochistic impulse structure both as a condition and as a result of social adjustment. In our form of society, sadistic as well as masochistic tendencies actually find gratification. The pattern for the translation of such gratifications into character traits is a specific resolution of the Oedipus complex which defines the formation of the syndrome here in question. [...] [Subject] develops deep "compulsive" character traits, partly by retrogression to the anal-sadistic phase of development. Sociologically, this syndrome used to be, in Europe, highly characteristic of the lower-middle class." (Adorno et al., 1982, p. 361).

From this passage many different implications for studying authoritarianism can be drawn. The most important for present purpose is the importance of psychoanalytical 'characterology', i.e., the role of pre-Oedipal phases of development. This path of analysis has been taken in a series of studies at the University in Novi Sad, under the guidance of Prof. Ignjat Ignjatović (e.g., Ignjatović et al., 1995, Trogrlić et al., 1995a, b), and the present study builds on their research.

The rationale of their operationalization of libido fixations as a foundation of later character development can be best seen from their own words. They started from a common place in psychoanalytic theory that

"Libido fixations in different phases of biogenetic development of an individual leave *different* relatively universal, perceivable (and self-perceivable) characteristics. Individual differences in these characteristics exist within the continuum which is determined by individual's intensity of utilisation of the mechanism of displacement; where

one end of the continuum is determined by almost bodily symptoms of fixations, known as bad habits in connection with mouth and biting, habits about consuming food and drink, preferences for certain food, bad habits regarding morning and evening toilette, and similar, and the other end by what is denoted as traits of character, i.e., emotional, motivational, interpersonal traits and traits of attitudes, ideas, beliefs about self. Those characteristics come into being by intensive *replacement* which is sometimes completely in accordance with standard finding of closer and distant similarity with basic fixational libidinal desiring and develops according to common sense logic, and sometimes it is performed by paradox Lewis-Carrollian manner of classification characteristic for dreamlike primary processes.

This work is focused on bodily symptoms of fixations, ergo, on something what is closer to *soma* but what is doubtlessly *antecedent* in causal chain of shaping of what is known as character types in basic psychoanalytic theory of Freud, Abraham and Reich.” (Ignjatović et al., 1995, p. 16, translation mine, italics in original).

One of results of this research project was development of libido fixations scales (versions FR1, FR2, FR3). Revised scale FR3, with some additional items added by the present author, is applied in this study. Factor analyses of these scales showed partial success in measuring libido fixations. The clearest support has been obtained for anal retentive, oral and oral-aggressive fixation. Oedipal complex (and underlying phallic fixation) appeared in the form of a negative attitude towards adults and parental figures. In a number of studies libido fixations operationalized in this way resulted in meaningful relationships (e.g., with family relationships in Trogrlić et al., 1995b; with Adlerian inferiority complexes in Višekruna, 1995).

If authoritarianism would prove to be related in meaningful way to libido fixations, it would give significant support to the original interpretation of the concept and its development. It would be difficult to interpret relationship between libido fixations and authoritarianism treating the latter just as a set of ideological attitudes.

This work is the first attempt to link authoritarianism and psychometrically defined libido fixations. Because libido fixation scale is still in developing stage and needs further construct validation, only general hypotheses about the expected relationships with authoritarianism can be stated. One is that factors indicating Oedipus complex and ambivalent attitude towards parental figures should be related to authoritarianism, and the second is that anal fixation and character traits should be related to aggressive aspects of authoritarianism. Not subscribing to Popperian simplistic criticism of psychoanalysis, it is attempted to *empirically* investigate some of its hypotheses.

The main general hypothesis derived from personality approach to prejudice is that authoritarianism significantly predicts antisemitic and anti-Gypsy attitudes both in Yugoslavia and in Hungary, and that authoritarianism is related to libido fixations.

### ***Social Learning Perspective***

First of all, it should be emphasised that there does not exist a single social learning theory of prejudice. Rather socialization and learning are explicitly or implicitly assumed to play crucial role in development of prejudice by various different theories. To illustrate this point, it is possible to list different factors believed to influence prejudice via social learning: experiences in early years of childhood, parents' attitudes and prejudices, influence of peers, teachers, social institutions (like slavery), social contact (hierarchical or egalitarian), mass media representation of minorities, language, tradition, personal experiences, historical and religious factors, ideology (e.g., nationalism), economic factors, etc. Various principles of social learning that Bandura discusses are generally applicable to the development of prejudice (Bandura, 1977).

Among the explanations of prejudice, a well known frustration-aggression theory is primarily based on learning principles (Dollard et al, 1939; Miller and Dollard, 1941).<sup>13</sup> This theory is based on two main assumptions: that frustration leads to aggression (also at the group level) and that aggression can be displaced and directed towards socially defined targets (scape-goats), frequently minorities. Obviously, this theory could be easily integrated with group conflict approach.

Most of the socio-cultural approaches to prejudices, like Katz' and Braly's famous studies (1933, 1935), also imply certain social-learning processes. It is assumed that individuals simply accept prejudiced attitudes because they are widespread in a society, thus disregarding the problem of *individual differences* within examined groups or society in general.

Explanations of prejudice which stress the role of tradition and social circumstances also imply social learning. It has been argued that where prejudices are more legitimate part of value system they are transmitted through social conditioning and authoritarian personality plays smaller role (e.g., Heaven, 1984, Pettigrew, 1959).

Personality and group conflict approaches also imply social learning processes in developing prejudice. It has been shown that Altemeyer's conception of authoritarianism is primarily based on social learning theory. Therefore, the three examined theories should be seen more as complementary than exclusive ones.

In fact, the only explanation of prejudice really *alternative* to social learning perspective would be genetic determinism. This is so because social learning represents more a paradigm in psychology than a specific theory. Both personality development and group behaviour can be largely accounted in terms of social learning. For example, symptom formation which psychoanalysis describes in terms of defence mechanisms, could be explained according to the social learning theory, as 'inappropriate generalisation'. Bandura (1977), giving an example of learning by inappropriate generalisation, quotes a

---

<sup>13</sup> The earlier version of this theory (1939) was related to psychoanalysis, i.e., it was an attempt to 'translate' psychoanalysis in terms of learning theories, but in the later version (1941) the role of learning is more emphasised.

case of “a woman who suffered from obsessions about being dirty and spent much of her time performing incapacitating hygiene rituals. This obsessive-compulsive behaviour began with her severe guilt feelings of “dirtiness” because of a love affair with a married man. Eventually, a wide range of stimuli related to uro-genital activities and all forms of dirt became disturbing to her.” (Bandura, 1997, p. 78). It is not a place to discuss benefits and costs of translating psychoanalysis into social learning concepts, but the point is that behind surface differences the three approaches discussed here have much in common.

It is possible to derive different predictions drawing on social learning theories. The most obvious one is that there should exist positive correlation between prejudices of parents and of their children. Because large and important part of socialization occurs within family examination of the similarity in prejudices attitudes between parents and offspring is a relevant test of the social learning theory. Moreover, controlling for personality factors (authoritarianism) will show the net contribution of parental models.

### ***Group-Conflict and Social-Identity Approach***

Even further from individual psychology are theories which emphasise conflicts between groups as the primary source of stereotypes and prejudice (e.g., Brown, 1995). A body of experimental evidence suggests that not only conflicts between groups but even the very existence of groups is sufficient to produce prejudices and differential treatment of in- and out-groups.

Basic principles of this approach are best outlined in a series of studies conducted by Sheriff and his colleagues, which became known as Realistic Group Conflict Theory (e.g., Sheriff, 1966). According to this perspective, inter-group attitudes are reflection of relationships between group. Competition over scarce resources results in enmity and prejudice, while cooperation over common goals leads positive intergroup relationships.

Group conflict theories can considerably differ in their focus and level of conflicts they consider. Some of the classical topics in this area are, for example, problems of whether social mobility of one group is sometimes leading to increased prejudices due to increased inter-groups tension (e.g., Silberstein and Seeman, 1988), or whether and what kind of contact between groups can diminish prejudices (e.g., Weiss, 1988, Hamberger and Hewstone, 1997). Even outside of social psychology many authors attribute the causal role in certain prejudices to group conflicts. For example, Bibo (1991) elaborating the role of cultural and historical processes in contemporary antisemitism in Hungary, analyses group conflicts between Jews and Gentiles. To a certain extent, most studies that primarily examine the role of macro-sociological variables, like class, occupation, education, residence, etc., could be integrated into the group-conflict perspective (e.g., Kovacs, 1996).

Another example of the use of group membership as the focal point of a research design is concerning prejudice is research by Triandis and Triandis (1988). The main variables they are dealing with are race, social class, religion, and nationality - all indicators of group membership. However, to a certain extent they felt a need to combine the group-relationships perspective with other psychological approaches as elements of their

interpretative framework. In their view, prejudices are partly results of attempts to solve *cognitive dissonance* concerning existing social inequalities. In case of anti-Jewish prejudice in the USA, prejudiced individuals explain above-average socio-economic status of Jews in the way that they are “pushy, shrewd, grasping, intelligent, sly and aggressive” (p. 513). In this way higher status of Jews is explained by attributing to them various negative traits, while potentially negative consequences for one’s self-identity due to one’s own lower status are transformed into positive social comparison. The conclusion could be: *yes, I am poorer but am morally superior*. Besides this attempt of integration of cognitive and group-conflict approach, they also incorporated authoritarianism perspective in their research (though selectively).

However, strength and weakness of group-conflict perspective are more obvious in concrete cases, when it is attempted to derive testable predictions. In case of antisemitism of students in Yugoslavia, its weakness seem more obvious if one attempts to derive unambiguous predictions (not only *post-hoc* interpretations). Namely, it is not clear to which groups approximately 2-3.000 Jews in Yugoslavia are an important conflicting group, whether objectively or symbolically. Group conflicts relevant for antisemitic attitudes could be based obviously on different grounds, as they have been during history. In middle ages, antisemitism was based primarily on religious grounds, while with the emergence of nationalist doctrine it became based more on racial doctrine (e.g., Wistrich, 1992). In case of Jews in Hungary a clue can be found in Kovacs (1996, 1998). He found that antisemitic prejudices are more widespread among students in departments where Jews are proportionally more present, and also that content of prejudice differ in different groups. In case of Gypsies, general prediction could be that lower classes have more negative attitudes towards them because they could be seen as competing groups.

Closely related to the realistic group conflict theory developed research program known as the Minimal Group Paradigm (e.g., Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel et al., 1971) and social-identity theory. This theory is on the border between personality and group approach. It holds that mere group membership is sufficient to produce in-group favouritism and negative perception of outgroups. Prejudices and negative attitudes serve a function of enhancing one’s self-identity. This clearly points towards individual psychology (personality) and is, to a certain extent, similar to one of the functions of attitudes according to Katz (1960) - namely the ego-defensive function. In psychoanalytical theorising this rationale is also known. Especially Adler’s concept of compensation as a defence mechanism in the struggle for overcoming the feeling (complex) of inferiority resemble social identity explanation (Adler, 1979). Moreover, in *The Authoritarian Personality* it is possible to find considerations which could easily fit into social identity approach.

The difference between social identity and other more personality based approaches is that the former is more narrow in scope. It is concerned primarily with prejudices and stereotypes, not with attitudes in general. Its basic assumption is that members of a group will tend to hold more negative attitudes and stereotypes about out-group simply in order to maintain positive social identity. It focuses on the aggregate level, it does not specifically account for individual differences within groups. However, further

assumptions could be easily integrated into the nomological network of this approach. For example, that certain individuals may have more unstable and insecure, ambivalent self-identity, and therefore be prone to react more negatively when encountered with out-group. But, further development in this direction would take this theory into the realm of personality theories and social identity theory would lose its distinct social identity.

The other, more important difference, is that the emphasis is placed onto one's relationship towards her in-group and out-group. Groups are seen as very important sources of social identity. One's own self-definition is largely constructed around groups to which she belongs or does not belong, or just believes to belong or does not belong. For this reason similar groups with unclear boundaries between them may develop particularly antagonistic attitudes. From this follows that higher social strata may have more positive attitudes towards Gypsies because clear boundaries dividing them do not endanger their self-identity.

In a sense, group-conflict perspective as a general approach seems obvious, almost banal: How can a group display antisemitic prejudice if its members never heard of or had contact with them? Deviant cases, like antisemitism in Japan, or "antisemitism without Jews" in Poland could be interpreted as resulting from media influence (Japan) and historical heritage<sup>14</sup> (Poland).

For the same reason that group conflict perspective may seem a common place, it has strong empirical support. According to present data, Yugoslavs have the most negative attitudes toward Albanians, Bosnian Muslims, Croats, Turks and Germans - obviously the groups with history of conflicts with Serbia.<sup>15</sup>

While this approach seems inevitable in explaining the origin, spread and even content of various prejudices, its contribution to the explanation of individual differences within groups is not clear. In the present research, this approach will be tested only to the degree that it predicts differences in anti-Jewish and anti-Gypsy prejudice between 'classical' macro-sociological groups, like socio-economic strata.

### **Resume of the introduction:**

In various studies some aspects of these and other theories of prejudice are compared. However, attempts to simultaneously test several predictions from various theories are rare. Partly, it is because of the complexity of the theories of prejudice. It is difficult to successfully operationalize even some of the most relevant aspects of a single theory, let alone several theories at the same time. Another important reason for the deficiency of simultaneous comparisons of prejudice theories is the difficulty in specifying unambiguous predictions or testable predictions, as can be seen in the above presentation.

---

<sup>14</sup> Indeed related to group conflicts.

<sup>15</sup> However, group-conflict theory cannot explain why, for example, French and English are perceived most positively, even more than Serbs themselves.

Furthermore, it is not unlikely that from different theories could be derived the same predictions thus making differential evaluation of theories rather difficult.

However, it is important to note that these theories are in many respects complementary and that different domains they focus on are important for understanding of prejudice. Group processes are largely relevant for the origin, content and group differences in prejudices. Once prejudice came into being they are transferred via social learning. Further problem is how to explain in-group individual differences. Authoritarianism theory is one attempt of explanation, but it also needs explanation itself: what is actually authoritarianism. The ambition of the present research is to say something relevant about different aspects of these problems

### ***Research Problem: Causal Modelling of Anti-Gypsy and Anti-Jewish Prejudice***

This study attempts to examine relationships between antisemitic and anti-Gypsy attitudes, and a set of social and psychological variables. The goal is to compare explanatory power of different theories of prejudices, and to build causal models based on empirical results. The goal is by no means to offer decisive arguments pro or contra certain theories, because for that purpose much more complex research design would be needed.

In causal modelling research design it is crucial to provide theoretical justification of the order of variables. Statistical analysis only shows relationships *as if* the order of variables included in the analysis corresponds to the causal order, and if all relevant variables are included. For this purpose, obviously, it is necessary to have clear theoretical propositions according to which models could be constructed. However, it is frequently easier to agree with this principle than to fulfil it. For example, at the recent conference in Budapest on authoritarianism and prejudice, a variety of causal models have been presented (e.g., Kovacs, 1998, Enyedi, 1998, Fabian, 1998, Bergman, 1998). One of the constant elements in the presented models was that various socio-demographic variables were put at the beginning of hypothesised causal chains, for presumably obvious reasons (the same is done in this study too).

More questionable is, however, the inclusion of variables of the same theoretical 'order' as explanatory to each other. Specifically, prejudices (antisemitic or anti-Gypsy) were explained by ethnocentrism or xenophobia. It has been acknowledged that it is not perhaps the ideal explanation, but it seems that theoretical considerations and methodological operationalizations have not always been congruent.<sup>16</sup>

The same problem applies to authoritarianism: if it is a complex of attitudes, or ideology, which includes prejudice, than it cannot explain prejudice. It needs further explanation, e.g., that authoritarian attitudes and prejudices are learned and internalised in

---

<sup>16</sup> Therefore Kovacs (1998) interpreted antisemitism as one of the manifestations of xenophobia, not that xenophobia explains antisemitism. Bergman (1998), on the other hand, only acknowledged that it is problematic to explain ideology by another set of ideological factors, but did not offer solution.

an ideological 'package' and therefrom comes their correlation. In this case, authoritarianism would not be the 'cause' of prejudices, but only a correlated phenomenon. If authoritarianism is understood as a personality trait or 'type', than causal interpretation seems more appropriate. Of course, it still needs further explanation, and for that purpose scale concerning libido fixations has been included in the present research.

On the basis of the outlined theoretical considerations, variables included in this research are ordered in the way presented in Figure 1 (Hungarian study) and Figure 2 (Yugoslavian study). Both figures refer to antisemitic prejudice. In case of anti-Gypsy prejudice models are the same, except that the final response variable is anti-Gypsy prejudice (AG), and in Hungarian case, parent's anti-Gypsy attitudes (PAG) are one of the intermediate variables, instead of PAS. Causal chain starts from the right side.

### **Figure 1 Order of variables based on the survey in Hungary**

AS is treated as a response variable of the primary interest. According to Adorno et al's theory (1950), authoritarianism is the principal causal factor behind individual differences in prejudice, including antisemitism. Therefore, AUT variable is immediately behind the primary response variable. Parent's antisemitism is explanatory to student's authoritarianism and directly or indirectly to student's antisemitism. Parent's authoritarianism is seen as potentially influencing PAS, AUT and AS, while not being under their influence.

One could argue that PAS and PAUT should be analysed as variables on equal footing. On the one hand such argument could be accepted, because both could be seen as attitudinal variables and potential influence could go in both directions. However, relying on Adorno et al's theory, authoritarianism is taken as 'psychologically deeper' variable whose surface manifestation is, among others, antisemitism. Also, in this view, authoritarianism developmentally occurs much earlier.

Parents' income and education are treated as final explanatory variables. They are presented as being on equal footing. While this is problematic taking into account that education usually antedates income, for children's antisemitism this distinction is not particularly important. Furthermore, putting Income in front of Education would not change anything substantively in the performed analysis.

Unfortunately, it was impossible to obtain data on parents in the Yugoslavian survey. However, it contains students' responses on the questionnaire dealing with libido fixations.

**Figure 2 Order of variables based on the survey in Yugoslavia**

Socio-economic variables are again at the beginning of the hypothesised causal chain. Libido fixations are antecedent to authoritarianism, which is explanatory variable for antisemitic (and anti-Gypsy) prejudice.

It is assumed that in the previous sections sufficient justification has been provided for this order of variables. Some additional variables could have been included too, but the reason that they are not is that they either were unrelated to any or most of the included variables, or that their role both in the examined theories and in the present models is not clear.

***Hypotheses***

It is important to note that the following predictions are rather tentative and, particularly in the case of Group Conflict theories, rather ambiguous. Therefore it is more appropriate to understand the following analysis as descriptive or exploratory than as confirmatory in the strict sense. Nevertheless, the following main general hypotheses are derived:

- Authoritarianism theory predicts that authoritarianism has a primary role in antisemitic attitudes (both for parents and students) and that other variables can have only indirect influence. Additional specific hypothesis is that authoritarian aggressiveness is the most significant predictor of prejudice.
- Authoritarianism is expected to be stronger predictor of prejudices, especially anti-Jewish, in Yugoslavia than in Hungary. Also, authoritarianism should be more related to antisemitic than to anti-Jewish attitudes in both samples.
- About libido fixations predictions are not clear because these relationships seem not too elaborated in psychoanalytic literature, and there are no previous studies.

Therefore, only general hypothesis is suggested namely that there exist significant relationship between libido fixations and authoritarianism dimensions.

- Social learning theories predict that parents' attitudes are much more important than any other variable.
- From the Group Conflict approach predictions are rather ambiguous, because it is not sure which groups within Hungary and Yugoslavia are more in conflict with Jews than others. At least such groups are not sufficiently well represented in the survey. One hypothesis could be that because Jews tend to concentrate in middle-class occupations, especially where university education is required, educational level should be positively related to antisemitism (cf. Kovacs, 1996). Similar hypothesis could be proposed for the variable Income. On the other side, groups of lower education and income could perceive Jews as unjustly superior to them and therefore express prejudiced attitudes toward them (cf. Triandis and Triandis, 1988). Obviously, group-conflict perspective does not offer clear prediction concerning variables education and income.

### ***Method***

This work is based on two surveys conducted in Hungary and in Yugoslavia. Hungarian data are generously made available by Zsolt Enyedi of the Political Science Department, CEU, and were collected by the Social Research Informatics Center (TARKI). Yugoslavian survey was organised by the author with the help of the research grant obtained from Nationalism Department, CEU, Budapest. The data were collected with in cooperation with the Department of Psychology, University in Novi Sad, and newspaper @ig, Subotica, Yugoslavia.

### **Hungarian Sample**

Hungarian data are based on the random sample of 400 college students and their parents (only one parent of every student is interviewed; total N=800). The study was conducted in two Hungarian cities: Sopron and Salgotarjan, in November and December of 1997.

Data were collected by interviewing each respondent. Equal number of interviews was collected in both cities. 22.8% of parents were of the female gender, while sexes were more equally represented among students: 48.5% of them were girls. Most students were born in 1981 (83.5%) while the rest were born in 1980. Average age of parents was 44 years, with standard deviation of 5 years and six months.

### ***Variables***

The following variables are included in the model:

1. **AS** - Antisemitic attitudes or prejudice of students. This is the response variable of the primary interest in this study. It is operationalised by the scale of 13 items in Likert format, with originally four degrees of dis/agreement. Answer option of 'do not know'

was assigned intermediate value (1 stands for 'strongly disagree', 4 for 'strongly agree', while 'do not know' received the value of 2.5; the same strategy was applied to both students' and parents' samples and to both antisemitism and authoritarianism scales). Preliminary analysis showed that this increases reliability of the scale, and, obviously, the number of valid cases. Sample item: *There is a secret Jewish co-operation.*

For the analysis, AS attitudes are mathematically defined as the first principal component from the antisemitism scale. Reliability of the antisemitism scale (Cronbach's alpha) on the student sample is .78.

2. **AG** - Anti-Gypsy attitudes of students. AG scale consists of nine items in the same format as AS and AUT scale. Sample item: *The inclination to commit crimes is inborn in Gypsies.* Reliability of the AG scale on the sample of students is .80.
3. **AUT** - Students' Authoritarianism, represents students' answers to the authoritarianism (AUT) scale. The scale consists of 21 items of the same format as the AS scale. The AUT scale is based on Adorno et al.'s F scale and Altemeyer's RWA scale (Altemeyer, 1981, 1988). Sample item: *The most important virtues a child has to learn are obedience and respect of authorities.*

Four items from the entire 25-item scale are omitted for they explicitly dealt with attitudes either to Hungarian nation or toward ethnic minorities. Presence of such items would artificially increase relationships with ethnic prejudice due to the overlapping content (semi-tautological items). Alpha reliability of the AUT scale on the student sample is .68.

4. **PAS** - Parent's antisemitism is constructed in the same way as the student's antisemitism (AS), only that it is based on parents' answers. Reliability of this scale on the sample of parents is .78.
5. **PAUT** - Parent's authoritarianism is constructed in the same way as the AUT scores for students, only that this variable is based on the answers given by parents. Reliability of the AUT scale on the sample of parents is .78, rather better than on the sample of students.
6. **PAG** - Parents' anti-Gypsy attitudes are defined by parents' answer to the anti-Gypsy scale. Analysis is performed on the first principal component. Reliability of the AG scale in this sample is .79.
7. **Income** - this variable consists of parents' answer to the question concerning *net family income per month*. After excluding those who refused to answer (70 cases) and those who answered 'does not know' (10 cases), the average family net income is 67,549Ft (Median=60.000.00, Mode=50,000.00Ft; standard deviation is 43,609.88Ft).
8. **Education** - this is a composite variable, constructed by adding answers to two questions dealing with educational level of both parents. The questions had 7 categories, from category 1 meaning unfinished primary school, to 7 meaning university education. Hence, the composite variable had minimum of 2 and maximum

of 14. Preliminary analysis showed that such a joint variable has better predictive power than educational level of a single parent.

It is important to note that all selected variables are (in principle) continuous<sup>17</sup> except the variable Education. However, this variable can be justly treated at least as an ordinal variable. For ordinal variables there are convincing arguments that they can be treated as if they are measured on the interval level, if the number of levels is five or more. Therefore, in the present analysis all variables are treated as being of the interval type, and corresponding methods of analysis were employed.

### **Yugoslavian Sample**

This sample consists of **120** respondents, primarily students from the University in Novi Sad, Yugoslavia. Data were collected in May and June 1998. Questionnaires were administered in *group setting*, and *anonymity* of respondents was secured, what is an advantage in examination of prejudice. The sample is not representative. 54.3% of respondents are females. Median age of respondents is 23, so the sample is evidently older than the Hungarian. 63.7% of respondents are ethnic Serbs.

Differences between the two samples are significant so direct comparisons of sample *parameters* will be avoided. However, the emphasis is on *relationships* between variables, and for that purpose samples can be treated as comparable.

### **Variables**

Antisemitism, anti-Gypsy and authoritarianism scales are directly translated by the author to Serbo-Croatian language and incorporated into the Yugoslavian questionnaire. Reliability of the **AS** scale in Yugoslavia is .76, of anti-Gypsy (**AG**) scale is .78, and of authoritarianism scale .81.

In the Yugoslavian sample was included also scale of libido fixations, **FR3** (Ignjatović et al., 1995). The scale originally consisted of 64 items, but the present author added 14 new items, so the applied version contained 78 items. The scale is in Likert format, with 7 degrees of dis/agreement, higher value indicating higher agreement. Details of the analysis of this scale will be presented in subsequent sections. Sample items: *I frequently read in toilette.*

Variables of Income and Education are operationalized in the same way as in the Hungarian sample. The only difference is that in the Hungarian case answers were given by parents, and in Yugoslavia by students. Average level of education of parents of Yugoslavian respondents is higher than in Hungary. It is due to the fact that Yugoslavian respondents are primarily university students, non-randomly selected.

---

<sup>17</sup> More appropriate is to say that variables are treated as quantitative rather than continuous. Continuous variables in the strict sense are rare occurrences in social sciences.

### ***Method of data analysis and graphical presentation***

First step in the analysis is to ‘prepare’ variables for causal modelling. For that purpose, authoritarianism scale is factor-analysed in all samples, and extracted factors are entered into causal models. Anti-Gypsy and antisemitism scales are re-scaled onto the first principal component in all samples. Libido fixations scale is factor analysed and six extracted factors were retained for the further analysis.

Causal modelling is performed according to slightly modified rules elaborated by Cox and Wermuth (1996). The main results are presented in the form of partially directed acyclic graphs (Cox and Wermuth, 1996). This methodology is in a strict sense *graphical modelling* not causal modelling (the same holds for path analysis). Causal interpretation comes entirely from theoretical, subject-matter considerations, not from the results of the statistical analysis. Different order of variables, exclusion of some and inclusion of other, perhaps more relevant variables, may substantively change the model.

### ***Results***

#### **Preparatory analyses**

##### ***Antisemitism (AS) scale***

Antisemitism scale, with items means for students and parents is presented in the Table 1. It appears that parents generally displayed lower level of antisemitic attitudes than their children. For example, with the item I: *It would be better if Jews lived in their own state, Israel.*, students expressed higher agreement. They agreed or strongly agreed in 32,9% of cases, while parents expressed such agreement in 15.7% of cases.

**Table 1 Antisemitism scale, with item means of students and parents, Hungarian sample<sup>18</sup>**

Code label	Item (abbreviated versions)	Students’ Mean	Parents’ Mean*
ZSIDOA	Marriage between Jews and non Jews does not do good to either	2.05	1.86
ZSIDOB	There is a secret Jewish cooperation.	2.21	2.34
ZSIDOC	Jewish intellectuals keep media and culture under their influence	2.06	2.34
ZSIDOD	The deportation and annihilation of Jews in 2nd world war was...	2.33	1.85
ZSIDOE	What sort of person one is does not depend on if he is Jewish	1.29	1.19
ZSIDOF	In certain professions the number of Jews should be limited	1.82	1.56
ZSIDOG	Jews are often charged with ridiculous things	2.08	1.97
ZSIDOH	Jews profited the most from the system change	2.28	2.16

<sup>18</sup> In further text prefix S in front of antisemitism and other items refers to parents responses, while prefix F refers to students’ answers in the Hungarian sample.

ZSIDOI	It would be better if Jews lived in their own state, Israel	2.30	1.80
ZSIDOJ	One's fortune should not depend on his origin	1.43	1.26
ZSIDOK	It is better to have nothing to do with Jews	2.15	1.96
ZSIDOL	Hungarian Jews suffered as much as others	1.69	1.53
ZSIDOM	I will not tell anyone what I think of Jews	2.30	2.10

\* Means refer to the numeric scale from 1 (disagree) to 4 (agree).

It contradicts to widely held belief that prejudices are decreasing over time. However, it is possible that these results represent the age effect and not cohort or period effects. Moreover, these differences are relatively small, and they tend to diminish further when the neutral answer category is left out of the analysis. On the other side, parents seem to be more inclined towards belief in Jewish conspiracy - they have higher means only on the items B and E. It seems that parents tend to accept more those items that could be interpreted as 'old -fashioned', or 'traditional' antisemitism (cf. Kovacs, 1996). These findings could be discussed extensively. Here they serve only to illustrate the importance of studying antisemitic attitudes in Hungary: if these results represent a general trend of more negative views of minorities by the youth, it may be worrying (cf. Kovacs, 1996).

Communalities and loadings at the first principal component of the antisemitism scale in Hungary and Yugoslavia are presented in the Table 2. Though communalities are relatively low, loadings are generally high enough to justify retaining only the first component from the AS scale.

**Table 2 Loadings on the 1st principal component of the antisemitism scale and communalities in samples from Hungary and Yugoslavia\***

Variable	Hungarian students		Hungarian Parents		Yugoslavian students	
	Loading	Communality	Loading	Communality	Loading	Communality
FZSIDOA	.51897	.26933	.59266	.35125	.48853	.41067
FZSIDOB	.44055	.19409	.55983	.31341	.76071	.82831
FZSIDOC	.50706	.25711	.59082	.34907	.69043	.87375
FZSIDOD	.38886	.15122	.39510	.15610	.48374	.74950
FZSIDOE	.42759	.18283	.31819	.10125	.26146	.73550
FZSIDOF	.66875	.44723	.64969	.42209	.68823	.56245
FZSIDOG	.42512	.18073	.35695	.12741	.57842	.72039
FZSIDOH	.47593	.22651	.70791	.50114	.45800	.37198
FZSIDOI	.69842	.48779	.68092	.46365	.62572	.65248
FZSIDOJ	.50922	.25931	.30130	.09078	.22304	.73709
FZSIDOK	.70398	.49559	.63551	.40388	.71489	.55039
FZSIDOL	.52731	.27805	.47766	.22816	.09321	.75565
FZSIDOM	.42640	.18182	.43821	.19203	.58614	.63176
% of variance	27.8%		28.5%		30.1%	

\* Items formulated in negative direction are re-coded, therefore all of them have positive loadings.

Structure of this dimension seems to be similar in all three samples, though in Yugoslavian case ‘traditional’ stereotypes (items B and C) seem to be more relevant. Also, item L has very low loading. It may be due to the fact that problem of Jewish sufferings in Serbia during the Second World War have not actually been present in public discourse, or much less than in Hungary. Belief in Serbian-Jewish friendship could also contributed to this feature of the data. For the same reason traditional stereotypes could appear as more relevant because discriminatory measures towards Jews have also never been part of the public debate. Nevertheless, dimensions defined in this way seem to well represent the concept of interest in this research.

### ***Anti-Gypsy (AG) scale***

Anti-Gypsy scale, with item means for students and parents in the Hungarian sample is presented in the Table 3.

**Table 3 Anti-Gypsy attitudes scale and item means for parents and students, Hungarian sample**

Code label	Items (abbreviated versions)	Parents' Mean*	Students' Mean
SROMAA	Gypsies must get more help than others	3.17	3.22
SROMAB	Gypsies must be separated from the rest of the society	1.57	1.82
SROMAC	Many Gypsies do not work for they get benefits	3.00	3.07
SROMAD	This country should make sacrifices so that Gypsies could learn...	1.98	2.46
SROMAE	It is good to still have places of entertainment where Gypsies can not enter..	1.82	3.38
SROMAF	It would be better for all if Hungarian and Gypsy kids would be separated...	1.67	2.04
SROMAG	The inclination to commit crimes is inborn in the Gypsies	2.35	2.46
SROMAH	Many Gypsies do not work because they cannot find a job...	2.35	2.40
SROMAI	There is the same amount of honest people among Gypsies as among....	2.21	2.14

\* Means refer to the numeric scale from 1 (disagree) to 4 (agree).

Loadings and communalities at the first principal component of the anti-Gypsy scale in Hungary and Yugoslavia are presented in the Table 4. Great difference between parents and students at the item E (students more in favour of entertainment places without Gypsies) points towards group-conflict interpretation.

Similarities between samples in the AG scale are even greater than for the AS scale. Percentages of explained variance are also higher than in case of AS scale. That means that

respondents expressed more homogeneous or coherent attitudes regarding Gypsies than about Jews.

**Table 4 Loadings on the 1st PC and communalities for the anti-Gypsy scale, samples from Hungary and Yugoslavia\***

Variable	Hungarian students		Hungarian parents		Yugoslav students	
	Loading	Communality	Loading	Communality	Loading	Communality
FROMAA	.54	.30	.57	.33	.44	.50
FROMAB	.70	.49	.71	.50	.80	.65
FROMAC	.50	.25	.53	.28	.47	.25
FROMAD	.56	.31	.54	.30	.49	.63
FROMAE	.67	.45	.70	.50	.65	.50
FROMAF	.73	.53	.65	.42	.65	.65
FROMAG	.70	.49	.72	.52	.81	.70
FROMAH	.49	.24	.54	.29	.44	.54
FROMAI	.63	.40	.57	.33	.66	.47
% of variance	38.4%		38.5%		38.0%	

\* Items formulated in negative direction are re-coded, therefore all of them have positive loadings.

Reliabilities for AG scale in samples of Hungarian parents, students and Yugoslavians are .79, .80 and .78. They are slightly higher than in case of the AS scale, which is another sign of the greater coherence of anti-Gypsy attitudes. It can be concluded that this scale reliably measures the same thing in all three samples and that meaningful comparisons can be made.

#### ***Authoritarianism scale, Hungarian students***

Eigenvalues, raw and cumulative percentages of explained variance by the three extracted factors of the Authoritarianism scale in the sample of Hungarian students are given in the Table 5. According to the Scree criterion, three factors are extracted and rotated in

Oblimin position. 30.5% of variance accounted for by these three factors are relatively satisfactory result. Relative strength of the all three components suggest that they all represent substantive dimensions.

**Table 5 Eigenvalues, raw and cumulative percentages of explained variance by the three extracted factors of the Authoritarianism scale, sample of Hungarian students**

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of explained variance	Cumulative %
1	3.13	14.9	14.9
2	1.76	8.4	23.3
3	1.53	7.3	30.5

Structure of the first rotated factor is given in Table 6. Items generally deal with discipline and obedience, respect for authorities, like parents, tradition, leaders. Items with aggressive content also appeared on this factor, though with lower projections.

**Table 6 Authoritarian submissiveness, students from Hungary**

No.	Item (abbreviated version)	FAC1
1	Healthy normal and honest people do not think of hurting friend or ...	.55
3	The most contemptible are those who do not show respect to their parents...	.52
4	The most important virtues a child has to learn are obedience...	.68
5	The young sometimes have rebellious thoughts...	.62
7	The young should be encouraged to revise the traditions...	-.31
11	The country rather needs devoted leaders than laws	.31
13	Young people need strict determination and regulations..	.48
14	Most social problems would be solved by getting rid of immoral...	.48
17	One should be careful not to get a disease...	.45
22	Courts are right to condemn drug users...	.30

Taking into account previously analysed factorial studies of authoritarianism, it seems that this factor corresponds to *authoritarian submissiveness* from Altemeyer's studies.

Second rotated factor (Table 7) contains items expressing hierarchical authoritarian world-view (item 24, 15), projection of aggressiveness (items 18, 2, 14), preference for violent management of conflicts (item 12), but also racist tendencies (21). Common for these items seems to be *authoritarian aggressiveness*. Aggressive content generally expresses itself under the guise of certain authority, or traditional 'morality' (items 16 and 2). Therefore, the interpretation of this factor in the sense of authoritarian aggressiveness seems justified. It resembles its definition by Adorno et al. (1950), and also Altemeyer's (1988) conception.

**Table 7 Authoritarian Aggressiveness; Hungarian students**

No.	Item (abbreviated version)	FAC2
-----	----------------------------	------

2	We should revenge the offences to our honesty	.51
8	Immoral conditions are due to that parents and teachers forg	.31
11	The country rather needs devoted leaders than laws	.34
12	Violence is often better than long negotiations	.49
14	Most social problems would be solved by getting rid of immoral...	.48
15	People can be divided into 2 groups: the strong and the weak	.51
16	One should often say what he thinks	.39
17	One should be careful not to get a disease...	.32
18	Most people are not aware that secret conspiracies influence...	.53
21	It is wrong that Black and White people can marry.	.48
24	There are nations destined to rule and others to serve.	.59

Third factor is presented in the Table 8. This is bi-polar factor. One end is defined by items expressing negative opinion of ‘soft’ teachers and parents (8), distrust in social environment (17), racism and obedience (4). Negative pole is defined by higher (negative) projections, and items expressing critical view of traditional authorities (religion, item 9, and patriarchalism, item 20) and hierarchical view of nations (item 25).

**Table 8 Authoritarian conventionalism, Hungarian Students**

No.	Item (abbreviated version)	FAC 3
4	The most important virtues a child has to learn are obedience...	.30
8	Immoral conditions are due to that parents and teachers forg	.49
9	Traditional religious principles should be less emphasised	-.57
17	One should be careful not to get a disease...	.36
20	One should refuse the idea that father is the head of family	-.37
21	It is wrong that Black and White people can marry.	.36
25	None nation is better than the other.	-.46

It seems that one end of this dimension is defined by traditional, patriarchal and authoritarian values and beliefs, while the other end represents non-conventional, non-conformist, liberal attitudes. This factor seems to be less clearly defined comparing to the previous two. It could be seen as a component of authoritarian submissiveness and of aggressiveness. However, it is interpreted as *authoritarian conventionalism*, in the sense of rigid, intolerant acceptance of conventional values.

Correlation between the three extracted factor are shown in the Table 9. Coefficients are relatively low, but it may be due to the Oblimin method of rotation, which tends to underestimate correlation between factors. If all these dimensions are part of the

one syndrome, coefficients should be higher. However, present results suggest that we deal with relatively independent dimensions.

**Table 9 Correlation coefficients between authoritarianism factors, Hungarian student sample**

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Factor 2	.17	
Factor 3	.01	-.03

Summarising the factor analysis of the AUT scale among Hungarian students it can be said that three extracted factors resemble three authoritarian dimensions most frequently mentioned in literature. They are: authoritarian submissiveness, authoritarian aggressiveness, and authoritarian conventionalism.

***Authoritarianism scale, Hungarian parents***

Scree test suggested also three significant factors in the correlation matrix of the AUT scale among parents in the Hungarian sample. First component accounts for somewhat higher proportion of variance than among students (three factors together too, Table 10). It means that parents gave more homogeneous answers to the entire scale than students. It is possible that at the older age authoritarianism becomes more organised and unidimensional, while youth differently sees various aspects of the authoritarian syndrome. However, it can be effect not only of age but also of the period and cohort.

**Table 10 Eigenvalues, raw and cumulative percentages of explained variance by the three extracted factors of the Authoritarianism scale, sample of Hungarian parents**

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of explained variance	Cumulative %
1	4.52	21.5	21.5
2	1.47	7.0	28.5
3	1.41	6.7	35.3

The three extracted factors generally resemble factors from the student sample. The first factor (Table 11) is interpreted also as *authoritarian submissiveness*. Though it seems that in this case it contains somewhat stronger aggressive component (items 14, 8, 12). However, the predominance of items dealing with obedience, submission, authority, provides justification for the adopted interpretation.

**Table 11 : Authoritarian Submissiveness: structure of the first Oblimin rotated factor; Hungarian parents**

No.	Item (abbreviated version)	FAC1
4	The most important virtues a child has to learn are obedience...	.64

5	The young sometimes have rebellious thoughts...	.54
7	The young should be encouraged to revise the traditions...	-.40
8	Immoral conditions are due to that parents and teachers forg	.32
11	The country rather needs devoted leaders than laws	.69
12	Violence is often better than long negotiations	.66
13	Young people need strict determination and regulations..	.61
14	Most social problems would be solved by getting rid of immoral...	.72
15	People can be divided into 2 groups: the strong and the weak	.56
17	One should be careful not to get a disease...	.63
18	Most people are not aware that secret conspiracies influence...	.60
21	It is wrong that Black and White people can marry.	.39
22	Courts are right to condemn drug users...	.40
24	There are nations destined to rule and others to serve.	.45

The second factors (Table 12) very clearly suggests interpretation in the sense of *authoritarian aggressiveness*. Presence of items with lower saturation expressing obedience and submission shows that aggressiveness in this case is indeed authoritarian.

**Table 12 Authoritarian Aggressiveness : structure of the second Oblimin rotated factor; Hungarian parents**

No.	Item (abbreviated version)	FAC2
1	Healthy normal and honest people do not think of hurting friend or ...	.38
2	We should revenge the offences to our honesty	.64
4	The most important virtues a child has to learn are obedience...	.38
5	The young sometimes have rebellious thoughts...	.34
8	Immoral conditions are due to that parents and teachers forg	.64
14	Most social problems would be solved by getting rid of immoral...	.39
16	One should often say what he thinks	.49

The third factor (Table 13), as in the previous case, is relatively unclear, but is similar to the corresponding factor in the sample of students. On the one pole is again traditional, conventional values (authority of the father, strict teachers, and nationalism), while on the other end is non-traditionalism, expressing the right to stand against authorities.

**Table 13 Authoritarian Conventionalism: structure of the third Oblimin rotated factor; Hungarian parents**

No.	Item (abbreviated version)	FAC3
3	The most contemptible are those who do not show respect to their parents	-.31
8	Immoral conditions are due to that parents and teachers forg	.30
9	Traditional religious principles should be less emphasised	-.52
20	One should refuse the idea that father is the head of family	.40
25	None nation is better than the other.	.63

For the same reasons as above, this factor is interpreted as *authoritarian conventionalism*, though it should be kept in mind its relatively specific meaning. Perhaps, cultural differences between western countries and Hungary contributed to relatively specific definition of conventionalism. Especially in this sample, this factor is ambiguous. It deals largely with traditional authorities, especially parents, but similar items have projections in both directions. On the one hand, critical attitude towards patriarchalism (item 20) is in positive direction, while in negative is critical attitude towards ‘traditional religious principles’ (item 9). It seems that this factor expresses a kind of balanced view of authorities. It is critical towards some established authorities, but also accepts the value of some elements in tradition. The item with the highest saturation is non-nationalist statement. Therefore, it should be kept in mind that although label *conventionalism* may be appropriate to this factor, it is not sure that attribute of *authoritarian* fits it well.

Correlations between factors are again relatively low, though relationship between submissiveness and aggressiveness is relatively stronger (Table 14). Obviously, among parents these two dimensions tend to converge towards one dimension, what was noticeable already in the structure of the factors.

**Table 14 Correlation coefficients between authoritarianism factors, Hungarian Parents sample**

	Factor 1	Factor 2
Factor 2	.24	
Factor 3	.01	-.08

Factor analysis of the AUT scale among parents also allowed interpretation of the factors in the sense of Altemeyer’s triad of authoritarian submissiveness, aggressiveness and conventionalism. It could be objected that the factors do not always exactly follow definitions of these concepts. Arguments in favour of the present interpretation are that the use of widely known concepts for labelling of factors will enhance communication of the results and comparison with other research, and also that slight departure of present factors could be due to cultural differences.

### ***Authoritarianism scale, Yugoslavian sample***

In the Yugoslavian sample, three factors were also extracted according to the Scree test. Eigenvalues, percentages of variance and cumulative percentages of variance are presented in the Table 15. The explained variance is slightly higher than in Hungarian samples.

**Table 15 Eigenvalues of magnitude above zero, and percentages of explained variance for Authoritarianism scale, Yugoslavian sample. First 3 factors are rotated and extracted.**

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.55983	21.7	21.7
2	1.92254	9.2	30.9
3	1.71922	8.2	39.1

First Oblimin factor is presented in the Table 16. It resembles corresponding factors from the Hungarian samples, and is interpreted in the same way, as *Authoritarian Submissiveness*.

**Table 16 *Authoritarian Submissiveness* - structure of the first Oblimin rotated factor from the Authoritarianism scale, Yugoslavian sample. Correlations above .30 presented.**

No.	Item (abbreviated version)	Loading
1	Healthy normal and honest people do not think of hurting friend or	.67
3	The most contemptible are those who do not show respect to their parents	.68
4	The most important virtues a child has to learn are obedience...	.33
8	Immoral conditions are due to that parents and teachers forg	.46
11	The country rather needs devoted leaders than laws	.52
13	Young people need strict determination and regulations..	.62
14	Most social problems would be solved by getting rid of immoral...	.57
15	People can be divided into 2 groups: the strong and the weak	.40
16	One should often say what he thinks	.38
22	Courts are right to condemn drug users...	.43

The second factor (Table 17) also clearly resembles corresponding factors in the previous analyses. It is interpreted as *authoritarian aggressiveness*. It is interesting that items capturing nationalist sentiments appears on this factor (item 25). It seems that in Yugoslavia authoritarian aggressiveness is closely related with extreme nationalism (cf. Todosijević, 1998)

**Table 17 *Authoritarian Aggressiveness* - structure of the second Oblimin rotated factor from the Authoritarianism scale, Yugoslavian sample. Correlations above .30 presented.**

No.	Item (abbreviated version)	Loading
1	Healthy normal and honest people do not think of hurting friend or	-.33
2	We should revenge the offences to our honesty	.38
5	The young sometimes have rebellious thoughts...	.46
8	Immoral conditions are due to that parents and teachers forg	.41
12	Violence is often better than long negotiations	.57
17	One should be careful not to get a disease...	.53
18	Most people are not aware that secret conspiracies influence...	.54
21	It is wrong that Black and White people can marry.	.71
24	There are nations destined to rule and others to serve.	.48
25	None nation is better than the other.	-.51

In Table 18 is shown pattern of the third authoritarianism factor. It is again bipolar, with traditional, patriarchal, conventional attitudes on the one side and non-conformist, rebellious attitudes on the other. Therefore, the same interpretation is applied here as in case of Hungarian respondents, and factor is labelled as *authoritarian conventionalism* (note that *negative* pole is defined by conventionalism, while items with positive projections express non-conformist, non-conventional attitudes).

**Table 18 *Conventionalism* (negative pole) - structure of the third factor from the Authoritarianism scale, Yugoslavian sample. Correlations above .30 presented.**

No.	Item (abbreviated version)	Loading
4	The most important virtues a child has to learn are obedience...	-.52
7	The young should be encouraged to revise the traditions...	.65
9	Traditional religious principles should be less emphasised	.61
15	People can be divided into 2 groups: the strong and the weak	-.33
20	One should refuse the idea that father is the head of family	.54
21	It is wrong that Black and White people can marry.	.44
25	None nation is better than the other.	.36

Correlation between authoritarianism factors are relatively higher and significant (Table 19) This suggest that in Yugoslavian case, authoritarian dimensions indeed appear as measuring different aspects of the one syndrome.

**Table 19 Correlations between the three extracted Authoritarianism factors.**

	Auth. Submissiveness	Auth. Aggressiveness
Authoritarian Aggressiveness	.21**	
Conventionalism	-.13*	-.14**

\*\* p<.01; \* p<.05

This part of analysis resulted in three authoritarianism factors in each of the analysed samples. They are interpreted as indicating the same dimensions - authoritarian submission, aggressiveness, and conventionalism. In spite of certain differences between corresponding factors, it seems that they have sufficiently similar content that justifies treating them as comparable dimensions.

Results in Yugoslavia more resemble theoretical definition of authoritarian syndrome. Factors are more correlated, percentage of explained variance is higher, as well as reliability of the whole scale. Besides possible cultural differences between samples, it can be the result of specific features of the Yugoslavian sample. The respondents are older on average, they are more educated (predominantly university students), and come from families of the higher socio-economic status comparing Hungarians respondents. Homogeneity of the sample according to 'external' variables may contribute to the greater role of personality.

### ***Libido fixations scale FR3, Yugoslavian sample***

From the 78-item libido fixations scale are extracted six factors, according to the Scree test. The first component accounts for 8.9% of the total variance, while all six factors account for 31.4% of variance. There is no significant drop in the explained variance after the first component, what means that the scale is rather heterogeneous, what has been expected.

The factors are rotated in Oblimin interpretative position. Structure of the extracted six factors is presented jointly in the Table 20. On the first glance it appears that factors have reasonably simple structure.

**Table 20 Libido fixations scale FR3: Structure of the 6 Oblimin factors**

Item No.	Items (abbreviated versions)	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
1	Suffers without milk						-.26
2	Dislikes cream						-.45
3	Sad when children do not have milk		.55				
4	Milk is more than food		.29				
5	Lips are a source of pleasure		.55				
6	Often touches lips by the tongue		.42	.45			
7	Puts fingers in the mouth		.34				-.32
8	Throws what dislikes						-.28

9	Used to vomit as a child	.33			
10	Is squeamish				-.42
11	Afraid of being eaten	.28			
12	Dislikes when someone devours food		.26		
13	Notices dangerous mouths and teeth			.28	
14	Sad because of behaviour towards parents				
15	Sad if offends close ones	.42		.46	-.32
16	Easily becomes sad	.56			
17	Likes to drink through a straw	.57			
18	Likes creamy food	.48			
19	Likes crunchy food	.38			
20	Likes eating seeds	-.27	.26		
21	Likes biting food		.40		
22	Bites candies		.41		
23	Spits distasteful food	.33			-.45
24	Bites lips	.47		.31	-.30
25	Bites tongue	.36	.37		
26	Was reprimanded for biting	.34			-.40
27	Can not go to toilet when on trip	.38		.49	
28	Reads in toilet			.51	
29	Defecation several times a day			.38	
30	Suffers of haemorrhoids				.52
31	Remembers punishments when toilet-trained				.32
32	Problems with colon				.74
33	Suffers from opstipation				.71
34	Takes laxatives				.60
35	Likes strange smells				.39
36	Easily adapts to bad smells		.36	.43	.36
37	Punished by mother for problems with urination				
38	Can refrain from urinating		.39		
39	Goes to toilet in the last seconds			.43	
40	When ill frequently goes to toilet	.47			
41	Avoids drinking for going frequently to WC			.28	
42	Problems with urinary system				
43	Remembers enuresis in bed				.53
44	Ashamed because of problems with enuresis nocturnae	.33			.41
45	Scratches pimples	.35			-.28
46	Bites nails on fingers				
47	Afraid of knives and blades	.41			
48	Always has small knife		.57		
49	Never without a pencil	.25			
50	Touches own 'indecent' body parts			.52	
51	Often rubs palms of hands			.37	
52	Caresses back or buttocks			.63	
53	Reprimanded by friends for self-touching			.41	
54	Never understood by mother	.47		.34	-.28
55	Mother is determined person			.29	

56	Older women are unpleasant	.69		
57	Difficult to go along with elders	.62		
58	Elders are mean	.61		
59	Elders are guilty for generation gap	.67		
60	Never will become spiritually old			.21
61	World should rule those under 30	.46		
62	Was afraid of father	.35		.29
63	Father is a strange man	.51		
64	Father one of the best people in the world		.35	
65	Would like to have a hand-gun		.43	
66	Easily makes decisions			.26
67	Eats quickly			
68	Likes and dislikes mother	.51		.44
69	Likes and dislikes father	.50		.47
70	Dislikes when family members kiss	.44	-.35	.35
71	Does not like shaking hands		-.34	
72	Early interested in the opposite sex			.38 .33
73	Problems with the opposite sex	.51	-.33	.37
74	Easily involves in sex			.46
75	Happy to have children in future	-.53	.40	
76	Likes small children	-.44	.50	
77	Hates homosexual film scenes	.28		-.32
78	Puberty was difficult period	.43		

First factor is defined primarily by items referring to parents and parental figures represented by 'elders'. It contains negative and ambivalent (items 68 and 69 particularly) attitudes towards them. Previous studies with the FR scale (Ignjatović et al., 1995) showed that factors for females and males are similar and that analysis could be done jointly. Items indicating problems with the opposite sex (78, 73) support the interpretation of this factor as *Oedipus-Electra complex*. More narrowly, factor could be interpreted in the same way as in Ignjatović et al. (1995), as hostility towards elders. Males have higher scores on this factor ( $p < .01$ ).

The second factor deals with attitude toward milk, oral stimulation, positive attitude towards children, contains also some characterological items expressing emotional sensitivity (items 15 and 16), and positive attitude towards emotional expressiveness (items 70 and 71). Also it contains some items intended to elicit phallic fixation (items 41 and 25). Perhaps such factor configuration resulted from under-factorisation. Nevertheless the main theme seems to be what is known as oral character, whether represented by items indicating direct somatic indicators, or as characterological manifestations. Therefore, general label of *orality* seems to be appropriate in this case. Females have higher scores on this factor ( $p < .01$ ).

The third factor contains items indicating oral aggressiveness (20, 21, 22, 25), indicators of phallic fixation (38, 48, 65), identification with father (64), and items indicating early interest in the opposite sex and permissive attitude towards sex (72 and

64). It seems that the most appropriate interpretation of this factor could be in the sense of *phallic fixation* and its characterological manifestation. It could result also from the identification with father as a solution to the Oedipus complex, and for that reason manifest as over-identification with masculinity, with some residuals of auto-destructiveness (items 25 and 38). Indeed, males have significantly higher scores on this factor ( $p < .01$ ).

The fourth factor contains indicators of anal fixation (28, 29, 36, 39, 41), indicators of auto-erotism (items 50-53), ambivalent attitude towards mother (54, 55) and father (69). Also, there is indication of the early interest in the opposite sex and acknowledgement of problems with the opposite sex. Finally, this person has nothing against homosexual film scenes. Anal fixations seems to be one possible interpretation of this factor, and it seems that strict and determined mother play important role in the development of this fixation. However, majority of items with higher correlation are indicators of *auto-erotism*, and it is adopted as its primary interpretation. Corresponding to Freud's discussion of 'anality' and anal character, strong presence of auto-erotism indicates homosexual tendencies. There are no significant differences between sexes in this factor.

Straight-forward indicators of anal fixations primarily correlate with the fifth factor (items 30-35, 27), so it is interpreted as *anal fixation* (more specific label could be anal-retentive fixation). Females tend to have quite higher scores on this factor ( $p < .001$ ), what confirms psychoanalytic hypothesis that females tend to be more retentive and males more expulsive.

Finally, the sixth factor in positive direction contains indicators of urethral fixation (items 43, 44, tentatively item 36 could be also accepted as belonging here), than rejection of ever getting 'spiritually old' (60), and item saying that easily makes decisions (66). In negative direction is set of indicators of orality, rejection of auto-erotism (45), more than usual feeling of being understood by mother (item 54), and lack of sadness after offending close-ones (15). Character which on the one side acknowledges urethral problems, feels that never will become old and easily makes decisions, and on the other side, rejects auto-erotism, bad habits connected with food and drink, unusually feels understood by mother, but is not particularly sad if offends 'neighbours', seem to represent reaction-formation concerning the urethral phase of development. Reaction to the shame connected with learning to control urethral functions seem to lead to the exaggerated performance of the role of an 'adult'. This factor in somewhat narrower version has been previously obtained, and was interpreted as the "adapted overcoming of the urethral shame" (Ignjatović et al., 1995, p. 29). It seems that males are particularly sensitive to this mechanisms, because they have significantly higher scores ( $p < .001$ ).

Correlations between libido fixations factors are presented in the Table 21. They are generally unrelated, what supports hypothesis of the independence of fixations between each other.

**Table 21 Correlation coefficients between factors of libido fixations**

	FREUD 1	FREUD 2	FREUD 3	FREUD 4	FREUD 5
--	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

FREUD 2	-.02				
FREUD 3	-.04	.02			
FREUD 4	.12*	.08	.03		
FREUD 5	.08	.12*	.09	.05	
FREUD 6	-.08	-.11*	-.07	-.06	-.06

\*\* p<.01; \* p<.05

Factor analysis of the libido fixations scale resulted in six interpretable factors. They do not exactly correspond to psychoanalytic descriptions of libido fixation partly because of under-factorisation. It is interesting that characterological items and items directly related to somatic indicators of fixations converged as theory predicts. The fact that obtained factors resemble factors previously obtained (Ignjatović et al, 1995) shows that these constructs can be relatively successfully operationalized in the questionnaire form and be replicated in independent samples.

Obviously, further psychometric improvement of the FR scale is needed, and its especially external validation. Analysis of the influence of libido fixations onto authoritarianism is an important step in that direction.

After this extensive preparatory analysis is completed, it can be proceeded to the main part of the present work: causal modelling of antisemitic and anti-Gypsy attitudes.

### ***Causal Modelling: Hungarian sample***

Graphic models, according to the adopted approach, is constructed via series of regression equations, starting from the primary response variable, i.e. students' antisemitism, and going to the right side of the model. Each variable is regressed on the all other variables on its *right* side. Variables treated 'on equal footing' (e.g., factors of authoritarianism) are entered in dashed boxes. Relationships between them are of the zero-order and are indicated by dashed undirected lines. Each of variables inside such boxes is regressed onto variables on its right, *not* controlling for other variables in the same box. Accepted level of statistical significance is p<.01.

The final results are presented in the form of *partially directed acyclic graph*, according to the rules elaborated by Cox and Wermuth (1996), though the graphic presentation is done in somewhat modified way. Because the adopted methodological approach can incorporate simultaneously variables on different level of measurement, there are no numbers above the arrows as is the case with path analysis. However, since in the present case all variables are treated as continuous, regression coefficient could be meaningfully entered. They can be read from tables accompanying each graph.

Presence of an arrow (directed edge) in a graph denotes a significant *conditional* relationship between a variable towards which the arrow is directed and variable from

which the arrow starts, controlling for all other variables to the right of the pointed variable.

### Causal Model of anti-Jewish attitudes in Hungary

Graph depicting the obtained model for anti-Jewish attitudes in Hungary is presented in the Figure 3, and corresponding summary of the regression equations is given in the Table 22. The results show that AS attitudes are directly related to authoritarianism factors (aggressiveness and conventionalism) and to parent's antisemitic attitudes.

Relationship with authoritarian aggressiveness seem to be the strongest ( $\beta=.42$ ,  $p<.001$ ). The amount of explained variance of AS attitudes ( $R^2=.31$ ) is relatively high, comparing to models reported without containing personality variables (e.g., Kovacs, 1998).

**Table 22 Summary of regression equations for the causal model of antisemitism in Hungary. Variables at the top of columns are regressed on the variables in rows. In the lower part of the table are given standardised regression coefficients (beta).**

	AS	Aut-sub	Aut-agr	Aut-conv	PAS	PAut-Sub	PAut-Agr	PAut-Conv
R	.56	.33	.39	.25	.45	.40	.28	.03
R <sup>2</sup>	.31 ***	.11 ***	.15 ***	.06 **	.21 ***	.16 ***	.08 ***	.00
Beta coefficients:								
AUT-SUB	-.05							
AUT-AGR	.42 ***							
AUT-CONV	-.16 ***							
PAS <sup>a</sup>	.29 ***	-.03	.07	-.02				
PAUT-SUB	-.01	.26 ***	.19 **	-.05	.37 ***			
PAUT-AGR	-.04	.00	.08	-.12 *	.15 **			
PAUT-CONV	-.00	-.03	.03	.20 ***	-.15 **			
INCOME	.05	-.04	.17 **	-.05	-.13 *	.02	-.15 **	.03
EDUC	-.01	-.11	-.21 **	-.12	.08	-.40 ***	-.21 ***	.00

\*\*\*  $p<.001$ ; \*\*  $p<.01$ ; \*  $p<.05$

<sup>a</sup> Prefix P in front of variable labels refers to the sample of parents. E.g., PAS denotes parents' antisemitism.

### Figure 3 Causal model of anti-Jewish attitudes in Hungary

Results suggest that both personality and socialisation, or parental modelling, play important role in antisemitic prejudice. The other variables have only indirect influence. Students authoritarianism factors are related both to parents' authoritarianism and to socio-economic status. Authoritarian submissiveness is related only to parents' corresponding factor, but does not influence students antisemitism. It seems that this trait, at least in the present sample, is not important for explanations of prejudice.

Authoritarian aggressiveness of students is related to parents' submissiveness, and to both socio-economic variables - income and education. It is interesting to note that higher income *increases* students' authoritarian aggressiveness, while higher education decreases it. In this context, Ray's claims (1986, 1984) that authoritarianism has something to do with achievement motivation seems acceptable. However, it is not clear whether the relationship occurred due to income increasing aggressiveness, controlling for education, or higher aggressiveness is useful in market competition.

Authoritarian conventionalism of students is related only to parents' conventionalism, so it seems that this trait is at least partly transferred from parents to children. However it is not clear why students' and parents' authoritarian aggressiveness

are not related. It is perhaps due to the control of the other two authoritarian dimensions of parents (indeed zero-order correlation between students and parents' aggressiveness is significant:  $r=.15$ ,  $p<.01$ ).

Parents' antisemitism is related to all authoritarian dimensions, primarily with authoritarian submissiveness. Parents' conventionalism is *negatively* related with their AS attitudes. This is understandable if the meaning of this authoritarianism factor is taken into account, which is interpreted as relatively critical, balanced views of authorities. Most likely for the same reason students' conventionalism is negatively related to their own antisemitic prejudice.

Parents authoritarian submissiveness is related to education, negatively, as well as authoritarian aggressiveness. It is another confirmation that education is negatively related to authoritarianism (cf. Scheepers et al., 1990, Schuman, Bobo, and Krysan, 1992). This finding is in accordance with similar results reported in literature. Namely, Lipset's thesis on working-class authoritarianism is usually contested by findings that authoritarianism is related only to education, but not other indicators of social class (e.g., Dekker and Ester, 1993). This can be explained in different ways. It is possible that education in itself decreases authoritarianism by developing more tolerant and pro-democratic attitudes. More cynical explanation would be that the better educated are more aware of what answers are more socially desirable and therefore pretend to be more tolerant than they really are.

Income is also negatively related to *parents'* authoritarian aggressiveness, i.e., in opposite direction than in the case of students' aggressiveness. It remains open for discussion why family income has opposing influence onto the same trait in parents and their children. One possible interpretation is that higher income, and with that related mobility rises status consciousness or competitive awareness of the youth, what is than expressed as increased aggressiveness.<sup>19</sup>

The findings could be summarised stating that AS attitudes of students are primarily related to their personality, especially aggressiveness, and to modelling influence of their parents. Parents' antisemitism is also related to their personality (authoritarianism), and to a certain extent to socio-economic status. Income and education have indirect influence onto antisemitic prejudice both in student and parents. Their influence is mediated by the authoritarian traits. This to a large extent confirms similar findings by Scheepers et al. (1990). It also seems that two authoritarian dimensions (conventionalism and submissiveness) do not play very important role in prejudice, or at least much smaller than aggressiveness.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Increased in-group bias of the authoritarians could be even adaptive in group-competition situations, increasing for example, group solidarity and preventing out-groups success. Of course, potential adaptiveness of a certain act does not have to mean its sufficient moral justification.

<sup>20</sup> Parents' submissiveness increases students' aggressiveness, so it is one path of the influence the former trait has on prejudice.

### Causal Model of anti-Gypsy attitudes in Hungary

Results for the anti-Gypsy prejudices are rather similar, what is to a certain extent inevitable because most of the explanatory variables are the same. From the Figure 4 and Table 23 it can be seen that AG attitudes of students are also primarily related to authoritarian aggressiveness and parents AG attitudes. Authoritarian conventionalism here is not related to prejudice, as well as authoritarian submissiveness.

Socialisation seems to play stronger role in anti-Gypsy attitudes than in the case of antisemitism, because beta for parents' AG prejudice is .52, and for authoritarian aggressiveness of students .29. In case of AS prejudice aggressiveness was more strongly related (beta for aggressiveness is .42, and for parents AS .29, see Table 22).

**Table 23 Summary of regression equations for the causal model of anti-Gypsy attitudes in Hungary. Variables at the top of columns are regressed on the variables in rows. In the lower part of the table are given standardised regression coefficients (beta).**

	AGyps y	Aut- Sub	Aut-Agr	Aut- Conv	PAG	PAUT- SUB	PAUT- AGR	PAUT- CONV
R	.65	.34	.39	.26	.39	.40	.28	.03
R <sup>2</sup>	.38 <sup>***</sup>	.12 <sup>***</sup>	.15 <sup>***</sup>	.06 <sup>**</sup>	.15 <sup>***</sup>	.16 <sup>***</sup>	.08 <sup>***</sup>	.00
Beta coefficients:								
AUT-SUB	.01							
AUT-AGR	.29 <sup>***</sup>							
AUT-CONV	.02							
PAGypsy	.52 <sup>***</sup>	-.05	.04	-.05				
PAUT-SUB	-.08	.29 <sup>***</sup>	.20 <sup>**</sup>	-.02	.39 <sup>***</sup>			
PAUT-AGR	.02	-.00	.11	-.10	.08			
PAUT-CONV	-.06	.01	.04	.22 <sup>***</sup>	-.09			
INCOME	.10 <sup>*</sup>	-.02	.16 <sup>**</sup>	-.04	-.07	.02	-.15 <sup>**</sup>	.03
EDUC	.17 <sup>**</sup>	-.11	-.21 <sup>**</sup>	-.08	.21 <sup>***</sup>	-.40 <sup>***</sup>	-.21 <sup>***</sup>	.00

\*\*\* p<.001; \*\* p<.01; \* p<.05

An important difference from the AS attitudes is that education of parents has direct and positive (though relatively small) influence on students' anti-Gypsy prejudice. In the same way education is related to parents' anti-Gypsy prejudice. Contrary to the group conflict approach, in Hungary Gypsies are less liked among better educated, while on the other side, income is not related to attitudes toward Gypsies. If the explanation for this is not that better educated simply feel more superior to Gypsies (what is simply saying that they are prejudiced in different words), the explanation could be that lower strata have more contact with gypsies, and therefore more positive (or less negative) attitudes towards them. If this would be proved to be true, it would lend some support to much debated contact hypothesis in development of prejudice. On the other hand, income is not directly related to AG prejudice both of parents and of students.

It is also interesting that AG attitudes of parents are less based in authoritarianism - only authoritarian submissiveness is significant predictor. This may be the result of socio-cultural factors, i.e., the prevalence of anti-Gypsy prejudices in society. As Pettigrew (1959) has argued, if prejudices are a social norm, personality plays a smaller role. However, still authoritarian submissiveness of parents is more related to their anti-Gypsy prejudice than education (betas are .39 and .21, respectively).

**Figure 4 Causal model of anti-Gypsy attitudes in Hungary**

Although in case of AG prejudice, socialisation seems to play relatively stronger role, and socio-economic status too, the role of personality traits is still important and significantly contributes to the fit of the model.

### ***Causal Modelling: Yugoslavian sample***

#### **Causal Model of anti-Jewish attitudes in Yugoslavia**

Causal model of anti-Jewish attitudes constructed on the basis of Yugoslavian data is presented in the Figure 5. Summary of regression equations for both anti-Jewish and anti-Gypsy attitudes are in Table 24 and Table 25.

#### **Figure 5 Causal Model of anti-Jewish attitudes in Yugoslavia**

A remarkable .54% of variance in the AS attitudes are explained with the present model, what is a result that can be rarely met in literature. However, only two variables appear to have a direct effect: authoritarian aggressiveness, as usually, and income, both in positive direction. The primary role is played by aggressiveness (beta=.60) what again confirms the importance of authoritarian aggressiveness for explaining prejudice.

In unstable social situation, as is the case with Yugoslavia, it is possible that earning of higher income is related to more aggressive personality traits, and that it is expressed also via the correlation between income and prejudice. If higher income, controlling for education, can be taken also as a sign of rapid social mobility, than theory of anomie and its role in prejudice could also be applied. Interpretation that higher income is related to group competition with Jews does not seem applicable to the case of Yugoslavia (Novi Sad, actually). Another related possibility is that higher income simply leads to stronger feeling of superiority.

**Table 24 Summary of regression equations for the causal model of anti-Gypsy and anti-Jewish attitudes in Yugoslavia. Variables at the top of columns are regressed on the variables in rows. In the lower part of the table are given standardised regression coefficients (beta). (continued in Table 25)**

	AGYPSY	ASEMIT	AUT-SUB	AUT-AGR	AUT-CONV
R	.62***	.73***	.47***	.49***	.25*
R <sup>2</sup>	.38	.54	.22	.24	.06
Beta coefficients:					
AUT-SUB	-.03	-.07			
AUT-AGR	.36***	.60***			
AUT-CONV	-.10	-.05			
FREUD 1	.32***	.04	-.06	.21***	.17**
FREUD 2	-.06	.00	.37***	-.00	-.13*
FREUD 3	.10	.11*	.06	.35***	.08
FREUD 4	-.14**	-.03	-.26***	-.19***	.07
FREUD 5	.04	-.01	-.07	-.16**	.01
FREUD 6	-.13*	.00	.08	.03	-.01
Education	-.01	-.11*	.01	-.01	-.11
Family income	.11*	.28***	.20***	.23***	-.01

\*\*\* p<.001; \*\* p<.01; \* p<.05

**Table 25 Summary of regression equations for the causal model of anti-Gypsy and anti-Jewish attitudes in Yugoslavia (continuation of the Table 24). Variables at the top of columns are regressed on the variables in rows. In the lower part of the table are given standardised regression coefficients (beta).**

	FREUD 1	FREUD 2	FREUD 3	FREUD 4	FREUD 5	FREUD 6	Income
R	.18*	.26***	.20**	.04	.15*	.23***	.28***
R <sup>2</sup>	.03	.07	.04	.002	.02	.05	.08
Beta coefficients:							
Education	-.07	-.23***	.19**	.03	-.16*	-.20***	.28***
Family income	-.15*	-.07	.03	.02	.02	-.06	

\*\*\* p<.001; \*\* p<.01; \* p<.05

It is interesting that the other two authoritarian dimensions are not related to the AS attitudes. It may be due to the fact that antisemitism have not played an important role in public discourse in Yugoslavia, and therefore it is not a parcel in the ideology submissive and conventional individual adopt.

Authoritarian aggressiveness is significantly explained by the present model (R<sup>2</sup>=.24). It is related to several factors of libido fixations. Oedipus complex factor and phallic fixation are positively related to aggressiveness (beta=.21 and .35 respectively). On the other side, autoerotism factor and anal fixation factor are negatively related (betas -.19 and -.16 respectively). Income is also positively related to aggressiveness. It seems that Adorno et al. (1950) were right at pointing out that particular dissolution of the Oedipus complex is at the root of authoritarianism. Over-identification with masculinity as a solution or expression of the phallic fixation seems also so be at the hart of authoritarian aggressiveness. Further research would be needed to clarify to what extent Oedipus complex and phallic fixation may be developmentally related. It seems that they both result in the exaggerated identification with the male role, i.e., aggressiveness. Also the original interpretation by Adorno et al. (1950) that authoritarian aggressiveness is transformed aggression directed towards parents have to be taken into account. The role of income in authoritarian aggressiveness could be interpreted in the same way as in the Hungarian case.

Authoritarian submissiveness is primarily related to orality factor (beta=.37), to a lesser extent to autoerotism factor (beta=-.26) and to income (beta=.20). If orality implies acceptance, 'taking inside', than this relationship fits the psychoanalytic theory. That would mean that the uncritical acceptance of authorities is unconsciously motivated (partly, of course, because R<sup>2</sup>=.22). Negative relationship between submissiveness and autoerotism factor seems curious, and its interpretation will be avoided. The same applies for negative relationship between autoerotism and authoritarian aggressiveness.

Authoritarian conventionalism seems to be an outlier in the model, for it is related only to the Oedipal factor ( $\beta=.17$ ;  $R^2=.06$ ). It should be remembered that conventionalism in the Yugoslavian sample corresponds to the *negative* pole of the factor. Therefore, Oedipal complex finds its expression in rebellious attitude towards authorities. It may look as contradicting to the Adorno et al.'s hypothesis, but in psychoanalytical theories contradicting outcomes of the same underlying processes are almost a rule, rather than an exception (cf. Ignjatović et al., 1995). So, the results suggest that problems with Oedipal situation may result in the increased aggressiveness, which is then related to prejudice, and also in rebellious attitude towards traditional authorities (or non-conventionalism).<sup>21</sup>

Interesting result is also the negative connection between anal fixation and authoritarian aggressiveness, though it is rather weak ( $\beta=-.16$ ). This also contradicts to the authoritarianism theory. However, it is possible that the present 'anal' factor captures those respondents who consciously have integrated their fixation into personality, and as better integrated personalities tend to be less aggressive. *Repression* of the anal erotism may result in the increased aggressiveness. However, other interpretations are possible, and on the basis of the present data it can not be said which is the most appropriate.

Libido fixations, according to the present model, are not entirely independent of socio-economic background, i.e., of the parents' educational level. Education is negatively related to oral fixation factor and to urethral fixation factor, while positively to phallic fixation factor. No sensible interpretation came to the mind of the writer of these lines in this respect. It is possible that some unspecified variables are responsible for the relationships. It is possible that certain personality traits (e.g., psychoticism, neuroticism) caused these relationships, though this interpretation would cast doubt on the primacy of libido fixations in personality development.

One possible objection to the presented results and their interpretation could be that libido fixation factors represent sex differences and that established relationships are spurious, i.e., that psychoanalytical explanation is not valid. To test this, complete series of regression equation was repeated with included variable of respondents sex. Results did not change substantively. Sex was significantly related to AS prejudice ( $\beta=-.22$ ,  $p<.001$ ), indicating that, as usually, males are more prejudiced. However, the influence of other variables onto AS did not change at all. In case of authoritarianism factors, changes were somewhat larger. Concerning submissiveness, most coefficients slightly increased, especially in case of the anal fixation factor, which became significant predictor of submissiveness ( $\beta=-.17$ ,  $p<.01$ ), again indicating that anal fixation (or whatever it represents) decreases authoritarian dimensions. However, sex was not related to submissiveness. In case of aggressiveness, Oedipal factor dropped below statistical significance, thus supporting its interpretation as male identification with father. Other coefficients slightly increased, but sex again was not significant predictor of the

---

<sup>21</sup> Slightly further speculation in this direction could finish in claims that, psychologically, leftists and rightists are about equal. However, the present results still do not support this theory.

authoritarianism factor. In case of conventionalism no significant changes resulted from the introduction of sex into the equation. All these results suggest that libido fixations operationalized in this way independently of sex contribute to the explanation of the authoritarianism, and that they are concepts applicable to both sexes. A slight exception is Oedipal factor, which by its definition should be more related to psychology of males.

### **Causal Model of anti-Gypsy attitudes in Yugoslavia**

Causal model of anti-Gypsy attitudes is presented in the Figure 6. In this case, the model explains rather smaller part of the variance ( $R^2=.38$ ) than in the case of antisemitic prejudice. It seems primarily due to the decreased predictive power of authoritarian aggressiveness. In case of anti-Gypsy attitudes coefficient  $\beta=.36$ , while in the case of AS attitudes it was  $.60$ . This seems to be strong support for the Pettigrew's claim that in more socially approved prejudice personality plays smaller role (but it still plays important role).

Another difference is that libido fixations displayed direct influence onto anti-Gypsy attitudes. Oedipal complex factor is positively related to AG attitudes, to an almost equal degree ( $\beta=.32$ ) as aggressiveness. It seems that Gypsies are target for expressing aggressiveness implied in Oedipal complex much more than Jews. It can be a part of the display of masculinity to direct negative attitudes towards particularly powerless group as Gypsies happened to be. Autoerotism factor crossed the border of significance ( $\beta=-.14$ ), and its influence is in negative direction - decreasing anti-Gypsy prejudice. Other relationships are the same as in the case of AS prejudice. However, note that socio-economic variables do not exhibit direct influence onto anti-Gypsy prejudice.

**Figure 6 Causal Model of anti-Gypsy attitudes in Yugoslavia**

Relatively constant element in both models in the Yugoslavian sample seems to be the role of authoritarian aggressiveness, though it is stronger in case of antisemitic prejudice. The main difference is that Oedipal complex factor and autoerotism factor displayed direct effect, regardless of authoritarianism factors. Concerning the authoritarianism theory, the role of the Oedipal complex and of phallic fixation (which included oral aggressiveness in the same factor) has been confirmed. The strange results appeared concerning the anal fixation and closely related autoerotism factor. They both negatively influence authoritarianism factors. Urethral fixation does not have any effect on authoritarianism factors. It may be that this fixation and its characterological manifestation result in really adapted behaviour, which includes tolerant attitudes to the same degree as intolerant. Authoritarianism factors are primarily influenced by libido fixations, though income still exhibit certain direct effect. It may be explained in terms of frustration-aggression hypothesis, but also that authoritarian features help in securing higher income (at least in Yugoslavia it seems to be the case). This interpretation can be valid if it is assumed that authoritarianism of students resembles authoritarianism of parents, because the latter earned the income reported here (Hungarian results support this view).

### ***Discussion***

Previous results clearly show that the constructed models are able to explain part of the variability in anti-Gypsy and antisemitic prejudice. The explained variance is not large in absolute terms, but comparing to other models represented in literature, the present ones appear as rather exceptional. It refers primarily to the anti-Jewish attitudes in Yugoslavia. More than 50% of the variance in the AS attitudes are explained by the direct influence of virtually only two variables: authoritarian aggressiveness and to a lesser extent, family income.

Strong predictive power of authoritarian aggressiveness in all models shows that authoritarianism theory should not be omitted from explanations of individual differences

in prejudice, unless a better variable is available. Overview of literature showed that attempts directed towards that goal have not yet been too successful. Results also indicate that it would not be much lost if the other two dimensions of authoritarianism would be dropped. However, their better psychometric operationalization may help in re-establishing their relevance. It should be noted that the applied authoritarianism scale consists of two *shortened* scales (F and RWA scales), and that many of the element of authoritarian syndrome from the original conception are not represented by the item-content.

The four presented models also show that the effect of income and education on prejudice is mostly indirect (except income in case of antisemitism in Yugoslavia, and education in case of anti-Gypsy attitudes in Hungary) (cf. Scheepers et al., 1990, Schuman, Bobo, and Krysan, 1992; Dekker and Ester, 1993). They contribute to prejudice primarily via authoritarian aggressiveness, and to a certain extend via libido fixations. This is actually not surprising. Lower income cannot directly cause prejudice, it has to be mediated by some psychological processes. It can be frustration-aggression mechanism, authoritarianism, or something else. All the presented models suggest that income primarily exhibits its influence via authoritarian aggressiveness. However, Yugoslavian data show that income's influence onto authoritarianism factors is smaller than of libido fixations. Most probably both frustration-aggression mechanism and psychodynamic processes play an important role in development of authoritarianism.

The role of education could be more direct than of income, because part of school curricula may be the teaching of ethnic egalitarianism. But, as the present results primarily suggest, it can exhibit also indirect effect, via for example, modifying personality traits, or by widening of the "breadth of social perspective" (Kelman and Barclay, 1963).

Hungarian data unambiguously show that parental socialisation, or modelling, is very important factor in both development of prejudice and authoritarian features. Parental prejudices are strongly related to the prejudice of the offspring. Also, parents' authoritarianism influences children's, though relationships are somewhat weaker than could be expected, but still generally larger than the influence of socio-economic background.

Those were relatively constant findings in the four causal models. Now, anti-Gypsy and anti-Jewish attitudes should be compared. In both samples, anti-Jewish attitudes are under the stronger influence of authoritarian aggressiveness than anti-Gypsy prejudice. It supports already mentioned Pettigrew's (1959) hypothesis that socio-cultural factors can overwhelm the role of personality in prejudice. Anti-Gypsy prejudice is more socially acceptable in both countries and therefore is largely acquired via social learning. This is supported also by the fact that parents' and students' prejudices towards Gypsies are much more similar than in case of antisemitism (Hungarian sample). On the other hand, if certain prejudice does not play an important role in public arena, personality (i.e., authoritarian aggressiveness) appears as the most relevant variable. In Yugoslavia, antisemitism is primarily an expression of authoritarian aggressiveness.

It is difficult to compare models from Yugoslavia and Hungary because of relatively different sets of included variables. However, it seems that similarities are greater than differences. In both cases aggressiveness is a major predictor of prejudices, while other authoritarian dimensions are rather irrelevant. Quite larger percentage of the explained variance in case of the Yugoslavian antisemitism is attributed to socio-cultural factors, i.e., that fewer social reinforcements for development of antisemitism exist in Yugoslavia.

Models of anti-Gypsy prejudice are rather similar in both countries. Anti-Gypsy attitudes appear to be more under the influence of socio-cultural factors, i.e., socialisation than antisemitism. However, it seems also that some deeper psychological processes, deeper than authoritarianism traits, may have some contribution in anti-Gypsy prejudice. It is indicated by the direct influence of certain libido-fixations factors onto anti-Gypsy attitudes in the Yugoslavian model. Gypsies, as rejected social outcasts, might have special symbolic place in psychodynamic processes.

Referring back to the discussed three approaches to prejudice, it seems that a single general theory is not likely to be sufficient. One of the reasons is that prejudices are multi-functional (e.g., Rot, 1989). They can perform different functions for different individuals and groups, and different functions simultaneously for the same individual. In the presented causal models, which are obviously simplified and incomplete, different theories and concepts are needed in order to interpret the obtained relationships. Therefore, the results suggest the need for integration of different approaches.

In fact, as has already been mentioned, most accounts of prejudice tend to incorporate elements of several basic perspectives. For example, it has been argued that group approach and authoritarianism could be integrated (Stone et al., 1993b, p. 238; Duckitt, 1989). Altemeyer's extensive studies (e.g., 1981, 1988) show that it is fruitful to combine the ideas of authoritarianism research and social learning approach, though his blend of the approaches is rather biased against psychoanalysis. Stone (1993) also points toward integration of cognitive, psychodynamic and other approaches to authoritarianism and prejudice.

Dilemma whether authoritarianism is a personality feature or ideology is solved, or avoided, by factor-analytical approach to the analysis of the AUT scale, and by the inclusion of libido fixations scale in the Yugoslavian sample. Of the three authoritarianism factors, aggressiveness seems to be the closest to the 'pure' personality trait, while the other two seem more of the attitudinal kind.

The validity of psychoanalytical interpretation of authoritarianism is reinforced by generally meaningful relationships between libido fixations and authoritarianism factors. Autoerotism and anal fixation seem to decrease prejudice, while Oedipal complex and phallic and oral-aggressive fixation contribute to authoritarian aggressiveness. It perhaps results from the applied defence mechanisms which include overt display of 'maleness' and aggressiveness as a part of their behavioural manifestations. While this can be interpreted in terms of social learning, it seems worth to examine psychoanalytical assumption in a

greater depth. It is interesting to note also that libido fixations factors were able to explain relatively greater proportion of variance (Yugoslavian sample) than authoritarianism of parents (Hungarian sample). The latter could be understood as test of the modelling hypothesis of the development of authoritarianism, while the former as psychodynamic interpretation. Present results suggest that parents can influence their children's authoritarianism more by interfering into psycho-sexual development than by simply showing the model-behaviour (though it would be difficult to separate them).

Group conflict approach was discussed the least extensively. The reason is that socio-economic status groups, as defined by the used variables, do not appear as a strong independent predictors of prejudice. In order to examine the value of this approach better operationalization of relevant group membership is needed.<sup>22</sup>

Socio-cultural approach can explain why some prejudice are more widespread. In both Hungary and Yugoslavia Gypsies are viewed much more negatively than Jews. This of course cannot be explained by personality. But, the focus of this research were *individual differences*, and they seem to be largely in the domain of psychological forces and parental modelling.

The main suggestions from the present primarily exploratory study are that antisemitic and anti-Gypsy attitudes are partly directly transferred from parents to their children via socialisation, and that personality (authoritarian aggressiveness) mediates the influence of other factors including socio-economic variables. The obtained relationships between authoritarianism factor and libido fixations also reinforce the personality interpretation of authoritarianism, primarily aggressiveness.

Some 'fundamental' criticisms could be made to the presented interpretation of the findings. One could be that what has been detected are only spurious relationships. Namely, it can be hypothesised that certain other, more basic personality traits are responsible for the obtained relationships. For example, emotional instability can be behind scores on libido fixations, authoritarianism and prejudice. However, before this interpretation is acceptable it needs empirical verification.

Another objection could be that the results show only the individual differences in readiness to acknowledge socially disapproved statements, like prejudices, authoritarian items, or items from libido fixations scale. In that case, results would only indicate response style of respondents, or the degree of social desirability they felt necessary to display in answering to the survey. These problems, however, are not specific for this study, but generally for survey research. The fact is that the survey in Yugoslavia was anonymous, and therefore the pressure for social desirable answers was smaller. Still the results are similar in both countries. That is surely an important argument in favour of the robustness of the main findings.

---

<sup>22</sup> If prejudice towards Albanians in Yugoslavia would be examined, group conflict perspective would surely appear as more relevant. For example, negative or very negative attitude towards Albanians expressed 61.3% of respondents, while only 7.6% expressed the same attitude towards Jews, and 25.2% towards Gypsies.

### ***Final interpretative resume***

The most important results of the performed analysis could be summarised in the following way:

1. Predictions of both personality and social learning theories are generally verified. Antisemitic and anti-Gypsy attitudes are independently related to authoritarianism and to parent's prejudices (Hungarian sample).
2. Authoritarianism theory received particularly strong support in the sense that authoritarian aggressiveness appears to be the most important explanatory variable in all samples and for both prejudices.
3. Authoritarianism factors are influenced by authoritarianism of parents (Hungarian sample) and of libido fixation factors (Yugoslavian sample). In the latter case larger proportion of variance is generally explained.
4. Income is ambiguously related to authoritarian aggressiveness. It is positively related to students authoritarian aggressiveness in both countries, while negatively influences parents aggressiveness.
5. Higher education decreases authoritarianism, though in the Yugoslavian sample its role is smaller and mediated by libido fixations.
6. Oedipus complex and phallic-oral-aggressive libido fixations factors increase the authoritarian aggressiveness. Oral fixation positively contributes to authoritarian submissiveness. Autoerotism factor and anal fixation decrease authoritarian aggressiveness
7. Group-conflict theories received ambiguous support, in the same way as hypotheses derived from them were ambiguous.
8. Models of individual differences in prejudice which exclude personality variables are unlikely to be very successful.
9. The analysed three approaches to prejudices seem to be all relevant for understanding the phenomenon in question. They should be conceived as complementary theories rather than exclusive. Large part of the differences between them could be accounted by differences in the focus of analysis. For example, personality approach is primarily interested in *individual differences*, treating social and historical processes and circumstances as being given. On the other side, group-conflict theories are more concerned with the aggregate level of analysis.
10. Multivariate analytical approach adopted in this study proved to be of great usefulness. Instead to treat certain relationships in isolation, and than to claim that one or another theory is more useful, the multivariate approach allows treatment of a number of relevant variables at the same time. This lead to the conclusion that different theories of prejudice are all relevant in certain respects. Particular advantage of the adopted

methodology is in great simplification of rather complex and confusing relationships if variables are treated without systematic approach.

[23374 words]

## References

- Adler, A. (1979) *Superiority and Social Interest: A Collection of Later Writings*. Eds. Ansbacher, H.L. and Ansbacher, R.R., Norton, New York.
- Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswick E., Levinson, D.J. and Sanford, R.N., (1950) *The Authoritarian Personality*, Harper and Row, New York. Abridged edition: (1982), Norton & Company, New York, London.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981) *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Univ. of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (1988) *Enemies of Freedom: Understanding Right -Wing Authoritarianism*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA.
- Andrejević, M. (1993) Concern Over Anti-Semitism in Yugoslavia. In: *Anti-Semitism in Post-Totalitarian Europe*. Franz Kafka Publishers, Prague.
- Antisemitism World Report 1993* (1993). Institute of Jewish Affairs, London.
- Asch, S.E. (1987) *Social Psychology*, Oxford University Press, Oxford. (First published in 1952).
- Bandura, A. (1977) *Social Learning Theory*. Prentice Hall, Neglewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Bergman, W. (1998) Difficulties in Explaining Antisemitic Attitudes in Present-Day Germany. Paper presented at the conference Authoritarianism and Prejudices in an International and Inter-Generational Perspective, CEU, Budapest, Hungary, June 1998.
- Bibo, I. (1991) The Jewish Question in Hungary After 1944. In: Nagy, K.(Ed.) (1991): *Istvan Bibo: Democracy, revolution, self-determination. Selected writings*. Columbia University Press, NY.
- Billing, M. & Cramer, D. (1990) Authoritarianism and Demographic Variables as Predictors of racial Attitudes in Britain. *New Community*, 16, 2, 199-211.
- Brown, R. (1995) *Prejudice: Its Social Psychology*. Blackwell, Oxford, UK.
- Bohleber, W. (1995) The Presence of the Past—Xenophobia and Right-wing Extremism in the Federal Republic of Germany: Psychoanalytic Reflections. *American Imago*, 52.3, p. 329-344.
- Christie, R. and Jahoda, M. (Eds.) (1954). *Studies in the Scope and Methods of "The Authoritarian Personality"*. Free Press, Glencoe IL.
- Cox, D.R. and Wermuth, N. (1996) *Multivariate Dependencies*. Chapman & Hall, London.
- Crowe, D. M. (1995) *A History of the gypsies of Eastern Europe and Russia*. I.B. Tauris Publishers, London, New York.
- Dekker, P. and Ester, P. (1993) Authoritarianism and socio-economic differentiation: the Lipset thesis. In: Dekker, P. and Ester, P. *Social and Political Attitudes in Dutch Society: Theoretical Perspectives and Survey Evidence*. Social and Cultural Studies, Vol.16, SCP, Rijswijk.
- Dollard, J., Doob, L.W., Miller, N.E., Mowrer, O.K. and Sears R.R. (1939) *Frustration and Aggression*. Yale University Press, New Heaven, Conn.
- Duckitt, J. (1989) Authoritarianism and group identification: A new view of an old construct. *Political Psychology*, 10, 63-84.
- Duckitt, J. (1993) Right-wing authoritarianism among White South African students: Its measurement and correlates. *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol 133(4) 553-563, Aug 1993.
- Đurić, Đ. (Ed.) (1995) *Ličnost u višekulturnom društvu Vol.2*. (Personality in Multicultural Society, Vol 2). Odsek za psihologiju, Univerzitet u Novom Sadu, Novi Sad.
- Đurić, Đ. (1995) Socijalno-psihološka obeležja etničkog identiteta mladih. (Social-Psychological Characteristics of the Youth Ethnic Identity). In: Đurić, Đ. (Ed.) (1995).
- Enyedi, Zs. (1998) Causal Models of Anti-Semitism: Two Hungarian Studies. Paper presented at the Symposium Authoritarianism and Prejudices in an International and Inter-Generational Perspective, CEU, Budapest, Hungary, June 1998.

- Eysenck, H. J. (1954) *Psychology of Politics*. Routledge and Kegan, London.
- Eysenck, H. J. & Wilson, G. D. (Eds.) (1978) *The Psychological Basis of Ideology*. MTP Press Ltd. Lancaster.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1982) *Personality, Genetics, and Behavior*. Praeger Publishers, New York.
- Fabian, Z. (1998) Authoritarianism, socio-demographic variables and socialization in the explanation of prejudices attitudes: Antisemitism and Anti-Gypsy attitude in Hungary. Paper presented at the Symposium Authoritarianism and Prejudices in an International and Inter-Generational Perspective, CEU, Budapest, Hungary, June 1998.
- Feldman, S. and Stenner, K. (1997). Perceived Threat and Authoritarianism. *Political Psychology, Vol. 18, No 4*, 471-770.
- Ferrarotti, F. (1994) Beyond the Authoritarian Personality: Adorno's Demon and Its Liberation. *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, Vol.8, No.1. 105-127.
- Forbes, H.D. (1985) *Nationalism, Ethnocentrism and Personality*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D.J. and Sanford, R.N. (1947) The Antidemocratic Personality. In: Newcomb, T.M. and Hartley, E.L. (Eds.) *Readings in Social Psychology*, Henry Holt & Co., New York.
- Fromm, E. and Maccoby, M. (1970) *Social Character in a Mexican Village*. Prentice- Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Hamberger, J. and Hewstone, M. (1997) Inter-ethnic contact as a predictor of blatant and subtle prejudice: Tests of a model in four West European nations. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, p.173-190.
- Heaven, P.C.L. (1987) Authoritarianism, Dominance, and Need for Achievement. *Australian journal of psychology, 39, 3*, 331-337.
- Heaven, P.C.L. (1984) Afrikaaner Patriotism Today: The Role of Attitudes and Personality. *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*, Vol. 11, No.1, 133-139.
- Heaven, P.C.L. (1976) Personality Factors and Anti-Semitism among a Group of Afrikaans-Speaking Students. *Humanitas, 3, 4*, 483-484.
- Ignjatović, I., Vasić, A., Kosanović, B., Mitrović, D. and Momirović, K. (1995). Freud još jednom: Opšti, muški i ženski faktori u kolekciji čestica FR2. (Freud Once More: General, male and female factors in the collection of items FR2). In: Đurić, Đ. (Ed.) (1995).
- Katz, D. (1960) 'The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes', *Public Opinion Quarterly, 24*, 163-204.
- Katz, D. and Braly, K. W. (1933) Racial Stereotypes of 100 College Students. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 30*, p.280-190.
- Katz, D. and Braly, K. W. (1935) Racial Prejudice and Racial Stereotypes. *Journal of Social Psychology, 30*, p.175-193.
- Kelman, H.C. and Barclay, J. (1963) The F scale as a measure of breadth of perspective. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*, 608-615.
- Kindervater, A. (1997) *Measuring Antisemitism: An Example of Austrian Youth in 1992*. Paper presented at the XX Annual Scientific Meeting of the ISPP, Krakow, Poland, July 1997.
- Kovacs, A. (1996) Anti-Semitism and the Young Elite in Hungary. *Sociological Papers*, Vol. 5., No. 3. Sociological Institute for Community Studies, Bar-Ilan University, Jerusalem.
- Kovacs, A. (1998) *Antisemitism in Present-Day Hungary*. Paper presented at the conference Authoritarianism and Prejudices in an International and Inter-Generational Perspective, CEU, Budapest, Hungary, June 1998.
- Lendvai, P. (1971) *Anti-Semitism in Eastern Europe*. Macdonald, London.

- Lewis, T. T. (1990) Authoritarian Attitudes and Personalities: A Psychohistorical Perspective. *Psychobistory Review*, 18, 2, 141-167.
- Lipset, S. M. (1959) Democracy and working-class authoritarianism. *American Sociological Review*, 24, 482-502.
- Meloan, J.D. (1993) The F Scale as a Predictor of Fascism: An Overview of 40 Years of Authoritarianism Research. In: Stone et al., (Eds.), (1993a).
- Miller, N. E. and Dollard, J. (1941) *Social Learning and Imitation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, Oxford University Press.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (1959) Regional Differences in Anti-Negro Prejudices. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol.59, No.1, 28-36.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M. & Malle, B. F. (1994) Social Dominance Orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 4, 741-763.
- Ray, J. J. (1990a) AIDS, authoritarianism, and scientific ignorance: A comment of Wit. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 20, p. 1453-1455.
- Ray, J. J. (1989) Authoritarianism Research is alive and well in Australia: A review. *Psychological Record*, 39, 4, 555-561.
- Ray, J.J. (1988) Sexual Liberation, Old-Fashioned outlook, and Authoritarianism: A Comment on Kelley. *Journal of Sex Research*, 24, 385-387.
- Ray, J.J. (1986). Assertiveness as Authoritarianism and Dominance. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 126, 6, 809-810.
- Ray, J.J. (1984) Achievement Motivation as a Source of Racism, Conservatism, and Authoritarianism. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 123, 1, 21-28.
- Ray, J. J. (1984) Alternatives to the F Scale in the Measurement of Authoritarianism: A Catalogue. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 122, 2, 105-119.
- Ray, J. J. (1985a) Authoritarianism of the Left revisited. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6, 2, 271-272.
- Ray, J. J. (1985b) Defective Validity in the Altemeyer Authoritarianism Scale. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 125, 2, 271-272.
- Ray, J.J. (1982) Authoritarianism/Libertarianism as the Second Dimension of Social Attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 117, 1, 33-44.
- Ray, J. J. (1972a). New Balanced F scale and its relation to social class. *Australian Psychologist*, 7, 155-166.
- Ray, J. J. (1972b). Non-Ethnocentric Authoritarianism. Australian and New Zealand. *Journal of Sociology*, 8, 2, 96-102.
- Ray, J. J. (1973). Conservatism, authoritarianism and related variables: a review and empirical study. In: Wilson, G. D. (Ed.) *The Psychology of Conservatism*. London, Academic Press, p. 17-35.
- Ray, J.J. and Jefl, W. (1984) Authoritarianism and Achievement Motivation in Contemporary Germany. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 122, 1, 3-19.
- Rokeach, M. (1956) Political and religious dogmatism: An alternative to the authoritarian personality. *Psychological Monographs*, 70.
- Rot, N. (1989), *Osnovi Socijalne Psihologije*, ZUNS Beograd (Foundations of Social Psychology).
- Rot, N. and Havelka N. (1973), *Nacionalna vezanost i vrednosti kod srednjoškolske omladine*, Institut za psihologiju, Beograd (National Attachment and Values in High-school youth).
- Samelson, F. (1993) The Authoritarian Character from Berlin to Berkeley and Beyond: The Odyssey of a Problem. In: Stone et al., (Eds.), 1993a, p. 22-43.

- Scheepers, P., Felling, A., Peters, J. (1990) Social Conditions, authoritarianism and Ethnocentrism: A theoretical model of the early Frankfurt School updated and tested. *European Sociological Review*, Vol.6, No.1, 15-26.
- Schuman, H., Bobo, L. and Krysan, M. (1992) Authoritarianism in the General Population: The Education Interaction Hypothesis. *Soc. Psychology Quarterly*, 55, 4, 379-387.
- Sidanius, J. Pratto, F. and Mitchell, M. (1994). Group identity, social dominance orientation and intergroup discrimination: Some implications of social dominance theory. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 134, 151-167.
- Silberstein and Seeman (1988) Social Mobility and Prejudice. In: Bergman, W. (Ed.) *Error Without Trial. Psychological Research on Antisemitism*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, p. 258-271.
- Sherif, M. (1966) *Group Conflict and Co-operation: Their social psychology*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Smither, R. D. (1993) Authoritarianism, Dominance, and Social Behavior: A Perspective from Evolutionary Personality Psychology. *Human Relations*, 46, 1, 23-43.
- Snyder, M. and Ickes, W. (1995) Personality and Social Behaviour. In: Lindzey, G. and Aronson, E. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, (1985) Random House, New York.
- Spears, R., Oakes, P. J., Ellemers, N. and Haslam, S. A. (1997). *The Social Psychology of Stereotyping and Group Life*. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, UK.
- Stankov, L. (1977) Some experiences with the F Scale in Yugoslavia. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 16, 2, 111-121.
- Stone, W.F. (1993) Psychodynamics, Cognitive Functioning, or Group Orientation: research and Theory in the 1980s. In: In: Stone *et al.*, (Eds.), 1993a, p. 159-181.
- Stone, W.F., Lederer, G. and Christie, R. (Eds.) (1993a) *Strength and Weakness: The Authoritarian Personality Today*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Stone, W.F., Lederer, G. and Christie, R. (1993b) The Status of Authoritarianism. In: Stone *et al.*, (Eds.), 1993a, p. 229-245.
- Tajfel, H. (1981) *Human Groups and Social Categories*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Tajfel, H., Flament, C., Billig, M.G. and Bundy, R.P. (1971) Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1, 149-178.
- Todosijević, B. (1995) *Some Social and Psychological Correlates of Ethno-Nationalist Attitudes: Yugoslavia 1995*. Unpublished M.A. dissertation, CEU, Prague.
- Todosijević, B. (1997) Relacije između porodičnog funkcionisanja i autoritarnosti. (Relationships Between Family Functioning and Authoritarianism) In: Genc, L. (Ed.): *Ličnost u višekulturnom društvu Vol. III*. Odsek za psihologiju, Univerzitet u Novom Sadu, Novi Sad.
- Todosijević, B. (1998) *Relationship Between Authoritarianism and Nationalist Attitudes*. Paper presented at the Symposium Authoritarianism and Prejudices in an International and Inter-Generational Perspective, CEU, Budapest, June 1998.
- Triandis, H.C. and Triandis, L.M. (1988) Race, Social Class, Religion, and Nationality as Determinants of Social Distance. In: Bergman, W. (Ed.) *Error Without Trial. Psychological Research on Antisemitism*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, p. 501-516.
- Trogrlić, A., Mitrović, D. and Vasić, A. (1995a) Sex differences in libido fixations measured by the Scale FR2. In: Đurić, Đ. (Ed.) (1995).
- Trogrlić, A., Vasić, A., Kosanović, B. and Ignjatović, I. (1995b) Relations between the scale of educational influences in a family made according to the E. Fromm's model and libido fixations measured by FR1 scale. In: Đurić, Đ. (Ed.) (1995).
- Van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (1989). Moral judgment, Authoritarianism and Ethnocentrism. *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol.129, No.1, 37-45.

- Višekruna, M. (1995) Canonical relationships of libido fixations measured by the scale FR2 and set of items designed for examination of infantile inferiority, complex of inferiority and complex of superiority. Diploma Work, Department of Psychology, University in Novi Sad.
- Vivian, J. and Brown, R. (1994) Prejudice and Intergroup Conflict. In: Colman, A.M. (1994) (Ed.) *Companion Encyclopaedia of Psychology, Vol. 2*. Routledge, London.
- Weiss, H. (1988) On the significance of personal contact to Jews. In: Bergman, W. (Ed.) *Error Without Trial. Psychological Research on Antisemitism*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, p. 331-356.
- Wilson, G.D. and Brazendale, A.H. (1973) Social Attitude Correlates of Eysenck's Personality Dimensions. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 1, 2, 115-118.
- Wistrich, R. S. (1992) *Antisemitism. The Longest Hatred*. Thames Mandarin, London.
- Yzerbyt, V., Rocher, S. and Schadron, G. (1997). Stereotypes as Explanations: A Subjective Essentialistic View of Group Perception. In: Spears et al (Eds.) (1997), 20-50.