

1973

Male and Female Anti-Feminism: A Further Examination of the Authoritarian Personality

David L. Arntzen
Eastern Illinois University

Recommended Citation

Arntzen, David L., "Male and Female Anti-Feminism: A Further Examination of the Authoritarian Personality" (1973). *Masters Theses*. 3812.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/3812>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

PAPER CERTIFICATE #2

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

August 3, 1973
Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because _____

Date

Author

pdm

MALE AND FEMALE ANTI-FEMINISM: A FURTHER

EXAMINATION OF THE AUTHORITARIAN PERSONALITY

(TITLE)

BY

DAVID L. ARNTZEN

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1973

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

Aug. 3. 73
DATE

ADVISER

Aug 3 1973
DATE

MALE AND FEMALE ANTI-FEMINISM:
A FURTHER EXAMINATION OF THE AUTHORITARIAN
PERSONALITY

By

DAVID L. ARNTZEN

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of
Arts in Sociology at the Graduate School
of Eastern Illinois University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....page 1

II. WOMEN AS A MINORITY GROUP.....page 7

III. AUTHORITARIANISM AND MALE ANTI-FEMINISM.....page 15

IV. AUTHORITARIANISM AND FEMALE ANTI-FEMINISM....page 29

V. THE HYPOTHESIS.....page 41

VI. METHODOLOGY.....page 44

- 1. Design
- 2. Sampling
- 3. Methods of measuring the variables
- 4. The scoring of the scales
- 5. Methods of gathering the data

VII. RESULTS.....page 55

- 1. Internal consistency: Statistical analysis of the individual items of the A-F Scale
- 2. Mean F Scale scores for the tested subgroups
- 3. Mean A-F Scale Scores for the tested subgroups
- 4. Correlations of the F Scale with the A-F Scale

VII. CONCLUSIONS.....page 69

REFERENCES.....page 73

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this particular research project is to examine as thoroughly as possible the relationship between certain social psychological factors and anti-feminist attitudes, or, perhaps more succinctly, the relationship between authoritarian personality structures and anti-feminism.

This author, in common with most social scientists, holds the view that anti-feminism is based, for the most part, on factors in the subject rather than on so-called negative characteristics of females. If the above assumption is correct, and most social scientific research seems to indicate that it is, one place to look for determinants of anti-feminist attitudes is within the persons who display them. Before proceeding further, however, it should be made clear that personality should not be viewed as the ultimate determinant of anti-feminist attitudes. That is, to the degree that personality is not something that is given and remains fixed, but rather is profoundly influenced by the social environment, it is in the latter where the "root" causes of anti-feminism are necessarily found.*

* This means, of course, that changes in the structure of a society will have a profound effect on the types of personality, and the attitudinal correlates of personality, that emerge within a society. Erich Fromm's Escape from Freedom, particularly his chapter of the "Psychology of Nazism", provides an excellent analysis of how certain

In the final analysis, then, the use of authoritarianism as an explanatory variable should not be viewed as an attempt to provide a purely psychological explanation of anti-feminist behavior patterns. Neither is the following study an effort to furnish the reader with a single factor explanation of anti-feminism. Rather, by employing the theory of authoritarianism we simply hope to provide a social psychological explanation of why some people accept the ideology of anti-feminism while others do not.

As the reader familiar with the concept of authoritarianism is undoubtedly aware, research dealing with this variable has, almost without exception, been employed in a one-sided manner. That is, the researcher when studying, for example, the relationship between authoritarianism and anti-Semitic attitudes frequently examines only one-side of the relationship, i.e., anti-Semitism among Gentiles. However, as Joseph Adelson so pointedly notes, "if the notion of an 'authoritarian' personality is to possess generality it is necessary to demonstrate that these ideological-personality connections exist among other groups, including minorities."^{1/} Such a perspective, from

changes in the institutional structure of German society created a "national" authoritarian personality that allowed the Nazis to come to power. Along these same lines, it is interesting to note that anti-feminism was an official policy of the Nazi regime. See, for example, Kate Millett's Sexual Politics pages 159-168

1/ Adelson, Joseph, "A Study of Minority Group Authoritarianism", The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 48, 1953 pages 477 -485

this author's view, is most essential in research dealing with anti-feminist attitudes for there seems to be a great deal of evidence indicating that a great number of women are anti-feminist. Therefore, in dealing with the problem of anti-feminism we will necessarily concern ourselves not only with male anti-feminism, the more obvious side of the coin, but also with the phenomenon of female anti-feminism, the less obvious, but equally essential side.

One of the most important elements in justifying the investigation of any sociological problem is its relation to a critical population and problem. The investigation at hand would seem justified if only because of the fact that women make up such a large and important percentage of the total population of the society. But even more important is the fact that despite constituting a numerical majority of the society, women, by definition, are a sociological minority. However, in contrast to most other recognized minority groups, the status afforded women by the dominant group is rationalized on the grounds of a differing biological make-up. For women "biology is destiny." Consider, for example, what the following "objective" psychologists had to say on the subject of women.^{2/}

Sigmund Freud (1936)

We say of women that their social interests are weaker than those of men and that their capacity for the sublimation of their interests is less....

^{2/} Chesler, Phylis, "Women as Psychiatric and Psycho-therapeutic Patients", Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33, 1971 pages 746-758

the difficult development which leads to feminity seems to exhaust all the possibilities of the individual.

Eric Erickson (1964)

Young women often ask whether they can 'have an identity' before they know whom they will marry and for whom they will make a home. Granted that something in the young woman's identity must keep itself upon for the peculiarities of the man to be joined and of the children to be brought. I think that much of a young woman's identity is already defined in her kind of attractiveness and in the selectivity of her search for the man (or men) by whom she wishes to be sought.

Bruno Bettelheim (1965)

....as much as women want to be good scientists and engineers, they want first and foremost to be womanly companions of men and to be mothers.

The discipline of sociology, and in particular its functionalist school, treated the subject of women in much the same manner as did their counterparts in psychology. For example, Schwendinger and Schwendinger note that Comte perceived women as constitutionally inferior to men because their maturation was halted at childhood and maintained that they should be the "pampered" slaves of the men they marry.^{3/}

Similarly, Herbert Spencer argued, seemingly in opposition to his principles of Darwinian individualism, that women be denied the opportunity to engage in free competition for occupations with men. Moreover, Spencer

3/ Schwendinger, J. and Schwendinger, H., "Sociology's Founding Fathers: Sexist to a Man", Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33, 1971, pages 783-789

maintained that to educate women for competition in business and political spheres would be positively "mischievous."^{4/}

The modern era of sociology is not without its own sexist apologist in Talcott Parsons, sociology's leading functionalist. The female, in Parsons' Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process, is found to be "expressive" while her male counterpart is labeled "instrumental." And, as Kate Millett so dutifully notes, "while 'instrumental' translates easily to the older, more obviously prejudicial category of intellectual capacity and mastery, 'expressive' is but a new name for emotional."^{5/}

The above paragraphs are not intended in any way to "point a finger" at the prejudices of the aforementioned psychologists and sociologists. Rather, the purpose of including these statements is to illustrate the existence of a particular orientation of thought about women as a group. In contrast, the study at hand is an attempt to establish women as a minority group and to show how accepted social psychological theories of prejudices can be applied to them. In short, males and females, not unlike blacks and whites and Jews and Gentiles, are not bio-psychological opposites as Parsons and others would seem to suggest, but rather operate in a majority-minority relationship complete with the

^{4/} Ibid., pages 783-789

^{5/} Millett, Kate, *Sexual Politics*, Avon Books, New York, 1969 page 229

prejudices that so frequently come to bear in such arrangements. It is from this perspective that the phenomenon of anti-feminism will be investigated.

To date there have been precious few studies that deal with women as a minority group, a few that have examined the relationship between authoritarianism and sex role differentiation among children, but a complete lack of research into the connection between authoritarianism and male and female anti-feminism. It is hoped that this present inquiry will help, at least partially, to fill this obvious void.

Research into the problem of anti-feminism will not only serve to erase in part a gap in sociological research, but, hopefully, will also permit greater generalization to the theory of authoritarianism by correlating still another minority group with authoritarianism. Moreover, if a positive correlation is found between female anti-feminism and authoritarianism we will have succeeded in supplying additional support to the studies done on minority group authoritarianism thereby further increasing the viability of the concept.

CHAPTER II

WOMEN AS A MINORITY GROUP

As was noted previously in the introductory chapter there exist precious few references to women as a minority group. This particular chapter is not an attempt to elaborate on these studies. Rather, the purpose of including such a section is to familiarize the reader with some of the basic theoretical and conceptual assumptions underlying the proposition of women as a minority group. We must, in short, evidence the existence of a female minority if we are to provide a theoretical base for our research. Likewise, it should be remembered that the aim of this project is not merely to find another correlate for authoritarianism, but to permit generalization of the concept. This can only be accomplished by first establishing women as a minority group.

As should be obvious to the reader, majority-minority relations rest not upon numerical strength, but rather upon the distribution of power within the relationship. Louis Wirth, for example, defines a minority "as a group of people who, because of physical or cultural characteristics, are singled out from the others in the society in which they live for differential and unequal treatment, and who

therefore regard themselves as objects of collective discrimination."^{6/}

Given the all too obvious fact that many women in this society do not regard themselves as targets of discrimination must we then not acknowledge that women do not constitute a minority group? Not necessarily, for as Millett points out, the very fact that women do not perceive themselves as discriminatory objects only serves to underscore the totality of their conditioning.^{7/} A process of conditioning which has summarily aided the dominant male in further entrenching him in his superordinate position.

In the final analysis, then, if we were to extend Wirth's definition to its logical conclusion, we must necessarily arrive at the determination that, sociologically speaking, there would be no minorities providing the dominant group were able to successfully condition them to accept their subordinate position as normal and proper. From this author's perspective it seems inconceivable that one could deny minority status to a particular group solely on the grounds that they are unaware of the unequal treatment afforded them.

We have seen thus far that women as a group, while

^{6/} Simpson, G. and Yinger, Milton J., Racial and Cultural Minorities, Harper and Row, New York, 1958, page 22

^{7/} Millett, op. cit., page 55

meeting the objective element of minority group status, i.e., physical differences giving rise to discrimination, generally fail to fulfill the more subjective criterion of awareness. However, as has been pointed out, this fact does not necessarily disqualify them from being properly defined as a minority group. Indeed, as will be made clear in the following pages, women as a group can be seen in striking parallel with this society's largest minority, i.e., black Americans. And, moreover, it will also be shown that while women may be accurately judged to be unaware of the discriminatory practices aimed at them they do suffer, in a manner not unlike many other oppressed minorities, psychologically from male oppression - a subjective factor at least as important as an awareness of discrimination.

The mental placement of individuals into groups on the basis of common physical or cultural traits is as common with respect to sex as it is to race. For many people sex grouping, like racial grouping, is an important psychological mechanism for the in-group, i.e., the male sex. As Gordon Allport notes, "with half of mankind (his own sex) the male may feel an in-group solidarity, with the other half an irreconcilable conflict."^{8/}

^{8/} Allport, G., The Nature of Prejudice, Doubleday and Co., Garden City, N.Y., 1958, page 32

Moreover, as is the case with black Americans, any biological differences that do exist, with respect to certain primary and secondary sex differences are greatly magnified by the dominant in-group and provide them with unwarranted support for the belief that females are inferior. The supposed inferiority of the female is, in turn, seen by the male in-group as justification for its discriminatory practices.

To further evidence the proposition that the grouping of males and females into sexual ingroups and outgroups is not unlike racial grouping we might take note of the fact that both racial and sexual recognition take place in early childhood and follow a similar pattern thereafter. For example, research on racial awareness indicates that racial recognition in both black and white children is visible by age three and sharpens significantly each succeeding year.^{9/} Similarly, as concerns sexual recognition, we see that while a child of two normally makes no distinction on the basis of sex, by the time he enters the fourth grade the awareness of sex groups is firmly established.^{10/}

Further parallels between women and black Americans are

^{9/} Pettigrew, T., A Profile of the Negro American, D. Van Norstrand and Co., New Jersey, 1964, page 7

^{10/} Allport, G., op. cit., pages 31-32

noted in Gunnar Myrdal's Appendix V to his voluminous An American Dilemma. Here Myrdal argues, as we implied earlier, that the study of women's intelligence and personality followed roughly the same historical pattern as was recorded for blacks. That is, it was argued, as it was for blacks, that women's intellectual inferiority was "evidenced" by smaller brains and a scarcity of geniuses. And both were conditioned, Myrdal notes, to believe in this myth of intellectual inferiority.^{11/}

In line with the dominant groups perception of women as an inferior species it was firmly believed that they, and by inference society, would be better off with little save the most essential education. Later, of course, it was determined that perhaps the education of women was not wholly negative and more monies were subsequently set aside for the education of our female population. However, and here again we see a striking similarity in the treatment afforded women and blacks, the education of women, particularly on the college level, was carried out in separate institutions presumably in the belief that women have different educational needs than men.

Attitudes concerning occupational potential also yield evidence of a distinct parallel between women and black

^{11/} Myrdal, Gunnar, An American Dilemma, Harper and Row, N.Y., 1944, page 1077

Americans. Each was provided a "place" in society subordinate to the dominant group. Both were forced into jobs that the dominant group found essential but unacceptable and thus befitting and proper for an "inferior" species. For women the designated "place" was in the home, in maternalistic fields such as nursing, elementary school teaching, etc. that were in accord with her "natural maternal instincts", or in low paying and low prestigious industrial jobs. Likewise, the low paying low opportunity jobs provided blacks were believed, as a means of justification, to be commensurate with their inferior abilities.

The occupational antagonisms of the dominant group to its subordinate minorities did not, as Myrdal points out, affect relations on a more personal level. This is, most assuredly, not to say that these non-occupational relations were carried out in a manner remotely resembling an equalitarian relationship, only that these more primary relationships seemed less overtly hostile. Indeed, the paternalism present in these primary relationships merely serves to evidence an even greater assumption of superiority on the part of the dominant group. The following quotation from Myrdal clearly illustrates this point.

In personal relations with both women and Negroes, white men generally prefer a less professional and more human relation, actually a more paternalistic and protective position.

As in Germany it is said that every Gentile had his pet Jew, so it is said that in the South every white had his 'pet nigger'. We sometimes marry the pet woman, carrying out this paternalistic scheme. But even if we do not, we tend to deal kindly with her as a client and a ward, not as a competitor and an equal.^{12/}

While we have acknowledged the fact that, for the most part, women lack a conscious recognition of the collective discrimination aimed at them this fact does not seem to have insulated women from psychological damage resulting from their subordinate position. In short, all related research seems to indicate that women often manifest many of the same adverse psychological effects that we commonly associate with more self aware minority groups. That is, a woman may suffer, as a result of her acceptance of inferiority, ingroup rejection and self-hate. Or perhaps more succinctly, she comes to identify with the aggressor, i.e., the dominant male group, and accepts their stereotyped image of women.*

What I have attempted to do in these preceding pages was to examine the degree to which the term "minority group" can be applied to women. It was readily acknowledged early in the paper that women do not fit Louis Wirth's definition

^{12/} Ibid., page 1078

* Because the psychological consequences of male oppression are often manifested in an identification with the dominant male group and a resultant anti-feminism we will examine these reactions in greater detail in Chapter IV.

of a minority group because they do not admit to a recognition of the discrimination visited upon them. However, the all too obvious fact that women are discriminated against,* the striking parallel between women and black Americans, and the psychological reactions to oppression that we will discuss at length later in the paper would seem to strongly suggest that women can be correctly perceived as constituting a sociological minority group. The concept of women as a minority is an important one for future sociological analysis and a necessary one for our purposes.

* Specific discriminatory practices were not included here for to do so would be merely to belabor the obvious and add precious little to the aims of the paper.

CHAPTER III

AUTHORITARIANISM AND MALE ANTI-FEMINISM

Before discussing in detail the theoretical concept of authoritarianism and its possible relationship with anti-feminism we must first necessarily confront the argument that insofar as there exists in this society a legally sanctioned ideology concerning women, anti-feminism cannot correctly be labeled a prejudice. In short, it is claimed that an attitude can only be considered a prejudice if it violates some important societal norm or value. Admittedly, anti-feminism, despite its obvious undemocratic stance, violates no norm or value.

However, such a definition of prejudice is both incorrect and useless for if one were to carry it to its logical conclusion one would have to acknowledge that neither the caste system of India nor the period of slavery in the United States could be considered manifestations of prejudice. As Gordon Allport so pointedly notes:

Whenever a negative attitude toward a person is sustained by a spurious overgeneralization we encounter the syndrome of prejudice. It is not essential that people deplore this syndrome. It has existed in all ages in every country. It constitutes a bona fide psychological problem. The degree of moral indignation is irrelevant.^{13/}

13/ Allport, G., op. cit., page 10

In the final analysis, then, despite the fact that the norms and values of this society condone the different treatment of women there exists, nevertheless, the element of prejudice.

Although authoritarianism has been used extensively and fruitfully as a variable in both psychology and sociology the concept itself seems to defy a precise definition. Indeed, the most useful definition of authoritarianism seems to be the scale itself.^{14/}

Adorno and his associates in the Berkely studies viewed the concept of authoritarianism as a composite of sub-variables with dynamic relationships with prejudice. These variables are listed below with a definition of each.^{15/}

- a. Conventionalism. Rigid adherence to conventional, middle class values.
- b. Authoritarian submission. Submissive, uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities of the ingroup.
- c. Authoritarian aggression. Tendency to be on the outlook for, and to condemn, reject, and punish people who violate conventional values.
- d. Anti-intraception. Opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tenderminded.

^{14/} T. W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswick, D. J. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality, W. W. Norton and Co., N.Y., 1950, page 228

^{15/} Kirscht, J., and Dillehay, R., Dimensions of Authoritarianism: A Review of Research and Theory, U. of Kentucky, 1967, page 6.

- e. Superstition and stereotype. The belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate; the disposition to think in rigid categories.
- f. Power and "toughness." Preoccupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension; identification with power figures; overemphasis upon the conventionalized attributes of the ego; exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness.
- g. Destructiveness and cynicism. Generalized hostility, vilification of the human.
- h. Projectivity. The disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; the projection outwards of unconscious emotional impulses.
- i. Sex. Exaggerated concern with sexual "goings-on."

While these variables when combined make up the syndrome of authoritarianism, it is possible and, for our purposes, desirable to discuss a number of these variables individually and examine their relationship with prejudice in general and anti-feminism in particular.*

While conventionalism and authoritarian submission are separate elements in the authoritarian personality their obvious similarity permits them to be examined concurrently. Both involve elements of submission. One to moral values, the other to moral authorities.

Initially, the relationship between the acceptance of conventional values, as Adorno points out, and prejudice

* While the total F-Scale will be used in the research design to measure authoritarianism only the most important of the component variables will be examined individually.

is positive yet not extraordinarily high. The key to the relationship is not conformity per se, but rather the type of conformity exhibited. That is, if the adherence to conventional values is simply a manifestation of individual conscience there should be no necessary correlation.

However, as Adorno note:

If....adherence to conventional values is determined by contemporary external pressure, if it is based upon the individual's adherence to the standards of the collective powers with which he....is identified, then we should expect a close association with anti-democratic receptivity.^{16/}

A study conducted by Lindzey lends support to the findings in The Authoritarian Personality. Lindzey found, for example, that those high in prejudice conform much more rigidly to the commonly accepted societal norms than did those low in prejudice.^{17/}

Similarly, support for Adorno's claim that conformity resulting from submission to external pressure is the key factor in the relationship between conventionalism and prejudice can be found in studies conducted by Crutchfield^{18/}

^{16/} Ibid., page 230

^{17/} Lindzey, G., "Differences Between the High and Low in Prejudice and Their Implications for a Theory of Prejudice", Journal of Personality, 19, 1950, pages 16-40

^{18/} Crutchfield, R. S., "Conformity and Character", American Psychologist, 10, 1955, pages 191-198

and Wells, Weinst, and Rubel.^{19/} In both experiments the subject was placed in a situation where he was faced with an obvious conflict between his own clear perception and a unanimous contradictory concensus on the part of the "pressure group." In each case a comparison of the F-Scale scores showed that those who yielded to the pressure to conform were more prejudiced than those who did not.

The elements of authoritarian submission and conventionalism not only correlate with prejudice in general, but it would also seem that they would be integral components of anti-feminist attitudes. Such a proposition is not without the support of theoretical logic, for if we concede that the values of the dominant group dictate that women are an inferior group, and should conform to certain accepted sexual roles that imply inequality, conformity to these conventionally held values must necessarily manifest itself in anti-feminism.

While conventionalism and authoritarian submission generally represent the masochistic element of authoritarianism authoritarian aggression represents its sadistic counterpart. And the two complement, rather than contradict, one another. That is, authoritarian aggression is manifest

^{19/} Wells, W. D., Weinst, G., and Rubel, M., "Conformity Pressure and the Authoritarian Personality", Journal of Psychology, 42, 1956, pages 133-136

in the extreme conventionalist who, unable to maintain a critical perspective of accepted authority, has a desire to condemn and punish those who violate conventional values.^{20/} Or, perhaps more succinctly, the individual who finds his impulses thwarted by submission to the conventional values of the in-group is likely to grow up, in Allport's words, "hating himself for his many transgressions." Consequently, any violation of convention on the part of others results in anxiety which will likely result in a desire to punish the offender just as he himself was punished. Persons who constantly battle individual impulses in the face of conventional values cannot be permissive and tolerant of others.^{21/}

Such harsh moral judgment on the part of high authoritarians is in direct contrast to the attitudes expressed by low authoritarians who are a great deal more tolerant of violations of conventional norms. They are, in short, as lenient toward "social misdemeanors" as they are accepting of social out groups.^{22/}

Evidence of the relationship between the element of authoritarian aggression and rejection of out-groups can be

^{20/} Adorno, op. cit., pages 232-234

^{21/} Allport, G., op. cit., page 375

^{22/} Ibid., page 375

found in a study conducted by R. Epstein. In Epstein's experiment subjects were provided the opportunity to electrically shock a Negro victim following a series of shocks delivered to the victim by a fellow subject who was actually serving as an accomplice in the experiment. Epstein discovered, not unexpectedly, that those scoring high on the F-Scale delivered more shock to the victim than did those scoring low on the F-Scale.^{23/}

It is extremely doubtful, given the "protective position" afforded women in this society, that Epstein's experiment would yield similar results if applied to women. This, however, is not to say that women do not serve as targets of male aggression. Rather, it seems that the punishment directed at them is less overtly physical and more verbal and psychological. Certain derogatory terms applied solely to women would seem to evidence such a contention. Labels such as slut, bag, whore, bitch, wench, etc., for which there is no appreciable male counter term, can only be seen as a means of expressing a hatred for, and the punishment of, women.^{24/}

23/ Epstein, T., "Aggression Toward Out Groups As a Function of Authoritarianism and Immitation of Aggressive Models", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 1966, pages 574-579

24/ Greer, G., The Female Eunuch, Bantam Books, N.Y., 1970, pages 278-281

The element of anti-intracception, i.e., opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, and the tenderminded, is also an important ingredient in the authoritarian personality. Here the general attitude is a devaluation of the human being and an overevaluation of the physical object. And even more important, in terms of the thesis of this paper, is that in its "most extreme, human beings are looked upon as if they were physical objects to be coldly manipulated."^{25/}

Such a condition often exists in male-female relations. The authoritarian male looks upon women not as human beings, but rather as objects of exploitation manipulable for his own purposes. One obvious example of feminine exploitation is found in the "sexual conquest." The sexual conquest of the female becomes a means by which the authoritarian male can evidence his sexual prowess and, in the process, secure status. As Greer so pointedly notes, "for boys broaching manhood the dominant fantasy of adventure simply expands to include women as exploit; sex is admitted as a new kind of prowess or hazard".^{26/} Adorno, likewise, argues that, "sex is for him (the authoritarian) in the service of status, be this masculine status as achieved by pointing toward conquests, or be it social status as achieved by

^{25/} Adorno, op. cit., page 235

^{26/} Greer, G., op. cit., page 200

marrying the "right kind" of woman.*^{27/}

The relationship of stereotypy and dichotomization to prejudice is obvious but, nevertheless, deserves some discussion here. Briefly, stereotypy and dichotomization are manifestations of the individuals inability to examine human phenomenon in its entire complexity for to do so would be potentially "anxiety producing."^{28/} That is, in so far as the individual is unable to deal with the integration of both good and bad traits in his own personality he find it psychologically necessary to categorize all phenomenon into right and wrong. And, most importantly, it is the same person who seeks a definitive category for all human action that finds it necessary to emphasize the distinction between in groups and out groups,^{29/} i.e., males and females. With the first, as we noted earlier, the authoritarian male feels in group solidarity, with the later, irreconcilable conflict.

* The "double standard" in sexual relations, the setting up of an "ideal" female body type, e.g., the Playboy Bunny, the beauty pageant contestant, to which all females are compared, and the use of women as "accessories" in advertising are further examples of how women are perceived as physical (sexual) objects.

^{27/} Adorno, op. cit., page 477

^{28/} Ibid., page 236

^{29/} Allport, G., op. cit., pages 376-377

For the authoritarian the need for definitiveness makes it necessary for him to further dichotomize the out-group into good and bad. The "good nigger" and the "uppity nigger", the "pure woman" and the "bad woman." The following are examples of the high authoritarian's dichotomous conception of "pure" and "bad" women found in Adorno's interviews with high scoring men.^{30/}

"She taught me something that stuck with me all my life, that a woman is the most perfect thing in the world, that is, the right kind of woman."

"I don't like the Maizie or Flo types or the sex boxes. Yes, I have been out with the latter, but you have to be careful. There's always the danger of disease."

Initially, one might mistakenly conclude from the above the categorization of women into good and bad elements negates the assumption of a stereotype. Lindzey, for example, notes that "the ability to see the minority group as all bad means that the confusion of seeing them as partly good or partly bad is avoided....and there is no confusion as to how to react to them."^{31/} First it must be emphasized that, in agreement with Lindzey, the anti-feminist does not view the individual members of the minority female out-group as "partly good or partly bad", but rather as solely good or bad. However, even more important is that the term "good"

^{30/} Adorno, op. cit., page 397

^{31/} Lindzey, G., op. cit., pages 16-40

or "pure" is not in any way to be equated with equal. Rather, a woman, or any member of a minority, is labeled "good" if she fits the stereotyped role the authoritarian deems proper for her. This does not negate the clear cut distinction the male anti-feminist makes between in-groups and out-groups and neither does it confuse dominant-minority relations.

Another component variable of the authoritarian syndrome which would seem to suggest a strong relationship between authoritarianism and male anti-feminism is that of the pre-occupation with power and "toughness" displayed by the authoritarian. That is, in the authoritarian personality there seems to be a strong disposition to perceive human relations in terms of such categories as strong-weak, dominant-submissive, leader-follower, etc.

This tendency on the part of the authoritarian to categorize relations among people in terms of a power motif has obvious connections with anti-feminist attitudes. Briefly, individuals who perceive most human relations in terms of a strong versus weak polarity are also quite likely to apply these same categorical referents to sexual in-groups and out-groups. That is, the authoritarian male would be inclined to perceive the male in group as strong and dominant, i.e., superior, and the female out group as weak and submissive, i.e., inferior, and carry out his sexual relations accordingly. In short, the authoritarian's claim of

membership in the "superior" male in-group functions to evidence his sought after position of power and superiority in relation to the female out-group.

While we have not discussed all of the components of the syndrome of authoritarianism it seems that the relationship between authoritarianism and male anti-feminism seems well grounded in theory. However, no matter how logically valid a theory might appear it must, nevertheless, have some empirical reference if it is to be considered truly valid. Unfortunately, due to the almost complete lack of investigation into the problem at hand, only two related studies can be cited in partial support for our claim of a relationship between authoritarianism and anti-feminism. The following studies by Else Frenkel-Brunswick and Johnson, Johnson, and Martin while not attacking the problem in the same manner we are, nevertheless, lend some support to our hypothesis that there is a relationship between authoritarianism and anti-feminism.

In the study by Frenkel-Brunswick, a co-author of the Authoritarian Personality, 120 boys and girls were found to be either extremely prejudiced or unprejudiced were interviewed to determine their attitudes toward members of the opposite sex. The researchers found, not unexpectedly and in accordance with our theoretical framework, that ethnocentric children tend to perceive the other sex as an out-group,

are inclined to think in terms of rigidly dichotomized roles, and tend toward segregation from, and resentment against, the opposite sex.

For example, the prejudiced of both sexes tended to agree with the statement that "Girls should learn only things that are useful around the house." Likewise, when asked what is the worst occupation for a woman one of the ethnocentric boys answered, "to earn her own living, usually the man does that." In contrast, in response to the same question a low ethnocentric boy replied, "what she doesn't like to do."^{32/}

Further empirical support for the basic orientation of this research can be seen in a study conducted by Johnson, Johnson, and Martin to determine the relationship between authoritarianism and parental expectations of sex roles in children. The investigators found that subjects with high F-Scale scores, i.e., high authoritarianism, rated far fewer behaviors appropriate for both sexes than did those low in authoritarianism. In short, they discovered that the authoritarian expects children to behave in accordance with specifically assigned sexual roles.^{33/}

—

^{32/} Frenkel-Brunswick, Else, "A Study of Prejudice in Children", Human Relations, 1, 1948, page 299

^{33/} Johnson, R., Johnson, C., and Martin, I., "Authoritarianism, Occupation, and Sex Role Differentiation of Children", Child Development, 32, 1961, pages 271-276

In the final analysis, then, we are hypothesizing that the authoritarian male because of a rigid adherence to conventional values, the need to think in rigidly defined categories, a tendency toward anti-intraception etc. will tend to exhibit strong anti-feminist attitudes.

CHAPTER IV

AUTHORITARIANISM AND FEMALE ANTI-FEMINISM

Except for casual references we have discussed anti-feminism as if it were a phenomenon peculiar to the male sex alone. And while, admittedly, the aforementioned studies of Frenkel-Brunswick and Johnson, Johnson and Martin included as their subjects both males and females, neither made an effort to provide a clear theoretical explanation for anti-feminism among females. Perhaps, in so far as neither study perceived the problem in terms of a dominant-minority relationship they felt no need to make such an effort. However, the fact remains that if we are correct in our assumption that women do, indeed, constitute a minority out-group we must attempt to explain why some women adopt the values of the dominant male group, values that seem objectively to be antagonistic to their own best interests, while others do not. In short, we must consider female anti-feminism as a separate and distinct phenomenon, albeit having theoretical similarities with male anti-feminism. Thus, again, it is the concept of authoritarianism that will provide the theoretical framework for this investigation.

Central to any discussion of female anti-feminism and its relation to authoritarianism is the concept of

"identification with the aggressor" for it is by identifying with the values of the dominant group that the minority group member comes to reject both the self and the minority group. The individual comes to see her own group through the eyes of the dominant group. That is, although the individual, by nature of particular physical or cultural traits, is barred from admittance to the dominant group she, nevertheless, mentally identifies with the stereotyped images and prejudices of the dominant group towards her own minority in group. In short, she sees her group as the dominant group sees it.

Bruno Bettelheim's classic study of Nazi concentration camps clearly shows the degree to which an oppressed group can identify with its oppressors.^{34/} That these, the prisoners, reactions were extreme is obvious, but to deny that the basic theoretical orientations underlying Bettelheim's work are not applicable in less isolated instances is to deny some of the basic tenets of social psychology. The black American who comes to believe what he has for so many decades been told, e.g., that he is lazy, ignorant, dirty, etc., provides a striking illustration of "identification with the

34/ Bettelheim, Bruno, "Individual and Mass Behavior in Extreme Situations", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 38, 1943, pages 417-452

aggressor." He has adopted the stereotyped image the dominant group holds of him.

Sarnoff, in his study of anti-Semitism among Jews, notes three prerequisites for situations in which identificatory responses are likely to be evoked. These include one, an aggressor who is determined to impose his hostility upon a scapegoat; two, a victim who is socially dependent upon the aggressor and who makes a likely target for the latter's hostile feelings; and three, a social situation in which the victim cannot entirely escape the influences of the aggressor upon him.^{35/} The following pages show the degree to which women meet these prerequisites.

That men use women as scapegoats cannot be denied although, admittedly, the phenomenon may not initially appear as obvious as in the case of ethnic and racial minorities. According to the theory of displacement, an integral element in "scapegoating", the aggressor, i.e., the authoritarian male, finds it necessary to direct his hostility to out-groups (women). Such displacement of aggression by the authoritarian is necessary for he is psychologically unable to consciously recognize frustrating agents socially defined

^{35/} Sarnoff, I., "Identification With the Aggressor: Some Personality Correlates of Anti-Semitism Among Jews", Journal of Personality, 20, 1951, pages 199-218

as part of the in-group (men).^{36/} In short, unable to attack elements in the in-group he must displace this hostility on a scapegoat, i.e., women.*

The second stipulation that Sarnoff sets forth is that the victim must be socially dependent upon the aggressor and a likely target for hostile feelings. That women are socially dependent upon the dominant male group is so obvious that it needs no discussion here. As concerns their accessibility as targets of aggression one need only note that women, like all subordinate minorities, are characterized by the dominant group as weak and inferior. This implied weakness of the female makes her a likely target for the hostile feelings of the members of the dominant group because such hostility can be freely expressed without restraint or fear of retaliation on the part of the victim.^{37/} In short, the accessibility of women as targets of displaced hostility is evidenced by their perceived inability to strike back.

Finally, Sarnoff notes that in order for the victim to exhibit identificatory responses it is necessary that a social situation exists in which the victim cannot entirely

^{36/} Simpson, G. and Yinger, Milton J., op. cit., page 76 and Adorno, op. cit., page 233

^{37/} Adorno, op. cit., page 485

* Obviously, the choice of a scapegoat is, to a great extent, dependent upon the social situation. Our purpose here is merely to show that women, by virtue of their status as an out-group, can serve as potential scapegoats.

escape the influence of the aggressor. Such a situation is obviously even more evident in the relation of women to the dominant male group than it is in any other majority-minority relationship for the simple reason that women interact as frequently with the members of the dominant group as they do with members of their own sex. In short, unlike most subordinate minorities, women are not geographically or socially segregated from the dominant group and therefore find it even more difficult to escape its influence. Such a situation necessarily implies that the potential for mental identification with the dominant group will be at least as great, if not greater, among women than among other minorities.

While there are precious few studies of women that have concerned themselves directly with the phenomenon of "identification with the aggressor" there are a number of studies that seem to indicate that a significant percentage of women mentally identify with the dominant male group and reject their own sex group.

An interesting experiment conducted by Philip Goldberg lends some support to the assertion that women accept the stereotyped image provided by the dominant male group that women are intellectually inferior to men. In the experiment Goldberg simply asked a number of undergraduate women to respond to a set of articles. The sets of articles were

identical except that one set was signed by John McKay and the other by Joan McKay. The results were as expected with the articles signed by John McKay receiving a much higher evaluation than those signed by Joan McKay. Goldberg concluded from the results that the reaction to the articles was primarily dependent upon the sex of the "author." In short, these undergraduate women accepted the stereotyped image of female intellectual inferiority.^{38/}

In accord with the findings of Goldberg, the Fortune polls of 1946 showed that women, even more than men, had doubts concerning women's ability to participate in industry, the professions, and civic life.^{39/} Similarly, Myrdal in his Appendix V to An American Dilemma acknowledges the acceptance by women of their supposed inferior abilities when he notes that while men usually find it "unnatural" to work under women, "it is often said about women that they prefer men as bosses and do not want to work under another women."^{40/}

We have, in these last paragraphs, discussed the concept of "identification with the aggressor" primarily as it pertains to the acceptance on the part of women of the

^{38/} Goldberg, Philip, "Are Women Prejudiced Against Women?", Trans-Action, April 1968, pages 28-30

^{39/} Hacker, Helen, "Women as a Minority Group", Social Forces, 30, 1951, page 61

^{40/} Myrdal, G., op. cit., page 1077

stereotyped image of themselves as intellectual inferiors. However, these identificatory responses seem to go even beyond this level. The following studies clearly show that in many cases not only do women see themselves as inferior, but also reject their own in-group in favor of the dominant male group.

Evidence of the depth of these identificatory responses exhibited by some women can be found in a Fortune survey that showed more than one-fourth of all the women surveyed wishing they had been born of the opposite sex. Likewise, a study of fourth graders showed ten times as many girls wishing they could be boys as boys wishing they could be girls.^{41/}

Still another indication of the presence of the potential for group rejection in women is the all too obvious phenomenon of parental preference for male children. Amitai Etzioni notes, for example, that male babies are much preferred over female babies by both male and female parents.^{42/}

The studies and surveys just cited, however, not only evidence extreme identificatory responses among women, but

^{41/} Amundsen, Kristen, The Silenced Majority; Women and American Democracy, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New Jersey, 1971, pages 120-121

^{42/} Millett, K., op. cit., page 57

also serve to illustrate another major point, that the myth of the contented woman, like the myth of the contented black, is, indeed, nothing more than a myth. For if women were "content with their lot", as is all too commonly believed, it would be inconceivable that they would manifest such negative feelings toward their own sexual group.

The central question which we now must confront is, of course, to what degree is identification with the values of the dominant group related to authoritarianism. Or, perhaps more succinctly, what is the relationship between the prejudice expressed toward the female in-group and authoritarian personality patterns. Naturally, in so far as the authoritarian personality patterns. Naturally, in so far as the authoritarian woman herself is an object of prejudice we cannot expect that her ideological views will reflect exactly those of the authoritarian male. However, at the same time, we may assume that the authoritarian mode of defining issues will be apparent.

Unfortunately, in so far as no study has ever undertaken the investigation of this phenomenon as it relates to women we are forced, out of necessity, to rely on studies dealing with other minority groups to evidence the connection between authoritarianism and identification with the aggressor. While the reader may find it difficult to accept the relevance of these studies to our central problem, nevertheless,

the fact remains that if our assumption that women are a minority group is correct then the following data and theories should be applicable to women. Furthermore, we have already established the fact, by the empirical evidence set forth by Goldberg and others and also by illustrating how the female minority conforms to the criteria for identificatory responses set forth by Sarnoff, that women manifest a potential for "identification with the aggressor." Only the question of the relationship between this concept and authoritarianism remains and this author believes that the use of the following studies is justified for the purpose of examining that relationship.

G. Steckler in his "Authoritarian Ideology in Negro College Students" found a significant correlation between anti-Negro attitudes and authoritarianism. That is, blacks who scored high on the F-Scale tended to accept anti-Negro statements. And in accordance with the theory of authoritarianism Steckler attributed these findings to an apparent attempt on the part of the authoritarian black to deny that he may be unworthy of acceptance by the dominant white group.^{43/}

Similarly, Sarnoff in his study of anti-Semitism among

^{43/} Steckler, G., "Authoritarian Ideology in Negro College Students", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 54, 1957, pages 396-399

Jews theorized that Jewish anti-Semitism was a manifestation of a need in the authoritarian Jew to "assimilate the strength he perceives in the aggressor because he feels his own resources are inadequate".^{44/} In short, plagued by feelings of insecurity and internal weakness, all traits of the authoritarian personality, he finds it necessary to identify with the dominant group rather than his own minority in group.

The Radke-Yarrow and Landes study of Jewish anti-Semitism yielded similar results. Their data revealed, for example, that Jews who had the greatest number of anti-Semitic reactions scored significantly higher on the F-Scale than did individuals giving the fewest anti-Semitic responses ($r = .58$).^{45/}

Finally, a study conducted by Joseph Adelson revealed a significant correlation of .67 between authoritarianism and anti-Semitic attitudes among Jews. Adelson further discovered that, like the authoritarian of the dominant group, the authoritarian Jew identified two kinds of Jews; the "good" and the "bad." Such a need for definitiveness, as we mentioned earlier, is an integral element in the

44/ Sarnoff, I., op. cit., pages 199-218

45/ Radke-Yarrow and Lande, "Personality Correlates of Differential Reactions to Minority-Group Belonging", Journal of Social Psychology, 38, 1953, pages 253-272

authoritarian personality. Adelson's study also found evidence of a preoccupation with conventional, i.e., dominant group, values in the authoritarian Jew. Indeed, the authoritarian Jew believes that it is the non-conformist Jew who provokes the dominant group and thus endangers the position of the Jews who conform.^{46/}

From the above studies it is readily apparent that the minority authoritarian exhibits many of the same personality traits and attitudes common to majority authoritarians, and also that there is a significant correlation between anti-in-group attitudes, i.e., mental identification with the stereotyped values of the aggressor, and authoritarianism. In the final analysis, then, despite the fact that these studies deal with minority groups other than women, they do lend some peripheral theoretical and empirical support for our assertion that the female authoritarian will tend to exhibit anti-feminist attitudes.

In conclusion, then, we are hypothesizing that just as the authoritarian male stereotypes and "rejects" the female minority out-group, the female authoritarian because of a preoccupation with conventional values, the need to think in rigidly defined categories, and a disposition to glorify,

^{46/} Adelson, J., op. cit., pages 477-485

to be submissive to and uncritical of the dominant male group etc. will tend to identify with the values of the dominant male group as regards the proper role of women and exhibit anti-feminist belief patterns.

CHAPTER V
THE HYPOTHESIS

The following hypothesis will be tested:

There will be a positive correlation between authoritarianism and anti-feminist attitudes.

In effect, then, we are predicting that there will be a positive correlation between the independent variable authoritarianism and the dependent variable anti-feminism. That is, a high score on the one variable will result in a correspondingly high score on the other, and that the correlation will hold true for both males and females.

The independent variable of authoritarianism will be measured by the F-Scale used by Adorno and his associates in The Authoritarian Personality and the dependent variable anti-feminism will be measured on an Anti-Feminist Scale constructed of items taken from Kirkpatrick's Attitudes Toward Feminist Belief Patterns Scale forms A, B, and C.^{47/}

The F-Scale itself will serve as the working definition of authoritarianism^{48/} while the dependent variable anti-feminism will be operationally defined as negative attitudes

^{47/} Shaw, Marvin E. and Wright, Jack M., Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes, McGraw-Hill, 1967, pages 279-287

^{48/} Kirscht, John and Dillehay, Ronald, op. cit., page 6

concerning the adequacy, rights, and perogatives of women as measured by the Anti-Feminist Scale.

If we should succeed in establishing empirical support for the above hypothesis we will have added a new and significant correlate to the concept of authoritarianism. Equally important, however, is the understanding that if we find no significant sex differences in the relationship between authoritarianism and anti-feminist attitudes we will have provided even further theoretical generalization for authoritarianism. That is, as was mentioned previously, if the notion of an authoritarian personality is to have generality it is necessary that these ideology-personality connections exist in the minority (female) group as well as in the dominant majority (male) group.

Also, validation of the above hypothesis will, by logical inference, add further support for our proposition that women are a minority group and, thus, contribute to greater sociological and social psychological understanding of majority-minority relations. That is, to the degree that authoritarianism has previously been highly correlated with prejudice toward a number of racial and cultural minority out-groups a positive correlation between authoritarianism and anti-feminism in the homogeneous male subgroup should add even further evidence of the minority status of women.

Likewise, if we find that the association between authoritarianism and anti-feminism holds for females as well we would have to conclude that the authoritarian female perceives her own in-group, i.e., accepts the stereotyped image of the group provided by the dominant male group, in much the same manner the authoritarian black or the authoritarian Jew sees his minority ingroup. And we could assume, then, that minority identificatory responses can be generalized beyond the traditional racial and ethnic minorities to include women.

CHAPTER VI
METHODOLOGY

Design

The hypothesized relationship between authoritarianism and anti-feminism will be measured by the Pearsonian product moment correlation.

The following variables will be controlled for by correlating authoritarianism and anti-feminism within the various homogeneous subgroups of the control variables.

1. Sex. (Subgrouped in categories of male and female.)
2. Major. (Subgrouped in categories of humanities, social science, agriculture, education, and natural science.)
3. Religion. (Subgrouped in categories of Catholic Protestant.)
4. Residence.* (Subgrouped in categories of urban area, small city, and rural area.)
5. Age. (Subgrouped in categories of 20 years old and under and 21 years old and older.)

Sampling

Following the example set by the authors of The Authoritarian Personality as well as researchers studying the concept of authoritarianism it was decided that the research subjects for a study of this nature should be drawn from a population of college students.

* Residential groups were defined as follows: Urban: Cities of 50,000 or more or suburbs of such cities; Small City: Cities with populations of 5,000 to 49,999; and Rural: Cities with populations of 4,999 or less.

College students were selected as research subjects for a number of other reasons, not the least of which was their availability and the likelihood that they would cooperate more willingly than residents of the community at large. However, at the same time, there were other important considerations in their selection as research subjects in a study of anti-feminism. By employing college students as sample subjects we can assume that their intellectual and educational level is high enough so that we need not restrict the number and nature of items in the scales. In short, we could feel fairly certain that they had opinions on women as a group. Secondly, we are assured that all the subjects understood the items in the same way so that the same response would have uniform significance. Finally, the relative homogeneity of college students in terms of class background, especially those enrolled at small state universities, permit greater accuracy in the analysis of the relationship between authoritarianism and anti-feminism. To quote Christie, "the....evidence hints that the F-Scale is most useful when employed in middle-class samples. Interpretation of scores in other samples must be cautiously made."^{50/} And the likelihood of finding a middle-class

^{50/} Christie, Richard and Cook, Peggy, "Guide to Published Literature Relating to the Authoritarian Personality", Journal of Psychology, 45, 1958, page 176

sample is far greater in a population of college students attending a small state supported university than in a sample of the community at large.

Methods of Measuring Variables

The Authoritarian Personality (F) Scale employed by Adorno in The Authoritarian Personality will be used to measure the independent variable authoritarianism.

Reliability:^{51/} Author's report on studies---mean $r = .90$, range .81 to .97.

Correlation with Ethnocentrism Scale---mean $r = .75$ with range from .59 to .87.

Using Fisher's Z_r , each item was correlated with every other item $r = .13$ and the range was from $-.05$ to $.44$.

In addition, each item was correlated with the remainder of the scale, the mean r being $.33$, the range from $.15$ to $.52$.

Validity: The authors used the case study method to validate the scale.

There has been some criticism of the validity of the F-Scale because the items in the scale are all worded in a single direction. Briefly, the argument is that such a procedure results in a response "set" which manifests itself

^{51/} Miller, D. C., Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, David McKay Co., New York, 1970, page 367

in a mechanical tendency to consistently agree or disagree regardless of content. While space does not permit a proper examination of this criticism, it should be noted that, in the final analysis, the validity of the F-Scale is clearly demonstrated by the fact that high scorers differ significantly from low scorers in a wide variety of characteristics consistent with the theory of authoritarianism. For example, the scale has been correlated with ethnocentrism, rigidity, dogmatism, xenophobia, intolerance of ambiguity, and aggression toward out-groups.^{52/}

The Authoritarianism (F) Scale

1. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
2. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough willpower.
3. Science has its place, but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.
4. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.

^{52/} See, for example, Brown, R. W., "A Determinant of the Relationship Between Rigidity and Authoritarianism", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 48, 1953, pages 469-476; Rokeach, M., "The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism", Psychological Review, 1954, pages 194-204; Campbell, D. T., "Ethnocentrism, Xenophobia, and Personality", Human Relations, 4, 1951, pages 185-192; Block, J., "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Intolerance of Ambiguity and Ethnocentrism", Journal of Personality, 19, 1950, pages 303-311; and Epstein, R., op. cit., pages 574-579

5. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.
6. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.
7. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.
8. What youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
9. Some people are born with the urge to jump from high places.
10. Nowadays when so many different kinds of people move around and mix together so much, a person has to protect himself especially carefully against catching an infection or disease from them.
11. An insult to our honor should always be punished.
12. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
13. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.
14. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere punishment; such criminals should be publically whipped, or worse.
15. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.
16. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.
17. Some day it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things.
18. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.
19. Wars and social troubles may someday be ended by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world.

20. Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked, and feeble-minded people.
21. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.
22. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.
23. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by the plots hatched in secret places.
24. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.
25. The businessman and the manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.
26. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.
27. Familiarity breeds contempt.
28. Nobody ever learned anything really important except through suffering.

An Anti-Feminist (A-F) Scale was constructed to measure the dependent variable anti-feminism. The items that make up the A-F Scale were selected from the three forms of Kirkpatrick's Attitudes Toward Feminism Belief Patterns Scale.^{53/}

Because it was regarded as desirable that all of the items in the A-F Scale be worded in a single direction some of the pro-feminist items in the Kirkpatrick scale were

^{53/} Shaw, Marvin E. and Wright, Jack M., op. cit., page 279

changed to reflect anti-feminist attitudes more directly.* One of the advantages of restricting the scale to negatively worded items is that, as R. Nevitt Sanford notes, they tend to be more discriminatory and "express subtle hostility without seeming to offend the democratic values which most prejudiced people feel they must maintain."^{54/} Also, another important underlying motive in the decision to employ only anti-feminist items in the scale is that insofar as we are measuring receptivity to anti-feminist ideology it seemed appropriate that the items should reflect that ideology.

Reliability: No estimate of the reliability of the A-F Scale was made. However, Kirkpatrick reported an equivilant-forms reliability of .85 for his 80 item (Form A) Attitudes Toward Feminism Belief Patterns Scale.^{55/} This would seem to suggest that there is a sufficient degree of reproducibility among the items themselves.

Validity: The validity of the A-F Scale was determined by a panel of judges who were either professors of sociology,

* The reversal of the pro-feminist items was carried out in such a way as to preserve the reliability of the item. For example, an item that read "Adultry is no greater sin for a woman than it is for a man" was reworded to read "Adultry is a greater sin for a woman than a man".

^{54/} Adorno et al, op. cit., page 59

^{55/} Shaw, Marvin E. and Wright, Jack M., op. cit., page 279

graduate students in sociology or counseling, or members of a local womens liberation organization on campus. In addition, the validity of the original Attitudes Toward Feminism Belief Patterns Scale, from which the items for the A-F Scale were drawn, was determined by the use of known groups (National Women's Party members and Lutheran pastors).^{56/}

The Anti-Feminist Scale

1. Women should not be permitted to hold public offices that involve great responsibility.
2. The unmarried mother is morally a greater failure than the unmarried father.
3. There should be a sharp distinction between men's and women's sports.
4. As head of the household the father should have final authority over the children.
5. A woman who refuses to bear children has failed in her duty to her husband.
6. A man has the right to insist that his wife accept his views as to what can or cannot be afforded.
7. A woman who continues to work outside the home after marriage is shirking her fundamental duty to home and children.
8. A husband should have the right to dispose of family property as he may please.
9. In general it can be said that women think in more personal terms than do men.
10. It is more disgusting for women to use obscene or profane language than it is for men.

^{56/} Ibid., page 279

11. It is natural and proper for parents to keep a daughter under closer control than a son.
12. The husband should be regarded as the legal representative of the family in all matters of law.
13. Women's work and men's work should be fundamentally different in nature.
14. Married women should not work if their husbands are able to support them.
15. Adultery is a greater sin for a woman than it is for a man.
16. It is ridiculous for a woman to want to retain her maiden name after marriage.
17. In general, men can be said to be intellectually superior to women.
18. Alimony is an appropriate protection for women as members of the weaker sex.
19. If women need special hours and conditions of work in industry it proves that their true place is in the home.
20. The satisfaction of her husbands sexual desires is a fundamental obligation of every wife.

The Scoring of the Scales

Both scales used in the research design use a Likert type format in which the subject is allowed six choices of responses for each item: slight, moderate, or strong disagreement or agreement. The degree of agreement is indicated by a +1, +2, or +3, disagreement by -1, -2, or -3.

While the F-Scale originally employed this type of response mode the items taken from Kirkpatrick which make up the A-F Scale used only two degrees of agreement or

disagreement. It was felt that the application of the Likert type item analysis used in The Authoritarian Personality would not only improve the scale items themselves by providing the subject with the opportunity to more accurately indicate his strength of agreement or disagreement, but would also serve to make the two scales more uniform in response mode thereby insuring more accurate statistical analysis.

Since high scores on the F-Scale were intended to express high degrees of authoritarianism and high scores on the A-F Scale indicating increasing degrees of anti-feminism, all responses were scored as follows:

-3 = 1 point	+1 = 5 points
-2 = 2 points	+2 = 6 points
-1 = 3 points	+3 = 7 points*

A persons score is simply the sum of his scores on the single items of the scales.

Methods of Gathering Data

The questionnaires used in the present study were distributed to 98 students enrolled in the Introductory Sociology classes at the University of Wisconsin-River Falls. The

* Four points represents the hypothetically neutral point and was assigned when the item was omitted. This same scheme was used in The Authoritarian Personality because "there seemed to be a greater psychological gap between -1 and +1 responses than between any other two adjacent responses." The Authoritarian Personality, page 72

sample was fairly representative of the population at large in terms of sex, age, religion, major, and home residence.

The cooperation of the groups, once they were presented with the questionnaire, was excellent with only one subject present who failed to fill out the questionnaire. Inevitably, some students were absent on the day the questionnaire was distributed, but in so far as there was never any advance notice that the questionnaire was going to be administered there was no reason to suspect that the responses of the absentees would have been significantly different from those who attended the session and filled out the questionnaire.

It was felt that this method of gathering data was superior to collecting the data by mail, the only other economically feasible alternative. In the first place, by distributing the questionnaires in this manner the researcher is guaranteed a significantly higher rate of return thus yielding a more representative sample. Secondly, and probably most important, the researcher can control which person answers the questionnaire and, also, can prevent any "group discussions" of the items.

Chapter VI

Results

Internal Consistency: Statistical Analysis of the Individual Items of the Anti-Feminist Scale

In the previous chapter it was pointed out that the newly constructed A-F Scale had obvious content validity. Furthermore, as was also mentioned previously, the original Attitudes Toward Feminist Belief Patterns Scale from which the A-F Scale was constructed was tested for validity by the use of known groups. However, insofar as the validity of a scaled instrument is its most essential element it was determined that a further test of the validity of the A-F Scale was in order.

This additional test of the validity of the A-F Scale was accomplished by analyzing each individual item in the Scale. The data on the item analysis of the A-F Scale is presented in Table I. Each item in the scale is identified by a key word or phrase. The Discriminatory Power (D.P.) of an item provides us with a statistical basis for judging the worth of an item. An item's Discriminatory Power is simply the difference between the mean score of the high A-F quartile on that item and the mean score of the low A-F quartile on the same item.

In general the D.P.'s for the A-F Scale (Table I) are

TABLE I

Item No.	Item	Upper Quartile	Lower Quartile	D.P.	Group Mean
1	(public office)	4.0	1.04	2.96	2.27
2	(unmarried mother)	3.08	1.29	1.79	2.03
3	(mens and womens sports)	4.50	1.71	2.79	2.56
4	(final authority)	5.25	1.58	3.67	3.51
5	(bear children)	4.63	1.71	2.92	2.85
6	(cannot be afforded)	4.71	1.92	2.79	3.18
7	(family property)	3.17	1.33	1.84	2.51
8	(shirking duties)	3.16	1.25	1.91	2.66
9	(personal terms)	4.33	3.50	.83	4.14
10	(profane language)	6.04	2.60	3.44	4.30
11	(closer control)	4.54	2.60	1.94	3.93
12	(legal rep- resentative)	5.08	3.29	1.79	4.26
13	(mens and womens work)	5.08	1.58	3.50	3.34
14	(married women should not work)	4.58	1.42	3.16	2.94

Item No.	Item	Upper Quartile	Lower Quartile	D.P.	Group Mean
15	(adultry)	2.96	1.25	1.71	1.95
16	(maiden name)	5.00	1.96	3.04	3.67
17	(intellect- ually superior)	3.13	1.25	1.88	2.00
18	(alimony)	3.16	2.04	1.12	2.56
19	(place in the home)	4.92	1.66	3.26	3.00
20	(satis- faction of sexual desire)	5.04	2.66	2.38	4.13
	OVERALL PROPERTIES	4.33	1.93	2.40	3.09

Number: Total Group = 98; UQ = 24; LQ = 24

very satisfactory, averaging 2.40. For the 20 items in the scale 6 D.P.'s are over 3.0, 5 are over 2.0, and six between 1.12 and 1.94. There is only one item, item number nine, with a D.P. below one. However, despite its weakness in relation to the remaining items in the scale it is positive* and seems to significantly differentiate between those scoring high on the scale and their low scoring counterparts.

In the final analysis, then, the A-F Scale seems to be a valid instrument by which to measure tendencies toward anti-feminist belief patterns.

Mean F Scale Scores for the Tested Subgroups.

While an examination of the differences between the mean F Scale scores obtained by the various subgroups is not directly related to the test of the hypothesis that individuals scoring high on the F Scale will tend to exhibit anti-feminist attitudes it will, nevertheless, add some peripheral information to the study and may, also, be of some benefit to future research.

It is evident from the data presented in Table II that, except for two cases, the mean differences obtained are not very large. However, as Adorno notes, we should not expect

* A negative D.P. would, by definition, mean that the item was worded in the wrong direction and, thus, would be measuring something other than anti-feminist attitudes.

to find any real differences among the groups except in those cases where membership in a particular group has some "psychological significance."^{57/}

Of the five major control groups there were only two groups that showed what seemed to be significant F score differences. And both of these cases can be examined and explained in light of the general theory of the psychological significance of group membership. For example, in the academic major group we see that the mean of 86.92 obtained by the humanities majors is significantly lower than the mean F Scale scores obtained by subjects in the other academic disciplines. The mean scores for these other groups ranged from 96.29 for the social and behavioral science group to 105.00 for education majors. These differences seem to be in accordance with the aforementioned theory of group differences. That is, in so far as the general fields of the humanities, i.e., art, literature, theater, etc., are more conducive to individual creativity and freedom of expression than most other academic disciplines, we might expect that individuals entering the humanities would tend to score relatively low on the F Scale.

The second major group difference is found in the religious control group. Here we find that the Protestant

^{57/} Adorno, op. cit., page 267

TABLE II
 MEAN F-SCALE SCORES FOR TESTED GROUPS
 WITHIN TOTAL SAMPLE

GROUP	N	MEAN	S.D.	RANGE
<u>Sex</u>				
Females	36	99.66	17.86	51-129
Males	62	98.82	22.54	53-169
<u>Residence</u>				
Urban	24	97.33	19.75	66-129
Small City	24	103.17	25.67	51-169
Rural	50	98.06	18.60	64-143
<u>Religion</u>				
Protestant	49	94.24	18.20	64-143
Catholic	32	106.75	20.17	69-169
<u>Major</u>				
Agriculture	27	98.85	20.28	64-143
Education	13	105.00	16.03	77-129
Social and Behavioral Science	14	96.29	25.86	53-136
Humanities	13	86.92	13.32	66-115
Natural Science	25	104.28	22.17	51-169
<u>Age</u>				
Under 21	74	97.80	20.37	51-143
21 and over	24	103.25	22.14	76-169
<hr/>				
OVERALL PROPERTIES	98	99.13	20.96	51-169

subgroup's mean of 94.24, while apparently not significantly lower than the overall mean of 99.13, is considerably lower than the F Scale mean of 106.75 obtained by the Catholic subgroup. These differences follow the general trend of research dealing with religious differences in authoritarianism. Rokeach, for example, found that Catholic students score relatively high on the dogmatism, authoritarianism, and ethnocentrism scales. Similarly, Warshay, Goldman, and Biddle discovered that Catholics consistently score high on the F Scale.^{58/}

To be sure, the relation of authoritarianism to major religious groups presents complex problems of interpretation. However, if we assume that Catholicism is generally more orthodox than Protestantism, especially in terms of the ritualistic aspects of the Church, the hierarchy of authority, etc., and that orthodoxy is a key factor in authoritarianism we can more readily understand the differences in the obtained F Scale scores.

In the final analysis, then, in the two cases where there were apparent within-group differences, the obtained differences could be accounted for by the psychological significance of group membership.

^{58/} Kirscht, J., and Dillehay, R., op. cit., page 70

Mean A-F Scale Scores for the Tested Subgroups.

As was the case in the preceding section, the present investigation into the obtained group differences on the Anti-Feminist Scale is not an attempt to support our stated hypothesis that individuals with authoritarian personality patterns will tend to exhibit negative attitudes toward women. Again, however, an examination of the group differences may be valuable to future research.

As can be seen from the data presented in Table III, there exist only two cases where differences within groups seem to appear significant. Also, in general, most of the mean A-F scores obtained by the various subgroups are close to the overall mean of 62.55.

The data indicates that sex and major are the only factors that seem to affect anti-feminist attitudes. As concerns the effect of sex upon A-F Scale scores we see that the mean of 55.72 for females differs considerably from the males mean of 66.51. While this author expected a somewhat lower female mean, the difference, while not subjected to statistical tests, does appear to be significant.

The fact that females scored relatively low on the A-F Scale, however, does not refute our hypothesis that females scoring high on the F Scale will also tend to score high on the A-F Scale. Rather, the differences between males and

TABLE III
 MEAN A-F SCALE SCORES FOR TESTED
 GROUPS WITHIN TOTAL SAMPLE

GROUP	N	MEAN	S.D.	RANGE
<u>Sex</u>				
Females	36	55.72	16.60	28-92
Males	62	66.51	19.76	21-112
<u>Residence</u>				
Urban	24	61.54	21.36	21-93
Small City	24	65.21	24.44	23-112
Rural	50	61.76	15.02	30-97
<u>Religion</u>				
Protestant	49	61.51	18.32	26-97
Catholic	32	64.38	21.36	21-112
<u>Major</u>				
Agriculture	27	65.04	16.27	37-97
Education	13	64.38	16.27	37-87
Social and Behavioral Science	14	64.36	21.76	21-92
Humanities	13	43.54	13.90	26-83
Natural Science	25	65.84	19.15	28-112
<u>Age</u>				
Under 21	74	60.70	18.57	21-102
21 and over	24	68.25	20.64	37-112
<hr/>				
OVERALL PROPERTIES	98	62.55	19.38	21-112

females on the A-F Scale merely indicates that, in this particular sample, females are less anti-feminist than their male counterparts. Such a finding, again, does not contradict our original hypothesis for, as was mentioned previously in the chapter dealing with female anti-feminism, we indicated that identificatory responses would be found in females exhibiting authoritarian personality patterns, not in females in general. In the final analysis, then, sex seems to have an effect on A-F scores, but not, as will be shown in the following section, on the general relationship between authoritarianism and anti-feminism.

The greatest within-group difference was found in the academic major group. Here, as was the case with the F Scale, humanities majors scored considerably lower than their counterparts in other academic disciplines. Initial investigation seemed to indicate that the low scores obtained by the humanities majors could be accounted for by the fact that nine of the thirteen subjects were low scoring females. However, a further examination of the data showed that the males in this particular group scored, in general, lower on the A-F Scale than did the females. Sex, in short, did not account for the difference.

While further research into this particular problem is in order we might suggest that the obtained difference between humanities majors and individuals in other subject

areas may be accounted for by the fact that the generally high level of tolerance associated with the arts may carry over into the area of majority-minority relations.

Correlations of the F Scale with the A-F Scale

The correlations of the F Scale are presented in Table IV. The major conclusion drawn from the data is that the relationship between authoritarianism and anti-feminism holds in all of the tested control groups.* That is, the obtained correlations support the hypothesis that individuals scoring high on the F Scale will tend to be more anti-feminist than their low scoring counterparts.

While the correlations between F and A-F vary somewhat from one group to another all, save one, indicate a marked degree of relationship. The correlation of .29 for subjects claiming residence in rural areas, i.e., geographical areas with a population below 5,000, although significant and thus indicating that a relationship does exist, was the lowest of all the control groups. This relatively low degree of correlation was particularly surprising in that one tends to perceive the gemeinschaft like rural areas as more traditional and conservative, especially in terms of familial relationships, and less tolerant of non-conformist attitudes than their

* All correlations were statistically tested for significance and were found to be significant at at least the .05 level.

TABLE IV

CORRELATIONS OF THE F SCALE WITH THE A-F SCALE FOR THE
TESTED GROUPS WITHIN THE SAMPLE

	GROUP	N	F.AF	
<u>Sex</u>	Females	36	.63	
	Males	62	.70	
<u>Residence</u>	Urban	24	.85	
	Small City	24	.84	
	Rural	50	.29	
<u>Religion</u>	Protestant	49	.67	
	Catholic	32	.56	
<u>Major</u>	Agriculture	27	.50	
	Education	13	.64	
	Social and Behavioral Science	14	.71	
	Humanities	13	.67	
	Natural Science	25	.63	
	<u>Age</u>	Under 21	74	.63
		21 and over	24	.67
OVERALL PROPERTIES 98			.65	

non-rural counterparts. Given this background theory one would expect a much higher correlation. This is, of course, not to say that no relationship exists only that the obtained correlation is considerably lower than the overall correlation of .65. This difference seems to indicate that some factor in rurality ameliorates the effect of authoritarianism on anti-feminist attitudes. While it is beyond the scope of this particular study to examine this problem more fully it would seem that research into this specific area would be of some benefit.

Given the nature of the problem under investigation of major interest was, of course, the effect, if any, of sex on the relationship between authoritarianism and anti-feminist belief patterns. The correlations between F and A-F for the male and female subgroups are also of major significance in terms of determining the viability of a generalized concept of authoritarianism. That is, we are concerned whether, in this particular case, the connection between personality and anti-feminist beliefs is applicable to both the male majority group and the female minority group.

The correlations of .70 and .63 obtained by the male and female subgroups respectively strongly suggest that sex has, for the most part, no effect on the relationship between authoritarianism and anti-feminist attitudes and, thus, necessarily indicates that the syndrome of authoritarianism

is generalizable to both majority and minority groups.

This finding is, then, in complete agreement with, and provides additional support for, the previously cited studies dealing with majority and minority authoritarianism. That is, we found, as previous research dealing with majority authoritarianism suggests, that the male authoritarian, because of a rigid adherence to conventional values, the need to think in rigidly defined categories, a tendency toward anti-intracception etc. tends to hold negative values of the female minority group. And, as concerns previous research on minority authoritarianism, our data suggests, as did their's, that the female authoritarian, because of a disposition to glorify and be submissive to the dominant male group, tends to identify with the values of that group and accepts their stereotyped of her own group.

In conclusion, we might simply state that from the correlations presented in Table IV it is evident that there is a marked relationship between the F and A-F Scales. In short, the data suggests strong support for our previously stated hypothesis that individuals high in authoritarianism will tend to, also, hold negative attitudes of women.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this particular research project was to examine the relationship between authoritarianism and anti-feminist attitudes. In short, we attempted to discover why it is that some individuals accept the ideology of anti-feminism while others do not.

The data presented in the previous chapter adds considerable support to our hypothesis that individuals high in authoritarianism will be more apt to exhibit anti-feminist attitudes than their low scoring counterparts. However, lest the reader arrive at the erroneous conclusion that anti-feminism is a manifestation of some innate psychological need, it must necessarily be reiterated that personality is a societal product. Thus, in the final analysis, while the concept of authoritarianism cannot be said to be the "ultimate" nor single most important determinant of anti-feminist attitudes, it does provide us with a social psychological explanation of why some people accept anti-feminist ideology while others do not.

Aside from the fact that this research project has at least helped to partially bridge a critical gap in sociological research dealing with women it has, also, served to further evidence the generalizability of the syndrome of authoritarianism in two important ways. First, by establishing empirical support for our hypothesis we have added a new and significant correlate to the concept of authoritarianism.

Secondly, in so far as we have statistically demonstrated that sex, for the most part, has no significant influence on the relationship between authoritarianism and anti-feminism we must accept the contention that the syndrome of authoritarianism is generalizable beyond the majority male group to include the female minority. That is, as was mentioned previously, if the notion of an authoritarian personality is to possess generality it is necessary that the ideology-personality connection exist in the minority group as well as in the majority group. Again, the data suggest, adding support to previous research, that authoritarianism does possess the necessary generality to make it a viable theoretical concept.

While, admittedly, the major aim of this study was to examine the possible relationship between authoritarianism and anti-feminism a secondary purpose of this project was to add further support to our contention that women do, indeed, constitute a sociological minority group. The data presented in the previous chapter suggests some support for this proposition. That is, just as previous research dealing with authoritarianism has found a relationship between authoritarianism and negative attitudes toward a number of racial and cultural minority groups the correlation of .70 between male (majority) authoritarianism and anti-feminist attitudes suggests a similar majority-minority relationship. In fine, then, the high degree of relationship between authoritarianism and anti-feminism for the male subgroup.

coupled with the differential treatment based on physical differences, the psychological consequences of male oppression, and the striking parallel between women and black-Americans provides sufficient evidence for the minority status of women.

Still further evidence for the belief that women are a minority group is found in the fact that the marked degree of relationship between authoritarianism and anti-feminism for the female subgroup. That is, the results indicate that the authoritarian female perceives her own in-group, i.e., accepts the stereotyped image provided by the dominant male group, in much the same manner the authoritarian black or the authoritarian Jew sees his own minority group. In short, minority identificatory responses can be generalized beyond the traditional racial and cultural minorities to include women.

While this research has helped to fill an obvious gap in sociological research by providing at least a partial explanation of why some individuals exhibit anti-feminist attitudes while others do not and has, also, among other things, provided further evidence of the minority status of women one must, necessarily, be cautious when generalizing the results. This is, of course, not to say that the conclusions arrived at are incorrect only that the sample, while representative of the population from which it was drawn, was made up entirely of

college students. From this author's perspective it would seem that further research employing a sample more representative of the population at large would improve the generalizability of the results.

One other important consideration that must be taken into account when generalizing the results of the present study is the problem of conditional relationships. Or, perhaps more succinctly, the degree to which the relationship between authoritarianism and anti-feminism may be affected by differences in social structure.

While the literature reviewed does not indicate that the relationship between authoritarianism and anti-feminism is conditional, the relatively low correlation between F and A-F obtained in the rural subgroup, although showing that a relationship does exist, seems to suggest that in certain social structural situations the effect of personality on anti-feminist attitudes may be minimal. Given the *gemeinschaft* like nature of rural society, this seems to indicate that in social structural situations where there exist clearly defined sex roles, continually enforced by strong cultural traditions, the effect of authoritarianism on anti-feminism may be reduced. Along these same lines, it might be hypothesized that in socio-cultural groups such as the Japanese-Americans and the Mexican-Americans, where the tradition of sexual inequity is

much stronger than in American society at large, the influence of personality on attitudes toward the role of women may, to a degree, be lessened.

In the final analysis, then while the social psychological variable of authoritarianism provides a partial understanding of anti-feminist attitudes, one must be extremely careful, when attempting to generalize the results of the study, to take social structural differences into account.

REFERENCES

1. Adelson, Joseph, "A Study of Minority Group Authoritarianism," The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 48, 1953, p. 477-485.
2. Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswick, Else, Levinson, D.J., and Sanford, R.N., The Authoritarian Personality, W.W. Norton and Co., N.Y., 1950.
3. Allport, Gordon, The Nature of Prejudice, Doubleday and Co., Garden City, N.Y., 1958.
4. Amundsen, Kristen, The Silenced Majority; Women and American Democracy, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New Jersey, 1971.
5. Bettelheim, Bruno, "Individual and Mass Behavior in Extreme Situations", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 38, 1943, pages 417-452.
6. Block, J., "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Intolerance of Ambiguity and Ethnocentrism", Journal of Personality, 19, 1950, pages 303-311.
7. Brown, R.W., "A Determinant of the Relationship Between Rigidity and Authoritarianism", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 48, 1953, pages 469-476.
8. Campbell, D.T., "Ethnocentrism, Xenophobia, and Personality", Human Relations, 4, 1951, pages 185-192.
9. Chesler, Phylis, "Women as Psychiatric and Psychotherapeutic Patients", Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33, 1971, pages 746-758.
10. Christie, R. and Cook, P., "Guide to Published Literature Relating to the Authoritarian Personality", Journal of Psychology, 45, 1958, pages 171-199.
11. Christie, R. and Jahoda, M., Studies in the Scope and Method of "The Authoritarian Personality", The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1954.

12. Crutchfield, R. S. "Conformity and Character", American Psychologist, 10, 1955, pages 191-198.
13. Epstein, T., "Aggression Toward Out Groups As a Function of Authoritarianism and Immitation of Aggressive Models", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 1966, pages 574-579.
14. Frenkel-Brunswick, Else, "A Study of Prejudice in Children", Human Relations, 1, 1948, page 299.
15. Goldberg, Phillip, "Are Women Prejudiced Against Women?", Trans-Action, April 1968, pages 28-30.
16. Greer, G., The Female Eunuch, Bantam Books, N.Y., 1970.
17. Hacker, Helen, "Women as a Minority Group", Social Forces, 30, 1951, pages 60-69.
18. Johnson, R., Johnson, C., and Martin, I., "Authoritarianism, Occupation, and Sex Role Differentiation of Children", Child Development, 32, 1961, pages 271-276.
19. Kirscht, J., and Dillehay, R., Dimensions of Authoritarianism: A Review of Research and Theory, U. of Kentucky, 1967.
20. Lindzey, G., "Differences Between the High and Low in Prejudice and Their Implications for a Theory of Prejudice", Journal of Personality, 19, 1950, pages 16-40.
21. Miller, D. C., Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, David McKay Co., Neew York, 1970.
22. Millett, Kate, Sexual Politics, Avon Books, New York, 1969.
23. Myrdal, Gunnar, An American Dilemma, Harper and Row, New York, 1944.
24. Pettigrew, T., A Profile of the Negro American, D. Van Norstrand and Co., New Jersey, 1964.

25. Radke-Yarrow and Lande, "Personality Correlates of Differential Reactions to Minority-Group Belonging", Journal of Social Psychology, 38, 1953, pages 253-272.
26. Rokeach, M., "The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism", Psychological Review, 1954, pages 194-204.
27. Sarnoff, I., "Identification With the Aggressor: Some Personality Correlates of Anti-Semitism Among Jews", Journal of Personality, 20, 1951, pages 199-218.
28. Schwendinger, J. and Schwendinger, H., "Sociology's Founding Fathers: Sexist to a Man", Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33, 1971, pages 783-789.
29. Shaw, Marvin E. and Wright, Jack M., Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes, McGraw-Hill, 1967.
30. Simpson, G. and Yinger, Milton J., Racial and Cultural Minorities, Harper and Row, New York, 1958.
31. Steckler, G., "Authoritarian Ideology in Negro College Students", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 54, 1957, pages 396-399.
32. Wells, W.D., Weinst, G., and Rubel, M., "Conformity Pressure and the Authoritarian Personality", Journal of Psychology, 42, 1956, pages 133-136.