

14

Authoritarianism and Socialist Ideology: The Case of Yugoslavia, 1995

Bojan Todosijevic

Central European University, Budapest, Hungary

Abstract

Since *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno, et al., 1950) appeared, many people questioned the similarity between supporters of parties and ideologies at the extreme left and right. In the West, authoritarianism correlated with conservatism and the political right. This chapter examines the relationships between authoritarianism and attitudes belonging to a broader framework of the socialist ideology. SOCID (socialist ideology) and Authoritarianism scales were administered to a sample of approximately 700 Yugoslavian college students. Both scales were factor analyzed and relationships between the extracted dimensions were analyzed. Results indicate that those aspects of the state-socialist ideology that involve more tough-minded, intolerant attitudes (e.g., militarism), were more related to authoritarianism than aspects involving more pro-social attitudes (e.g., egalitarianism).

Introduction

The Authoritarian Personality (Adorno, et al., 1950) is one of the major socio-psychological theories of anti-Semitism and prejudice. (In this chapter, "TAP" refers to the original 1950 edition; "TAP, 1982" refers to the abridged edition. Italics appear where they did in the original edition.) However, the authors claimed their primary aim was broader than explaining prejudice: "the major concern was with the potentially fascistic individual, one whose structure is such as to render him particularly susceptible to anti-democratic propaganda" (TAP, p. 1). Thus, the concept of authoritarianism predates the book and the authors' explicit concern with prejudice and was intended to explain the support for the anti-democratic ideology (Samelson, 1993; Worrell, 1998; Smith, 1998; Werz, 1998). The authoritarian personality emerged "as a link between psychological disposition and political leanings" (Horkheimer, TAP, p. xi).

Although TAP was concerned with the general support for “anti-democratic” ideologies, they concluded that supporting extreme right-wing ideologies (i.e., fascism) and (pseudo)conservatism is based on the authoritarian character structure. Even though they rarely used the terms of “left” and “right” in TAP, many assumed that their main claim was that all right-wing supporters are authoritarian and leftists were non-authoritarian (Martin, 2001). Mainstream Western social scientists argued that authoritarians also exist on the political left (Shils, 1954; Martin, 2001). Although the affiliation between the authoritarianism and the right-wing political leanings seems to be firmly established in the Western countries (Stone and Smith, 1993; Altemeyer, 1998), the debate about the existence of left-wing authoritarianism remains open.

In the spirit of Adorno, et al.’s and Altemeyer’s conception of authoritarianism, it could be related to different manifest ideological orientations as long as they are anti-democratic (i.e., can function in the psychological economy of highly authoritarian individuals). Since authoritarianism in both conceptions reflects socialization into dominant political values (including submitting to established authorities), ideological correlates of authoritarianism should vary in different political systems. Political socialization under communism may have provided the most fertile ground for the association between authoritarianism and aspects of the socialist ideology. McFarland, et al. (1996) found that a pro-communist orientation in the Soviet Union was related to authoritarianism. This chapter examines relationships between authoritarianism and support for the socialist ideology based on a 1995 survey of Yugoslavian college students.

Authoritarianism of the Right: Evidence from the West

Meloen’s (1993) review of authoritarianism studies shows that the F scale consistently was related to anti-democratic and fascist tendencies. Anti-democratic and pro-fascist groups generally have high scores on the F scale, higher than the population as a whole, and groups “that explicitly support democratic and antifascist values” obtain lower average scores than the general population (Meloen, 1993, p. 48). Stone’s (1980) review of left-wing authoritarianism concluded that it is simply a myth (Stone and Smith, 1993).

Altemeyer’s (1981, 1988, 1998) research on right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) indicates that RWA is significantly (but not particularly strongly) related to preference for more conservative parties both in Canada and the US (Altemeyer, 1988). However, on the level of political elites, Altemeyer finds very strong differences in the expected direction. For example, in a sample of legislators from Manitoba, he found eta-squared coefficient of .82 between party membership and RWA scores, concluding that “this was about the strongest relationship I had ever seen in the behavioral sciences” (Altemeyer, 1988, p. 243-4).

Altemeyer reinterpreted the left-right dimension, especially in its psychological aspect. To him, right-wing meant supporting the established order, regardless of the specific, manifest ideological justification or content of ideology. RWA actually measures pro-democratic orientation. In Yugoslavia, Hofman, Uzelac and Ignjatovic (1988, p. 676) argued that their authoritarianism scale measured “anti-democratic versus democratic orientation.”

Although more evidence abounds, these studies are sufficient to claim “beyond reasonable doubt” that in Western countries, authoritarianism is consistently related to right-wing political ideology and behavior. It does not mean that there are no leftist authoritarians. The question is about the relative frequency. While the quest for the authoritarianism of the left has not been impressively successful, critics failed to note that the “left authoritarianism” was also treated in TAP. Low ethnocentrism, coupled with high scores on the F scale among members of “liberal” trade unions was attributed to “the success of indoctrination in anti-discrimination,” not to a different personality structure (TAP, 1982, p. 198). One of the five syndromes described among the low scorers was labeled the rigid low scorer. Their superego tends to be strict and compulsive, which disposes them “towards totalitarian thinking” (TAP, p. 772), while their psychologically superficial tolerance results from the particular ideology they accept.

Authoritarianism of the Left: Evidence from the (former) Socialist Countries

Empirical studies of authoritarianism in socialist countries are rare. Perhaps the most relevant study to evaluate authoritarianism in socialist countries was conducted with unusual methodological care and sophistication in Yugoslavia by Rot and Havelka (1973). This occurred while socialism was still strong. For our purpose, the most important aspect is the relationship between the translated 29-item F scale and two sets of “values” (democracy vs. autocracy and socialism vs. capitalism). Democracy was defined as a system in which all have equal rights, an important condition for “social progress.” Autocracy was defined as a system in which only some people have power. Socialism was defined as “the most just and best possible social system in spite of shortcomings it may contain.” Capitalism was defined as a system based on private ownership and competition, which secures “the healthiest economy” (Rot and Havelka, 1973, p. 165). Both democracy and socialism were highly approved by most of the respondents. Authoritarianism proved to be negatively related with democracy (-.38), while socialism was on the border of statistical significance (-.09) (Rot and Havelka, 1973, p. 234). As in the West, Yugoslav respondents who valued democracy were less authoritarian; unlike in Russia in 1989, support for socialism was (almost) negatively related with authoritarianism.

Momirovic (1989) found a similarly insignificant zero-order correlation between authoritarianism and “self-management socialist orientation,” but in canonical analysis, authoritarianism and “residuals of dogmatic socialism in the variance of socialist value system” loaded on the same factor. So, in the case of Yugoslavia, Altemeyer and Kamenshikov’s (1991, p. 255) conclusion that “anti-communist Americans and anti-capitalist Russians are the same people” was only partly applicable.

New evidence appeared after 1989. McFarland, et al. (1993, p. 201) studied Russian and other former Soviet Union respondents, following Altemeyer’s reasoning that “where communism itself was the convention, authoritarianism should have included adherence to communism, authoritarian submission to the in-group (i.e., communist) authorities, and repressive attitudes toward nonconventional groups.” As they expected, they found that authoritarianism is positively correlated with anti-capitalist and anti-democratic attitudes as well as other prejudices. However, they also found that, within several years, the strength of the relationship between pro-communist attitudes and authoritarianism decreased and the usual pattern of relationships with the right-wing politics started to appear (McFarland, et al., 1996). For example, they found the correlation between the RWA score and “belief in communism” was .69 in 1989, .45 in 1991, and only .38 in 1993.

In Hungary, Enyedi, Eros, and Fábíán (1997) conducted a national survey conducted in 1994. They found the leftist groups (defined by a number of dimensions like vote, self-identification, and attitudes) stood between the anti-authoritarian liberals and the more authoritarian nationalist-conservatives. Those who identified themselves as “Leftist” and “Socialist” were less authoritarian than the “Christians” or the “Nationalists,” but more authoritarian than the “Democrats” and “Liberals.” Only supporters of reactionary Stalinist socialism were outstanding in their authoritarianism scores.

The evidence from the former Yugoslavia indicates that authoritarianism was either not related to pro-socialist attitudes or it was negatively related to a more democratic, self-management version of socialism and positively related with dogmatic, etatist (more Soviet Union type) socialism. More recent evidence from the former-communist countries suggests that after the regime change, highly authoritarian individuals could be found both on the extreme “reactionary” left and on the nationalist right. An important general point is that socialist ideology should be conceived as a complex structure with different specific values and beliefs (Vincent, 1992). Depending on the political context, and on the particular aspect of socialist ideology, authoritarianism may be differently related with it.

The Problem

Any comprehensive examination of the ideological leanings of authoritarians requires evidence from different ideological contexts. Arguably, former communist regimes represented favorable conditions for the emergence of the “authoritarianism of the left.” This study explores to what extent various aspects of the socialist ideology were related to authoritarianism in Yugoslavia in 1995.

Although the present data were collected in 1995 (after the fall of socialism on a global scale), two facts support the validity of the endeavor. First, the respondents as well as their parents were socialized when the rule of socialism was hardly publicly questioned. Since the effects of socialization are supposed to be relatively long-lasting, it should be reflected in the collected data. Second, political and economic “transition” has been a rather slow and ambiguous process in (present) Yugoslavia, without the sharp break with the socialist past that many other countries in the region experienced. Hence, the connection between authoritarianism and socialist ideology was probably reinforced by the fact that the former communists (Milošević’s party) remained in power for a long time, did not distance themselves from the earlier communist period, and sometimes used very strong nationalist rhetoric. In addition, ethnic conflicts and economic hardships (largely caused by the imposed economic sanctions against Yugoslavia) may have contributed to the more positive view of the earlier regime, especially among the authoritarians (e.g., through the “threat - authoritarian reaction link”) (Rickert, 1998). This reasoning suggests that we should find a strong connection between socialist ideology and authoritarianism in Yugoslavia (Hypothesis 1). However, socialist ideology cannot be considered as simple and homogenous set of values and attitudes, neither theoretically not practically. Socialism has not been concerned only with economic equality, though it has been its important component. Other central values include political equality, liberty, democracy, and the humanistic “belief that all humans are capable of self-development, regardless of country class, sex or race” (Vincent, 1992, p. 95). It was also noted that researchers in Yugoslavia made distinctions between “kinds” of socialist ideologies. Stone and Smith (1993) argue that content of ideology is important and that such central values of the left (like equality and liberty) make it naturally a part of the non-authoritarian orientation. According to Bobbio (1997, p. 60), the basic “criterion” for the left-right distinction is the “attitude of real people in society to the idea of equality,” where the left is characterized by the idea of reducing inequalities. From this perspective, it is hypothesized that authoritarianism is differently connected with various specific aspects of the socialist ideology. The relationship should be stronger with more dogmatic, state-oriented versions than with more humanistic, egalitarian, and democratic aspects (Hypothesis 2).

This provides additional theoretical relevance to the present research. It concerns “the meaning of authoritarianism” (Stone, et al., 1993, p. 230), whether authoritarianism is a personality syndrome (as conceived by Adorno et al.) or a specific set of social and political attitudes. Various authors made this objection. John Ray (1988, 1990) claims that the F scale is only an imperfect measure of conservatism, measuring “the Old-Fashioned Personality” and supporting “Victorian values.” After the first extensive application of the F scale in Yugoslavia, Rot and Havelka (1973) concluded that the scale actually measured the acceptance of beliefs characteristic of a patriarchal environment, not the degree and existence of some stable personality traits. Covariance of authoritarianism and ethnocentrism was explained by socialization within the common cultural or subcultural framework. If the later is true, it should not correlate with ideologies other than middle-class conservatism since authoritarianism would, then, be only one element in the broader ideological package and not a concept with explanatory power. If, on the other hand, authoritarianism indeed concerns something psychologically deeper than a set of political attitudes, we should be able to find its ideological correlates across the political spectrum, provided that they fulfill the psychological needs of the authoritarians.

Method

Survey and the Sample

The present research is based on secondary analysis of the data collected in a survey conducted by the Center for Social Research, Subotica, Yugoslavia. An ad hoc sample of approximately 700 college students (aged between 17 and 19) from various schools in Subotica was surveyed in Spring 1995. Approximately 50% of the respondents are women. The questionnaire, consisting of several attitude scales, was administered during regular classes, in a group setting, and lasted approximately 40 minutes. Full anonymity of respondents was secured. Prior to distributing questionnaires, respondents were informed about the general aim of the survey. Individuals responsible for administering the questionnaire were usually sociology or psychology teachers in the respondents' schools.

The sample is not representative, but in this research design, that is a minor problem because the goal is not to estimate population parameters, but the structure of the relationships between the analyzed variables. Authorities like Thurstone argue that for analysis of the latent dimensions, it may be even better if samples are not random (quoted in Kerlinger, et al., 1976). Due to the sample selection bias (i.e., restricted variance), it is more likely to expect even stronger relationships in the general population.

Measures

Attitudes toward socialist ideology are operationalized by the 33-item SOCID scale. The scale covers various aspects of socialist ideology: egalitarianism, collectivism, Yugoslav army, political opposition, conformism, state vs. private economy, "Western world," etc. Due to the lack of empirical studies of these attitudes, the selection of items was largely based on the experience of living in a socialist country. Therefore, certain items are specific to the official ideology and conditions in Yugoslavia.

The authoritarianism (AUT) scale consisted of 28 items. The scale contains a number of items from the F scale (usually more or less reworded), but also items from other Yugoslav versions of authoritarianism scales (Hofman, et al., 1988); some items were created for this particular survey. Items from both scales were presented in the Likert format, where respondents answered by circling one of four degrees of dis/agreement with each item (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, and 4=strongly agree). The scales are not really balanced (i.e., agreement with the items indicates the presence of the measured dimension). Despite possible objections, this is not a serious problem in the present research design since there "is no change in factorial validity . . . the only difference found was a difference in mean scores, which is trivial and irrelevant" (Wilde, 1977, p. 89).

Results and Discussion

The analysis started with the factor analyses of the two applied scales. This gave us a clear operational definition of the measured personality and ideological dimensions. Both scales were analyzed in the same manner: first, narrower range factors were extracted with Cattell's (1966) Scree test to determine the number of significant factors. The extracted primary factors were submitted to an oblique rotation (Direct Oblimin). Then, we performed the second-order factor analysis. In this way, socialist ideology and authoritarianism were operationally defined as hierarchically organized sets of attitudes and traits and their interrelationships on different levels of generality were analyzed.

Factor Analysis and Basic Metric Characteristics of the Authoritarianism Scale

First-Order Factor Extraction

According to the Scree test, seven factors were extracted from the authoritarianism (AUT) scale, accounting for 50.1% of the total variance. Items of the first rotated authoritarianism factor (Table 1) primarily refer to exclusion of culturally defined out-groups, whose low status is socially sanctioned: mentally ill, beggars, alcoholics, and homosexuals. Two items with the lowest loading are classical

authoritarian items, referring to obedience of state authorities and desire for strong leadership. In this way, the factor contains two important components of authoritarianism: rejection of socially sanctioned out-groups and submissiveness to official authority. Because the factor primarily contains the aspect of out-group rejection, it is interpreted as authoritarian aggressiveness, though one should keep in mind its relatively narrower content than the original concept from TAP.

The second authoritarianism factor contains some elements similar to the previous one, particularly those referring to rejection of out-groups (e.g., alcoholics also appear on this factor). However, the main theme here seems to be punishment of the out-groups and those who break the “rules of behavior” (item 14). For example, this includes questions about punishing those involved with narcotic drugs, sexual criminals, and juvenile delinquents in addition to supporting the death penalty. At the same time, the factor contains two submissiveness items (20 and 24), supporting the hypothesis that authoritarian aggressiveness and submissiveness often go together.

However, since the main element in this factor is obviously the punitive attitude toward rule-breakers and out-groups in general, it is interpreted as punitiveness. A similar factor (i.e., punitiveness) is one of four main sub-dimensions of the general conservatism dimension in Wilson’s (1973) model of the structure of social attitudes and that Heaven (1992) found punitiveness to be correlated with support of right-wing political parties. In addition, Majstorovic, Salaj, and Ignjatovic (1994) obtained a similar factor of authoritarianism (labeled there as penophilia). Hence, the present result can be seen as another support for the real existence of the dimension of punitiveness.

The third factor is also clearly interpretable. All but the last item expresses conformism and submissiveness to the established authorities. It incorporated submission at the work place (item 25), submission of children (items 18, 21, and 20), respect for “state authorities” (28), and even one personality inventory self-description as being “obedient and disciplined” (item 19). The only deviation from the common theme of obedience is the items concerning alcoholics (7), but that factor had the lowest loading. Therefore, the factor can be interpreted as submissiveness. Kerlinger, Middendorp, and Amon (1976, p. 270) obtained a similar factor emphasizing duty, discipline, and authority; it was a sub-factor of their general conservatism, labeled “traditional conservatism.”

The fourth factor is also rather homogeneous. Three items refer to women: their condemnation in case of extramarital sexual relationships (12), virginity as a condition for marriage (13), and distrust about their sexual fidelity (15). The two remaining items refer to condemning prostitutes and homosexuals. Hence, this factor is interpreted as patriarchal sexual morality or patriarchalism.

Table 1. Structure of the seven Oblimin rotated factors extracted from the Authoritarianism scale. Loadings above .30 shown.

No.	Statement	Auth Agg.	Pun itive	Sub Miss	Pat riarc	Con ven.	Pru denc	Sex- Fear
1	Homosexuals are hardly any better than criminals and should be severely punished	.38			.67		-.34	
2	Prostitutes are the worst kind of people.				.71	-.33		
3	Death penalty is the best punishment for notorious criminals.		.48				-.44	
4	Those with inheritable diseases should be sterilized	.63						
5	The mentally disordered should be put into asylum	.72						
6	Those who have any contacts with narcotic drugs should be arrested		.69					
7	Alcoholics should be expelled from society	.57	.45	.33				
8	Juvenile delinquents should be severely punished		.61					
9	Beggars should be expelled from the streets	.69						
10	Sexual crimes deserve stronger punishment than imprisonment; such criminals should be publicly whipped		.62					
11	Pornography should be prohibited by the law.					.62		
12	A woman who has extramarital sexual relationships should be condemned in every possible way.				.71			
13	Woman should enter the marriage as a virgin.				.65			.48
14	Those who break the rules of behavior should be punished		.44			-.34		.35
15	Women should never be trusted too much regarding their sexual fidelity.				.36		-.52	.43
16	Sometimes I am afraid of my sexual fantasies							.73
17	No matter how they look from outside, in contacts with women, men are interested only in sex							.41
18	Obedience is a valuable feature of the child's personality			.62				
19	I am obedient and disciplined			.43		-.41		
20	Respect of authorities is the most important virtue children should learn		.54	.41		-.45		
21	Children should be brought up in rigorous discipline.			.47				.53
22	Teachers and professors should be strict with their students					.40		.51
23	Those who don't show respect and gratitude toward parents should be despised					-.71		
24	Harmonious and strong family should be the main goal of our life and work		.36			-.59		
25	If one wants to be successful in his job, somebody has to tell him what and how to do it			.65				
26	Loyalty to the state is one of the nicest feelings one can experience					-.59		
27	This country needs a strong leader	.32				-.66		
28	One should not suspect decisions made by the state authorities	.32		.61				

The fifth factor is similar to that of submissiveness since it refers to respect of authorities (such as parents, state leadership, authority of the family, and so on). It also contains a strong, though relatively smaller, element of punitiveness (items 2, 14, and 23). Since most of the items express various aspects of conventional morality (in a given cultural milieu), the factor is interpreted as conventionalism, though its relatively narrow and specific meaning should be noted. The sixth factor's structure is bipolar. The positive pole is defined by two items: request for prohibition of pornography and request for strictness of teachers. The negative pole is represented by items expressing distrust of female sexual fidelity, support for the death penalty, and a negative attitude toward homosexuals. One side of the factor describes a kind of strict morality, the other disagreement with punitive attitudes. It seems that the factor is based on a strong superego, but without destructiveness. It would not be surprising if this factor would be related to intrinsic religiosity. So, the factor is interpreted narrowly as prudence, though it might also be labeled as superego. If the factor is not an artifact, it could be seen as the most interesting and intriguing result of the factor analysis of the authoritarianism scale.

The last authoritarianism factor also deals with aspects of gender relationships and sexual morality. The item with the strongest saturation is a personality inventory: the self-description of being afraid of one's own sexual fantasies. It is possible that this relatively unique item in the scale "pulled" some other items together to create this factor. The other items refer to the strict discipline of youth (21, 22), the cynical perception of men's attitude toward women, and two items about female sexual morality (13, 15). Perhaps, the item is based on the fear of spontaneity and insecurity due to repressed unconscious sexual impulses. However, further examination would be needed to clarify the exact meaning of the factor and to clarify whether it is really an existing psychological dimension or an artifact of the employed scale and method of factor extraction. The factor is labeled as sex-fear.

Table 2. Correlation between the authoritarianism factors. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$, 2-tailed.

	Authoritarian aggressiveness	Punitiveness	Submissiveness	Patriarchalism	Conventionalism	Prudence
Punitiveness	.11*					
Submissiveness	.17**	.17**				
Patriarchalism	.19**	.18**	.14**			
Conventionalism	-.15**	-.23**	-.21**	-.15**		
Prudence	-.06	-.04	.00	-.02	.03	
Sex-fear	.18**	.12**	.15**	.19**	-.15**	-.01

Most of the authoritarianism factors are significantly correlated and in the expected positive direction (note that the conventionalism factor has negative item loadings). The only “outsider” in this group of dimensions is the factor of prudence, which is not related to any other factor. This may be an additional support for its interpretation as an aspect of genuine, though rather strict, morality or superego. What is important here is that these coefficients allow us to perform the next step in the analysis (i.e., second-order factor extraction).

Second-order Factor Extraction

Second-order analysis yielded two factors, accounting for 40.5% of the variance. They are also rotated into Oblimin position; their structure is given in Table 3.

Table 3. Second order authoritarianism factors. Loadings above .30 shown.

Primary factors	Factor 1 General Authoritarianism	Factor 2 Prudence
5 Conventionalism	-.59	
3 Submissiveness	.56	
4 Patriarchalism	.56	
2 Punitiveness	.54	
7 Sex - fear	.53	
1 Authoritarian aggressiveness	.53	
6 Prudence (superego)		.97

The structure of the second-order factor supports what was noted in the matrix of correlations between the primary factors. Namely, prudence creates a dimension separate from the other primary factors, which all converge toward one higher-order dimension. Hence, the later is interpreted as a general authoritarianism dimension and the former did not need additional interpretation. Correlation between the two factors is insignificant ($r=-.05$, $p>.05$).

Factor Analysis and Basic Metric Characteristics of the Socialist Ideology Scale

First-order Factor Extraction

Seven factors are extracted from the SOCID scale, accounting for 54.0% of the total variance. The first rotated factor consists of two main groups of items (Table 4). Higher loading items express a positive evaluation of the state-run economy (35, 34, and 11). The second group of items refers to the “advanced” role of the working class (36, 32, 33). These two sets of attitudes represent classical components of the institutionalized socialism of Central and Eastern European. How-

ever, part of the variance may also be due to the experience with “post-socialism” (i.e., with the “wild,” semi-free-market economy following 1989). Since many of the new private entrepreneurs (at least, in Yugoslavia) have not been famous for their economic fairness and respect of the worker’s rights, belief in the state-ownership of the economy might be based partly on the realistic evaluation of the new experiences. Hence, we are not sure if this factor should be particularly strongly related to authoritarianism. Three items with the lowest loadings are relatively heterogeneous: expressing belief in communism(39), rejecting political opposition (13), and favoring pay equality (22). They do not significantly alter the meaning of this factor, which is interpreted as belief in economic socialism or state economy.

The second factor primarily contains items expressing a positive attitude toward the Yugoslav army, belief in the importance of its strength, a positive evaluation of the war, and similar items. Two anti-West items (37 and 38) have quite low loadings. The meaning of this factor is clearly militarism. A very similar factor (with the same name) was repeatedly obtained by Wilson (1973) as one of primary components of general conservatism dimension. In Wilson’s model, the first sub-dimension of general conservatism is named “militarism or punitiveness.” However, in the present analysis, these two constructs belong to separate domains: punitiveness to personality and militarism to ideology. Nevertheless, this may also be interpreted as an overlap between the two applied scales; this will be discussed more in the final part of this chapter.)

The content of the third factor seems equally clear. Most of the items with high loadings express a high evaluation of the collective, its primacy as a value over individual interest, and similar items. There are also two items with the lowest loadings that are different in content. One concerns pay equality and the other state ownership of the economy (items 22 and 11, respectively). Hence, the factor is interpreted as collectivism.

The fourth socialist ideology factor primarily refers to the role of the state. The state is seen as “the bearer of the spirit of the people” (item 9), the most important decision maker (7) who “knows” the interests of citizens (8), and can help achieve “economic progress” (10). The two items with the lowest loadings refer to approval of state ownership (11) and approval of the army (16). Hence, the factor’s meaning seems to be best captured by the label etatism. It corresponds more to the role of the state seen in the dogmatic, Stalinist’ version of socialism, than to the late Yugoslav version of the “worker’s self-management socialism.”

Items with the highest loadings on the fifth factor express negative, restrictive attitudes toward political opposition and the multi-party system. Therefore, they represent a more general anti-democratic attitude than a specific aspect of the socialist ideology. However, among the items with lower loadings, some specifically refer to socialist ideology. For example, there is a belief in the “communist world” (item 39), approval of the state economy (35), the army (16),

and the working class (36). Perhaps, experiences in Yugoslavia after 1989 fostered the rejection of democracy and belief in communism. For example, the emergence of political opposition was accompanied by increased social conflict, ethnic wars, a sharp decline in economic well-being, and similar processes. Hence, although these two processes (emergence of political opposition and social deterioration) are not necessarily causally linked (in the sense that opposition did not cause deterioration, but that the former communists trying to maintain power caused the society to collapse), the public may perceive them as closely linked. In any case, interpreting the factor as anti-democracy seems appropriate.

The sixth factor of socialist ideology is primarily determined by a negative attitude toward the West. The West is seen as "full of injustice" (38); its aim is to exploit the people (37). The rest of items with significant though lower loadings contain aspects of etatism (10), militarism (16, 3), and rejection of the multi-party system (12). Due to the two strongest items, we interpret this factor as the anti-West attitude (also based on aspects of dogmatic socialist ideology).

Finally, the seventh factor represents a more universal component of the socialist ideology: egalitarianism. These items express desire for an egalitarian economic standard (24), rejection of social elites (24), request for the equal pay policy (22), and others. In addition, there is a belief in the special role and importance of the working class (32, 33, and 36), approval of state ownership of economy (34 and 35), and one militarist item (16). Hence, it seems that this factor satisfactorily covers the concept of socialist egalitarianism as it has been officially (in a more populist version) conceived in Yugoslavia.

Primary factors of the socialist ideology are somewhat more correlated than authoritarianism factors. Without particularly interpreting a separate coefficient, it is sufficient to note that second-order analysis is justified by the obtained coefficients. (Negative coefficients in the case of anti-democracy are due to negative loadings on the factor. So, negative coefficients mean negative relationship with a pro-democracy attitude and positive with anti-democracy.)

Table 4. Structure of the seven Oblimin rotated factors extracted from the SOCID scale. Loadings above .30 shown.

No.	Statement	State Eco.	Militar ism	Collective	Etatism	Anti- Dem.	Anti- West	Egalit.
1	War is the best occasion to show courage and strength		.59					
2	Society should provide more money for modernization of the army		.75					
3	Strong army is the only guarantee that nobody will attack us		.69				.35	
4	Serving in the army is the greatest honor		.73					
6	I enjoy seeing young soldiers marching.		.80					
7	The state should make political and economic decisions in the name of the people				.71			
8	State authorities know what are interests and needs of their citizens				.70			
9	State is bearer of the spirit of the people				.76			
10	Without a strong state, it is impossible to achieve economic progress				.49		.52	
11	State ownership over the means of the production is better than private	.58		.34	.36			
12	Multiparty political system caused political chaos and disorder					-.64	.31	
13	Political activity of the opposition should be stopped	.39				-.74		
14	Police should prohibit political demonstrations					-.78		
15	People should not be given too great political rights and liberties					-.73		
16	In case of social disorders, only army can make order		.46		.35	-.39	.41	.33
17	One can live a happy life only if s/he belongs to a collective			.66				
18	One works better for a collective than only for him/herself			.76				
19	Individual interests should be sacrificed for the benefit of the collective			.80				
20	Collective goals should be the supreme values for the youth			.79				
21	Security can be achieved only by following rules and customs of the collective			.69				
22	All workers should have equal salaries	.35		.35				.73
23	There would be fewer conflicts if everybody would enjoy equal economic standard							.76
24	Society should prevent creation of social elites							.75
25	All people have more or less equal abilities							.56
26	It is a shame that some have two cars and some not a single one							.59

32	The worker is more important than the engineer	.53						.48
33	Workers, not managers, should make decisions	.46						.43
34	Better to work in a state enterprise, the private owners' only aim is exploitation	.70						.39
35	Most enterprises should be owned by the state	.72				-.41		.35
36	Working class is the most advanced social force	.58				-.34		.32
37	Western world and its capital only want to exploit our people		.39					.68
38	Western world is full of injustice		.35					.77
39	In the communist world there is more justice	.47				-.51		

Table 5. Correlation between the socialist ideology factors. * p<.05; **p<.01, 2-tailed.

	State economy	Militarism	Collectivism	Etatism	Anti-democracy	Anti-West
Militarism	.15**					
Collectivism	.23**	.22**				
Etatism	.07	.18**	.20**			
Anti-democracy	-.28**	-.24**	-.21**	-.17**		
Anti-West	.06	.19**	.12**	.13*	-.15**	
Egalitarianism	.29**	.16**	.24**	.05	-.25**	.11**

Second-order Factor Extraction

Second-order analysis yielded two factors, accounting for 45.3% of the variance. They are also rotated into Oblimin position and their structure is shown in Table 6. The correlation between the two factors is $r=.25$ ($p<.05$).

Second-order analysis resulted in two relatively clear higher-order factors. The first one is based on primary factors of state economy, egalitarianism, anti-democracy, and marginally, militarism. It seems that this factor contains some of the more universal aspects of the socialist ideology, especially egalitarianism, state-economy, and collectivism, referring primarily to economic equality, not so much to the worship of the powerful state (note the insignificant loading of etatism). However, the factors should not be interpreted too positively, since there is

a strong projection of anti-democracy. The first factor can be interpreted as representing more “self-management” or a populist form of Yugoslav socialism.

Table 6. Second order factors of the Socialist Ideology scale. Loadings above .30 shown.

Primary factors	Factor 1 Egalitarian socialism	Factor 2 Authoritarian, dogmatic socialism
State economy	.74	
Egalitarianism	.72	
Anti-democracy	-.60	-.38
Collectivism	.53	.41
Etatism		.70
Anti-West		.62
Militarism	.34	.61

This is labeled egalitarian socialism since that seems to be its main character. The second factor is saturated primarily by etatism, anti-West attitude, militarism, and to a lesser extent, collectivism and anti-democracy. In comparison with the first factor, this represents more the etatist, authoritarian, dogmatic version of the socialist ideology. If the distinction is correct, a stronger correlation with authoritarianism should be expected in the case of dogmatic than egalitarian socialism.

The Main Analysis: Relationships between Authoritarianism and Socialist Ideology

After the clear operational definition of socialist ideology and authoritarianism on different levels of generality, the main part of the analysis can be approached.

Level of the Second-order Factors

Significant relationships are obtained at the level of the second-order factors (Table 7). The factor of general authoritarianism is significantly and rather strongly related with both socialist ideology factors, but somewhat more strongly with dogmatic socialism ($r=.51$, compared with $r=.46$ in the former case). Obviously, both components of the socialist ideology (measured by the SOCID scale) are strongly based on authoritarianism. However, a differential interpretation of the two socialism factors (with different degrees of rigidity built into them) is supported by these findings. Egalitarian socialism is based less on authoritarian personality than on dogmatic socialism.

Table 7. Correlations between second-order factors of authoritarianism and socialist ideology.

	Egalitarian Socialism	Dogmatic Socialism
General authoritarianism	.46 ($p < .000$)	.51 ($p < .000$)
Prudence (2nd order factor)	-.01 ($p > .05$)	-.20 ($p < .000$)

Prudence (the other second-order authoritarianism factor) is not related to the egalitarian socialist ideology, but is significantly negatively, though rather weakly, correlated with dogmatic socialism. On the one hand, that supports the previous interpretation of the prudence factor as being based more on strict, but non-authoritarian morality (the opposite pole of that factor would be authoritarianism without such morality, i.e., amoral punitiveness). On the other hand, it suggests that dogmatic socialist ideology is based on amoral prudence, but egalitarian socialism is not. In this way, interpretations of the factors in two domains are clarified and reinforced. If both authoritarian factors are taken together, it is clear that dogmatic socialism is more authoritarian than the more egalitarian kind.

Level of the Primary Factors

Instead of relying on zero-order correlation coefficients, here the analysis is based on multiple regressions. Each ideological dimension is regressed onto the seven authoritarianism factors. In this way, we attempted to isolate the unique contribution of the authoritarianism factors to the variance in the socialist ideology factors. The results show that socialist ideology factors can be predicted by authoritarianism factors better than by chance (in all cases, the F test for the entire equation is significant, $p < .05$), but the strength of the relationships varies considerably (Table 8). Support for the state-owned economy is the weakest correlate of authoritarianism factors ($R^2 = .07$). Interestingly, it is related with patriarchalism and somewhat less with submissiveness and conventionalism. It may mean that support for state ownership is less based on the authoritarian personality traits and more on “socialist traditionalism” (if such a conceptual stretch is allowed) the strongest correlate of authoritarianism factors ($R^2 = .32$). It is related primarily to conventionalism (beta = $-.34$), then negatively to prudence, and again positively to authoritarian aggression, patriarchalism, and the sex-fear factor. It seems that authoritarian aggressiveness (whose elements can be detected in these authoritarianism factors) is the most responsible for the covariation with militarism. This seems to fit the TAP hypothesis of the relationship between personality and political attitudes.

Collectivism is the second strongest correlate of authoritarianism factors, though quite a lot weaker than militarism ($R^2 = .20$). Its best predictors are conventionalism, submissiveness, sex-fear, and prudence factors. It seems that highly

conventional individuals, with more submissive than aggressive personalities and problematic attitudes toward sexuality, seek submission to a collective. It is interesting that the prudence factor is now positively related with the ideological factor, implying that sublimed or only compensation-based morality is also at the roots of collectivism.

Etatism is still the weaker correlate of the authoritarianism factors ($R^2=.12$). It is related with submissiveness, conventionalism, and authoritarian aggressiveness. Admiration and support for the strong state seems to be based partly on conventional submissiveness coupled with more aggressive trends. Again, this finding corresponds to the TAP theory.

Anti-democracy (or pro-democracy, if signs are reversed) is among the strongest correlates of authoritarianism ($R^2=.17$). Punitiveness, authoritarian aggressiveness, submissiveness, and conventionalism are the basis of an anti-democratic attitude. Three main components of authoritarianism according to Altemeyer (e.g., 1988) - authoritarian aggression, submission, and conventionalism - are joined here as predictors of anti-democratic attitude. In this way, the present findings corroborate Altemeyer's claim that the opposite side of (right-wing) authoritarianism is not communism but anti-democracy.

While in the West, authoritarianism has been found to correlate with a negative evaluation of the socialist regimes, among Yugoslav respondents, authoritarianism predicts a negative attitude toward the West ($R^2=.15$). This factor is related primarily to punitiveness, prudence (negatively), conventionalism, and rather weakly to sex-fear. Conventional rejection of out-groups, with authoritarian amorality leads to rejection of yet another out-group: the West. Egalitarianism (like other more clearly ideological factors) is rather weakly related with authoritarianism factors ($R^2=.10$). It is related only with punitiveness and conventionalism. That means that individuals with punitive attitudes toward out-groups and the highly conventional (in the meaning of traditionalist conventionalism) are somewhat more frequently found among those expressing egalitarian value orientations.

If you focus on the rows in the table, conventionalism is significantly related with all ideology dimensions, suggesting that in a socialist country, conventional individuals profess socialist ideology. Exactly what is predicted by the authoritarianism theory and Altemeyer (1988) or McFarland (e.g., 1996) in part. The other authoritarianism factors are more varied as correlates of the ideological dimensions. Authoritarian aggressiveness is primarily linked with militarism and anti-democracy, which does not need interpretation. Punitiveness is related with anti-West orientation and anti-democracy, suggesting that the West and political opposition are seen also as out-groups that ought to be rejected. The relationship with egalitarianism is somewhat more surprising, but it probably means that part of the variance in egalitarian beliefs is based on the desire to pun-

ish those who deviate from the average, even if they are the minority of more successful and capable people.

Submissiveness is connected with etatism, collectivism, and anti-democracy attitude. The pattern fits the expectations: etatism implies submission to the strong state, collectivism to the collective. On the other hand, democracy (with its unpredictable competition) may be threatening to very submissive personalities.

Table 8. Regression coefficients (Beta) and R² for Authoritarianism factors explaining Socialist Ideology dimensions. * p<.05; **p<.01.

	State econ.	Militar.	Collectiv.	Etatism	Anti-dem	Anti-West	Egalitarian
Auth. Aggress.	.04	.18**	.04	.11**	-.15**	.07	-.08
Punitiveness	.04	-.01	.06	.03	-.19**	.23**	.16**
Submissiveness	.11*	-.00	.13**	.20**	-.13**	-.07	.08
Patriarchalism	.13**	.15**	.08	-.03	-.06	-.09*	.10*
Conventionalism	-.10*	-.34**	-.29**	-.18**	.12**	-.14**	-.14**
Prudence	.06	-.20**	.10*	.00	-.02	-.18**	-.08
Sex-fear	.07	.13**	.13**	.03	-.05	-.09*	-.03
R ²	.09	.32	.20	.12	.17	.15	.10

The strongest correlate of patriarchalism is militarism; this is not particularly surprising, given that the exaggerated masculinity or machismo is a rather universal component of patriarchalism. Militarism can be seen as a political expression of these orientations. In addition, patriarchalism in Yugoslavia is rather strongly based on the “freedom fighters” tradition.

Prudence significantly predicts militarism and anti-West orientation, both in negatively. If it is interpreted as strict morality versus amoral aggressiveness, its connection with militarism seems natural and, to a certain extent, with an anti-West attitude (i.e., strict moral consciousness would not imply rejection of the West in general, simply because they are identified with ideological opposition). Moreover, if prudence is related to religiosity, then the two relationships would seem even more natural.

Sex-fear factor is generally weakly related to ideological dimensions, notably with militarism and collectivism and on the border of significance, with anti-West attitude. The interpretation of such findings would follow the psychoanalytic

lines of TAP. However, note that although the factor is weakly correlated with ideology, it gives a “psychological richness” to the obtained results.

As a general conclusion of this part of analysis, we emphasize that the general expectation that different dimensions of socialist ideology are differently related with various aspects of authoritarianism is confirmed. It is confirmed also that more dogmatic, aggressive, or “authoritarian” aspects of socialist ideology are more related with authoritarianism than dimensions emphasizing more humanist aspects of socialism (e.g., egalitarianism and socialist economy).

The problem of what aspects of the socialist ideology are related to authoritarianism can also be examined somewhat differently to shed more light on the issue of different ideological correlates of authoritarianism in ideologically different political systems. Clearly, some of the obtained socialist ideology factors are more “ideological” than others. Namely, state economy, egalitarianism, or etatism represent some aspects of the ideology that was officially supported in former communist countries. These values and attitudes do not generally represent part of the official ideology in Western countries. On the other hand, some of the obtained ideological dimensions seem to be more universal or “ideologically neutral.” Such a dimension is militarism; nowadays, we can clearly see how glorification of the army, its power, and strength fits the official ideology of many Western countries. In Wilson’s (1973) model of conservatism, militarism is one of the four main sub-dimensions. Likewise, the factor of anti-democracy can be seen as a dimension of individual differences, applicable across official ideologies. To this group of dimensions not inherently related to socialist ideology can be added the factor of anti-West orientation. It can be viewed as corresponding to general anti-socialist attitudes in the West, because it represents basically general approval of the domestic system and opposition to the foreign one. In the present research, these two blocks of ideological factors (non-ideological and ideological) are compared, according to their relatedness with general authoritarianism. This was done by regressing the first principal component of the authoritarianism scale on the two blocks of ideology factors. Non-ideological factors were entered as the first block. By examining the incremental variance accounted for by the ideological factors over the variance accounted for by the non-ideological ones, it is possible to examine to what extent specifically socialist ideology dimensions are related to authoritarianism.

Standardized regression coefficients (beta) and corresponding values of t -tests, together with the variance explained by the first block and incremental variance explained by adding the next four ideological dimensions, are shown in Table 9. The first block explains 33% of the variance in the general authoritarian dimension. As expected, the strongest single correlate is militarism (beta=.32), followed by anti-democracy (-.20) and anti-West attitude (.10). Obviously, militarism is the most responsible dimension for correlation between authoritarianism

and socialist ideology. If it is accompanied by anti-democracy and anti-West attitude, it has one-third of the variance in common with authoritarianism.

Table 9. Relationship of authoritarianism (1st principal component) and factors of Socialist Ideology. Entries are beta coefficients for the total equation (with t-values in brackets), and R² value for the first block, and incremental R²

	Independent variable Block 1 ("non-ideological")				R ²
	Militarism	Anti-democracy	Anti-West		
Authoritarianism, 1 st Principal Component	.32 (8.49)	-.20 (-5.24)	.10 (2.62)		.33
	Independent variable Block 2 ("ideological")				R ² change
	State economy	Collectivism	Etatism	Egalitarianism	
Authoritarianism, 1 st Principal Component	.08 (2.21)	.22 (5.84)	.14 (3.76)	.02 (.71)	.09 (p<.05)

By adding the other four ideological dimensions, the explained variance can be increased for only 9 percentage points. Among the second block of variables, the strongest correlate of authoritarianism is collectivism (beta=.22), followed by etatism (.14) and state economy factors on the margin of statistical significance. Egalitarianism appears as not to be related to authoritarianism.

The connection between collectivism and authoritarianism does not seem surprising. First, it has been a part of the ruling ideology in Yugoslavia (though surely not in the Stalinist form of collectivism), sharing its common variance with authoritarianism. Second, as suggested in TAP, authoritarian individuals seek psychological security in submerging to the in-group; collectivism may share part of this tendency. Similar reasoning can be applied with etatism; the difference is that, here, the target of identification (or submission) is not the "collective," but the state and its power. Attitude toward state ownership of the economy and egalitarianism (as some of the most basic elements of the socialist ideology) are virtually not related to general authoritarianism. So, it could be concluded that individual differences in these dimensions are based on other factors, not on authoritarianism. Nevertheless, the most important point this analysis attempted to make is that there is much in common in authoritarianism's relationship to ideology both in the Western countries and (former) socialist countries (i.e., Yugoslavia). Dimensions (such as militarism) that are common to the two ideological systems are those that attract authoritarian individuals to the ruling ideologies.

Final Discussion and Conclusions

This analysis examined the relationship between socialist ideology and authoritarianism. Although in the West, it has been repeatedly found that authoritarianism correlates with the political right and conservatism, it was expected that in a former socialist country, socialist ideology ought to correlate with authoritarianism since it was a convention there. This argument has been advanced primarily by Altemeyer (e.g., 1988), empirically supported by McFarland, et al. (e.g., 1993, 1996), and is generally in agreement with the original TAP theory. However, since ideologies are complex and often contradictory constructions, it is possible to hypothesize that the specific content of ideology is important, too. Stone and Smith (1993) emphasized this argument, claiming that due to its humanist and egalitarian character, socialist (and leftist) ideology in general ought to be less based on authoritarianism. Presently, it was hypothesized that humanist, egalitarian, and pro-democratic aspects of the socialist ideology will be less based on authoritarianism than more authoritarian, dogmatic aspects of socialism. Methodologically, socialist ideology was operationalized by examining the relationships between the dimensions of authoritarianism and the socialist ideology at different levels of generality. As a first step, the SOCID and AUT scales were factor-analyzed. At the level of first-order factors, socialist ideology (operationalized by the SOCID scale) consists of seven sub-dimensions: support for the state-owned economy, militarism, collectivism, etatism, anti-democracy, anti-West attitude, and egalitarianism. At the level of second-order factors, dimensions of state economy, egalitarianism, anti-democracy and collectivism converged toward the higher-order factor interpreted as egalitarian socialism. Primary factors of etatism, anti-West, and militarism converged to the higher-order factor of dogmatic socialism.

First-order factor analysis of the Authoritarianism scale yielded seven factors: authoritarian aggressiveness, punitiveness, authoritarian submissiveness, patriarchalism, conventionalism, prudence, and sex-fear factor. In general terms, some of the factors correspond to components of authoritarianism described in TAP. Altemeyer's (1981) three main dimensions of authoritarianism are also reproduced among the obtained factors. Actually, it is possible to find a counterpart to every factor obtained here in other reports of factor-analytic studies of authoritarianism (e.g., Altemeyer, 1981; Raden, 1981; Kline and Cooper, 1984; Đuric, 1987; Goertzel, 1987; Billings, Guastello, and Rieke, 1993; Majstorovic, et al., 1994). At the level of the second-order factors, six primary factors converged toward the higher-order general authoritarianism factor, while prudence remained relatively independent. However, as the reliability analysis and first principal component extraction showed, all items converge toward the common authoritarianism dimension. Through this kind of methodological approach, it was possi-

ble to obtain clearly operationally defined, as reliably as possible, measures of aspects of authoritarianism and socialist ideology at different levels of generality.

At the level of second-order factors, relationships between authoritarianism and socialist ideology proved statistically significant. The results showed that egalitarian socialism is less based on authoritarian personality dimensions than on dogmatic socialism. This finding supported the second hypothesis that more humanistic aspects of socialism are less authoritarian, while more dogmatic and rigid components of state socialism are more authoritarian.

Analysis of relationships at the level of primary factors provided further support for the complexity of the relationship between ideology and authoritarianism. Militarism proved to be the strongest correlate of authoritarianism factors (primarily of conventionalism, prudence, and authoritarian aggression), while collectivism and etatism are mostly based on submissiveness and conventionalism. In general, the authoritarianism dimension of conventionalism, authoritarian aggressiveness, and submissiveness proved to be the strongest predictors of ideological dimensions. When seven authoritarianism factors are regressed on the first principal component of the SOCID scale, conventionalism appears to be the strongest predictor (beta=-.35, $t=-9.02$), while the second largest is punitiveness (beta=.16, $t=4.31$). As expected, conventionalism is the most responsible for conventional support for the ruling ideology (Stone and Smith, 1993.) Ideology factors of state economy and egalitarianism proved to be weakly or not at all related to authoritarianism factors. Additional analysis corroborated the finding that militarism is the single most important factor responsible for the connection between ideology and authoritarianism; but, if taken together with the other two relatively "non-ideological" dimensions, they account for the main part of the common variance between the two domains. As the analysis on different levels of generality showed, the initially strong relationship between the two domains can be decomposed in some more specific relationships. The largest part of the relationship is based on the militarist component of the socialist ideology, then on collectivism, anti-democratic, and anti-West attitude, and finally on etatism, state economy, and egalitarianism.

Even in an officially dogmatic socialist country, there were aspects of the socialist ideology that (by their egalitarian, humanist character) were not related to authoritarianism. The findings imply that relatively universal or common psychological tendencies can be detected behind authoritarians' support for the dominant ideologies. It suggests that political socialization research of political attitudes ought to take into account relatively universal psychological processes more than usually practiced.

There are many potential objections to this analysis and interpretation of the findings. The applied SOCID scale hardly covers the complexity of the socialist ideology, even in the official Yugoslav version. Even more important, most of its items are formulated in a rather extreme manner, so the responses may not accu-

rately reflect the respondents' real attitude toward the socialist system or ideology. (For example, only 12.2% of the respondents agreed and strongly agreed with a militarism item, "war is the best occasion to show courage and strength.") The tendency to agree with statements formulated in this way could be an important factor behind the covariance of the two scales. However, the main findings seem to be reasonably clear: in Yugoslavia in 1995, among the college students, support for dogmatic, intolerant, reactionary, socialist ideology is significantly and strongly related to authoritarianism; support for the more humanist and egalitarian socialism is generally less based on authoritarianism.

References

- Adorno, T., E. Frenkel-Brunswick, D. Levinson, and R. Sanford (1950). *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York, NY: Harper and Row. Abridged edition: (1982), New York, NY and London, UK: Norton & Company.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-Wing Authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (1988a). *Enemies of Freedom: Understanding Right-Wing Authoritarianism*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Altemeyer, B. (1988b). "Marching in step: A Psychological Examination of State Terror," pp. 30-38 in *The Sciences*, March/April.
- Altemeyer, B. and A. Kamenshikov (1991). "Impressions of American and Soviet Behavior: RWA Images in Mirror," pp. 255-260 in *South African Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 21.
- Billings, S., S. Guastello, and M. Rieke (1993). "A Comparative Assessment of the Construct Validity of Three Authoritarianism Measures," pp. 328-348 in *Journal of Research in Personality*, Vol. 27.
- Bobbio, N. (1997). *Left and Right: The Significance of a Political Distinction*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Cattell, R. (1966). "The Scree Test for the Number of Factors," pp. 245-276 in *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, Vol. 1.
- Đuric, Đ. (1987). "Prilog proučavanju strukture autoritarnosti kod studenata" (A contribution to the study of the structure of authoritarianism in students), pp. 13-21 in *Zbornik Instituta za pedagogiju*, Univerzitet u Novom Sadu.
- Enyedi, Z., F. Eros, and Z. Fábrián (1997). "Authoritarianism and the Ideological Spectrum in Hungary." Discussion Papers. Budapest: Collegium Budapest/Institute for Advanced Study.
- Goertzel, T. (1987). "Authoritarianism of Personality and Political Attitudes," pp. 7-18 in *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 127, No. 1.
- Heaven, P. (1992). "The Paradox of Socialism: Demographic Correlates of Social and Economic Beliefs," pp. 289-297 in *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 132, No. 3.
- Hofman, E., S. Uzelac, and I. Ignjatovic (1988). "Latentna struktura skale autoritarinosti" (Latent structure of an authoritarianism scale), pp. 676-690 in *Pedagoška stvarnost*, Vol. 9-10.

- Kerlinger, F., C. Middendorp, and J. Amon (1976). "The Structure of Social Attitudes in Three Countries: Test of a Criteria Referents Theory," pp. 265-279 in *International Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 11, No. 4.
- Kline, P. and C. Cooper (1984). "A Factorial Analysis of the Authoritarian Personality," pp. 171-176 in *British Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 75, No. 2.
- Majstorovic, N., M. Salaj, and I. Ignjatovic (1994). "Struktura autoritarnosti merena skalom 'A' iz upitnika MK-240 kod uèenika uzrasta 16 i 18 godina" (Structure of authoritarianism measured by the MK-240 questionnaire, among students aged between 16 and 18) in *Liènost u višekulturnom društvu Vol. I*. Novi Sad: Univerzitet u Novom Sadu.
- Martin, J. (2001). "'The Authoritarian Personality' 50 years Later: What Lessons are there for Political Psychology," pp. 1-26 in *Political Psychology*, Vol. 22.
- Meloen, J. (1993). "The F Scale as a Predictor of Fascism: An Overview of 40 Years of Authoritarianism Research" in: Stone et al. (eds.) *Strength and Weakness: The Authoritarian Personality Today*. New York, NY: Springer Verlag.
- McFarland, S., V. Ageyev, and M. Abalkina (1993). "The Authoritarian Personality in the United States and the Former Soviet Union: Comparative Studies," pp. 199-225 in Stone, et al. (eds.) *Strength and Weakness: The Authoritarian Personality Today*. New York, NY: Springer Verlag.
- McFarland, S., V. Ageyev, and N. Djintcharadze (1996). "Russian Authoritarianism Two Years After Communism," p. 210 in *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 22, No. 2.
- Momirovic, K. (1989). "Relacije primarnih konativnih faktora i rezultata u testovima za procenu socijalnih stavova" (Relationships Between Primary Cognitive Factors and Results in Tests for Estimating Social Attitudes), pp. 81-90 in *Psihologija*, Vol. 22, No. 1-2.
- Raden, D. (1981). "Authoritarianism Revisited: Evidence for an Aggression Factor," pp. 147-153 in *Social Behavior and Personality*, Vol. 9, No. 2.
- Ray, J. (1990). "The Old-Fashioned Personality," pp. 997-1013 in *Human-Relations*, Vol. 43, No. 10.
- Ray, J. (1988). "Sexual Liberation, Old-Fashioned Outlook, and Authoritarianism: A Comment on Kelley," pp. 385-387 in *Journal of Sex Research*, Vol. 24.
- Rickert, E. (1998). "Authoritarianism and Economic Threat: Implications for Political Behavior," pp. 707-720 in *Political Psychology*, Vol. 19, No. 4.
- Rot, N. and N. Havelka (1973). *Nacionalna vezanost i vrednosti kod srednjoškolske omladine* (National Attachment and Values in High-School Youth). Beograd, Yugoslavia: Institut za psihologiju.
- Samelson, F. (1993). "The Authoritarian Character from Berlin to Berkeley and Beyond: The Odyssey of a Problem," pp. 22-43 in Stone et al. (eds.) *Strength and Weakness: The Authoritarian Personality Today*. New York, NY: Springer Verlag.
- Shils, E. (1954). "Authoritarianism: 'Right' and 'Left'" in: R. Christie and M. Jahoda (eds.): *Studies in the Scope and Method of "The Authoritarian Personality"*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Smith, D. (1998). "The Ambivalent Worker: Max Weber, Critical Theory and the Antinomies of Authority," pp. 35-83 in *Social Thought and Research*, Vol. 21, No. 1-2.
- Stone, W. (1980). "The Myth of Left-wing Authoritarianism," pp. 3-19 in *Political Psychology*, Vol. 2, No. 3-4.

- Stone, W., G. Lederer, and R. Christie (eds.) (1993). *Strength and Weakness: The Authoritarian Personality Today*. New York, NY: Springer Verlag.
- Stone, W. and L. Smith (1993). "Authoritarianism: Left and Right," pp. 144-156 in Stone, et al. (eds.) *Strength and Weakness: The Authoritarian Personality Today*. New York, NY: Springer Verlag.
- Vincent, A. (1992). *Modern Political Ideologies*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Werz, M. (1998). "Personality, Authority and Society: Remarks on the Analysis of Authoritarianism and Prejudice in the Social Sciences," pp. 85-106 in *Social Thought and Research*, Vol. 21, No.1-2.
- Wilde, G. (1977). "Trait Description and Measurement by Personality Questionnaires" in R. Cattell and R. Dreger (eds.) *Handbook of Modern Personality Theory*, Hemisphere Publishing Co.
- Wilson, G. and J. Patterson (1970). *The Conservatism Scale*. Windsor, UK: NFER.
- Worrell, M. (1998). "Authoritarianism, Critical Theory, and Political Psychology: Past, Present, Future," pp. 3-33 in *Social Thought and Research*, Vol. 21, No.1-2.

**Democratization,
Europeanization, and
Globalization Trends:
Cross-National Analysis of
Authoritarianism,
Socialization,
Communications, Youth,
and Social Policy**

Editors

Russell F. Farnen
Henk Dekker
Christ'l De Landtsheer
Heinz Sünker
Daniel B. German