

Relationships between Family Functioning and Authoritarianism *

Published as: Todosijević, B. (2000). Relationships Between Family Functioning and Authoritarianism. *Politics, Groups and the Individual, Vol. 9*, No. 1 & 2, pp. 17-33.

Introduction

Theory of the authoritarian personality has been known as a major comprehensive theory of psychological predisposition for ethnocentrism and anti-democratic ideologies in general. Publication of *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson and Sanford, 1950)¹, provoked both strong criticism and extensive further research (cf. Stone, Lederer and Christie, 1993). Although the later research has generally confirmed Adorno et al.'s (1950) basic empirical hypotheses, at least as far as the F scale is concerned (Meloan, 1993),² relatively little attention has been paid to one of their central claims, namely that authoritarian traits originate in particular intrafamily relationships. For example, Cherry and Byrne (1977) quoted only five studies as relevant for the problem of 'parental antecedents of authoritarianism', but only two of them investigated child-rearing practices directly. In a volume edited by Stone et al. (1993), the only chapter that deals with this topic (Hopf, 1993) presents a reanalysis of the interviews from TAP.

The goal of the present study is to contribute to this insufficiently researched problem, by examining the relationships between the perceived family functioning and authoritarianism on the sample of Yugoslavian youth. Adolescents' perception of the functioning of their families is derived from the abridged version of the Family Assessment Device (FAD) (Epstein, Bishop and Levin, 1983). Presently applied authoritarianism scale (AUT) is a new instrument designed specifically for this study. The study adopts

* An earlier version of the paper was presented as a poster at the 14th World Congress of Sociology, Montreal, July 1998. Another version in Serbian language was published in L. Genc, (ed.) (1997), *Ličnost u višekulturnom društvu, Vol. 2*. Novi Sad: Univerzitet u Novom Sadu.

¹ In the further text referred to as TAP. The abridged edition is referred to as TAP, 1982.

² Meloan's (1993) meta-analysis of literally thousands of studies dealing with authoritarianism shows that across countries and across 30-years period, the F scale has been consistently related with antidemocratic and pro-fascist tendencies.

multidimensional approach to the measurement of both authoritarianism and perceived family functioning.

Authoritarianism and family functioning

The original theory

In line with their Marxist background, the authors of TAP attributed the sources of authoritarianism to the general socio-economic relationships and capitalist culture. In their words, the authoritarian “character structure must largely be the outcome of our civilization” (TAP, 1982, p. 261). However, in their empirical research they concentrated on the family antecedents of authoritarianism. Their findings are presented primarily in Frenkel-Brunswik's chapter on the interviews with the prejudiced.

Families of the high-scoring subjects were found to be characterized by “harsh and more threatening type of home discipline”, where relationships between family members are “based on rather clearly defined roles of dominance and submission” (TAP, 1982, p. 256-7). In social outlook those families display “status anxiety”, and therefore demand strictly conventional behavior from children and are “intolerant of any manifestation of impulses”, so every behaviour on the part of children which is out of the prescribed scripts is “rendered ego-alien and ‘split off’ from the rest of personality” (TAP, 1982, p. 257).

Such family atmosphere does not allow “adequate development of [...] self-reliance”, it rather encourages dependency on parents, and leads to children's “self-negating submission”, but also to “underlying resentment against, and feelings of victimization by, the parents” (TAP, 1982, p. 258). Resentment, naturally, has to be “rendered ego-alien”, while on the surface “there is often rigid glorification and idealization of parents” (TAP, 1982, p. 258). It is emphasized that particularly the prejudiced men “tend to report having a ‘stern and distant’ father who seems to have been domineering within the family” (TAP, 1982, p. 259).

The unprejudiced subjects, according to TAP, present less homogeneous and specific picture. Generally, less obedience was expected from them, and love was expressed in more open ways. Particularly the low-scoring men tend to report emotionally warm relationships with the mother. Instead of using mechanisms of displacement and projection in an excessive way, they “tend to take their conflicts up where they originate: with their parents and with themselves” (TAP, 1982, p. 280).

This analysis was supplemented with data from Frenkel-Brunswik's earlier study on ethnocentrism in children (1949). This study dealt with both children *and* their parents. The findings corroborated hypotheses developed through the research with adults: "fear and dependency [...] discourage the ethnocentric child from conscious criticism of the parents", and the repressed antagonism is displaced toward outgroups (TAP, 1982, p. 276).

Thus the general hypothesis that can be derived from the TAP theory is that the more harmonious, tolerant, open-minded a family is, the less authoritarian will be the children.

Subsequent research

Among the thousands of studies on authoritarianism, only a few have dealt with the role of the family relationships. Moreover, most of them examined authoritarianism of parents and their child-rearing practices, or relations between authoritarianism of parents and of children, rather than examining the influence of parenting practices upon children (cf. Cherry and Byrne, 1977).

Relationship between parents' authoritarianism and child rearing style was examined, for example, by Levinson and Huffman (1955), who found a positive correlation (.70) between autocratic family attitudes and authoritarianism. Hart (1957) found positive relationship between mother's use of non-love-orientated punishment techniques and her degree of authoritarianism. Thomas (1975), relying on data from 56 interviews with mothers with children between 4 and 6 years old, found strong positive correlation (.84) between scores on Conservatism scale³ (Wilson and Patterson, 1968) and authoritarian child-rearing practices.

Concerning the intergenerational similarity in authoritarianism, Bush, Gallagher and Weiner (1982), relying on the data from 68 families, found significantly lower authoritarianism among offspring than in parents, but no correlation between authoritarianism scores of parents and offspring.⁴ Methodologically more appropriate studies reveal different results. In two Hungarian towns, Todosijević and Enyedi (1998) found that authoritarianism on the sample of 400 randomly selected adolescents significantly correlated with

³ Which he regards as an "indicator of the dimension variously labeled as conservatism or authoritarianism" (Thomas, 1975, p. 97). Ray (1973) also equates authoritarianism and conservatism.

⁴ They interpreted it as "an indication of shifting socialization influences from the family to other institutions" (Bush et al., 1982, p. 91).

authoritarianism of their parents ($r=.39$, $p<.01$). This corresponds to Altemeyer's (1988) repeated findings of similar parents-children correlation in RWA scores, which average around .40.

Lyle and Levitt (1955) concentrated more directly on parents' behaviour, and found authoritarianism in children positively related to parental punitiveness. More recently, Peterson, Smirles, and Wentworth (1997) found that generativity was negatively related to authoritarianism, and that high authoritarians used more punitive parenting style. Milburn, Conrad, Sala and Carberry (1995) found that among males, recalled punitiveness of parents was related to their conservatism/authoritarianism, and concluded that "childhood affect can be displaced onto adult political attitudes" (abs.). Thus, parental punitiveness seems to be one of the most responsible factors in the development of children's authoritarianism.

Authoritarian parents display also some other specific parenting tendencies besides punitiveness. For example, Endsley, Hutcherson, Garner and Martin (1979) found that more authoritarian mothers were less likely to interact positively with their children and to orient them to explore the novel materials. In India, it was found that "parental rejection correlated with children's level of authoritarianism and prejudice " (Hassan 1987, abs.).

For the present research it is also interesting that it has been found that more general features of family functioning correlated with authoritarianism. For example, Hastings (1997) found that wife abuse was related to higher RWA scores. Altemeyer (1988) found more frequent incidence of acts of physical violence in families of the high RWA scoring children. It applies especially to violent conflicts between parents, but the evidence of the influence of violence of parents against children is more inconclusive (Altemeyer, 1988, 191, footnote2).

Thus, while there is some evidence that children resemble their parents in authoritarianism scores, and that parental punitiveness results in higher authoritarianism among children, the evidence concerning the Adorno *et al.*'s hypotheses about specific family influences on authoritarianism remains ambiguous. In light of the reviewed studies, it is hypothesized that general family functioning, as perceived and recalled by adolescents can help in clarifying this important but unresolved problem in the authoritarianism research. Particularly, it is expected to find connection between intrafamily hostility and authoritarianism.

The present study

The present research investigates relationships between adolescents' perception of the family functioning and their level of authoritarianism. It is expected that the more conflicting and dysfunctional the family is, the more authoritarian are the children. This research design obviously shares with most of the quoted studies the problem of not observing parenting practices directly. However, it could be supposed that adolescents' perception of family atmosphere reflects to a reasonable degree the real intrafamily relationships. Moreover, one could argue that in this way it is possible to capture the subjective experience of family relationships, what could be psychologically more relevant than 'objectively' recorded behaviors of family members.⁵

The study relies on the multidimensional approach to the authoritarianism and family functioning. While both concepts are often theorized in that way, they are not so often operationalized in the adequate manner. Hence, in order to obtain greater conceptual validity of its measures, authoritarianism is approached in line with factor-analytic studies of authoritarianism conducted both internationally and in Yugoslavia (e.g., Kline and Cooper, 1984, Altemeyer, 1981, Billings, Guastello and Rieke, 1993, Đurić, 1987, Hofman, Uzelac and Ignjatović, 1988, Majstorović, Salaj and Ignjatović, 1994, Todosijević, 1995). The same applies to the measurement of the perceived family atmosphere, where the starting point is multidimensional Family Assessment Device.

McMaster Model of Family Functioning and the FAD

Family Assessment Device (FAD) was originally developed as an operationalization of the McMaster Model of Family Functioning (MMFF) (Epstein *et al.* 1983, 1978). The MMFF model postulates six dimensions crucial for family functioning: *Problem Solving, Communication, Roles, Affective Responsiveness, Affective Involvement, and Behaviour Control* (Epstein *et al.* 1978, p. 21-26).

FAD was designed as an operationalization of the 6 dimensions from the MMFF with the aim of measuring "people's perception of their families" (Epstein *et al.*, 1983, p. 178). FAD consists of seven subscales, one for each of the six theoretical dimensions, plus an

⁵ The main contra-argument would be that adolescents' perceptions are already psychologically transformed experiences, for example through mechanisms of repression or projection. Positive perception of the family could be based both on genuine experiences, but also on defense mechanisms.

additional subscale for the estimation of the *General Functioning*, i.e., general family 'health'. According to the authors of the scale, it offers an adequate multidimensional description and measure of family functioning. Authors reported satisfying metric characteristics of the instrument and its validity in discriminating between clinical and nonclinical families (Epstein *et al.*, 1983, Miller, Epstein, Bishop and Keitner, 1985). Several other studies confirmed the applicability of the FAD for research purposes in different countries (Sawyer *et al.* 1988; Kabacoff *et al.*, 1990; Wenninger *et al.*, 1993; Keitner *et al.*, 1990). The abridged version of the FAD scale applied in this research was created on the basis of the results of the application of the original 60-item version of the FAD in Yugoslavia (Šram and Todosijević, 1992).

It is expected that the multidimensional approach is capable of capturing different dimensions of family functioning with possibly different consequences for the development of authoritarianism among children.

METHOD

Survey and the Sample

The paper presents secondary data analysis of a survey conducted in May 1992, in Subotica, Yugoslavia, by the Center for Social Research, Subotica.⁶ The respondents were 403 secondary-school students, between 18 and 19 years old. 69.7% of the respondents were females. Questionnaire was administered in group setting, during regular school classes, and filling lasted approximately one hour. Participation was voluntary, and full anonymity was secured. Prior to distributing the questionnaires, the respondents were informed about the general aim of the study. The survey included, among other instruments, a scale for measuring respondents' perception of the family functioning (FAD), and an authoritarianism scale (AUT).

⁶ I owe thanks to Prof. Šram of the CSR for the access to the data.

Variables

Authoritarianism was operationalized with a scale of 37 items, intended to measure three components of the authoritarian syndrome: conventionalism, authoritarian submission and authoritarian aggression. It was developed at the Center for Social Research, Subotica.

Family functioning or atmosphere was operationalized through a set of 23 items referring to respondents' perception of her/his family functioning. The scale is an abridged and translated version of McMaster Family Assessment Device (FAD) (Epstein *et al.*, 1983).

Both scales are balanced, and their items were presented in Likert-format, with four possible degrees of agreement (1-4), higher number indicating higher agreement with a particular statement.

RESULTS

Factor Analysis of the abbreviated FAD scale

According to the Scree test (Cattell, 1966) four factors were extracted, accounting for 47.8% of the variance. Considerably higher first eigenvalue (accounting for almost 30% of the total variance of the scale) suggests the existence of a general dimension of the perceived family functioning. Oblimin rotation resulted in acceptably simple structure.

First rotated factor is shown in Table 1. Common for all items in this factor is satisfaction with, or affirmative description of, family relationships. They refer to emotional atmosphere (items 17, 21, 9 in negative direction), open communication (items 19, 7, 18) and problem solving (items 1, 3, 8, 18, 23).

Table 1 First factor of perceived family functioning: *Harmony*.

<i>Items</i>	<i>Loading</i>
19 We are sincere and open with each other.	.74
1 We successfully solve most of problems in our family.	.71
7 We always speak openly about everything, without need to guess what somebody wishes or thinks.	.70
17 We successfully solve most of our emotional problems.	.68
21 We express tenderness towards each other.	.64
3 If somebody of us is in any kind of trouble, other members of the family are engaged about its solution.	.61
8 Every member of our family knows precisely his duties and responsibilities.	.61
18 We negotiate about who will do various domestic jobs.	.60
23 We usually try on different ways to analyze and solve certain problem.	.55
9 It is difficult for us to speak to each other about our emotions.	-.43

The content of this factor can be related to several dimensions from the original McMaster model, namely communication, affective responsiveness and problem solving. But, it is most similar to the scale of general functioning, because it integrates various aspects of relationships between family members. It seems that the most important underlying element is open and direct communication, which is necessary component of both emotional responsiveness and successful problem solving. Such clustering of items shows that respondents (adolescents) perceive family quite unidimensionally, and as generally good or as not-so-good. Hence, this factor is labeled as *Harmony*. Such label indicates the complex and general nature of the factor: emotional, communicational and problem solving aspects.

The second rotated factor (Table 2) has smaller number of defining items, with lower loadings. It seems that there are two aspects of this factor. One is represented by items 2, 10, 5 and 14, describing unpredictability of the behaviour of family members, irresponsibility and disorder, and corresponds to the *roles* dimension from the original theory. The other aspect, represented by the items 22, 4 and 14, indicates hostility and negative emotional exchange. Thus, the factor is interpreted as *Hostility*, since that seems to be the integrating element behind this factor. Poor role performance, neglect of family duties, lack of communication and emotional exchange, can be seen as an expression of hostility between family members.

Table 2 Second factor of perceived family functioning: *Hostility*.

<i>Items</i>	<i>Loading</i>
2 When somebody in our family is asked to do something, than it is usually necessary to check if it is done.	.64
22 After a quarrel we usually do not speak for some time with each other.	.57
4 We have difficulties in showing emotions to each other.	.47
10 In our family, everyone takes care only about him/herself and her/his own problems.	.43
5 Duties and tasks are not well distributed in our family.	.43
14 We always know when someone has to be criticized for what s/he did.	.39

The third factor has only three significant projections, of which one is quite low. This factor is presented in the Table 3. Items from this factor clearly correspond to the behaviour control dimension from the McMaster Model. It shows the degree of order and respect of rules. Negative projection of item 14 shows that there are also no clear rules for what to do when somebody does not respect rules. Hence, this factor is labeled as *Disorder*.

Table 3 Third factor of the perceived family functioning: *Disorder*.

<i>Items</i>	<i>Loading</i>
6 We do not take care too much about breaking rules of behaviour in our family.	.66
20 There are no stable rules of behaviour in our family.	.65
14 We always know when someone has to be criticized for what s/he did.	-.36

Most of the items loading on the fourth FAD factor (Table 4) refer to emotionality and communication, and could be related to the dimension of *affective involvement* from the McMaster model. Because the majority of items refers to the lack of satisfying interaction, negative emotional climate, manipulateness, distance and coldness, it seems appropriate to label this factor as *Alienation*. The exception is item 11, which refers to the attention given to clothing and appearance. It seems that alienated families should be visually recognizable. Somewhat curious negative projection of the item 22 perhaps means that this dimension describes families where conflicts are not expressed by silence. This suggests that alienated families talk rather than really communicate.

Table 4 Fourth factor of the perceived family functioning: *Alienation*.

<i>Items</i>	<i>Loading</i>
11 We don't pay attention to clothing and appearance.	.69
22 After a quarrel we usually do not speak for some time with each other.	-.47
16 We do not devote much time to find about personal interests and needs of other members of family.	.46
13 There is a lot of animosity and dissatisfaction in our family.	.45
12 We do not show love towards each other.	.43
15 We communicate only when someone finds is/her interest in that.	.36

Correlations between the family functioning factors are shown in Table 5. The correlations suggests that Harmony, Hostility and Alienation converge towards higher order dimension, similar to General Functioning dimension in the McMaster model. Factor Disorder is most independent of all others, and is significantly related only to factor Harmony.

Table 5 Intercorrelations of the family functioning factors

	1. Harmony	2. Hostility	3. Disorder
1. Hostility	-.27**		
2. Disorder	-.18**	.03	
3. Alienation	-.20**	.20**	.05

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$ (2-tailed).

The weak connection between family functioning dimensions justify the adopted multidimensional approach. It is not very likely that a single dimension can describe family functioning well.

Factor Analysis of the Authoritarianism scale

The Scree test indicated four significant factors, accounting for 34.1% of variance of the total scale. The first Oblimin rotated authoritarianism factor is presented in Table 6. Ten items with the highest saturations are quite similar in content. In various ways they express passivism, conformity, obedience, willingness to follow others, and desire not to be different from others.

Table 6 First Authoritarianism factor: *Conformism*.

<i>Items</i>	Loading
1. I always behave as people around expect from me.	.64
2. I always try to let others make decisions.	.60
3. I prefer when others lead, and I only do my tasks.	.59
4. One would make the fewest mistakes if does what majority do.	.59
5. It is better to be satisfied with modest life than to invest much efforts to achieve something.	.54
6. I try to be as little different from others as possible.	.49
7. I don't like people who are too different from the group, and whose behaviour is too different.	.45
8. I never try too hard, because anyway most things do not depend on me.	.45
9. One can be happy only if belongs to a collective.	.42
10. It is the best to be silent and to watch our own business, even when we see obvious injustice.	.40
11. Most women are either good or bad.	.36
12. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and should be treated similarly.	.31

The last two items (11 and 12) give to this factor a flavor of the original conception of the authoritarian attitudes as based on deep intrapsychical conflicts. Without these two items the factor could be interpreted simply as a lack assertiveness or low level of energy. But, because there is no logical connection between conformity and the opinion that 'most women are either good or bad', and that 'homosexuals should be treated like criminals', it is tempting to invoke psychoanalytical explanations. The most appropriate label for this factor seems to be *Conformism*.

The second Authoritarianism factor (Table 7) is defined primarily by items emphasizing the importance of the state authority and its role as a guarantee of the security and social order. It is possible that such converging of items is influenced by the collapse of the former Yugoslav state and the following conflicts. In such a framework the state may be looked upon as a lost safeguard, but there are also compelling reasons to see it as a source of insecurity.

Table 7 Second Authoritarianism factor: *Authoritarian Ideology*.

<i>Items</i>	Loadin g
1. State should increase its influence when there is a social turmoil.	.73
2. State is a warranty of internal and external safety.	.67
3. Without a state it is impossible to preserve natural and cultural resources	.65
4. In present situation it is necessary needed a stronger state.	.60
5. In our society only Army is still functioning, so it should be allowed to make order.	.59
6. Those who are governing the state have to be firm and determined in making decisions no matter how drastic.	.56
7. All mentally sick individuals should be isolated.	.44
8. That what this country needs more than laws and political programs are a few courageous, tireless and devoted leaders whom people could trust and follow.	.43
9. We should always be cautious and suspicious towards other nations, even if they act as our friends.	.35

Authoritarian nature of this dimension is particularly indicated by the request for the stronger role of the army, exclusion of the 'mentally sick individuals', distrust of the 'other' national groups, and by the classical authoritarianism item stating that the country needs a strong leader who could be followed. Thus, the factor is labeled as *Authoritarian Ideology*, to emphasize its relatedness to a particular view of political matters.

Three topics are represented by the items loading on the third factor (Table 8). The first group of items emphasizes the importance and value of the family (items 1 and 5) and obedience of children (item 2). The second group of items (3 and 6) expresses *non-nationalist* attitudes. The remaining item 4 represents positive evaluation of the war (negative projection).

Table 8 Third Authoritarianism factor: *Non-nationalist familism*.

<i>Items</i>	Loading
1. Creation of a firm and harmonious family should be the main purpose and aim of life and work of any individual.	.59
2. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important qualities children should learn.	.58
3. One can frequently find better friends among members of other nations.	.58
4. Even besides victims and material damage, wars have at least partially contributed to the development of humankind.	-.49
5. There is nothing worse than a man who does not feel great love, thankfulness and respect towards his parents.	.47
6. National origin does not determine the value of a person.	.43

The meaning of the factor seems somewhat different from what the original Adorno *et al.*'s theory proposes. Namely, they described authoritarians as rigidly submissive to the family authority, but also as ethnocentric (one of their crucial hypothesis) and militarist. One possible reason for the appearance of this factor can be cultural specificity. Namely, strong family relations and high evaluation of family are elements of traditional (patriarchal) value system. Hence, the respect of family authority in this context does not have to mean the authoritarianism as a personality syndrome based on intrapsychical conflicts. Its relationship with non-nationalist and anti-war attitudes suggests different psychological foundation. Therefore, this factor is interpreted and labeled as *Non-nationalist familism*, rather than authoritarian submissiveness to the family authority.

The fourth factor (Table 9) consists of items expressing displaced aggressiveness (item 1), rationalized aggressiveness (items 3, 4 and 6), misanthropic view of human nature (items 8 and 5), feeling of isolation (item 2), and pessimism (item 7). These last two mentioned aspects give the psychological richness and complexity to the factor. Therefore, the factor cannot be interpreted simply as generalized tendency of aggressive reacting in frustrative situations.

Table 9 Fourth Authoritarianism factor: *Destructiveness and Cynicism*

<i>Items</i>	Loading
1. I often feel like breaking things.	.61
2. Sometimes I feel I am excluded from the life events.	.59
3. Sometimes I even have to be crude towards impolite or boring people.	.58
4. I get mad when somebody gives me advice when I don't ask for it.	.57
5. In order to achieve something, one frequently has to do even illegal things.	.53
6. I can't stand when somebody interfere into my matters.	.53
7. After every change, things become worse than they were before.	.42
8. Human nature is best described by the saying: Homo homini lupus est.	.38
9. Majority often is not right.	.35

It more looks like compensatory reaction to the inner feelings of insecurity. However, it does not have the broadness which is implied in the conception of the authoritarian aggressiveness by the later authors (e.g., Altemeyer, 1981). It mostly resembles one of the nine components from the original study, named *Destructiveness and Cynicism*. Therefore, it is labeled in that way.

There are only two significant ($p < .05$) although quite low correlations between these four factors. One is between *Conformism* and *Destructiveness* ($r = .16$, $p < .01$), and the other between *Authoritarian Ideology* and *Destructiveness* ($r = .22$, $p < .01$). These results again suggest certain common elements between conformity, ideological attitudes and aggressive personality. It also offers certain support for the original conception of authoritarianism as a specific blend of ideological attitudes and personality tendencies, but quite loosely interrelated.

Relationships between the perceived family functioning and Authoritarianism

In the main part of the analysis are presented correlations between the abbreviated FAD scale and authoritarianism factors (Table 10). Although the coefficients are relatively low, they are worth consideration. The general dimension of the perceived family functioning, here named *Harmony*, has the greatest predictive power. It is correlated with all authoritarianism factors, primarily with the non-nationalist familism.

Table 10 Correlations between the perceived family functioning and Authoritarianism

AUT \ FAD factors	Harmony	Hostility	Disorder	Alienation
Conformism	.14*			
Authoritarian Ideology	.14*			-.17**
Non-nationalist familism	.34**		-.18**	-.19**
Destructiveness and cynicism	-.18**	.20**	.13*	

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$ (2-tailed). Insignificant coefficients not printed.

However, the direction of the correlations with the first three authoritarianism factors is unexpected. According to the original theory and some of the later studies, authoritarians are expected to come from dysfunctional families. Here, factor Harmony is defined in the way that higher scores mean more favorable perception of the family functioning, and it is *positively* related with the non-nationalist familism ($r = .34$), conformism ($r = .14$) and authoritarian ideology ($r = .14$). It appears that better family produces higher authoritarianism, what is contrary to the original theory. The reason for this results is probably in the specific meaning of these authoritarianism factors, particularly the non-nationalist familism factor. It is defined by items expressing respect of the *family* authority and of its value, by non-nationalist items, and the negative evaluation of the war. It seems that this factor reflects positive socialization into the prevailing patriarchal value system, where the family has rather central place. This interpretation is supported by the *negative* correlation of the Non-nationalist familism with the other two FAD factors - Disorder and Alienation.

Those who perceive their families as generally good (higher Harmony) tend to be more conformists and to accept strong role of the state (higher Authoritarian Ideology). Two reasons can be responsible for this. One is that they uncritically identify with dominant ideology (etatism in the Authoritarian Ideology) and tend to avoid conflicts, resulting in the conformist attitudes. The other reason, which does not exclude the former, is that the favorable perception of one's own family is an indicator of the conformist personality, which than results in the uncritical acceptance of family and state authority.

Correlations with the aggressive component of authoritarianism (Destructiveness) is in the expected direction. It is negatively related to Harmony ($r = -.18$), and positively to Hostility ($r = .20$) and Disorder ($r = .13$). According to these results, hostile atmosphere within family and the lack of order result in higher aggression and destructive attitudes. This result is in accordance with the original TAP theory.

The only purely ideological authoritarianism factor (Authoritarian Ideology) is weakly related to the perceived family functioning. It is negatively related to Alienation ($r=-.17$) and positively to Harmony ($r=.14$). Thus, it appears that those supportive for the strong role of state tend to come from families (more accurately: to perceive their families) with less alienated members and generally functioning well. Again, it contradicts the original theory, which would predict the opposite association. One explanation for this 'strange' behaviour of the Authoritarian Ideology can be in then (and still) present crisis in Yugoslavia. It is possible that many perceived the cause of the crisis in the dissolution of the former Yugoslavian state, and therefore see the strength of state as something desirable.

Gender differences

Since the authors of TAP and some of the later studies found gender differences in the family-authoritarianism relationship, correlation coefficients are also calculated separately for the female and male subsamples (Tables 11 and 12). Correlations are generally similar, although due to the smaller size of the male subsample fewer coefficients crossed the significance threshold.

Table 11 Correlations between the perceived family functioning and authoritarianism - the male subsample.

AUT \ FAD factors	Harmony	Hostility	Disorder	Alienation
Conformism				.35**
Authoritarian Ideology				-.21 ^a
Non-nationalist familism	.35		-.25*	
Destructiveness and cynicism				

Note: * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$ (2-tailed); ^a $p=.07$.

Table 12 Correlations between the perceived family functioning and authoritarianism - the female subsample.

AUT \ FAD factors	Harmony	Hostility	Disorder	Alienation
Conformism	.17*			
Authoritarian Ideology	.16*			-.16*
Non-nationalist familism	.30**		-.15*	-.16*
Destructiveness and cynicism	-.15*	.29*		

Note: * $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$ (2-tailed).

Two differences seem the most interesting. The first is the greater influence of Alienation on authoritarian factors in the male sample. It is particularly obvious in its correlation with Conformism factor, which is absent in the female sample. It seems that alienation, lack of affective involvement and distance between family members, influence primarily male adolescents in the way of increasing their conformism and submissiveness. Of course, it is again possible to interpret it conversely, as that submissive adolescents perceive their families as more alienated. Although this finding corresponds to the original hypotheses, it is somewhat contrary to common belief that boys react to dysfunctional family by the increased aggressiveness.

The present results support such view, but for the females. There, the second highest correlation is between hostile family atmosphere and Destructiveness. Destructiveness is also negatively correlated to general family functioning. Thus, comparing to males, negative aspects of family functioning are increasing the aggressive authoritarian attitudes in females. Other coefficients are generally similar in both samples.

The role of the socio-economic status

Partial correlations between family functioning and authoritarianism factors are also calculated, controlling for the father's educational level, taken as a rough indicator of family socio-economic status (Table 13). It is obvious that relationships are not influenced by socio-economic status, at least as measured by the father's educational level. Their stability, in spite of a low magnitude, indicates the credibility of the obtained results.

Table 13 Partial correlations between the perceived family functioning and authoritarianism, controlling for SES (father's educational status)

AUT \ FAD factors	Harmony	Hostility	Disorder	Alienation
Conformism	.15*			
Authoritarian Ideology	.14*			-.17**
Non-nationalist familism	.35**		-.18**	-.21**
Destructiveness and cynicism	-.18**	.21**	.13*	

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$ (2-tailed).

Biased sample, i.e., probable exclusion of those from the most dysfunctional families, who in larger proportion drop out from schooling prior to higher grades of secondary school level,

also supports the credibility of results. It is more likely that population coefficients would be higher, not lower, due to the greater variability in the examined variables.

Discussion and conclusions

The performed analysis did not result in a simple answer to the question of whether authoritarianism is generated by dysfunctional family relationships. It is primarily due to the multidimensionality of both constructs: authoritarianism and family functioning. Each of the perceived family functioning dimensions has specific relationship with dimensions of authoritarianism.

Family Harmony, or general family functioning is the major correlate of authoritarian factors, primarily of the non-nationalist familism. The more family is perceived as harmonious, the more the adolescent adheres to the non-nationalist familism. It is contrary to the original Adorno *et al.*'s hypothesis, unless we interpret the non-nationalist familism as a 'non-authoritarian' dimension. The most probable explanation is that non-nationalist familism, as defined here, reflects successful socialization into the prevailing patriarchal value system, not necessarily based on pathological motivation.

Against the original theory are also findings that authoritarian ideology, or favoring of the strong role of state, is negatively correlated with alienation in both samples, and positively with family harmony in the female sample. This relationship could be due to a particular age of the respondents. Since adolescence is frequently seen as a period of increased rebelliousness against all authorities, primarily parents, dysfunctional or alienated family could be even more likely to produce rebellious adolescents than the functional.⁷ Longitudinal study could clarify whether this rebelliousness against authorities is only a feature of adolescence, or continues into the older age. If it changes into the support for the authoritarian ideology, Adorno *et al.*'s theory would be supported.

Destructiveness and cynicism, i.e., the aggressive component of authoritarianism, is related to harmonious family functioning (negatively), Hostility and Disorder, but primarily for female adolescents. This is in accordance with the original hypotheses. Adolescents who perceive their families as disharmonious, conflicting and hostile tend to hold more aggressive and destructive social attitudes. In line with original theory are also findings that conformism

⁷In this connection see, for example, Altemeyer's (1988) discussion of the role of particular experiences in the genesis of authoritarianism.

or submissiveness is related to family alienation (in the male sample). Thus, this set of relationships corroborates the Adorno et al.'s belief that for the development of nonauthoritarian personalities "All that is essential is that children be genuinely loved as individual humans" (TAP, 1982, 479).

The pattern of the relationships did not change after introducing the control for socio-economic status. It suggests that relationships are more based on psychological and developmental processes than on the influence of socio-economic factors.⁸

Since the obtained correlations are generally low, it is tempting to conclude that the family functioning is rather irrelevant for the development of authoritarian traits. However, the strength of the relationships has to be evaluated within the context of comparable studies. Given the general failure of attempts to find consistent evidence on the influence of parental behavior on children's personality traits (e.g., Harris, 1995, Maccoby and Martin, 1983), the present findings appear in different light. It applies particularly to the connection between family hostility and destructiveness and cynicism, and family alienation and conformism of the male children.

It should be noted that the FAD scale deals with the perception of present family functioning. On the one side, it is reasonable to suppose that family functioning is relatively permanent feature and that treatment of children is an integrated part of the general family functioning. But, on the other side, it is interesting in its own that adolescents' perception of contemporaneous family functioning is related to their authoritarianism. Perhaps if the two aspects were combined, i.e., family functioning and upbringing practices, it would be possible to obtain a more complete picture of the family roots of individual differences in authoritarianism.

From the methodological point of view, it is important to note benefits of the multidimensional approach. Conceiving of authoritarianism and family relationship as unidimensional constructs would obviously lead to unwarranted conclusions. Different subdimensions within both 'spaces' can have different interrelationships. In the present case, for example, family harmony increased some of the authoritarian dimensions (non-nationalist familism), and decreased some other facets of authoritarianism (destructiveness). Hence, the

⁸ However, it does not mean that the *level* of authoritarianism or of family functioning dimensions is not different across socio-economical strata (cf. Scheepers, Felling and Peters, 1990).

general question of whether family functioning influences authoritarianism has to be reformulated into: what aspects of family functioning increase and what decrease different aspects of the children's authoritarianism?

One obvious difficulty with the design applied in this study, is relying on respondents' *perception* of the family functioning instead of direct observation. Perception of the family relationships is at least partly the *result* of socialization in that particular family. Altemeyer (1988) suggests that violent treatment of children might lead to lower authoritarianism, depending on the specific elaboration of such experiences. Henceforth, it is very difficult to disentangle the causes and effects. Perception of the family as harmonious could be an accurate description, but also the consequence of the unconscious family idealization, resulting from pathological relationships between family members.⁹

An additional problem of this study concerns the applied authoritarianism scale, and the shortened FAD scale. Regarding the former, it is obvious that the selection of items is biased, and that original concept of authoritarianism is only partially covered but the items in the AUT scale. There are not enough items referring to other social authorities, except the state and family. Religious component is also missing, as well as superstition, preoccupation with deviant sex, or treatment of criminals. More complete cover of the authoritarian traits could result in different general picture. Shortening of the FAD scale was perhaps premature. It would have been more useful if the entire scale was applied, and then analyzed both theoretical scales and factor-analytically constructed dimensions.

It could be also objected to the offered interpretation of the factors and proposed labels. An attempt was made to interpret them in line with other similar studies and thus to enhance comparisons. However, because the patterns of factors are fully presented, the reader can easily develop her own interpretation and, if needed, modify the conclusions.

⁹ However, Hopf (1992) did not find evidence of idealization of parents among high authoritarians, but did find avoiding of overt criticism and conflict with parents.

References:

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik E., Levinson, D. J. and Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper and Row. Abridged edition: (1982), New York: Norton & Company.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of Freedom: Understanding Right-Wing Authoritarianism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Billings, S. B., Guastello, S. J. and Rieke, M. L. (1993). A Comparative Assessment of the Construct Validity of Three Authoritarianism Measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, Vol. 27, 328-348.
- Bush, D. F., Gallagher, B. J. III, and Weiner, W. (1982). Patterns of Authoritarianism Between Generations. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 116, 91-97.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The Scree Test for the Number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1, 245-276.
- Cherry, F. and Byrne D. (1977). Authoritarianism. In: T. Blass. (Ed.): *Personality Variables in Social Behaviour*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Đurić, Đ. (1987). Prilog proučavanju strukture autoritarnosti kod studenata. [A contribution to the study of the structure of authoritarianism in students]. *Zbornik Instituta za pedagogiju* (pp. 13-21). Novi Sad: Univerzitet u Novom Sadu.
- Endsley, R. C., Hutcherson, M. A., Garner, A. P. and Martin, M. J. (1979). Interrelationships among selected maternal behaviors, authoritarianism, and preschool children's verbal and nonverbal curiosity. *Child Development*, 50, 331-339.
- Epstein, N.B., Bishop, D.S. and Levin, S. (1978). The McMaster Model of Family Functioning. *Journal of Marriage and Family Counselling*, 4, 19-31.
- Epstein, N. B., Baldwin, L. M. and Bishop, D. S. (1983). The McMaster Family Assessment Device. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 9, 171-180.
- Frenkel-Brunswik, E. (1949). A Study of Prejudice in Children. *Human relations*, 1, 295-306.
- Harris, J. R. (1995). Where Is the Child's Environment? A Group Socialization Theory of Development. *Psychological Review*, 102, 458-489.
- Hart, I. (1957). Maternal Child-Rearing Practices and Authoritarian Ideology. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 55, 232-237.
- Hassan, M. K. (1987). Parental behaviour, authoritarianism and prejudice. *Manas*, 34, 41-50.
- Hastings, B. M. (1997). Association of right-wing authoritarianism and income with wife abuse. *Psychological Reports*, 80, 667-70.
- Hofman, E., Uzelac, S. and Ignjatović, I. (1988). Latentna struktura skale autoritarnosti. [Latent structure of an authoritarianism scale]. *Pedagoška stvarnost*, 9-10, 676-690.
- Hopf, C. (1992). Parent Idealization and Authoritarianism. Critical Considerations for Sociopsychological Acceptance. [Eltern-Idealisierung und Autoritarismus. Kritische Überlegungen zu einigen sozialpsychologischen Annahmen]. *Zeitschrift für Sozialisationsforschung und Erziehungssoziologie*, 12, 52-65.
- Hopf, C. (1993). Authoritarians and their Families: Qualitative Studies on the Origins of Authoritarian Dispositions. In: Stone et al., (Eds.), (1993).

- Kabacoff, R.I.O, Miller, W. I., Bishop, D. S., Epstein, N. B. and Keitner, G. I. (1990). A Psychometric Study of the McMaster Family Assessment Device in Psychiatric, Medical and Nonclinical Samples. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 3, 431-439.
- Keitner, G. I., Ryan, C. E., Fodor, J., Miller, I. W., Epstein, N. B. and Bishop, D. S. (1990). A Cross-Cultural Study of Family Functioning. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 12, 439-454.
- Kline, P. and Cooper, C. (1984). A Factorial Analysis of the Authoritarian Personality. *British Journal of Psychology*, 75, 171-176.
- Levinson, D. J. and Huffman P. E. (1955). Traditional Family Ideology and its Relation to Personality. *Journal of Personality*, 23, 251-273.
- Lyle, W. and Levitt, E. (1955). Punitiveness, Authoritarianism and Parental Discipline of Grade School Children. *Journal of Personality*, 23, 251-273.
- Maccoby, E. E. and Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.) & E. M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (4th ed., pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.
- Majstorović, N., Salaj, M. and Ignjatović, I. (1994). Struktura autoritarnosti merena skalom MK-240 kod učenika uzrasta 16 i 18 godina. [Structure of authoritarianism measured by the MK-240 scale among students 16 and 18 years old]. In: Đurić, Đ. (Ed.): *Ličnost u višekulturnom društvu* (pp. 143-157). Novi Sad: Univerzitet u Novom Sadu.
- 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.), 1993, pp. 47-69.
- Milburn, M. A., Conrad, S. D., Sala, F. and Carberry, S. (1995). Childhood Punishment, Denial, and Political Attitudes. *Political Psychology*, 16, 447-478.
- Miller, I.W., Epstein, N. B., Bishop, D. S. and Keitner, G. I. (1985). The McMaster Family Assessment Device: Reliability and Validity. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 11, 345-356.
- Peterson, B. E, Smirles, K. A. and Wentworth, P. A. (1997). Generativity and authoritarianism: implications for personality, political involvement, and parenting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 1202-16.
- Ray, J. J. (1973). Conservatism, authoritarianism and related variables: a review and empirical study. In: Wilson, G. D. (Ed.) *The Psychology of Conservatism* (pp. 17-35). London: Academic Press.
- Samelson, F. (1993). The Authoritarian Character from Berlin to Berkeley and Beyond: The Odyssey of a Problem. In: Stone et al., (Eds.), 1993, pp. 22-43.
- Sawyer, M.G., Sarris, A., Baghurst, P. A., Cross, D. G. and Kalucy, R.S. (1988). Family Assessment Device: Reports from Mothers, Fathers, and Adolescents in Community and Clinic Families. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 14, 287-296.
- 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*, 6, 15-26.
- Šram, Z. and Todosijević, B. (1992). Family Relationships, Personality Dimensions and Attitudes Toward Sexuality. Unpublished research report.
- Stone, W.F., Lederer, G. and Christie, R. (Eds.) (1993). *Strength and Weakness: The Authoritarian Personality Today*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Thomas, D. R. (1975). Conservatism, Authoritarianism and Child-rearing Practices. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 14, 97-98.
- Todosijević, B. (1995). *Some Social and Psychological Correlates of Ethno-Nationalist Attitudes: Yugoslavia 1995*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Central European University, Prague-Lancaster.

- Todosijević, B. and Enyedi, Zs. (1998). Anti-Jewish Prejudice: A Socio-Psychological Causal Model. Paper presented at the 14th World Congress of Sociology, Montreal, July 1998.
- Weninger, W.F.M.B., Hagrman, W.J.J.M. and Arrindell, W. A. (1993). Cross-National Validity of Dimensions of Family Functioning: First Experiences with the Dutch Version of the McMaster Family Assessment Device (FAD). *Personality and Individual Differences*, 14, 769-781.
- Wilson, G. D. and Patterson, J. (1968). A new measure of conservatism. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 7, 264-269.