Highly Dominating,
Highly Authoritarian Personalities

BOB ALTEMEYER
Department of Psychology
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Canada

ABSTRACT. The author considered the small part of the population whose members score highly on both the Social Dominance Orientation scale and the Right-Wing Authoritarianism scale. Studies of these *High SDO–High RWAs*, culled from samples of nearly 4,000 Canadian university students and over 2600 of their parents and reported in the present article, reveal that these *dominating authoritarians* are among the most prejudiced persons in society. Furthermore, they seem to combine the worst elements of each kind of personality, being power-hungry, unsupportive of equality, manipulative, and amoral, as social dominators are in general, while also being religiously ethnocentric and dogmatic, as right-wing authoritarians tend to be. The author suggested that, although they are small in number, such persons can have considerable impact on society because they are well-positioned to become the leaders of prejudiced right-wing political movements.

Key words: authoritarians, leadership, prejudice, right-wing movements, social dominators

SUPPOSE YOU wondered what kinds of persons harbored the greatest prejudice against disadvantaged groups in our society, especially with a view toward the social and political implications of such prejudice. How would you proceed? If you were a psychologist, you might administer a large bunch of personality tests to a large bunch of people and see which tests predicted how these folks would score later on prejudice scales. McFarland and Adelson (1996) did just this, giving 18 personality tests a chance to predict prejudiced attitudes toward blacks, homosexuals, and women among hundreds of University of Western Kentucky students and hundreds more of nonstudents. Only two of the personality measures predicted much, but they predicted lots in this and subsequent replications (Altemeyer, 1998). Putting it in a nutshell, such prejudice appeared to be largely a matter of personality: Just two kinds of personalities were involved—social

Address correspondence to Bob Altemeyer, Department of Psychology, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3T 2N2, Canada; altemey@cc.umanitoba.ca (e-mail).

dominators and right-wing authoritarians—and together these two kinds of per-
sonalities controlled most of the variance in sundry prejudice scores.

I shall begin the present article by briefly describing each of these traits.
Then I shall focus on the small number of people who manifest both kinds of
highly prejudiced personalities.

Social Dominance Orientation

Social dominance orientation (SDO) was conceived by Felicia Pratto and
Jim Sidanius (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; Sidanius & Pratto,
1999; Pratto, 1999) to tap "a general attitudinal orientation toward intergroup
relations, reflecting whether one generally prefers such relations to be equal, ver-
sus hierarchical" (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth & Malle, 1994, p. 742). The 14-
item Social Dominance Orientation scale (SDO scale), balanced against response
sets, accordingly asks participants how much they favor or agree with such things
as "increased social equality," "increased economic equality," and simply "equal-
ity" itself. Approaching the matter from the other direction, do you agree that
"some people are just more worthy than others" and that "This country would be
better off if we cared less about how equal all people were"?[1]

Rokeach (1973) similarly studied the pivotal connection between prejudice
and how much one values equality. Given the central place of equality as a
democratic value—you can hardly miss it in the French Revolution and the U.S.
Declaration of Independence—I wondered why social dominators were rela-
tively "again' it." So in the fall of 1998, I collected reactions to a home-grown,
balanced Social Inequality scale (Table 1) from 470 Caucasian introductory
psychology students at my university and from 674 of their parents. Answers
to the 22 items intercorrelated over .25 on the average in each sample, produc-
ing Cronbach's alpha reliabilities exceeding .90. SDO scores in turn correlat-
ed rather massively with summed Social Inequality scores: .72 among the stu-
dents and .76 among the parents.

Why do social dominators view equality with such disdain? If we look at the
SDO correlations with each of the items in Table 1, we can find several reason-
able SDO objections to the notion that people can be equal: Ultimately complete
equality is probably impossible; natural forces inevitably govern the worth of the
individual; and most people should have to earn their place in society.

But Table 1 reveals many other social dominator sentiments that seem less
defendable—and that even contradict the prosaic ones just given: Yes, people
in general should have to earn their place in society, but those born to wealth
do not have to. The poor ought to pull themselves up by their bootstraps. But
they should not be given the opportunity to do so; an *un*level playing field is
just fine (Items 5 and 6). It matters little if the concentration of wealth makes
a few people immensely rich and millions of others poor (Item 4). The "jus-
tice" system should favor the powerful (Items 9 and 11). It is not worth our

TABLE 1. The Social Inequality Scale

Text	$r_{\text{SDO-students}}$ [a]	$r_{\text{SDO-parents}}$ [b]
This survey is about "equality." In what sense, and to what extent, should the adults in our country be "equal"? Please indicate your reaction to each of the following statements on a –4 to +4 basis.		
Economic Inequality		
1. Economic equality is a bad idea dreamed up by muddle-headed "do-gooders." It would be a big mistake to pursue it.	.56	.55
2. Although it may be ultimately impossible, economic equality is a very worthy goal that we should definitely strive for.[c]	.56	.49
3. People have **no** right to economic equality. All of us should get as much as we can, and if some don't get enough, that's their problem.	.51	.55
4. If the natural forces of supply and demand and power make a few people immensely wealthy and millions of others poor, so be it.	.43	.50
5. Everyone should have an equal opportunity for economic success. Those born into poor circumstances should be given extra help to make the "playing field" level for them.[c]	.28	.39
6. "Access programs" to higher education, which give people from poor backgrounds extra financial support and counseling while in university, are a good idea.[c]	.33	.35
7. Nobody should get extra help improving his place in society. Everyone should start off with what his family gives him, and go from there.	.29	.38
8. Tax money should be used to make sure everyone has an adequate standard of living.[c]	.28	.39
Legal Inequality		
9. There is nothing wrong with the fact that powerful people get better treatment by the law than poor people do.	.34	.34
10. Society should provide poor people with a good attorney in court if they cannot afford one.[c]	.25	.38
11. If powerful people can get away with illegal acts because they can afford the best lawyers, and		

(table continues)

TABLE 1. Continued

Text	$r_{\text{SDO-students}}$ [a]	$r_{\text{SDO-parents}}$ [b]
because they have "friends in high places," so what? It's just natural.	.40	.29
12. Since so many members of minority groups end up in our jails, we should take strong steps to make sure prejudice plays no role in their treatment by the legal system.[c]	.22	.42
13. It is very important that women and members of visible minorities become police officers and move up in the ranks.[c]	.27	.35
14. The "one-person–one vote" idea is dumb. People who make bigger contributions to our society should get a lot more votes than those who do nothing.	.23	.25
Miscellaneous		
15. "Equality" is one of those nice-sounding names for suckers. Actually, only fools believe in it.	.52	.57
16. Equality is one of the fundamental principles of democracy, so we should work hard to increase it.[c]	.54	.55
17. Some groups just don't care about improving their lot, and don't deserve to be equal with others.	.48	.55
18. It is a huge mistake to treat everyone as equals. That will just encourage the shiftless, lazy people to coast along reaping the benefits of other people's hard work.	.45	.52
19. The biggest challenge before us is to create greater social justice for the disadvantaged in our country.[c]	.41	.39
20. Every human life is worth as much as every other human life.[c]	.41	.34
21. If everyone really were treated equally, I would get less and I would not like that.	.38	.40
22. No racial group is naturally inferior to any other. If a group does poorly, it is usually because of discrimination.[c]	.37	.38

Note. SDO = Social Dominance Orientation. [a]Numbers indicate correlations between responses to the items and SDO scores among 470 White students. [b]Numbers indicate correlations between responses to the items and SDO scores among 674 of the White students' parents. [c]The anti-equality response is to disagree.

time to make sure prejudice plays no role in our courts (Item 12). Important people should have more votes than others do (Item 14). Some human lives *are* worth less (Item 20), and some races are naturally inferior (Item 22). And if people were treated more equally, the social dominators would personally get less, which they would not like (Item 21).

In short, in social dominators' way of thinking, equality should not be a central value of our society or a goal toward which we should strive. To high SDOs, "equality" is a sucker-word in which only fools believe.

The data in Table 1 therefore suggest that social dominators' prejudice is not based so much on the philosophical or pragmatic objections to equality which one may hear from them, but on preference for an unfair and unjust social system that they believe benefits them.

I was not surprised by this peek into social dominators' minds, for I knew that the more points someone piles up on the SDO scale, the higher he usually scores on a balanced Personal Power, Meanness, and Dominance scale (Altemeyer, 1998, p. 74). Social dominators tend to agree with statements such as "Do you enjoy having the power to hurt people when they anger or disappoint you?" and "If you have power in a situation, you should use it however you have to to get your way," and "I will do my best to destroy anyone who deliberately blocks my plans and goals," while *disagreeing* with "It is much better to be loved than feared" and "Would it bother you if other people thought you were mean and pitiless?" Accordingly, social dominators' opposition to equality, and their many prejudices, seem based on a general drive for personal dominance. "It is a mistake to interfere with the law of the jungle; some people are meant to dominate others" says another item from the Personal Power, Meanness, and Dominance scale. Equality is antithetical to dominance, and social dominators want to dominate.

Social dominators also intend to proceed with relatively little moral restraint, as can be seen from their answers to a balanced Exploitive Manipulative Amoral Dishonesty scale that I also put together (Altemeyer, 1998, p. 78). Compared with others, relatively high-scoring SDO students and parents proved much more likely to agree with "There really is no such thing as 'right' and 'wrong;' It all boils down to what you can get away with" and "Basically, people are objects to be quietly and cooly manipulated for your own benefit," while *disagreeing* with "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you, and never do anything unfair to someone else," and "The end does NOT justify the means. If you can only get something by unfairness, lying, or hurting others, then give up trying."

Do you know such people: relatively intimidating, unsympathetic, untrusting and untrustworthy, vengeful, manipulative, and amoral people? It is undoubtedly unsympathetic to describe those who score highly on the SDO scale as such, but this is how they describe themselves, compared to others, when responding to the scale's items anonymously.

The Right-Wing Authoritarian

McFarland and Adelson (1996) also found that right-wing authoritarians (Altemeyer, 1981, 1988, 1996) were highly likely to be prejudiced. Such persons are (a) relatively submissive to those they consider the established authorities, (b) aggressive when they believe that authorities sanction the aggression, and (c) conventional. The construct is measured by the balanced 30-item Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) scale, which contains such items as "Our country desperately needs a mighty leader who will do what has to be done to destroy the radical new ways and sinfulness that are ruining us," "It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rabble-rousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people's minds," and "The 'old-fashioned ways' and 'old-fashioned values' still show the best way to live."[2]

We know quite a bit about right-wing authoritarians. Until the SDO scale came along, in fact, *High RWAs*, people in the top quartile of the distribution of RWA scores, got the nod for generally being the most prejudiced people around. Their hostility toward minorities appears to be instigated chiefly by fear, particularly of a dangerous, degenerating world. It seems that this impulse to attack is then disinhibited by self-righteousness and the perception that authorities approve of the aggression (Altemeyer, 1988, Chapter 5).

Obviously, high SDOs and high RWAs are usually cut from very different cloth. Social dominators want to dominate, and authoritarians are inclined to submit. Most high SDOs lack religious backgrounds and seldom darken a church's door, whereas most high RWAs are well schooled in their family's religion and still attend church regularly. Authoritarians are pretty dogmatic, but SDOs usually have little ideology to be dogmatic about. Social dominators' prejudice seems to spring from personal drives to dominate. Authoritarians' prejudice, as just mentioned, appears to arise largely from fear and self-righteousness. High SDOs often know that they are more prejudiced than others are. High RWAs usually do not realize that they are relatively prejudiced and lack self-insight in general.[3] Social dominators place highly on the "power-mad" and "manipulate, cheat and steal" scales. Authoritarians usually score low on them. SDO is mostly a "guy thing." The high end of the RWA scale distribution is filled with women and men equally.

Despite all these differences, one immediately grasps the mutual attraction between people who want to dominate and people willing to submit. This marriage of complementary inclinations is further promoted by many jointly held attitudes. Besides sharing racial, ethnic, sexist, and sexual orientation prejudices, both high SDOs and high RWAs tend to have conservative economic philosophies (Altemeyer, 1998) and tend to prefer right-wing political parties. Thus they will often find themselves allied on societal-economic-political issues.

As is often the case in real marriages, however, religious differences can jeopardize a happy union. The usually devout right-wing authoritarians will not knowingly plight their troth with people as amoral as social dominators tend to be. But RWAs can be their own worst enemies in this regard, because they are highly inclined to trust communicators who tell them what they want to hear (Altemeyer, 1996, pp. 104–112). So nonreligious SDOs can rather easily pass themselves off as true believers, donning sheep's clothing to take over the flock. And a few social dominators have nothing to fake, for they score highly on the RWA scale as well. These *Double Highs* are the subject of this paper.

Hign SDO–High RWA Personalities

The SDO and RWA scales pack so much predictive punch together when it comes to prejudice because they each have a solid relationship with such bias, but correlate only about .20 between themselves. They thus largely capture, with their two nets, persons prejudiced for different reasons. Still, a few people's prejudices have both social dominant and authoritarian sources.

But how can someone score relatively highly on both a measure of dominance and a measure of submission? Well, dominating individuals could rack up big scores on the RWA scale if they thought of themselves as the person to whom others should submit. How would Hitler have responded to the RWA scale item "Our country desperately needs a mighty leader who will do what has to be done to destroy …"? When I asked students to answer the SDO and RWA scales as they imagined Hitler would, his image produced almost the maximum possible score on *both* instruments (Altemeyer, 1998, pp. 79–80). You probably will not be surprised to learn that "Hitler" also rang the bell on the Personal Power, Meanness, and Dominance scale, and the Exploitive Manipulative Amoral Dishonesty measure.

Do double highs come along more than once in a nightmare, and are they really so venomous? I have given the two tests to many (Manitoba) samples over the past few years and have found that 5–10% of my respondents landed in the upper quartiles of both distributions—the criterion that I use to compare "high" with "low" scorers on such continuous variables.[4] The more I have found out about this small (and largely male) group, the greater the threat they seem to pose to democracy.

Method

Participants and Procedures

Most of my studies involve that constantly restocked population on whom so much psychological knowledge is based: introductory psychology students. I typically approach them, and test them, during a regular class meeting, telling

them my study involves answering surveys about "various social issues" by blackening little bubbles on a response sheet. They are rewarded for their participation with meager coin, experimental credits worth about 1% of their grade in the course. Despite this paltry payment, they usually volunteer in hordes; if a section carries 300 students on its lists, usually about 240 show up for the study. If I catch them at the beginning of the course, their cooperation and diligence is amazing. I then give a feedback lecture toward the end of the course, which my own students often flail as the worst class of the year.

To provide at least some check on the obvious dangers of studying just introductory psychology students, I repeat most of my searches in a population that is almost as captive: their parents. Students are invited to take home a booklet and two answer sheets for their progenitors' consideration. An accompanying letter explains that their student–child will receive a small part of the introductory psychology grade if the parents participate, but the student can earn this small part in lots of other ways. Parents are asked to participate only if they freely wish to. Perhaps because their own genes are usually at stake, parents overwhelmingly come through for their kids, with over an 80% response rate. (For ethical reasons, students with only one parent are allowed to substitute an aunt, uncle, and so on for a missing father or mother, respectively. But over 90% of the completed answer sheets have come from the actual moms and dads.)

I have never detected a self-selection bias in the parents' data—judging from what their children are like (Altemeyer, 1988, pp. 21–24). Both the students and their parents serve anonymously. The students write down a "secret number" of their choosing on the answer sheets, and the parents use the same number, so that responses from the same household (and later studies) can be combined.

The typical booklet in my studies begins with the Religious Fundamentalism scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992, 2004), because religious opinions tend to be very well-organized, and their firmness of belief helps respondents build resistance to "yea-saying" response sets (Altemeyer, 1981, Chapter 2). The RWA and SDO scales then usually follow. Other instruments ensue, with seemingly innocuous surveys preceding measures, such as prejudice scales, that might be powerfully affected by social desirability. After completing the booklet, respondents are typically asked some "demographic" questions about their religious background, political preferences, and so on, printed on the back of the bubble sheet.

Virtually all of the scales that I use in my research are balanced against direction-of-wording effects. The level of interitem correlation on a measure varies according to the "single-mindedness" of its items. Thus, religion scales cohere appreciably more than a wide-ranging instrument such as the RWA scale does. But the Cronbach's alpha reliabilities of all the tests reported in the present article usually land between .85 and .92.

For further information on these procedures and the results of experiments that varied such factors as location of scales within a booklet, time of year of testing, and degree of anonymity, see Altemeyer (1996, Chapter 2).

Results

Double Highs and Prejudice

If this research program mainly involves persons anonymously filling in little bubbles on an optical scan sheet, what have these hundreds of thousands of black marks told us about Double Highs? I have often asked students and their parents to answer the Manitoba Ethnocentrism scale (Altemeyer, 1996, pp. 24–25)—a broadband measure of prejudice against sundry minorities. Among its 20 items you will find "Arabs are too emotional, and don't fit in well in our country"; "Black people are, by their nature, more violent and 'primitive' than others"; and the contraits (for which the prejudiced answer is disagreement), "Jews can be trusted as much as everyone else," and "Canada should open its doors to more immigration from Latin America."

Table 2 and Table 3 show the mean scores on this measure in eight studies of anonymously answering white Manitoba students and their parents by (a) the "High SDO–High RWAs," (b) the rest of the High SDOs, (c) the rest of the High RWAs, and (d) the rest of the sample. In every case, the High SDO–High RWAs had the highest prejudice scores of all—significantly higher than any other group when you combine all the students, and ditto for the parents. (You need thumping big Ns to get statistically significant differences between about 8% of a sample and another small part [e.g., "the rest of the High SDOs"] that scores nearly as highly.)

High SDO–High RWAs are thus very biased people, more accepting of stereotypes and more hostile toward a wide range of minorities than even the rest of the social dominators and more so than the rest of the authoritarians. We would expect this, given that both social dominance and authoritarianism have solid, but largely independent correlations with Manitoba Ethnocentrism scores (usually in the low .60s for SDO and in the low .40s for RWA). As noted earlier in the present article, being high in *both* traits should increase the chances that a person is more prejudiced than someone who scores highly on just one.[5]

If this is clear, you can see in Table 4 that the same pattern showed up when I measured, with balanced scales, hostility toward homosexuals (Altemeyer, 1996, pp. 26–27; e.g., "Homosexuals should be locked up to protect society"; see also Altemeyer, 2001). Table 5 in turn reveals this reoccurring pattern in attitudes toward sexual harassment (e.g., "Most charges of sexual harassment are frivolous or vindictive"), attitudes toward feminism (e.g., "Women will get unfair advantages in the workplace if feminism gets its way"), attitudes toward women in general (e.g., "Over the past few years, women have gotten more from the

TABLE 2. Mean Scores on the Manitoba Ethnocentrism Scale for University of Manitoba Introductory Psychology Students

Sample subdivisions	Autumn 1996 ($N = 362$)	Autumn 1997 ($N = 1,327$)	Autumn 1998 ($N = 1,135$)	Autumn 1999 ($N = 439$)
High SDO-High RWAs	90.2[a]	93.2[b]	94.8[b]	95.2[b]
Rest of the High SDOs	86.5	77.3	78.2	82.4
Rest of the High RWAs	67.5	68.1	69.6	71.8
Rest of the Sample	55.4	54.9	55.6	56.7

Note. High RWA = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Right-Wing Authoritarianism scores. High SDO = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Social Dominance Orientation scores. Generally, about 8% of a sample score in the top quartile on both the SDO and RWA scales (the *High SDO-High RWAs* in the present article). About 18% of a sample score in the top quartile on the SDO scale but not in the top quartile of the RWA scale (*Rest of the High SDOs*). A similar percentage scores in the top quartile of the RWA scale but not in the top quartile of the SDO scale (*Rest of the High RWAs*). The remainder of a sample, usually about 56%, is called the *Rest of the Sample* and are neither High SDOs nor High RWAs.
[a]The mean for the High SDO-High RWA participants is not significantly higher ($p < .05$) than the mean for the Rest of the High SDOs but is significantly higher than the other two means.
[b]The mean for the High SDO-High RWA participants is significantly higher ($p < .05$) than those of any of the other subdivisions of the sample by a one-tailed test.

government than they deserve"), and attitudes toward Quebec Francophones (e.g., "The French in Quebec are selfish, spoiled and greedy"). High SDO–High RWAs showed more animosity toward these diverse groups than did any other subdivision of the sample.

Understanding that, you can predict what happened when I administered a balanced Militia scale that I have developed to measure the beliefs of the armed bands that helped inspire the Oklahoma City bombing. This 16-item measure includes statements such as "Our federal government has been taken over by Jews, feminists, homosexuals and Communist types," "Powerful elements of the federal government are determined to take all the guns and fighting spirit from the people so they can enslave us," and "We could really use a strong, manly leader, such as Hitler was for Germany in the 1930s, to get rid of the cancerous troublemakers and lead us through the crisis ahead." (See Altemeyer, 1998, p. 67, for an early 12-item version of this scale.) Nearly all the students and parents who scored comparatively highly in "militia attitudes" were either High SDOs or High RWAs or both. Again, as an investigator would expect, the "boths" always scored higher than any other group.

The data in Table 2 through Table 6 thus lend themselves to easy summary. Social dominance and authoritarianism each has its own connection to prejudice.

TABLE 3. Mean Scores on the Manitoba Ethnocentrism Scale for Parents of University of Manitoba Introductory Psychology Students

Sample subdivisions	Autumn 1996 ($N = 239$)	January 1997 ($N = 331$)	January 1998 ($N = 373$)	Autumn 1998 ($N = 674$)
High SDO-High RWAs	96.0[a]	106.6[b]	98.6[a]	101.5[b]
Rest of the High SDOs	89.5	91.9	94.2	90.8
Rest of the High RWAs	78.9	79.3	82.3	74.7
Rest of the Sample	61.8	65.9	64.8	64.1

Note. High RWA = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Right-Wing Authoritarianism scores. High SDO = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Social Dominance Orientation scores. Generally, about 8% of a sample score in the top quartile on both the SDO and RWA scales (the *High SDO-High RWAs* in the present article). About 18% of a sample score in the top quartile on the SDO scale but not in the top quartile of the RWA scale (*Rest of the High SDOs*). A similar percentage scores in the top quartile of the RWA scale but not in the top quartile of the SDO scale (*Rest of the High RWAs*). The remainder of a sample, usually about 56%, is called the *Rest of the Sample* and are neither High SDOs nor High RWAs.
[a]The mean for the High SDO-High RWA participants is not significantly higher ($p < .05$) than the mean for the Rest of the High SDOs but is significantly higher than the other two means.
[b]The mean for the High SDO-High RWA participants is significantly higher ($p < .05$) than those of any of the other subdivisions of the sample by a one-tailed test.

So persons who score highly in both get an extra helping of racism, sexism, homophobia, etc., and appear to be the most prejudiced group investigators have found. But if we are now prepared to give Double Highs the gold medal at the prejudice Olympics, two paradoxes loom about Double Highs that need to be addressed.

The First Paradox: Dominate or Submit?

First, if High SDOs usually want to dominate others, while High RWAs typically prefer submitting to authority, what do High SDO–High RWAs want to do? I suggested earlier that some people might score highly on the RWA scale when they want people to submit to them. Is there evidence that this is true? Do Double Highs seek power, as ordinary High SDOs do, or do they tend to be less assertive, as do RWAs?

In 1997, I asked a group of students, at the end of a booklet, "How much *power, ability to make adults do what you want*, do you want to have when you are 40 years old?" Respondents chose from six alternatives ranging from 0 = *It does not matter at all to me. If I have no power over adults when I am 40, I will not care* to 5 = *My goal is to have a very great deal of power, being one of the real 'movers and shakers' in our country.* Overall, SDO scores correlated modestly but significantly (.36) with desires for power, while RWA did not (.07).

TABLE 4. Mean Scores on a Measure of Hostility Toward Homosexuals

Sample subdivisions	Students			January 1998 (N = 373)	Parents	
	Autumn 1997 (N = 287)	Autumn 1998 (N = 218)	Autumn 1999 (N = 439)		Autumn 1998 (N = 674)	Autumn 1999 (N = 634)
High SDO-High RWAs	62.8[a]	63.4[a]	59.7[b]	66.8[a]	65.4[b]	60.5[b]
Rest of the High SDOs	42.7	42.8	33.2	54.2	44.8	40.2
Rest of the High RWAs	57.3	55.2	48.8	59.0	53.0	55.2
Rest of the Sample	26.6	24.6	22.8	37.7	31.3	29.7

Note. High RWA = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Right-Wing Authoritarianism scores. High SDO = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Social Dominance Orientation scores.
[a]The High SDO-High RWA mean is significantly higher than all the others except that of the Rest of the High RWAs. [b]The High SDO-High RWA mean is significantly higher ($p < .05$) than that of any of the others by a one-tailed test.

TABLE 5. Mean Scores on Various Measures of Hostility Toward Women and Toward French Canadians

Sample subdivisions	Attitude toward sexual harassment	Attitude toward feminism	Attitude toward women		Attitude toward Quebecois
	Parents	Students	Students		Students
	January 1997 ($N = 331$)	Autumn 1997 ($N = 454$)	Autumn 1998 ($N = 218$)	Autumn 1999 ($N = 439$)	Autumn 1997 ($N = 350$)
High SDO-High RWAs	71.1[a]	109.2[b]	31.8[b]	30.7[b]	66.2[a]
Rest of the High SDOs	68.9	95.6	26.0	27.5	61.8
Rest of the High RWAs	54.9	94.8	25.1	24.2	60.1
Rest of the Sample	50.2	76.0	19.3	18.8	56.2

Note. High RWA = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Right-Wing Authoritarianism scores. High SDO = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Social Dominance Orientation scores.
[a]The High SDO-High RWA mean is significantly higher than all the others except that of the Rest of the High SDOs. [b]The High SDO-High RWA mean is significantly higher ($p < .05$) than that of any of the others by a one-tailed test.

TABLE 6. Mean Scores on the Militia Scale

	Students		Parents	
Sample subdivisions	Autumn 1997 ($N = 454$)	Autumn 1998 ($N = 470$)	January 1998 ($N = 373$)	Autumn 1998 ($N = 674$)
High SDO-High RWAs	63.2[a]	55.9[a]	55.5[b]	64.5[a]
Rest of the High SDOs	43.2	48.3	53.1	50.6
Rest of the High RWAs	49.9	45.8	49.6	48.0
Rest of the Sample	40.5	38.5	38.8	37.3

Note. High RWA = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Right-Wing Authoritarianism scores. High SDO = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Social Dominance Orientation scores.
[a]The High SDO-High RWA mean is significantly higher ($p < .05$) than that of any of the others by a one-tailed test. [b]The High SDO-High RWA mean is significantly higher than all the others except that of the Rest of the High SDOs.

TABLE 7. Mean Scores on Measures of Personal Dominance

	Power at Age 40?		"Power Mad" Scale	
	Students		Parents	Students
Sample subdivisions	Autumn 1997 ($N = 397$)	Autumn 1998 ($N = 1,123$)	January 1997 ($N = 331$)	Autumn 1998 ($N = 470$)
High SDO-High RWAs	2.87[a]	2.16[a]	36.4[a]	43.2[a]
Rest of the High SDOs	2.46	2.31	39.6	43.9
Rest of the High RWAs	1.41	1.45	20.1	26.6
Rest of the Sample	1.73	1.66	21.3	26.7

Note. High RWA = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Right-Wing Authoritarianism scores. High SDO = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Social Dominance Orientation scores.
[a]The High SDO-High RWA mean is not significantly different from the mean for the Rest of the High SDOs, but both are significantly higher ($p < .05$) than any of the others by a one-tailed test.

At the low end of the scale, 79 of 397 students indicated they would not mind if they had no power at age 40, but none of the Double Highs said this. At the high end of the scale, 18 students checked 5, the *mover and shaker* option. Of them, 7 (39%) were High SDO–High RWAs, who only constituted 8% of the sample. In terms of overall means, as shown in Table 7, Double Highs and the rest of

the High SDOs both scored higher than the rest of the High RWAs (and the rest of the sample) but not significantly higher than one another. Repeating the experiment in 1998 produced essentially the same result. So Double Highs look like the rest of the social dominators in wanting personal power and do not resemble the rest of the High RWAs, who show little drive for dominance.

I also collected responses from 331 parents in 1997 to the Personal Power, Meanness, and Dominance scale mentioned earlier. SDO scores proved strongly associated (.59) with these attitudes, while RWA responses did not (.11). Table 7 reveals that Double Highs and the rest of the social dominators again had significantly higher means than the rest of the authoritarians, and the rest of the sample. I gathered 470 student responses to this "Power Mad" scale in the fall of 1998, with the same general finding.

Pursuing the issue from a third angle, these same students, and most of their parents, answered the Social Inequality scale presented in Table 1. As mentioned earlier, SDO scores correlated .72 for students and .76 for parents with summed social inequality scores. The RWA scale pulled in much lower values of .24 and .29, respectively. In both samples, as one can see in Table 8, the High SDO–High RWAs most favored inequality, once again looking much more like social dominators than the rest of the authoritarians.

So what can we conclude? Social dominators as a group live up to their billing: they want power, they want to dominate, and they want inequality. In contrast, right-wing authoritarians as a group show little desire for these things. Those persons high in both traits *could* be like most authoritarians. But instead,

TABLE 8. Mean Scores on the Social Inequality Scale

	Social Inequality	
	Students	Parents
Sample subdivisions	Autumn 1998 (N = 470)	Autumn 1998 (N = 674)
High SDO-High RWAs	110.3[a]	110.6[b]
Rest of the High SDOs	104.0	108.9
Rest of the High RWAs	78.0	75.8
Rest of the Sample	72.4	71.0

Note. High RWA = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Right-Wing Authoritarianism scores. High SDO = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Social Dominance Orientation scores.
[a]The High SDO-High RWA mean is significantly higher ($p < .05$) than any of the others by a one-tailed test. [b]The High SDO-High RWA mean is not significantly different from the mean for the Rest of the High SDOs, but both are significantly higher ($p < .05$) than any of the others by a one-tailed test.

Double Highs clearly resemble the rest of the social dominators. They want to control others. They believe in submission, but they want to be the ones submitted to.

The Second Paradox: How Religious Are Double Highs?

The second puzzlement concerns religion. Social dominators are usually indifferent to spiritual matters, while authoritarians tend to be strong, active believers. What do dominating authoritarians do? Can persons so notably inclined to hurting and dominating others be religious at the same time?

"Being religious" has many meanings, and I have again approached the question from several angles. In 1999, I asked samples of both students and parents to indicate, on a 0–6 scale, 20 different ways the family religion might have been emphasized to them as they grew up (such as how often they went to church and how often they prayed at home; see Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1997, pp. 33–34). SDO correlated .02 with reports of childhood religious emphasis in both samples. The correlations between RWA and reports of childhood religious emphasis proved much stronger: .60 for the students, and .45 for the parents. The means displayed in Table 9 indicate that most students and most parents in the samples had rather nonreligious upbringings. But Double Highs came from relatively strong religious backgrounds, as did the rest of the High RWAs.

In 1998 I asked both students and parents how religious they thought they were by answering four questions on a 0–6 scale: "How religious (in the usual, traditional sense in our society) would you say you are in terms of your *beliefs* (in God, heaven, etc.)?"; "To what extent do you take traditional religious teachings into account when *deciding how to act* in various situations?"; "How religious (in the usual, traditional sense in our society) would you say your *behavior* is? To what extent do you act the way traditional religious beliefs say one should?"; and "To what extent do you think traditional religious beliefs make you *better* than you would otherwise be?" Among the students, the sum of these self-perceptions correlated –.07 with social dominance and .62 with authoritarianism. The figures for the parents were .00 and .55. Table 9 reveals that Double Highs said that they were pretty religious and that their beliefs appreciably affected their behavior—not as much as the rest of the High RWAs indicated, but significantly more than one ordinarily finds in High SDOs.

How about the simple act of going to church? I routinely ask samples how often they attend church in an average month. The data from my fall 1999 studies are quite typical: church attendance correlated –.06 with SDO and .56 with RWA among the students and –.07 and .49, respectively, among parents. Table 9 shows that High RWAs attend church almost weekly, while social dominators attend less than once a month, on the average. Double Highs report going to church relatively often, although their means fall significantly short of those of ordinary authoritarians.

What about religious fundamentalism, measured by a balanced 20-item

TABLE 9. Mean Scores on Measures of Religious Emphasis in Childhood, Self-Perceptions of Religiousness, and Frequency of Church Attendance

Sample subdivisions	Religious Emphasis		Self-Perception		Church Attendance	
	Students	Parents	Students	Parents	Students	Parents
	Autumn 1999 ($N = 439$)	Autumn 1999 ($N = 634$)	Autumn 1998 ($N = 1,018$)	Autumn 1998 ($N = 674$)	Autumn 1999 ($N = 1,135$)	Autumn 1999 ($N = 634$)
High SDO-High RWAs	48.6[a]	61.0[b]	11.6[a]	15.7[a]	2.00[a]	2.54[a]
Rest of the High SDOs	25.6	32.2	7.4	10.8	0.42	0.91
Rest of the High RWAs	60.2	59.6	15.8	17.7	3.25	3.17
Rest of the Sample	22.1	32.1	7.9	11.5	0.60	1.55

Note. High RWA = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Right-Wing Authoritarianism scores. High SDO = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Social Dominance Orientation scores.
[a]The High SDO-High RWA mean is significantly higher than that of the Rest of the High SDOs and the Rest of the Sample, but it is significantly lower than that of the Rest of the High RWAs. [b]The High SDO-High RWA mean is significantly higher than all the others except that of the Rest of the High RWAs.

scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; see also Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004) containing statements such as "God has given mankind a complete, unfailing guide to happiness and salvation, which must be totally followed" and "There is no body of teachings, or set of scriptures, which is completely without error"? SDO scores usually correlate less than .10 with Religious Fundamentalism scale responses, while RWA scores correlate by about .75. Table 10 reveals that Double Highs have much more fundamentalist attitudes than ordinary social dominators do, although they are not as fundamentalist as the rest of the High RWAs.

The data in Table 9 and Table 10 answer our question about the religiousness of Double Highs with considerable concordance. They have stronger religious backgrounds than most people do. They see themselves as being more religious than most people do. They go to church more often than most people do. They are more likely to be religious fundamentalists than most people are. In all these regards, they resemble the (even more religious) ordinary right-wing authoritarians. They certainly appear more religious than ordinary High SDOs.

Further Insights Into Double Highs' Personalities

As we scrutinize High SDO–High RWAs then, they can be viewed through one lens as (atypical) right-wing authoritarians who have a strong drive to dominate others. In fact, they are indistinguishable from the rest of the social dominators in this regard. Viewed through another lens, High SDO–High RWAs are (atypical) social dominators who are religious—although not as highly religious as ordinary authoritarians. What else can we discern about them, to see them in the round?

TABLE 10. Mean Scores on Measure of Religious Fundamentalism

	Students		Parents	
Sample subdivisions	Autumn 1997 (N = 688)	Autumn 1999 (N = 955)	January 1998 (N = 373)	Autumn 1999 (N = 634)
High SDO-High RWAs	94.6[a]	104.5[a]	95.1[a]	102.9[a]
Rest of the High SDOs	65.4	63.6	70.4	67.0
Rest of the High RWAs	103.0	117.9	114.6	112.4
Rest of the Sample	59.8	61.3	63.9	76.0

Note. High RWA = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Right-Wing Authoritarianism scores. High SDO = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Social Dominance Orientation scores.
[a]The High SDO-High RWA mean is significantly higher than that of the Rest of the High SDOs and the Rest of the Sample, but it is significantly lower than that of the Rest of the High RWAs.

Does the religiousness of dominating authoritarians translate into morality? The drive for dominance in them suggests no; their religiousness suggests yes. If we look at answers to the Exploitive Manipulative Amoral Dishonesty scale mentioned earlier, we find that these scores correlated .59 with SDO and –.08 with RWA among students, and .53 and .11, respectively, among parents in studies summarized in Table 11. Our usual breakdown of the data shows that High SDO–High RWAs resemble the rest of the dominators more than they look like the rest of the authoritarians. They may think of themselves as being religious and go to church more than most people do, but they believe in lying, cheating, and manipulating much more than the rest of the congregation does.

Furthermore, Double Highs' answers to two of the Exploitive Manipulative Amoral Dishonesty items are particularly revealing. The first item says "The best reason for belonging to a church is to project a good image and have contact with some of the important people in your community." Table 11 shows that Double Highs endorsed that sentiment as much as the rest of the social dominators did. The second item lowers the mask that Double Highs present to the public: "It is more important to create a good image of yourself in the minds of others than to actually be the person others think you are." Look at Table 11 and see where the Double Highs landed.

However, if we become as cynical about Double Highs' religiousness as they may be, and conclude that it makes no difference in their lives, we would be wrong. Unfortunately, the discernable effects can be more negative than positive. Consider a balanced 16-item Religious Ethnocentrism scale that I recently developed (Altemeyer, 2003b). It contains such items as "If it were possible, I'd rather have a job where I worked with people with the same religious views I have, rather than with people with different views;" "All people may be entitled to their own religious beliefs, but I don't want to associate with people whose views are quite different from my own;" and "Non-Christian religions have a lot of weird beliefs and pagan ways that Christians should avoid having any contact with." Religious ethnocentrism correlates in the high .70s with right-wing authoritarianism and in the low .20s with social dominance among students. The values for parent samples run about .70 and about .30, respectively. Table 12 reveals that ordinary social dominators discriminate only modestly on religious grounds while ordinary authoritarians do so rather massively. So do Double Highs.

Or consider dogmatism, which I measure with a balanced 20-item DOG scale that includes such items as "The things I believe in are so completely true, I could never doubt them" and "There are no discoveries or facts that could possibly make me change my mind about the things that matter most in life" (Altemeyer, 1996, pp. 204–205; Altemeyer, 2002). DOG scores correlate about .60 with RWA and about .20 with SDO. Table 13 reveals that Double Highs resemble the highly dogmatic right-wing authoritarians much more than they do the less dogmatic social dominators.

TABLE 11. Summed Score on the Exploitive Manipulative Amoral Dishonesty Scale and on Two Particular Items

Sample subdivisions	Sum EMAD		Religion Item		Image Item	
	Students Autumn 2000 ($N = 371$)	Parents January 1997 ($N = 331$)	Students Autumn 2000 ($N = 371$)	Parents January 1997 ($N = 331$)	Students Autumn 2000 ($N = 371$)	Parents January 1997 ($N = 331$)
High SDO-High RWAs	78.9[a]	70.7[a]	4.46[a]	3.08[a]	4.42[a]	5.40[b]
Rest of the High SDOs	87.9	78.6	3.86	3.82	4.56	4.16
Rest of the High RWAs	55.6	50.7	2.90	2.03	3.24	3.30
Rest of the Sample	63.3	49.0	3.02	1.98	3.51	3.05

Note. EMAD = Exploitive Manipulative Amoral Dishonesty Scale. High RWA = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Right-Wing Authoritarianism scores. High SDO = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Social Dominance Orientation scores.
[a]The High SDO-High RWA mean is significantly higher than all the others except that of the Rest of the High SDOs. [b]The High SDO-High RWA mean is significantly ($p < .05$) higher than any of the others by a one-tailed test.

TABLE 12. Mean Scores on Measure of Religious Ethnocentrism

	Students		Parents	
Sample subdivisions	Autumn 1998 ($N = 218$)	Autumn 1999 ($N = 439$)	Autumn 1998 ($N = 674$)	Autumn 1999 ($N = 634$)
High SDO-High RWAs	76.9[a]	73.3[a]	76.9[b]	78.4[a]
Rest of the High SDOs	49.8	46.7	58.3	50.6
Rest of the High RWAs	72.9	71.6	70.2	75.4
Rest of the Sample	38.4	38.6	35.7	44.6

Note. High RWA = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Right-Wing Authoritarianism scores. High SDO = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Social Dominance Orientation scores.
[a]The High SDO-High RWA mean is significantly higher than all the others except that of the Rest of the High RWAs. [b]The High SDO-High RWA mean is significantly ($p < .05$) higher than any of the others by a one-tailed test.

TABLE 13. Mean Scores on Measure of Dogmatism

	Students	Parents
Sample subdivisions	Autumn 1999 ($N = 364$)	Autumn 2000 ($N = 440$)
High SDO-High RWAs	100.4[a]	91.4[b]
Rest of the High SDOs	73.8	72.6
Rest of the High RWAs	112.3	100.0
Rest of the Sample	62.1	65.4

Note. High RWA = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Right-Wing Authoritarianism scores. High SDO = person in the top quartile of the distribution of Social Dominance Orientation scores.
[a]The High SDO-High RWA mean is significantly higher than that of the Rest of the High SDOs and the Rest of the Sample, but it is significantly lower than that of the Rest of the High RWAs. [b]The High SDO-High RWA mean is significantly higher than all the others except that of the Rest of the High RWAs.

Discussion

You may have been struck, as I have been as I have worked through these analyses, at how often High SDO–High RWAs alloy the least attractive qualities of each trait. Here's what I mean. The lack of assertiveness in most right-wing authoritarians could at least moderate Double Highs' drive to dominate others.

But Table 7 and Table 8 show that it does not. Similarly the greater religiousness (Table 9 and Table 10) of Double Highs could trump social dominators' Machiavellian attitudes toward power. But Table 11 shows that High SDO–High RWAs are nearly as exploitive and amoral as ordinary SDOs are, and that to a certain extent, their "religiousness" is something of a pose.

All right then, at least the social dominator in Double Highs would not care very much what religion someone belonged to. But Table 12 shows that the religious ethnocentrism of their authoritarian side "rules" in Double Highs. Similarly, how dogmatic will High SDO–High RWAs be, if most social dominators are not very dogmatic, and most authoritarians are? They turn out to be pretty dogmatic.

It does not have to be that way. Theoretically there might be High SDO–High RWAs who are nondomineering, deeply religious, moral, ecumenical, and open-minded. Or if that is too much to hope for, things could at least cancel each other out: Double-Highs could be neither dominating nor submissive, have ordinary attitudes toward lying, cheating, and manipulating, hold few religious prejudices, and so on. But instead they confoundedly fuse most of the worst of both worlds.

How do people get that way? Generally speaking, psychologists think behavior results from the interaction of genetic and environmental factors. The genetic basis of right-wing authoritarianism remains unclear (Altemeyer, 1996, pp. 69–75; but see also McCourt, Bouchard, Lykken, Tellegen, & Keyes, 1999). We can however make rather good predictions of how authoritarian university students will be if we know what sorts of experiences they have had in life with authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism (Altemeyer, 1988, Chapter 3).

I have been trying for four years to identify the experiences in life that might provide a "nurture" explanation of social dominance. Social-dominator students indicate very clearly that they were not usually *taught,* by parents or other important adults in their lives, to have socially dominant attitudes. On the other hand, they do say their experiences in life have taught them such things as "It has been my experience that life is a jungle. You either dominate others, or they will dominate you," and "I have taken advantage of 'suckers' at times, and it felt great." However, so far SDO scores have proven much less explainable by reports of such experiences (*r*s land in the .50s), than RWA scores have been by reports of experiences with authoritarian submission, and so on (*r*s in the low .70s). Maybe tomorrow someone will find the key experiences that I have missed. But at this point the evidence suggests that social dominance is less experiential in origin, and hence more directly biological, than authoritarianism is. Certainly we have evidence that social dominance can be genetically bred in other species.

Implications

Whatever the origin, dominating authoritarians constitute only a small part of the population. Why all this fuss? Well, High SDO–High RWAs seem to be

the people most likely to mobilize and lead extremist right-wing movements in North America. Like other social dominators, they would likely reach for the top in an organization that would bring them power. And ordinary right-wing authoritarians would be glad to let them have the job and submit to them.

One cannot easily administer personality tests to extremist groups, but this prediction has been supported in three studies of more ordinary folk. Son Hing, Bobocel, and Zanna (2002) assigned female university students as subordinates to a female confederate who played the role of a High SDO who advocated polluting a foreign country and exploiting its workers during an "in-basket" management exercise. High RWA students proved more likely to agree to this solution than Low RWAs did.

In a follow-up study that also involved just women, the experimenters created dyads of Low SDO with Low RWA women, or Low SDO with High RWA coeds, or High SDO with Low RWA women, or High SDO with High RWA coeds. The women in each dyad had to negotiate between themselves who would be the leader of their team in solving various business problems. High SDOs proved significantly more likely than Low SDOs to claim the job, and they had a particularly easy time getting it when paired with High RWAs.

The third test of this model was rooted in an experiment that I ran in 1994 using a simulation of the earth's future called the Global Change Game (Altemeyer, 1996, pp. 130–136). On one night the planet's supposed future was determined by 67 students who had all scored in the bottom quartile of the RWA scale distribution. These Low RWAs eschewed warfare, and instead entered into an unprecedented amount of interregional cooperation that resulted in a relatively stable, prosperous, environmentally friendly future—although 400 million succumbed to starvation and disease over the 40 years of the simulation.

On the next night, 68 High RWAs had their chance to make history. The High RWA game ended dramatically in a nuclear holocaust that killed everyone. Given a second chance, the players again produced a tragedy, with famine, disease, and conventional wars killing 2.1 billion people.

I had not gathered SDO scores in this 1994 study, so I can only speculate that there were probably *some* Double Highs present on the second night. In 1998, I made their presence the independent variable in a replication of the Global Change Game experiment. On the first night the world was populated entirely by High RWAs, but with *no* High SDOs present. At the beginning of the game, when the teams in each region of the earth are asked to produce a leader by personal self-nomination, no one stood up for 15 seconds, and it took 40 seconds for each region to get its "volunteer"—the last being physically pushed to her feet by her region-mates. Once the play had begun, the leaders spent most of their time in their own groups, which devoted themselves to solving their various economic, social, and environmental problems in isolation from the rest of the world. The poorest regions became swamped by their difficulties, but they got a little help from Europe and North America. The High RWAs were particularly plagued by

an inability to deal with population growth. By the end of 40 years, 1.9 billion people had perished from starvation and disease—but not from warfare. The regions usually kept their armies, even when millions were dying, but strictly for defensive reasons. Nobody ever threatened anybody else. The prevailing attitude in military matters, as well as in economic and environmental ones, seemed to be "You don't bother us, we won't bother you."

In the next night's game, the world was again populated entirely by High RWAs, but by manipulating the sign-up booklets I had steered seven students who were also High SDOs into this simulation. Each Double High was allocated to a different region, and when the time for self-nominations for leader came, one of the Double Highs immediately leapt to his feet. Within 12 s, every region had its leader, and the leaders included four of the seven Double Highs in the room. Of the three who did not claim the prize, one remained completely unnoticeable throughout the simulation, one quickly attached himself to his region's leader and made it a "leadership team," and the third staged a coup "back home" halfway through the simulation.

The leaders on this Night of the Double Highs spent very little time in their regions, concentrating their efforts instead on negotiating with one another. Economic alliances came and went with the wind, while back in the regions the ordinary High RWAs struggled, as their predecessors had the night before, to solve their area's problems. Because of all the wheeling and dealing, the world did not collapse as dramatically as it had 24 hr earlier. But several regions had been playing the "military card" from the start, threatening weaker regions with war if various concessions were not granted. Eventually "Oceana" bought nuclear weapons and declared war on defenseless India, which immediately surrendered and paid tribute from its meager coffers. The Double-High Oceana leader pulled off this bloodless victory strictly on his own, since his fellow regionaires were against going to war. But they did nothing to stop him.

At this point, North America offered "protection" to whoever would pay for it; and when the preset 40-year time limit of the game expired, nuclear war seemed imminent. The call to arms had exacerbated many unsolved problems around the globe, and 1.6 billion people had died from starvation and disease by the game's end. (See Altemeyer, 2003a, for a more complete description of this experiment.)

Let us be cautious. Although the Global Change Game is a fairly sophisticated simulation, it cannot begin to approximate the complications of the real world. Nor are Canadian introductory psychology students exactly representative of the earth's population. But I am sure you saw some familiar themes, and heard some historical echoes, in this last study. It seems that ordinary High RWAs have a profound ethnocentrism and fearfulness that isolates them on "islands" even in a room filled with other High RWAs. And they do not burst with a longing to take charge any more than they burst with new ideas when old mind-sets prove disastrous. Double Highs, on the other hand, quickly take command and charge into

competition against one another. The game is strictly King of the Hill, and to a notable extent they appear to proceed without charity or scruples. With such submissive folks under them, the Double Highs can pretty much do whatever they want.

High SDO–High RWAs' biggest problem in taking over a political movement will likely be handling the other social dominators lining up for the job of ruling submissive, frightened High RWAs yearning for a "mighty leader." Double Highs, like other High SDOs, share the conservative economic philosophies, right-wing political preferences, and racial/ethnic/sexual orientation/sexist prejudices that most rank-and-file authoritarians have. But in addition, they would be religiously acceptable to High RWAs, would share their religious prejudices as well, and would be similarly dogmatic. Ordinary SDOs have to fake most of these, and some could doubtless carry it off. But Double Highs appear to provide a "perfect match" for right-wing authoritarians.

Once in control of a school prayer, or antihomosexual, or antiimmigration, or antifeminist, or antiabortion, or anti-gun-control movement—not to mention a militia force—Double Highs can pose a serious threat. For they lead people who are uninclined to think for themselves, are gullible towards leaders of their "in-group," are brimming with self-righteousness and zeal, and are fain to give dictatorship a chance. Such a group could all show up at a local meeting, or a nominating convention, or a *putsch*, and have a far greater impact than their numbers warrant.

Their leader is apt to be a High SDO–High RWA. We have seen them in action before, to our sorrow. We might be wise to develop an understanding of their psychological makeup.

NOTES

1. Pratto et al. (1994) developed another measure of social dominance orientation besides the 14-item version. The second, 16 items long, focuses on attitudes toward *group* equality (e.g., "Some groups of people are just more worthy than others" versus "Some people are just more worthy than others"). The two measures correlated highly (.81) in a 1998 study that I did of 373 Manitoba parents, but not so completely as to be isomorphic. The "group" measure had slightly better psychometric properties and slightly stronger correlations with ethnocentrism, hostility toward homosexuals, and "militia sentiments." Nevertheless I have used the shorter, "non-group" version because I think it is a better measure of the *personally* dominating personality, and a little less vulnerable to the tautological criticism that "naturally a scale that measures how one feels about equality is going to correlate with intergroup prejudice."

2. I have recently distilled a 20-item version of the RWA scale that covers the same content area, has the same psychometric properties, and produces the same empirical correlations as the 30-item form. It consists of Items 3 through 16, 23, 30, then 19 through 22 on pages 49–51 of Altemeyer (1998). But the results presented in the present article are based on the full 30-item measure.

3. I have developed a balanced 20-item RWA Self-Awareness scale, based upon Altemeyer (1996), pp. 300–302, that asks respondents to indicate the extent to which they do certain things that we know right-wing authoritarians are rather likely to do. Half of the

items are worded such that the socially desirable response is to agree (e.g. "I would never accept illegal abuses of power by government authorities") while the "good" answer to the other ten items is to disagree (e.g., "I tend to be more dogmatic than most people"). Even in samples of over 300 students or parents answering anonymously, RWA scale scores do not correlate significantly with *any* of these items. All the statements are demonstrably true of right-wing authoritarians, often powerfully, but the high RWAs seemingly do not realize any of this. One of the items, incidentally, goes, "I really have no failings I am reluctant to think about; I squarely face the truth about myself, whatever it is." (See Altemeyer, 1999.)

4. Many researchers instead do a median split for such analyses, thus lumping all the top half of a distribution together and comparing it with the lump of the bottom half. I find this hard to justify, since you are then saying a difference of one point in the distribution (at the median) matters enormously—it is the difference between being a "high" and a "low"—while a difference of 20, 30, or more points within the "high" or "low" lump means nothing. I adopted quartile comparisons some years ago (Altemeyer, 1981, p. 229) to get at least some spread between the lowest "high" and the highest "low," without throwing away most of the sample for the comparison.

When referring to the upper quartile of an SDO or RWA distribution hereafter, the word "High" shall appear with an upper case "H." When referring to persons who score highly on these scales in a more general sense, "high" appears with a lower case "h," as it has previously in the present article.

Incidentally, when speaking of "High RWAs," "High SDOs," and "Double Highs," I am not conceptualizing a *type* of personality. These are just persons who score in the upper quartile of continuously distributed variables.

5. Some readers may be itching for multiple regression analyses of the data, but they are not particularly germane to an inquiry about Double Highs. For example, in the Autumn 1996 student study summarized in Table 2, social dominance correlated .666 with ethnocentrism, while right-wing authoritarianism correlated .379. A multiple regression analysis showed that together the two predictors (which correlated themselves but .108) explained 53.9% of the variance in ethnocentrism scores. However this tells us nothing precise about the Double Highs themselves, since the combined predictive power of the two scales is also due to the ethnocentrism of Low SDO and Low RWA respondents, and of the "Middles." Thus I have eschewed multiple regression analyses, and focused on what is going on in the high ends of the distributions, so we can see how much the Double Highs are like their brother dominators who are not authoritarians, and like their brother authoritarians who are not dominators.

I have also eschewed supplying sample sizes and standard deviations for the 204 means reported in Tables 2–13, and the significance values of various tests performed, to keep the tables from becoming totally unreadable. But to give one a feel for these values, in this same Autumn 1996 study, 22 of the 362 students were Double Highs (SDO > 50 and RWA > 147 in that sample). Their mean Ethnocentrism score of 90.2 had a standard deviation of 28.6. There were 64 High SDOs who were not also High RWAs, and the standard deviation of their Ethnocentrism scores equaled 23.9. Seventy other students were High RWAs but not High SDOs, and the standard deviation of their ethnocentrism scores was 18.9. The 206 students in the Rest of the Sample had an *SD* equal to 21.7. The *t* value of the difference between the Double Highs' 90.2 and the Rest of the SDOs' 86.5 was 0.54, clearly nonsignificant, while that for the Double Highs versus the Rest of the RWAs equaled 3.49, which is significant beyond the .001 level. And the difference between the Double Highs and the Rest of the Sample is even more significant (*t* = 5.54). Hence the designation in Table 2 that, in this study, the Double Highs were not significantly more ethnocentric than the rest of the social dominators, but they were significantly more ethnocentric than the rest of the right-wing authoritarians and the rest of the sample.

REFERENCES

Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-Wing Authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.

Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of Freedom*: *Understanding Right-Wing Authoritarianism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The Authoritarian Specter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Altemeyer, B. (1998). The Other "Authoritarian Personality." In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 30, pp. 47–92). San Diego: Academic Press.

Altemeyer, B. (1999). To thine own self be untrue: Self-awareness in authoritarians. *North American Journal of Psychology, 1,* 157–164.

Altemeyer, B. (2001). Changes in attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality, 42,* 63–75.

Altemeyer, B. (2002). Dogmatic behavior among students: Testing a new measure of dogmatism. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 142,* 713–721.

Altemeyer, B. (2003a). What happens when authoritarians inherit the earth: A simulation. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 3,* 161–169.

Altemeyer, B. (2003b). Why do religious fundamentalists tend to be prejudiced? *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 13,* 17–28.

Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest and prejudice. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 2,* 113–133.

Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (1997). *Amazing conversions*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Press.

Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (2004). A revised Religious Fundamentalism Scale: The short and sweet of it. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 14,* 47–54.

McCourt, K., Bouchard, T. J., Lykken, D. T., Tellegen, A., & Keyes, M. (1999). Authoritarianism revisited: Genetic and environmental influences in twins reared apart and together. *Personality and Individual Differences, 27,* 985–1014.

McFarland, S. G., & Adelson, S. (1996, July). *An omnibus study of personality, values, and prejudice.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

Pratto, F. (1999). The puzzle of continuing group inequality: Piecing together the psychological, social, and cultural forces in social dominance theory. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 31, pp. 191–263). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social Dominance Orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67,* 741–763.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: The Free Press.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Son Hing, L. S., Bobocel, D. R., & Zanna, M. P. (2002, June). *High SDO leaders and High RWA followers: A lethal union for unethical decision making.* Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.